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 SEMINAR

Wednesday
March 15, 2006

Taubman 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

ADVANCE SERVICES
Franklin, Massachusetts
(508) 520-2076

I N D E X



I N D E X

P R O C E E D I N G S

(9:08 a.m.)

MR. JONES: Welcome to the second phase of our Goldsmith Award celebration and ceremony. Today's program is really one of the most interesting aspects of it, I think, for those of us who do this and look forward to this every year. Because this is the time when the investigative reporters, whose work we have admired, get the chance to talk about doing this kind of work. In this particular situation, there may be some difficulty there. I don't expect Dana Priest to give us all her tradecraft, for instance. But I do hope that all of you sitting at this table will talk as candidly as you can about how you did what you did.

And what we are going to do is just simply go around the table, your, if you are a team, then maybe one or two of you could do the talking, but what we are really interested in, in this sort of initial round robin, is to hear how you went about doing what you did, and what difficulties you ran into and how you dealt with them.

Let's start, if I may, with *The Toledo Blade*, the group that did the Coingate stories. Do you have a designated speaker?

Mike?

MR. WILKINSON: Well a couple of us will speak. The story dates back to a tip that we got at the paper from a social friend, and it was fairly simple, and it turned out to be untrue that Tom Noe, our coin dealer, was buying gold for the State of Ohio. Now that was real interesting because he was such a powerful player in Republican politics. And the tip was that the state treasury bought a certain amount of gold every year and he was placing the order. Well that would be the easiest money you would ever make, if you were a gold buyer, you wouldn't, there is no skill involved in just buying gold.

I then passed along to Jim, who works in our Columbus Bureau, and he likewise thought it was a good tip, and he called around to all the people, are the regular suspects, the treasury, the pension boards in Ohio, and he didn't buy gold for the State of Ohio, it was not true. But then Jim, being a veteran of the Columbus Bureau, said, well, there is another a big pot of money in Columbus and that's the Bureau of Worker's Compensation, and he called them up and he said no, he doesn't buy gold for us, he buys rare coins for us. (Laughter)

MR. WILKINSON: And at that point, the process started of trying to extract information with using a public records requests, interviews, developing

it from there. And then just, once we finally ran the story, what it generated was a level of success in tips that I have never seen before in the business. Almost every tip we got was good, a lot of people wanted to talk about a lot of things surrounding both the person and the administration. And it was just a simple case, many times, of just going out and talking to as many people as possible, filing FOIA requests and just pursuing the story, at a time when a lot of people thought we were wrong to do it.

The governor came into our office four days after the story ran and challenged us, why are we beating up on this guy? He is on the Board of Regents, I put him on the head of the universities in the state, he is on the turnpike commission. He doesn't have a college degree but he was directing higher education policy, to an extent. And he came in and just said it's making money, what's the problem? Well the problem was it wasn't making money and *The Blade*, through it's efforts of our publisher, our attorneys, sued to get public records, at one point finally putting the state in opposition with Mr. Noe.

They had been defending him for the longest time, and then Mr. Noe stopped even giving the state records and, at that point, it all started to change. Search warrants were executed and then, on May

26th, as I am standing outside of his business, as a flock of people are going through his business with a toothpick, but with a search warrant, Jim calls me up and he says, Mike, I just got a tip that Noe has acknowledged that $10 to $12 million is missing, and I'm like okay. And then he calls me back 20 minutes later and said that tip is true, and at that point, everything changed.

MR. JONES: How much of this story was journalistic digging? How much of it was getting inside information about the federal investigation? How do you sort of see *The Toledo Blade's* journalistic role in this story now?

MR. WILKINSON: Well I mean a lot of it was just simply making calls, getting lists of people. Jim, having been in Columbus for eight years, covering state government, had a depth of sourcing that I don't have. I'm in Toledo, I'm kind of a project editors, projects reporter and editor, and he had these contacts that he had developed for so long that it made it so much easier to get at this, people trusted him. People who wouldn't take my calls, they didn't know me, took his calls, but I think one of the things that made the story take off was in the face of all, of everyone saying it's not a story, we persevered with the support of our editors pushing us.

They kept saying they made a profit and the state kept saying they made a profit, they gave us a check of $3 million. What we know is, Chris can tell you more about coins, you've got to prove that. It's not like you got one share of Proctor & Gamble and it goes from $10 to $20, you made a profit, you've got to prove it, and they wouldn't show us the records, and we kept pushing and pushing. And the Supreme Court came down on our side, after five justices had recused themselves because they had gotten so much of Mr. Noe's money. They had to get another Supreme Court for the state.

He gave so many people money, so many people couldn't deal with this, but it was that pressure that opened up the broader story, and that is still unfolding. We just got a tip today that one of the judges golfs with Mr. Noe, so the federal judge hearing this case might be a golf partner.

MR. JONES: When the story got to the governor, how funky was that?

MR. WILKINSON: When the story got where?

MR. JONES: To the governor, I mean when it got, when all of a sudden it was the governor who was--

MR. WILKINSON: I'll give that to Jim.

MR. DREW: Well he had, when he came to

*The Blade* to defend the investment, he was just very adamant about, basically said that, he had accused *The Blade* of having a vendetta against Mr. Noe and he said: "you ought to praise him, for Christ's sake". But the state government, which has been dominated by one political party since the early `90s, didn't deserve praise, it deserved a watchdog and the press was the only institution that could play that role. So I mean this scandal enveloped the governor and four of his top aides, it's let to sweeping reform in Ohio, in terms of the Ohio Bureau of Worker's Compensation.

MR. JONES: And it will never happen again.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: *The Toledo Blade* is owned by a family, this is a difficult time for newspapers, economically, there is so much change in the air. I was talking with some of you guys before we started this about the morale and the sort of attitude in your newsroom, and I was told that morale is very high, and that there is a lot of confidence in the ownership and so forth. I wonder if you consider yourself a very rare exception or do you, when you see colleagues, who are other investigative reporters around the country and so forth, how do you find taking the temperature of the newspaper industry and journalism, investigative

journalism, in particular, where do you feel it is right now?

MR. WILKINSON: Well because of our situation and our commitment that we have made to this kind of work, and we did a story on Vietnam atrocities a couple of years ago that many people are aware of. Two years before that, we did something on the beryllium industry. This isn't the only story we've ever done of this scope, it's a commitment that the paper has made and if you have newsem.org, which I'm sure a lot of you do, and you look at papers our size, you don't see that on Sundays. I am always amazed when I look and even papers that are much bigger than ours in Ohio, I keep waiting, where is the big investigative hit?

That you are going to be coming with a great picture of the boats in the bay on a sunny day, really a dynamic photo, but where is the story? And we are lucky, I think, because we are in a perilous time, I'm not sure, three years from now, we will be able to say that we are still in this position, because of what's going on in the industry. I hope it's not just *The Posts* and *The Times* that are able to do this kind of work, but we are quite fortunate that we have made this commitment, and it seems that it will continue.

MR. JONES: Thank you, thank you very

much.

Let's go on to *The Copley News Service*, Randy `Duke' Cunningham's story. Who would like to speak for your group?

MR. STERN: Well how about if I start. Our project was really in two phases, first was Cunningham, and the second part of it was looking at the systemic implications, which Jerry took more of a lead on earmarks.

MR. JONES: The grease the wheels part.

MR. STERN: Yes, exactly. I'll just tell you quickly a lot of people have asked me how did we get onto this story, and I don't want to make it sound like it was accidental, but it was, in a way, and there is no way around it. And it wasn't working hard with tips and so forth, it was actually going through the public domain, asking the wrong question but getting the right answer.

And essentially, Cunningham had taken two privately paid trips to Saudi Arabia, and I just couldn't understand why, and so I, his claim was that he was doing it to improve the relations between the two countries, and I was a little dubious about that. (Laughter)

MR. STERN: And so what I did is started just going through the public domain, the nexus records

and so forth, on all the folks who were involved that trip, that I knew about, and I really didn't get an answer to that. But the last thing I did, which is a sort of pretty standard step to take, is I looked to see if he had upgraded his living accommodations, and it turned out that, according to the San Diego County records, he had purchased a house, a year and a half earlier, for $2.55 million, which, and he had come to Washington without a whole lot, he didn't bring a lot of money to Washington.

So my next thought was, well, you know, the San Diego housing market is really hot, maybe he just made a lot of money off of the house he sold, and I looked, and sure enough, he had sold it for $1.675 million, and I said, well, I guess that's maybe doable, maybe the house was worth that and maybe that was enough for him to by this mansion in Rancho Santa Fe. But I looked and it turned out that he had sold his house, that house, to something called 1523 New Hampshire Avenue, Inc., which sounded like a Washington address.

So I did some more searching and I saw that it was a company registered in Nevada to a man named Mitchell Wade, who had another company registered in Nevada named MZM, which happened to be headquartered at that address, 1523 New Hampshire Avenue, Inc. And

so I looked up, I hate to say it, but Google, for MZM, and lo and behold, they were boasting about how they suddenly, about the time of the house sale, although they didn't mention that, they just said, 2002, they started getting tens of millions of dollars in contracts, defense contracts.

So that was basically how we got onto it and it was pretty clear, at that point, that he was probably going to go to jail. But anyway, but the challenge was to take it beyond just Cunningham, which is what Jerry did.

MR. KAMMER: Thanks.

