

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

Tuesday  
March 18, 2008

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

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

ADVANCE SERVICES  
Franklin, Massachusetts  
(508) 520-2076

ADVANCE SERVICES  
Franklin, Massachusetts  
(508) 520-2076

I N D E X

<u>OPENING REMARKS</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
David Ellwood	3
<u>Goldsmith Book Prizes</u>	
Tom Patterson	5
<u>Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting</u>	
Tom Patterson	11
<u>Goldsmith Career Award for Excellence in Journalism</u>	
Alex Jones	24
Paul Steiger	30
<u>QUESTION AND COMMENT SEGMENT</u>	
Jay Odarie	41
Phil Hills	42
Jim Snyder	45
Chris Russell	47
Kareem Bardesi	49
Nelson Raneiri	50
Jonathan Marr	54
Loretta Tofani	55

P R O C E E D I N G S

(6:05 p.m.)

MR. ELLWOOD: Good evening, everyone.

Welcome to the John F. Kennedy Jr. Forum. I am David Ellwood, Dean of the Harvard Kennedy School and I am enormously pleased to have you here. This is always one of the events that we are most excited and most proud of, largely because it represents the very best in what American journalism has to offer.

Indeed, for those of you who are interested, I have a tie on here that says We the People, now you can't read it from there, in some sense honoring the Constitution. Many people think it's the Declaration of Independence, that's When in the course of human events. We the People, and again, the First Amendment, in many ways, is what we are celebrating here tonight.

Now the Goldsmith Awards is something that is put on by the Shorenstein Center. And I want to say just a couple of words about Walter Shorenstein, who is unable to be with us tonight, but whose remarkable insight and support and vision has made it all possible. It is now twenty years since the Shorenstein center was created, the Joan Shorenstein Center on the