Yeah, on the basis of working with Mark a little bit on his early stories, we became aware of the earmarking avenue of this. Obviously Duke Cunningham was getting earmarks from Mitch Wade and MZM, and we also became aware of Cunningham's work getting earmarks for a San Diego businessman named Brent Wilkes, who had a document conversion company and we, just by checking public disclosure records, we became aware of his lobbyist, a former San Diego Congressman named Bill Lowery.

And Lowery was forced into retirement in 1992, after redistricting. He and Cunningham, both incumbents, were going to be facing off in a primary. Cunningham was going to highlight some of Lowery's

peccadillos in the past, his close relationship, very cozy relationship with a savings and loan crook, Don Dickson, of Vernon, aka "Vermin" Savings and Loan of Texas.

(Laughter)

MR. KAMMER: And so Cunningham's campaign slogan, running against Bill Lowery, was going to be showing the public that Duke was a Congressman we could be proud of, that will give you some idea of how good Bill Lowery was. Well Lowery retires and becomes a lobbyist, and we see him specializing in getting earmarks from Jerry Lewis, not Dean Martin's good buddy but the man who was now Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. Lowery and his lobbying firm specialized in getting earmarks, something that has exploded onto the Republican control of Congress.

Earmarks have been around forever but, under the Delay-Hastert regime, it became a way of raising money.

MR. JONES: Explain what earmarks are.

MR. KAMMER: There are actually several definitions, the most common definition is a project inserted into an appropriations bill. Frequently, in conference reports, not done with any sort of transparency at all, and one of the astonishing things we saw was just how clandestine, how opaque this

process is, and it continues that way. It's basically an incumbency protection plan that, it was frustrating trying to get Dems to talk about the Republicans, I thought that I would get members and their staffs to talk about Duke Cunningham, you know, wanting to turn on a Republican, it was very difficult to do because they are all beneficiaries.

They engaged in what we jokingly called a mutual pork protection pact, because it's very good for the members, and it's good for the districts and for those who get the earmarks. It's a phenomenon that concentrates benefits and disperses costs throughout the budget, so it's, politically, it works wonderfully, and so these guys want to protect that.

It reminds me of the savings and loans scandal, I spent four years on Charlie Keating, that was a scandal that grew out of Congressional action in the savings and loan industry that privatized gain and socialized loss with the S&Ls, so I'm beginning to see a certain motis operandi here at Congress.

But to get back to the earmarking part of this, we just began pulling records, public records and disclosure forms for this lobbying firm, and saw this astonishing connection involving people who worked for Jerry Lewis and then went to work for Bill Lowery as lobbyists, and one guy is recently going back to Jerry

Lewis as Deputy Staff Director of the House Appropriations Committee. We came to the conclusion really that the House Appropriations Committee and Bill Lowery's office basically seemed to be extensions of one another, and wrote extensively about the earmarks that Lowery got through Lewis and the connections to Brent Wilkes, one of the unindicted co-conspirators, and it was all basically following up on what Mark launched with his Duke Cunningham House story.

MR. JONES: My sense is that the Copley Family and *The San Diego Union Tribune* is essentially a Republican newspaper, am I correct in that?

(Laughter)

MR. KAMMER: As an editorial policy, absolutely, it's very Republican. Politics never entered into this, I think we were both thrilled at that, and I worked at *The Arizona Republic*, which is now owned by Gannett. Gannett doesn't do this type of stuff anymore, we wouldn't have, my friends at *The Republic* don't have the resources that *Copley* made available to us.

MR. JONES: Explain that.

MR. JONES: Well *Copley* is privately owned, they don't have to operate under the logic of the quarterly report, they are not concerned about the stock price. David Copley is a guy who has a sense of

*noblesse oblige*, of serving the public. Gannett plants its flag and establishes colonies. Arizona, my second home, a state where I lived for 25 years, it's a newspaper colony. The purpose of a colony is not to serve the inhabitants, it's the generate profits for the home country. In this case, the home country is in McLean, Virginia at Gannett Headquarters.

So I'm proud to work for an organization that believes in going after a story, and politics, I don't think politics ever entered into what we did, Marc?

MR. STERN: Let me say, first of all, that, editorially, they did support Duke Cunningham throughout his career, on the editorial pages, and the paper, the newsroom, turned around, and it didn't hesitate at all, put all their resources in this. They are more concerned about serving a role as a watchdog and establishing their identity as a watchdog with community. But the thing that, the Washington, we are in the Washington Bureau for *Copley News Service*, and we are sort of different, we are a different company from the papers.

And we have, we just have a lot of freedom, essentially, to do whatever we want, so we are really like that way, and it's the kind of thing that should be, I sometimes think we are sort of more of a

think tank than a daily paper, we don't have to feed the beast so much. Some of the people in the bureau do, but not everybody.

MR. JONES: When you think about the Copley organization, and especially San Diego, which is the flagship, and you read about Knight-Ridder and what's happening in the industry, again, let me ask you the same question I asked the guys from *The Toledo Blade*, what's the morale? What's the, is it optimistic? Is it frightened? Is it concerned? What do you think?

MR. KAMMER: Every night I say a prayer for the health of David Copley.

(Laughter)

MR. KAMMER: If we are bought by Gannett, I'm jumping off the Charles River Bridge in February. We really want the paper to stay under the type of ownership it now has and we fear that we will be brought into the belly of the beast, and I think perhaps that's inevitable. Well that does seem to be the way of the world.

MR. JONES: Have the Copley family cut back on news budgets at all or is that pretty much something that has not happened there?

MR. STERN: That has not happened yet, and maybe it will, they are sometimes a little behind the

trends, the business trends, but that's partly because they are family owned.

And the other thing I would say, in addressing your question, is that the business side is always a concern but I see, within the newsroom and the way the newsroom budgets are handled, sometimes it makes me think it's not so much how much you have in the way of resources, it's how you use them. And some of our, I'm actually the news editor, so I visit all of our papers, and the news editor in the Washington Bureau, and some are better than others, but I see that some papers keep their people really busy every day, covering press conferences and doing the little things, the little things, it's sort of like they are running, and they are looking at their feet and they never have time to stop, slow down, and look and think. And so I think some of the newsrooms could be a lot more effective if they changed their philosophy, their way of doing business every day.

MR. JONES: Is the idea that that has to be done and there is nothing left over for the other or that one would be swapped for the other?

MR. STERN: I'm sorry, I didn't understand that.

MR. JONES: The idea, for instance, you've got one of those newspapers where people run around

like crazy and you have a choice, you could have them stop running around like crazy and basically not get what they would have gotten by running around like crazy, or you can substitute some of that running around for something else. I mean you, or you can add people, which is pretty unlikely it seems.

MR. STERN: Well I don't understand that need to feed the beast or that urgency because there are so many wires, there is so much news out there. The world is covered, the daily news is covered really well.

MR. JONES: Local news?

MR. STERN: Not necessarily the local news and--

MR. JONES: I thought that's what they were running around covering.

MR. STERN: That is what they are running around covering and I guess I would argue they can do a better job if they slow down.

MR. JONES: Interesting.

MR. STERN: And just to be a little more thoughtful about how they approach it. I think some of the are just too, they are on a treadmill.

MR. JONES: What about things like having news staff assigned to do special section work and things like that, is there a lot of that?

MR. STERN: I'm in a bureau, I don't--

MR. JONES: Well this is something that happens at newspapers, especially mid-sized newspapers, increasingly, because that's a way to sell some advertising and news, it's not unlike what you are talking about, a slight variation on that.

The guardian story, *The Los Angeles Times*, I don't think there is any, I can tell you that when we were judging these things, no story sort of rocked our boats quite like that one, because all of us sort of had the there but for fortune go I feeling that, one day or another, we might end up in a situation like that.

And we were appalled to find out, I mean, frankly, the fact that there are crooked politicians on the take was not a shock, quite the way that it was to think of people, that you've never even seen, taking over your life in this kind of guardianship scam. Talk a bit about how you got it. I mean you were telling me last night, Evelyn, that you worked on this story for three years, that is a concept that I think is pretty astonishing, in and of itself.

MS. LARRUBIA: We didn't intend to work on it for three years.

(Laughter)

MS. LARRUBIA: It's one of those things

that happens where three months turns into a year, turns into two years, turns into three.

MR. LEONARD: They said months, right? Three months?

(Laughter)

MS. LARRUBIA: They said three months. In our case, we didn't have a tip, we didn't have a crooked politician, we didn't have somebody giving us the goods, we knew about this industry and we were concerned about it. And we did the thing that not a lot of papers have the time to do but, fortunately, *The L.A. Times* does, which is we took a look and we took a real look. We looked at more than 2,500 case files, every case file from Southern California, five counties, seven years. We were, there were moments when Jack and I were in a Long Beach courthouse, and you could see the files and you couldn't see us, and probably the drudgery of that was one of the more difficult parts of it.

And then you would come upon a file where someone had, clearly their life had been taken over, and then they knew nothing about it, and a relative had later found out and had come in and tried to undo it, and you got what John Carroll called the fire in the belly. And it really sort of reminded us of how important it is to do these kinds of stories, to speak

for the vulnerable people who cannot speak for themselves and who were having the most fundamental of their rights or liberty taken away without even knowing about it.

MR. JONES: Explain how this is set up at *The L.A. Times*. I mean do you work for an investigative unit? Do you work, I mean how does this work? How do you get assigned to a story that takes three years?

MR. LEONARD: Things have obviously changed in the last three years. What happened was, back then, there was no investigative team, there is now, so things will probably be a little bit different, but there was a lot of collaboration between reporters who are not on the team and reporters who are. And all three of us who were involved, plus Molly Moore, who is here too, a researcher here for *The Times*, who helped build our database, none of us were truly investigative reporters, we were all covering a beat at the time.

MR. JONES: But, for instance, what were the beats that you represented?

MR. LEONARD: Well the reason why we got onto this, Robin Fields, she was covering state government and she had just come off the census where she had covered issues involving the very elderly, people who were 100 years or older, and when she

started covering state government, she saw a minor bill going through the legislature that involved professional conservators. And I guess what's different from our story from a lot of others is when I got a call asking if I would be interested in helping out, I didn't know what a conservator was, I had never heard of one, I think most people at the paper hadn't heard of one.

And so it was more, our struggle was to understand what this profession was about and we didn't really have any traditional places to turn for that either. Usually, there is a watchdog agency, or there is a government regulating agency or there are sources who are keeping up with it, all the sources, for us, were inside players, they were the conservators themselves, their attorneys, judges who perpetuated the kind of misconduct that we found. And so we had to, we understood a criminal case file or a civil case file but we didn't, I had never seen a probate case file or understood really how it worked. So we had to really immerse ourselves in that to understand how the process worked before we could finally see what was really wrong with it.

I guess, at the paper, I was covering crime. You were covering the county, I think, right? It was just a question of pulling the resources

together to, people who would be energetic and were prepared to do some drudgery for a while. I think that still goes on, it's, I'm working on an investigative story now, even though I cover L.A. County government, which will take a couple of months. So, at a paper like the--

MS. LARRUBIA: Yeah, sure it will take a couple months.

(Laughter)

MR. LEONARD: At a paper like *The L.A. Times*, we can afford to use the resources, we are very lucky.

MR. JONES: Do you have sort of ongoing duties as you do this simultaneously or is this basically something that your, whatever your normal duties might be are suspended while you are doing this?

MR. LEONARD: Well, on this story, they were suspended, for the most part. I got pulled in to cover L.A. County government for about six months, a year before the final publication, but you know, off and on for about seven or eight months, and Robin Fields is working on the Getty stories. I don't know if you are aware of those.

MR. JONES: Oh, yeah.

MR. LEONARD: But you were pretty much full time and Robin was almost full time. But it was,

I mean three and a half years is pretty unusual, even--

MR. JONES: Oh, I would say so, yes.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: It's unprecedented, in my experience, almost.

MR. LEONARD: If we can go a lifetime without doing that again, that would be fine.

MR. JONES: Did you have sort of editors who would come by every six months and say how long do you think?

MR. LEONARD: I think so, yeah. I mean we had, we were lucky enough we work with John, when he was there, and John was constantly asking where is it, what's going on, and was very hands on, especially towards the end.

MS. LARRUBIA: Can I just take that? We never felt that we were in a, that we had to rush it, we never had the pressure of you've got to get the story in the paper, why isn't it ready, what else do you need to do. We had, in some cases, in some meetings, the opposite, where we were sort of jazzed, there was one case, in particular, it turned out to be the third day story, of one professional conservator who was victimizing veterans primarily. And we found a lot of really original things, just through our own reporting, in that case.

And at one point, we were advocating to just break it out, just put the story out there, and let the tips come flooding in and see what comes from that. And the feeling was that it was such an integral part of the series that we wanted to run the series, that, no. And there were some meetings with editors where they, did you look at this, did you look at that? We never felt that we were being limited and told you cannot do that, we must get the story in the paper, we always felt that we had the full support of our editors at *The Times* to really get to the bottom of it and to get it, and to do it right.

MR. JONES: Let me ask you the same question I've asked the other folks. Give me a temperature reading at the, of the newsroom of *The Los Angeles Times*. We are, at the Shorenstein Center, the beneficiaries of John Carroll's decision to leave. There have been news stories about cuts in the newsroom and a re-sort of orienting of the news gathering idea. What's going on there and how has the Knight-Ridder sale hit you guys?

MR. LEONARD: There was, I don't think it's any secret about *The L.A. Times*' relationship with *Tribune*, at least in the, for reporters, there is an enormous sense of distrust of our parent company because of newsroom cuts. Having said that, I've never

felt the paper stray from its commitment for investigative reporting. The current editor, who was managing editor under John Dean Bekay, I think has made investigative reporting a top priority, not just in teams but of beats. I think the sense is that this is something that only news papers will provide and so, if we are to survive, that we should provide readers with these kinds of services.

I don't know about the Knight-Ridder, have you got a sense?

MS. LARRUBIA: I mean people were talking about it, but some of that was kind of breaking, as we were actually flying out here, so we haven't --.

MR. JONES: If the *Tribune* company decided you just weren't worth the trouble and decided to sell, would that be a popular decision?

MS. LARRUBIA: It depends on who they sold us to.

(Laughter)

MR. LEONARD: They would be selling--

MR. JONES: David Geffen? I don't know.

MS. LARRUBIA: There has been actually, I mean that's one of the rumors that's been going around for a long time, you know, we weren't the cash cow they thought we were going to be with this idea of national advertising, Chicago, New York, L.A. It hasn't quite

worked out and maybe they will sell *The L.A. Times*, maybe we are just too expensive, like an Italian car or something.

MR. JONES: Spoiled.

MS. LARRUBIA: Yeah, but it's, you know, this is just what people talk about, we don't really get any information about what's going on in Chicago.

MR. JONES: Were you there during the Mark Willis time? Both of you?

MR. LEONARD: I was there for a few years then.

MR. JONES: And what was that like, compared to now?

MS. LARRUBIA: Boy--

MR. JONES: Mark Willis, for those of you who don't know, Mark Willis was the executive from General Foods who became publisher of *The Los Angeles Times* without knowing anything about newspapers, and ran it in a, basically with the belief that a business is a business and you run it based on metrics that make sense, and so forth and so on. He got himself in very bad trouble and was eventually removed, but that prompted the sale of the paper to the *Tribune* Company.

MS. LARRUBIA: I mean we all knew his nickname was the cereal killer because of--

(Laughter)

MS. LARRUBIA: I've got to say I never had any personal contact with him but, you know, the Staples scandal where there was a special section, you talked earlier about special sections, that, I'm sure you all know about it, sort of involved the placing of stories with advertisement. That was kind of an embarrassing time for all of us and we were, there was a lot of anger in the newsroom over how that was handled and who knew what. And yes, as you say, it led to a lot of changes at the top, rightfully so.

But I mean even back then, *The L.A. Times* is a big place and it's a serious news organization with serious people doing serious journalism, and even back then, I did not have the sense that we were all there for the advertisers or anything else. We were certainly sort of concerned at who was leading us, and there was not a lot of respect, but it wasn't as if you felt it in your day to day job.

MR. JONES: Jim Risen and Eric Lichtblau, can you talk about your story?

(Laughter)

MR. RISEN: I just wanted to apologize in advance for the fact that we are about to be very opaque about everything. But I can just say that Eric and I both work at the Washington Bureau of *The Times*, and by coincidence, we sit next to each other. And we

started working together on this story because we, after kind of comparing notes and realizing we were both hearing about the same thing, and it's been a great collaboration with Eric, we really, Dana may describe later the fact that there is now an FBI leak by the, a serious, maybe the most serious leak investigation I've ever seen, under way right now, about our story, I think it constrains what we can say about almost anything related to how we got this story, because I know for a fact that they, the Justice Department, the FBI, follows what we say in public and they are very curious about everything.

So, with that, I can just say that, what I've said in public before, which is that the people who talked to us did so, I think, for all the right reasons, because they believed that this program was illegal and possibly unconstitutional. And there were people throughout the government who just believed that this was, they were going too far with this, and so that's, I'll leave it at that.

Maybe Eric can add some things.

MR. LICHTBLAU: Yeah, as Jim indicated, unfortunately we are kind of restrained on what we can say. I think one point you are obviously very interested in, in kind of the mechanics of how this work, one point worth highlighting is that, unlike a

lot of investigative stories, there were no documents in this case. A lot of the reporting that we all do is document driven. I cover the Justice Department and law enforcement for the most part, and there is a comfort level when you have documents in your hand, that you know you are right about things when it's in black and white.

This was a story that was exclusively source driven, and as Jim said, these are sources who were in some jeopardy for even talking about what they were talking about. But the fact that the program was so classified, the Attorney General said it was the most classified program in the government, means that there were literally no documents that were available to us, and so there is a certain nervousness when you are dealing solely with human sources, as the intel community likes to call them, rather than documents.

MR. JONES: The thing about this particular situation that you find yourselves in is that this is both a legal issue and a political issue, and while the legal vulnerability has got to be very uncomfortable, with the FBI mounting this and the administration doing what they are doing, has though, a counterweight in I think a widespread belief that this is a story that should have been reported and it was appropriate to be reported. Last night of course

speaks for itself, in terms of what the judges of the Goldsmith Award indicated they thought.

How do you see the sort of political dimension of this playing out? Do you think that is going to create some restraints, constraints, reluctance, on the part of the FBI, to really pursue this with the kind of vehemence that might otherwise be there without that kind of political attitude. Because basically, what the FBI is going to be working in service of is that we should not have known about this, and there are not a hell of a lot of people, I think, in the public, or at least there are many people in the public who do not feel that way. This is not like the Judy Miller case, this is something that seems to be pretty clearly black and white, in journalistic terms.

MR. RISEN: Well I hope that the FBI feels the same way you do about this.

(Laughter)

MR. RISEN: I don't think they do though.

You know, there are leak investigations all the time in Washington, the CIA once told me, after, in fact in the middle of the Plame thing, the CIA PR office told me that they couldn't, it was interesting that CIA management couldn't understand why the Plame thing became such a bid deal politicly because they refer something like 50 leaks a year to

the Justice Department, and it's really routine for them. And so almost none of them ever go anywhere, the leak investigations, and that's the odd thing about the Plame case, in my opinion, is that this is like the first time America has discovered the fact that there are leaks in Washington and that there are leak investigations.

And in fact, most people will tell you that every, that the Justice Department, the FBI, they do leak investigations all the time knowing that they are not going to go anywhere, and Plame was different because you had a special prosecutor and a criminal case that involved the White House, and you had this obsessed prosecutor who just didn't care about the niceties of the press. And so it's difficult to tell, now, which of those dynamics from the past are going to take hold. You have this history where the FBI has always had this understanding that they'll do leak investigations, and then they kind of dribble away and nothing happens.

But then you have this Plame case where suddenly they did something and they broke all the precedents, and so it's hard to tell whether the, which side of that is going to continue, which tradition.

MR. JONES: But in the Plame case, the charges had nothing to do with leaking, they had only

to do with lying. I've compared what *The Times* did, in your case, with the Pentagon Papers, and I think people sometimes are unaware or forget that when the Supreme Court made its decision in favor of *The Times*, it was only along the lines that the government was not able to keep *The Times* from publishing, prior restraint was the issue. But in the ruling, the judges opened the door to pursuing *The Times* under the Espionage Act, which the Nixon Administration elected not to do.

They did go after Daniel Ellsberg and they didn't succeed there either. In other words, there is not a lot of history for pursuing these kinds of situations when the information itself is of debatable genuine secrecy, but highly embarrassing politically, which does not necessarily make a great case, especially in the court of public opinion.

Do you feel and do you think *The Times* feels supported by the rest of the media, supported in general by the public or do you think you guys are really hanging out there alone?

MR. RISEN: Well I think it's mixed. I mean we've got a lot of people who, there is an organized hate mail campaign against us, I get like five or ten letters a day. The Accuracy in Media has started--

MR. JONES: Oh, God.

MR. RISEN: --organized hate mail against me, in particular, which is kind of flattering, I guess. But the paper has been very supportive and it seems the rest of the industry has been very supportive. I think, to me, the funny thing is is I think the only secret we revealed is the fact that they were avoiding the law. And everybody knows that they eavesdrop on terrorists, the only thing we said was that they were doing it around FISA. So I think the story is very defensible, from a national security standpoint, but the Bush Administration doesn't agree with me on that.

MR. JONES: Well I mean I'm thinking out loud here. Is there a single news organization that has editorialized against you?

MR. LICHTBLAU: No, I think the media has kind of rallied around this case because they realize, as you were suggesting earlier, that compared to the Judy Miller saga, where I think, by the end, the paper and the media realized that we were holding too firmly to a principle where there was a bad set of facts behind it, and there was at least the perception that we were defending a political, we were going to jail for a political smear campaign. In this case, I think the media in general and the paper feel that the facts are really on our side. If there ever was a great test

case of the media's constitutional responsibilities, this is a pretty good one.

MR. JONES: And do you think that there is any appetite in Congress to pursue this?

MR. LICHTBLAU: As far as a shield law you mean or--

MR. JONES: No, I mean in terms of going after you guys, and prolonging this and making this a huge cause celebre.

MR. LICHTBLAU: Sure. Any number of republicans who have gone after us, I mean, you know, it's a pitched battle on both sides.

MR. RISEN: If you follow closely the hearings in the Senate Judiciary Committee, when Gonzales was testifying, several Republicans asked him how vigorously he was going to pursue and John Cornin, I think, in particular, asked him whether he was going to apply the Espionage Act against us.

MR. JONES: Now your turn, guys. I know that you have, especially you, Dana, are, you are facing some of the same stuff. Let me in fact just go directly to you and then we'll come around to the Abramoff story. When you look at your own situation on your own very sensitive story, with its own vulnerabilities, legally, where are you right now in that regard?

MS. PRIEST: Well, to the best of my knowledge, I am not in the situation that *The Times* is in because it's an investigation the agency is pursuing within the agency. They have, as Jim said, referred it to the Justice Department, and to the best of my knowledge they have not taken it up, they could do that in the future. So what they are doing is a lot of interviews and polygraphing in the CIA of people, and similar to his case, they I think are waiting for me to help them out in some way, inadvertently.

And my husband has the best analogy for this, he says, because when my story came out, similar calls for investigation, their story hadn't come out yet, and I had the House and Senate leaders on a press conference calling for an investigation, and a lot of the hate mail, and Bennett on the TV, and the vice president and all that. So he says it's like having been stopped by a cop for speeding, and the cop is writing you a ticket, and then some guy goes by at a hundred miles an hour, and he says, oh, wait a minute.

(Laughter)

MR. LICHTBLAU: You're welcome.

(Laughter)

MS. PRIEST: See you later.

(Laughter)

MS. PRIEST: Which is fine with me.

The other thing that's happened, on a different note, in this regard, a follow up note, is that outside of the United States, in Europe, this unleashed a huge reaction that continues today, which has both, sort of from public policy and educating the public, both good and bad to it. The bad, which is the more fun to talk about, is that it's, every reporter in national security in every country in Europe has now taken to following airplanes, and the cover work of the CIA has been so bad that's it not hard to do, once you get, and everybody has got these FAA or European flight records.

So we have now identified 40 planes or something with these tail numbers, so the media there is really on this frenzy of following planes everywhere, not focusing on the fact necessarily that you don't know what was in the plane that you are following. My favorite examples is the Austrian Air Force general who was forced by their media to stand up and talk about, to confirm the fact that one of these planes had flown over Austrian air space, not even landed in Austria but flown over Austrian air space.

So I think, in one regard, you know, I say that's the negative side because I think they are missing the point, and the point is not, or maybe they are maturing to the point where they will figure out

that the CIA has relationships in every European country, and I think that is a basic fact that is surprising right now to Europeans. And so, on the positive side, I think it has also had a lot of reporters and governments trying to figure out, well, what is our relationship to the CIA?

I have had talks with parliamentarians and other political figures, diplomats and others, in Europe, who expressed to me this idea that they are not sure what the relationship is, and so that's not a bad thing, if they are going to follow it up and if you understand, like I did and what was driving me to write that prison story but also the other stories in the packet, which have to do with foreign liaison work. You realize that in the War on Terrorism, foreign liaison work is where it's at, it's not the Pentagon firing missiles at a, I mean that's part of it.

But really the hard work, both good and controversial, gets done within the relationship between governments that are so far below the surface that when you start to look at it, you can get all the layers on top, including the political layer, including the parliamentary oversight committees, and certainly the public and even the defense level saying, well, we didn't know about this, or I don't know, saying I don't know, and they don't know. But it's not that that is

a, it's not that, it's that the systems are all set up to be that way.

Because the information is so closely guarded, the elected president and prime minister, or prime minister in each place, this is the tradition, that they don't inform, they don't inform a level below that and, therefore, there is ignorance all around.

MR. JONES: Talk, if you would, a little bit about what you know but you don't report. In other words, how you make the judgement about what is something that should be kept a secret, that you have learned, and something that is not.

MS. PRIEST: Well I think this is one of the more challenging issues for our business right now and so I think it's a really, it's a crucial question. Because if you agree that this relationship is where it's at on counterterrorism, and you need to know is it working, how is it working and then is it working effectively, you are going to enter a world in which there are things that you never thought of, and now you have to think about, as a reporter whose whole life has been spent putting things out, you have to think about the ramifications of doing that, whether you even know to think about that.

And then when you find out things, my editors aren't, they have not been reporters, the have

not been intelligence reporters, so you are now bringing it to people who otherwise, in other situations, are more experienced, theoretically, than you are but in fact don't have an experience in this category. So what we are doing, and I just had breakfast with Senator Graham and he is trying to do this here, in another way, is to help, is to start to educate ourselves more on how to think about these subjects.

So for instance, if you stumble upon a liaison relationship that is really fascinating and really important and if you report about it, is going to go away, what do you? I mean how do you even think about that question? Something that might not seem controversial that we are doing with another country, to me, might be controversial to someone in this room, so am I going to make that judgement by myself? I'm speaking, of course Len Downey makes the ultimate judgement on these kind of cases.

So I think that as more, hopefully more and more reporters and newspapers understand the crucial role of intelligence in this field, they will be trying to educate themselves so that they can participate in that kind of reporting. Because the opposite is this is too hard, it's too sensitive, let's go do something else, and then we are really missing

the ball because so much of what our country is doing now, in terms of counterterrorism, is in the intelligence arena.

MR. JONES: From your own personal perspective, talk about the revelation of Germany's intelligence operations helping the United States before the invasion of Iraq.

MS. PRIEST: By the time that got reported, I had so come to understand that the world is not how it seems, and it's not even not how it seems on one level below, where you might, I spent eight years writing about the Pentagon and there are a lot of secrets there, but they are nothing like the things that happen in between the services. So, by the time I heard about it, I was not surprised at all that the Germans, in this special, small, very contained relationship, would have done something with the knowledge of someone at the top, but that was totally contrary to what the public view of the relationship was.

One of my favorite stories in the packet that I did in this last year was a story "Dateline Paris", and it wasn't my favorite just because I went there but because it talked about how, at the very time that Rumsfeld was condemning the French and freedom fries were replacing french fries, that the French had

really been unbelievably cooperative with the Americans to the point of setting up a secret base in Paris, the only multinational counterterrorism base that operates to fuse intelligence between all the European countries, Canada and the U.S., and to find people, surveill them, capture them, kill them, whatever.

But the French had done this and they led us fly the Predator armed with Hellfires from their base in Jabudi. In other words, the world wasn't at all what it appeared and even for some reason that I don't quite understand, Rumsfeld was allowed to go out and put the relationship on the line, in a way, by really frontally bashing the French about this. And my lesson there is when people in the intel world would tell me that their relationships are beyond politics, and it could be a, it almost sounds like a cliche, it is actually really true, it really takes a big crisis to shake that relationship between the countries on the intelligence matters.

MR. JONES: So, in that light, how should we look at the relationship between the United States and Iran, at the moment?

MS. PRIEST: In terms of?

MR. JONES: Of things not being as they seem?

MS. PRIEST: Well, you know, things, hmm.

I think I would not be surprised if all sorts of countries are helping us understand what's going on in Iran or set up things to do whatever against Iran. But I don't have any sense that there is a, certainly not an intelligence relationship between the two countries. In fact, their service is one of the best at countering the U.S. and other European countries around the world.

MR. JONES: I want to ask you people from *The Washington Post* and also you guys at *The Times* the same question I asked the others. I know *The Post* announced newsroom cuts, *The Times* has already had some budget cutting, what do you think? I mean these are, *The L.A. Times*, *New York Times*, *Washington Post* are the places where the most important reporting, in the greatest quantity, takes place, that's just the facts. What's going to happen?

MS. PRIEST: Well I think there is some, ours was announced just last week and there is obviously a lot of angst in the news, there is some, I don't think there is a lot because we are a huge organization. What's going to happen, who is going to be cut. And they have said it's not going to be across the board, it will be more strategically initiated. And I do think there is a very firm commitment to investigative reporting so, in that sense, I do think *The Post* sees that as one of its main franchises and I

think we are lucky.

MS. SCHMIDT: And increasingly so. Actually, that is, Len Downey said specifically that investigative reporting would be one of the few areas that's not cut, and I think they see that as the way *The Post* can compete in the marketplace with everything that's shrinking. That's the one thing that we can do or one of several things actually that we can do that other people can't do, the bloggers can't do, as Jim Lehrer said last night. I think there is a strong recognition that that's our unique franchise.

MR. JONES: What about at *The Times*?

MR. LICHTBLAU: Well I think, luckily, we are in a slightly better position than other newspapers, we are treading water, when it comes to circulation, whereas a lot of other newspapers have seen pretty sharp declines, and we are actually hiring people. We did have a buyout last year that quite a few senior reporters took, but we've just hired a handful of new reporters, just in the Washington Bureau alone. And they are at least saying the right things, as far as commitment to investigative journalism and enterprise journalism.

And I think that's partly a reflection of the fact, as we've seen at Copley and elsewhere, that we are a family owned newspaper and we are a bit more

insulated from the corporate pressures than the Gannett and Knight-Ridder model.

MR. RISEN: I think the other factor today, at *The Times*, is that there is a reaction to the Judy Miller situation and the Jayson Blair situation in that I think there is now a growing recognition that this is our way out of it, to keep doing this kind of thing.

MR. JONES: Abramoff, a great story. Fortunately, I hope you are not being investigated by the FBI for it.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: Talk about, if you would, how that evolved and, you know, sort of how you started pulling those threads?

MS. SCHMIDT: Well I guess I'll start because I first heard about it in, well our first story appeared in February, 2004. And it was something I had been working on for several months, four or five months, I heard about it in the Fall of 2003. Basically, what I heard was this lobbyist, I had never heard of him before, was making millions and millions of dollars from Indian tribes, and I heard about it from another lobbyist who said, you know, what is this guy doing for these tribes? He is charging 10, 20 times more than the lobbyists he is displacing, he is

stealing these clients and what is he doing?

We quickly found out that he was working with this guy, Mike Scanlon, a former aide to Tom Delay, and it kind of went from there, and discovered how much money he was directing Indian tribes to give to members of Congress, mostly Republicans, and the tribes had not previously been big Republican donors. So that was the beginning and then, in 2004, we had a sit down with Abramoff for about an hour or so and, you know, by then, it was very clear that there was a big kickback scheme going on between him and Scanlon, and he had found sort of a perfect storm, a perfect niche.

The FBI doesn't investigate Indian tribes, unless it's a very unusual situation, so he was, he had a freedom to get in there and do whatever he wanted. He didn't have to, Mike Scanlon didn't disclose his fees because he was a public relations guy, so Abramoff was able to operate in secret there, and they split the profits.

From there, Jeff got involved with some of the--

MR. JONES: How did he deal with this sort of inquiry into what he was doing? Did he, was he, you know, being glorious enough to welcome the publicity, or what do you think?

MS. SCHMIDT: He had gotten very good

press up to then, and he had been, you know, touted as this big, new, Republican guy to reckon with on K Street. By the time I had that interview with him, he knew it was about to hit the fan in a big way, and he was fired two weeks later. But there was nothing, there was no stopping it, once the cork came out of the bottle, because he was at the center of this enormous enterprise with so many deals and so many machinations that were still, I mean to this day --. And I went to our editor at I guess it was the end of 2004 and said there are just so many leads and so many strands to this, if you put three reporters on this, we would be busy for six months, which is what he did and we are still busy.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: Jeff?

MR. SMITH: This was a happy convergence of interests. I wasn't, I got involved in the story because I was interested in Tom Delay, I just found him to be a fascinating character, a really very interesting politician who is very, very blatantly conducting a pay to play approach to policymaking on Capitol Hill and, literally, he was proud of it, he made it his signature. I had been overseas, as a reporter, when I came back to *The Washington Post* staff in 2002, and I just, it seemed like Washington was a

changed place, and the first few conversations I had with my editors about this was, well, this is what everybody does.

And they had been here, they had watched it grow in Washington, over a period of time, and it's like seeing a baby every day, you don't notice the changes but if you are away for a week, suddenly it seems very, very different. And it seemed very different to me than what it was before and I just wanted to get involved in writing about Tom Delay. And so I looked for opportunities to do that and there was a happy convergence in the form of Mr. Abramoff and his connections to Mr. Delay. And we very carefully figured out who was going to write about what, and then shared information as much as we could, and wound up finding a lot of the same connections between Delay and Abramoff, from two different directions.

MR. JONES: One of the shoes that I'm not sure whether it's going to drop or not, but I am very curious about what you think, what kind of an informer is Abramoff going to be?

MR. GRIMALDI: A difficult one. He was known to be a braggart and a liar. In fact he is a convicted liar now and that's a really difficult case. I mean he has been convicted of fraud. So everything that he gives the prosecutors has to be checked five or

six different ways, they have to have e-mail and documentation. If he says he gave a trip, or meals or contributions in exchange for an official action of some sort, they've got to make sure that that lawmaker or government official did the action, and they may have to be a kind of action that would be reverse of what that lawmaker normally would do, like a lawmaker voting, say, against an anti-gambling bill when they are using anti-gambling, or something of that effect, and then have to show the quid pro quo. A bribery case is a really difficult case to bring and surely any defense attorney is going to go after Jack Abramoff in a major way.

MR. JONES: Did he ever wear a wire?

MS. SCHMIDT: Not that we are aware of.

MR. JONES: What about the Duke?

MR. STERN: Well *Time Magazine* ran a story saying he did, but I'm pretty certain he did not and I think he has been of very little help. In fact he went off to jail crying but not singing, I mean he didn't--

(Laughter)

MR. STERN: He didn't tell us how much he actually took in bribes, he didn't tell us how much damage was done to the country and national security or how, he didn't talk about his co-conspirators, he didn't tell us how he manipulated the procurement

system or how he manipulated the appropriations system, so he wasn't too helpful.

MR. JONES: Was that a gentle prosecution then or did he get what they could have given him?

MR. STERN: They could have given him a few more months and I'm not sure why, I wasn't out there to cover the decision and I'm not sure what they took into account, but I think he could have faced ten and they gave him eight years and four months, and I think he can get 15 off for good behavior.

MR. JONES: So he had an incentive, hypothetically, to make a deal, if he could have. I mean eight years is a lot of time.

MR. KAMMER: Yeah, and if he is deemed by the prosecutors to have provided useful information and to have cooperated fully, he could get a downward departure, he could get some reduced time, and I think there is still hope that that will happen.

MR. JONES: What about in Abramoff's case?

MS. SCHMIDT: I think that's what he is hoping, but he has proven to be a little hard to control. As you can see, he is constantly giving interviews and this episode with the pictures and things that he claims to have, I think the prosecutors would like him to be quiet and he has shown that he is not doing that. So he has a deal for roughly ten years

but, if he is continuing to do this and he jeopardizes anything, he could end up facing 30 years.

MR. SMITH: It's really one of the wonderful mysteries in Washington right now is who he will drop a dime on and who he will not drop a dime on. We don't have very good insight into that but he is in a position to drop a dime on lots of people, and we know that from our own reporting, and whether he chooses to do so is just a wonderful, it's watch and wait.

MR. JONES: This is a group that includes people who think of themselves as fundamentally investigative reporters, in some cases, people who do not. But if you look at the sort of, all of you work for news organizations that have made it possible for you to do this extraordinary work, and we saw a good bit of other extraordinary work that we did not make finalists, this is the very best of what we saw.

My question is, again, if you look out beyond the confines of this table, if you look at the Gannetts, if you look at the Freedom Chain, if you look at Lee Enterprises, if you look at other, most newspapers, I think there is one of the real problems of putting a group like this together is it can give you a very, very distorted view of the way the world actually functions these days, in terms of newspaper

reporting and investigative work.

I was struck by what you said, Jerry, about looking at the, and Marcus looking at the paper and seeing so little. I come from Tennessee, when I go home, I look at the papers there, and the Sunday paper you can get through in about, you know, two or three minutes, at least that's the way it feels. What is, you know, when you talk to friends and colleagues who are not in this particular world of your own immediate world, what are you hearing? What are you seeing?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I know a lot of my colleagues are, I wouldn't say envious but their situations are quite different, where they are sort of doing the daily grind. Colleagues on Capital Hill really humping it for CQ or roll call, but they view my situation as very, as unique and that their own papers are not giving them the time or the resources to do this sort of journalism.

MR. JONES: That's the thing that is hard to explain to people because they see, because of the Web, all kinds of things. They have a vast amount of access to a vast amount of good work, but it's mostly focused on national and international stories, it is not focused on what's going on, if you happen to be in a town with one of these newspapers, what's going on in the mayor's office, or local government or things like

that, and it's the aggregate of that kind of information that seems to be in particular jeopardy right now. Does this strike you as an overly pessimistic way of looking at the way the world of newspapers, in general, not these elite institutions that you all work for, the way it's going?

MR. SMITH: I wanted to second something that Sue said about the way our editors view investigative reporting and suggest that more and more newspapers, in particular, will probably come around to seeing things the same way. With basically daily news being covered so well in so many different places, and people having the opportunity to go so many places to find information, sort of prosaic information about what happened, the deeper questions of just why things are happening or what provoked something to happen, those are the places where we, as an institution in society, can provide so much value added if we concentrate our efforts there.

We can really, through investigative reporting, we can really make a difference and distinguish ourselves from everything else that's available to people on the Web. I mean it's really the only, if you go to the newspaper and, by the time someone gets the morning newspaper, just think about the fact of how many times they will have heard,

typically, the guts of many stories that appear on the front page. We are very slow, as an institution, to realize that we can't write about what happened when people have so many different ways of hearing it before that newspaper reaches them.

And I think, sooner or later, every newspaper owner in America is going to figure this out and say, okay, I have to tell people something that they are not getting through any other medium. And at *The Washington Post*, we are told, right now, the editors are thinking investigative reporting is the way to do that. And I think other newspapers are going to come around to that point of view, sooner or later, or they are going to really suffer at the hands of our really good competition that's explaining simply what happened.

MR. JONES: Jerry, do you believe that the Gannett chain is going to get this?

MR. KAMMER: No, I don't think there is any evidence to support such an optimistic conclusion. I'm sorry to be so antagonistic toward Gannett, but I love Arizona and I love my former colleagues there, and there are some really talented people there who want to do a good job, and many times, they do a very good job, but I think it's more despite Gannett than because of Gannett. I don't think the culture there is one that

seeks to serve the people of Arizona, I think it's a culture, I mean you have the managers who are based on how they handle budgets, their ROI and the stock price.

MR. JONES: But what about the sort of economic argument that this is the economic way to save the business?

MR. KAMMER: Quality sells, I believe it, I mean I think it's definitely true, I just don't think Gannett believes it, certainly not with what they give to investigative reporting. When I was working on the investigative team on the Charles Keating Savings and Loan Keating Five story, under the Pulliam ownership, we got all the resources we needed and all the time we needed. We could not do that story today, under the current regime.

MR. JONES: I want to open it up to the audience. We've got a microphone here and another one over here, and I invite you to come and make a comment or ask a question, if you would like to.

FROM THE FLOOR: Two questions. Dana Priest said, with some emphasis, that the world is not as it seems. Does any reporter in fact ever think it is the way that it seems? Isn't that the essence of reporting, not to think that?

And the other thing, the other question, has to do with what James Risen talked about with the

hate mail campaign. And I mean this is an incredibly impressive group and I certainly wouldn't consider it a circular firing squad, but maybe it's like a circular Prozac squad. I don't think you know how much the rest of the world has no idea what you are doing.

I live in a building in Cambridge, after 30 years of small time reporting, and not anybody pays the least bit attention, the least bit of attention to what's going on. And I wondered, one, how Dana Priest's point could be made more public and Mr. Risen's information that this hate mail is what really makes most people think about the press the way that they do.

MR. JONES: Dana?

MS. PRIEST: Well, you know, my comment about that was on not knowing or not, the world is not what it appears really was on the German case because my point was of course we kind of start out that way, believing the politician is bullshitting or whatever. But the level at which it is true on some things that you would think are so basic, like the German's deciding not to go to war and back us in war but somehow the German Intelligence Service is there, to me, I mean that's, well it's surprising to most people.

But my point was once you really realized the depth of the intelligence relationship, it's not

surprising, so that sort of almost anything is possible at that level.

MR. JONES: James Risen, talk a little bit about, I mean I think that the questioner is onto something about hate mail, in this respect. I don't think any journalist now, who does a controversial story, does not know that you are in for an absolute shellacking from the blogosphere, from e-mail, from letters, and it is something that is shocking when it comes. I mean it really is unlike anything that I've, I mean I have a sort of hobby of saving hate mail, and I go back and read it occasionally and some of it is really quite imaginative. I don't know whether you have had that pleasure, I'm sure you must have.

But I guess my point is this, there is now a genuine price to be paid in a kind of an emotional way, an emotional battering. Look at what happened at *The Washington Post* when, you know, she made the mistake of framing Abramoff as someone who had given contributions to Democrats as well as Republicans, and the blogosphere, from the left side, started calling her incredible names, *The Post* had to shut things down. I mean I was with Deborah at a meeting that we organized in Washington with blogers and journalists and, essentially, the blogers' attitude was, well, get over it. I mean, you know, if you can't stand the

heat, get out of the kitchen, this is just the price of doing business.

Is that, one, the price of doing business now something that you expect to simply persist forever and is now just simply one of the things that happens?

And two, do you think that you have to have a thicker skin and a lot more sort of willingness to endure that now? And how many journalists do you think really have the stomach for that kind of thing?

MR. RISEN: You definitely have to have thicker skin. The one thing I've thought about a lot is what would have happened to Woodward and Bernstein, in 1972, if after their first couple stories, you had 500 people on the Internet saying why did Bernstein write it that way, why didn't they write, and everybody on talk radio attacking them. I think they would have been paralyzed and who knows whether they would have gotten as far as they did.

And so it's a very, it's a huge issue today that I think I'm sure everybody here has faced, in one way or the other, and it's just something now that comes with the territory, you have to deal with it, and I think the best, what I try to do is try to ignore it as much as I can.

MR. JONES: Dana, I don't know whether it has anything to do with gender, but somehow the way

Deborah was abused really came as a, she was freaked out by it, I think she really was, and I don't know that that was just because, I mean, you know, it happens to women, it happens to men. What's your take on it, though, as far as both, does gender have any relevance? Is it something that reporters simply have to now be prepared to endure?

MS. PRIEST: Well I think messages have an issue part, it exaggerates your vulnerability because there are other things people can say to get under your skin or to try to get under your skin. And I think that's what happened in her case because she wasn't used to that sort of crudeness. Until you are besieged by people who want you to be tortured at the hands of terrorists in black sites that you have just written about, and your family members too, it is hard to believe that there are people out there like that.

And so the first time it happened to me, it was, I mean I think I had that very sort of, this is just the way the world is but, eventually, you have to figure out, like Jim was saying, you have to toughen up, and then you find yourself being a public person in a way that you don't really want to be. As a reporter, you don't want to be the person that anybody is writing about. And so that adds for her too because she was, because that did happen to her, it adds this element

that is so contrary to what you're, a lot of us who are reporters are here because we don't want to be the story and we don't, we want to keep a low profile, and then all of a sudden you can't because someone else is putting your name out there.

MR. JONES: Is this the reality that you guys have had to cope with as well?

MR. WILKINSON: Well, and if you would like, we can forward our e-mails to you.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: I'll match e-mails with you, as far as creative abuse.

MR. WILKINSON: But there is a benefit to that. The relationship I think you talked about is mostly e-mail and, for every piece of hate mail, Steve just pointed out, we get lots of fan mail and we get tips. I mean the relationship, taken off a 37 cent stamp is a 39 now, or whatever, people weren't taking that step, but we have made it so easy to contact us now that they do, putting our phone numbers at the end of stories. It's unbelievable how many people did reach outside besides to tell us that we were the most evil people in Ohio, they did reach out and thank us. And I think Jim even has one now, an e-mail he keeps to remind us why we did the story.

But there are tips too, so there is a good

and a bad but, yes, the first time you are told how awful you are by, we have this one guy who, just every day, I finally had to block it.

(Laughter)

MR. WILKINSON: I just didn't need to hear it anymore.

MR. EDER: It was kind of a rollercoaster, from where we began, with it being a, you are going after and lifting the curtain on a machine, in a lot of respects and, since we moved forward with it, the attitudes really changed, some stayed the same. We had a whole realm of reaction from people thanking us for our dedication, and for continuing, and for digging and, for going as far as we went and we are continuing to go, and we still get those e-mails. And for every one of those, you had one going the other way, that you guys are evil, you are trying to do something that's evil, you are attacking good people, and it just really ran the gamut.

And then within a lot of those, you find nuggets of really good information. I met Tom Noe, the guy at the center of this, you know, at this event back five years ago, and we were able to take some of that stuff and actually find some pretty interesting stories in there. So, you know, you find all sorts of things, that's--

MR. JONES: By the way, did you ever find those coins that got lost in the mail?

(Laughter)

MR. WILKINSON: They might be in Australia. One of the funniest things we got though was Mr. Noe's wife sent out an e-mail to everybody. We were about to write a story using divorce records in which Mr. Noe talked about how he used politics and how it helped him get coin money, and we were about to do the story, and then an e-mail goes out from Bernadette Noe telling everybody to pray for them and to read Psalm 35, and one of the people, who is her friend, sent it to me and it is the most evil, awful psalm. If you think you are the source of the psalm, if you ever get to get Bible out, it is unbelievable, and it was very fun to read that.

I actually called her 20 minutes after I got it and said are you serious? And she didn't really appreciate the phone call. It was a very brief phone call too.

(Laughter)

FROM THE FLOOR: I would suggest people reread Richard III, for the curses, to toughen up their skin, as well.

I'm a little bit shocked that people think that newspapers are going to have a competitive

advantage through investigative reporting over blogs, for instance. Joshua Michael Marshall of *Talking Points Memo* has just hired people to do a muckraking investigative reporting. Yahoo has hired a foreign correspondent. Off the top of my head, John Arivosis of America's Blog is, as far as I know, the person to break the story that cell phone companies sell your information so you can get General Wesley Clark's cell phone records for $25 or something like that.

Paul Lucasiak did incredible work looking at the discredited story of the Texas Air National Guard figuring out what all the little numbers and letters at the bottom of the pages were. So there are many people around the world, who have particular points of interest that they are going to keep on digging at, and they will put it up on blogs. And there are groups of people who will get together on blogs and through other mechanisms, through e-mail, to do investigative reporting on the stories that concern them, whether it's Cambridge City Hall or national politics. So I'm not quite sure how newspapers think that investigative reporting is going to become their profit center.

MR. JONES: Jeff, do you want to respond to that?

MR. SMITH: I take your point and my first

reaction is the more people that get into the field, the better. We all prosper from each other's work and we all read each other's work. We pick up tips wherever we can get them, from the blog or elsewhere. I mean I'm delighted that so many other people are getting interested. It's our job though to do it better than other people and I think that it's our editors' jobs to hire people who will do it better and make sure that newspapers stay on top of this game.

I do think that blogs generally trade in opinion and not fact, that's why they are called blogs, and so it's going to be a harder stretch for them to write the kinds of investigative, do the kinds of investigative reporting and writing. It's one thing to uncover a fact, it's another thing to present it in a way that's credible and authoritative. If you've uncovered that somebody did something wrong, when you don't bother to collect that person's opinion or response, you are missing something important, and bloggers have no clue about things like this, typically.

MR. JONES: Well I think it really is a, one of the people who have great confidence and the future of blogs and the Web do see a huge resource of knowledge in citizen journalism and things like that. I'm just not persuaded that there is an economic basis

for that actually to sustain itself, at least not yet. Not that it doesn't happen, not that it doesn't happen and it is not useful. But it compares, I mean when you compare just the amount of money that's involved with supporting just the entries that came into the Goldsmith Awards this year, I would say it's tens of millions of dollars really, probably, in terms of salaries and time and resources and one thing and another.

That's what the newspaper model has been able to provide, that's the great thing about it and that's why the idea that newspapers are in an economic decline is something that is a real, in my opinion anyway, a real spear pointed at the heart of this kind of work, in an aggregate way, not necessarily the people sitting around this table, but looked at overall. And yes, I think that there will be something from the blogosphere, of course, but I don't know how it's going to sort of replace the kind of professional, well financed, resource rich environment of investigative reporting that newspapers have made one of their hallmarks.

MR. RISEN: Can I make, I just want to tell you one funny story I heard, which was a couple of weeks ago, a friend of mine, who is a reporter in California, sent me a note saying that somebody asked

him when is the mainstream media going to get on this NSA story?

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: I hope that you will sooner or later, Jim.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: Phil?

MR. CAVANAUGH: Thank you, Alex.

This institution explores, examines, studies the nexus between press, politics and public policy. All of the stories that we've heard about last night and today have an impact on all three of those dimensions, in one way or another. My curiosity or question is what is the nexus, I guess within the news institutions, between investigative reporting, uncovering this set of facts, which oftentimes shows corruption or deficiencies in public policy and that kind of thing, and then the editorial boards and the editorializing in the newspaper, which really becomes the advocate for changes in public policy based upon those things that you all have uncovered?

And I guess the second part of that, are you used just as a resource or when you finish the story, is it just let the chips fall as they may? Do you feel compelled to go advocate when you know that something needs to be changed because of what you've

discovered or written? How does that work?

MR. JONES: Good question. Let me ask and invite any of you who, I can't believe that your editorial page did not comment on the work that you did, maybe repeatedly. Were you consulted? Did anybody ask you a question or bother to inquire, pursue something, clarify a point, something like that? I know when I was at *The New York Times*, and that would happen sometimes, I would get a call from a member of the editorial board but, a lot of times, they did their own reporting at *The Times*. I mean the editorial board reporters did, and they made up their own mind and they really, they were allowed to take *New York Times* reporting as reliable, but beyond that, there really wasn't a lot of connection.

Jerry, what about you guys, did you have any--

MR. KAMMER: I think Mark can probably--

MR. JONES: Okay.

MR. STERN: Well, first of all, the unique thing in our situation or the unique aspect of our situation was that this was an editorial page at *The Union Tribune* that had consistently, over the years, had supported Randy `Duke' Cunningham, had bought into the notion of him as a superpatriot and a war hero, and it's a conservative Republican editorial page, so they

thought he was one of theirs. And after this broke, they turned around on a dime and they were very aggressive about writing editorials about his malfeasance and some of the bigger issues that were being raised about earmarking and corruption.

Now they did not, nobody ever called me and asked me any questions, but it was nice to see them at least show the flexibility to say, okay, we were wrong about this guy.

MR. JONES: Did any of you get a call from anyone in the editorial area of your paper? Did any of you not have editorial page comment on what you had done? Interesting.

Jeff?

MR. SMITH: Well there is a person who writes about editorials for our paper about some of the subjects, Tom Delay and others related to it, comes by and asks for information. She might ask for documents that we can share, but we don't have long conversations about what she is going to say, and in fact, we don't have any conversations about what she is going to say. And it's a pretty, there is a wall. I also think that it's part of the newspaper's responsibility though to track, in our case, the effort, a very small effort, in Congress, at reforming some of the laws that we reported, or rules that didn't stop what we wrote about

or that were broken.

And we'll continue to do that this year. I mean just write about it as a news story. You know, the reform effort is based on the revelations related that Jack Abramoff's misdeeds is a good story for us to continue to follow.

MR. JONES: Have any of you had the experience of having your editorial page report behind you, report things that you didn't know or things that you thought were perhaps wrong, or anything like that?

MR. STERN: Before you answer the question, I just wanted to say nobody from our editorial page called us or e-mailed us for information but the editorial writer from *The Washington Post* did. (Laughter)

MR. STERN: I wanted to just set the record straight on that.

MR. GRIMALDI: Ruth Marcus used to be a political, one of the political editors on the national desk, so she has taken, used to be a lobbyist reporter, and so she has taken a very strong interest in the topic, and one of your biggest fans.

MR. JONES: Marvin?

MR. KALB: I had just a comment and a question. My comment is to congratulate every single one of you finalists. I don't know if you fully

appreciate how much your work is valued. And I am delighted that the Shorenstein Center is in a position to honor it because what you have done is just phenomenal.

My question relates to *The New York Times* and I asked part of this of Eric last night at dinner. I asked the question last night whether this story, as it ultimately appeared, was meaningfully different from what it is that you knew 14 months before, because *The Times* held it for 14 months?

In back of that question is a lurking subquestion, whether *The Times* held it because it didn't want to involve itself in the final days of the 2004 campaign?

MR. JONES: I didn't ask that question because I assumed it wouldn't be answered, but I'm glad for Marvin to have asked it.

MR. LICHTBLAU: Well, I mean I think that the paper has spoken to this publicly and just to sort of echo what they've said, the paper was in a tough position. When the White House is telling you and the president is telling you personally that printing a story is going to sacrifice national, it's going to jeopardize national security, that's not a charge that any newspaper would take lightly. And I think *The Times* sees itself in an even more responsible position

because we have the belief that what we say kind of matters more than most people. There is that arrogance in *The New York Times* tradition.

So, you know, yeah, as we said, we held the story for a year, and did more reporting and certainly learned more over the course of that time than we knew before. I mean we, as the paper has said, we were aware of the basics of the story but every day that you do more reporting, you find out more things. And I know, speaking for Jim, that we are both just glad that the paper made the decision it did in running the story when it did.

MR. RISEN: I have answered this question many times. I just think it was a great public service that the paper ran the story when it did.

MR. JONES: That's what I call a no answer answer.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: Yes?

MS. DECKER: Hi, I'm Deborah Decker, I'm a mid-career student here now, but I had been an editorial writer for *The Dallas Morning News* several years ago, and did call *New York Times* reporters to get, to clarify information and did talk to our own staff about getting documents.

My question is, as papers struggle to make

money, how can you work either within your organizations more broadly, either if you have radio, TV, multiple media, I mean a lot of you come from organizations that do investigative units perhaps in another channel. Is there some way to leverage that, to share resources and do joint investigations? And how much is that being done? Even to TV, I mean Discovery Times Channel, I mean there is so much there.

MR. JONES: Have any of you ever worked in conjunction with another newspaper?

MR. RISEN: No, they have, *The New York Times* has relationships with television.

MR. JONES: I know, but I mean with another newspaper?

MR. RISEN: Not that I'm aware of.

MR. JONES: One of the good things about the Web is that it allows people to know what's happening other places, but you certainly would not know what was happening, if *The New York Times* is doing well, at *The Washington Post*, nor if *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times*, and I think that applies around. I think that's really, in many cases, a shame.

On the other hand, I know that, at *The Times*, that the idea was if *The Washington Post*, *The L.A. Times*, *Toledo Blade*, whatever, *Copley News Service*, if they broke a complicated, big investigative

story, *The New York Times*, while they might run an AP story, would be unwilling to run the story from the other news organization. And the argument was that it was not our reporting and we didn't know whether we could trust it or no, which I always thought was baloney.

MR. RISEN: I don't think that's the real reason, I think that that happens at every news organization.

MR. JONES: Well I'm saying--

MR. RISEN: Because you got beat, and it's not because you don't trust the reporting, it's because you got beat and it's not your story. And even if you did a second day story, nobody is going to care what you wrote because they are going to be watching what the other guy wrote.

MR. JONES: But if your idea is that you are giving readers the most important information out there on that day, that's not very much in service of that, is it?

MR. LICHTBLAU: Well I think, I was just going to say I think that what you are hitting on there is that the competition is what drives the media, and that's a double-edged sword. I mean it's the competitive juices that make us want to beat the competition and get the story ahead of everyone. But

it also means that when someone else has the scoop, we, your first instinct is to say, oh, we knew that, so it cuts both ways.

MR. JONES: That's what you say to your editor when he calls you at 11:30 and says *The Washington Post* has on the front page, yes. Oh, that's nothing.

(Laughter)

MS. PRIEST: But going to your question about multi media, I think this is where the future is, in one sense, because you are trying to maximize the resources that you have and get it out into a forum that is the most successful, accessible. In part, I think we have to figure out how to get our information out there in whatever medium it is and we've got to get out of the mindset that it has to be on paper. And, so, at *The Post*, we know that, some of us, and we try these little experiments to work with, never with *The New York Times* or other competitors.

But within our organization, we have our blogging and our website group. We are trying to do that more, we have a video group, within the Web, which is trying to take, who will go with some of our reporters sometimes, especially overseas, and they'll put their product where they, on the Web and then the reporter will do that. We have relationships with

television that are a little bit more, we don't own a platform, like you do, but we have a lot of different relationships that we try to do exactly what you are suggesting and get our stuff out there.

And we are just walking up to the very delicate scenario where, do we really want to start down an investigative road, not knowing where it's going to end up, with someone other than our own little group of people that we are very close with and can control where it goes, and especially if you are dealing with television, where they have different demands, they have a different culture, it's a really uncomfortable place to be, but I think, ultimately, we should try to do that in radio and other mediums.

MS. DECKER: Especially with *The New York Times,* since there is so many multiple outlets. *The Dallas Morning News* is struggling to try to do something like that because they've got radio, TV stations, all owned by the same family, so I mean there is just so much opportunity there and I think in print. And I'm trying to, through here, trying to think outside, more broadly.

MR. JONES: Thank you.

Dan?

MR. OKRENT: Just a comment on that. I think that it can only work when everybody working on

it is working under the editorial control of one editorial management, not an ownership management.

Just to relate an experience that I was witness to when I was at *Time Magazine*, shortly after Time Warner merged, acquired Turner, there was a strong effort for CNN and *Time* to do the same stories, and CNN broke a story, Tailwind or Tailhook?

MR. JONES: "Operation Tailwind".

MR. OKRENT: Tailwind. And so *Time* said, you know, this is the same company, get on board and run this story, and of course we all learned later not only was it not a story but the management of CNN was, they all lost their jobs because of it. It wasn't our story, it wasn't one that we had supervised and that we knew how it was going to work. And I think that only if you have somebody, only if you are doing it can you really make it work and rely on it.

MR. JONES: I think the greatest embarrassment in that story was, who was the reporter? Peter Arnett. Well what I mean is that's what he said, he said I didn't know anything about it. They put my byline on it but it was, you know.

Yes, go ahead.

MR. GRIMALDI: I was going to say one are of collaboration that you do see sometimes, increasingly so, is news organizations going together

in court in order to fight for documents, lawsuits being filed under the Freedom of Information Act and, you know, I've been advocating that news organizations really ought to do that more. There is a reason they don't often because you don't really want your competitor to know that you are going after what document for a particular reason.

But I wonder if all news organizations, a number of newspapers, if *The Post* had, say, gone in with *The New York Times* to sue the government for the torture documents that the ACLU got. We had filed FOIA requests for the same documents, but much more narrowly than the ACLU had. And we are filing more lawsuits all the time on Freedom of Information but, you know, there is a cost there, it's not cheap to bring a lawsuit against the government, and these days that's what you have to do to get a lot of these documents.

MR. JONES: Roberta?

MS. BASKIN: I'm Roberta Baskin and I was a reporter for 27 years in broadcasting. And I think that one of the sad comments here is that there isn't a broadcaster at this very illustrious table and that there--

MR. JONES: Roberta was one of the judges of the Goldsmith Awards and I think that it's fair to say that, at the Goldsmith Awards, we regard it, as I

said last night, we try to encourage this kind of reporting, so we were looking for a broadcast entry that belonged in this pool of finalists and we didn't find one.

MS. BASKIN: In some sense, I might have had a bias to be particularly looking for a broadcast entry and there just wasn't anything that was worthwhile, and that happened a few years ago also.

And I'm concerned about the fact, the reality, that most people in this country are still getting their information, their news, from local television, and I want to pick up on the point of collaboration here. I know that *The Washington Post* has had a relationship with "Dateline", and *New York Times*, with "Frontline", that sort of thing. But do you ever think about working with local television stations?

And I'm also wondering, particularly with Toledo and with San Diego, whether or not your stories were ignored by the broadcast media or they were picked up on.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Sometimes they are read word for word--

(Laughter)

MR. KIRKPATRICK: --without attribution.

MR. BOAK: I was going to say one of my

favorite moments in the story was when Taft had to send out an apology for all of Ohio for his actions and he had, he made the mistake of visiting Toledo the next day, and he was surrounded by the surrounded by the local media, and we had our questions for him but the TV reporter kept on saying I noticed that you didn't sign your apology, so was it genuine? And Taft said, well, it was an e-mail, I can't sign an e-mail with a pen, and the TV reporter kept on pressing him on it for the next five minutes.

And so I think there was kind of almost an obstacle for the stuff that we wanted to do versus the confrontation that they wanted for the sake of the cameras, and I just think that's a difference in the two mediums. And when you have a medium that is inherently visual, doing investigative work strikes me as much more difficult.

MR. JONES: What about you guys?

MR. STERN: Well we weren't in San Diego to watch the broadcast media and how it played out. I have a sense that, you know, they did pick up on the story, they didn't do a lot of the investigative stuff, but every time when Cunningham would come out and stand on the courthouse steps and make a statement, or when he resigned or when he was sentenced, there was an absolute frenzy. One of the sort of iconic clips that

played over and over the day he went to jail was a camera man stumbling. You know, there was a big melee, and a cameraman fell over backwards and Cunningham, looking frail, almost fell himself. So they were certainly on the story but not from the investigative side of it, they were more on it from the visual side of it.

MR. JONES: I bet the Los Angeles local television was all over the guardian story.

MS. LARRUBIA: There actually was one local station that tried to do it and I felt really sorry for her because she, the B role was have the story, she would have sort of a judge in a robe, and she was almost reading from the lead of one of the stories. She focused on one local case that we had highlighted in the first day story, but it was word for word and, but it was flattering that she even tried to do it. We were stunned that anyone would try to do it.

MR. JONES: Frankly, I was not kidding, I would think this would be a story that would have such human interest that television would just love it.

MS. BASKIN: There was a wonderful series in Chicago about 20 years ago--

(Laughter)

MS. BASKIN: --or longer and because television is a more emotional medium, those stories

led to the resignation or the firing, actually, of the guardian in Chicago. And it could be an opportunity to work with a local reporter, if you can identify a station and an investigative unit, there aren't very many left in this country, it's the first thing that gets cut.

MR. LEONARD: Some of our greatest obstacles would just kill it for TV. One of the things was many of the people we were writing about were dead or died while we were writing about them, they were elderly and they were sick. And the second biggest obstacle was that when they weren't dead, it was very hard to get access to them because their guardian was the one we were writing about, so they didn't want us to go visit them. And they pretty much legally owned the properties of the elderly people we were writing about, so it was very difficult to, first of all find the people who were willing to talk to us or were able to talk to us. Some of the people who were alive were, suffered from severe dementia, so it was everything, as I would think, as a TV reporter, you wouldn't want.

The second thing is the power of our story was more, that we had looked at more than 2,000 cases, and so anyone who was going to follow it was going to have to say that this is what *The L.A. Times* found, unless they were going to do their own reporting and

they weren't going to do that.

MR. JONES: We have reached the end of our time but we have one more thing to do and that is to present the finalists of the Goldsmith Awards with their plaques. What I'm going to do is hand them out and then I would ask those here in attendance to hold their applause until they are handed out, and then we will show our appreciation once again to you. And, once again, let me say, as a citizen, thank you very much and congratulations to you all.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, at 11:00 p.m., the meeting was ceremony.)

# 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 SEMINAR

Date: March 15, 2006

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts

_____ 03/27/06

Martin T. Farley Date
Advance Services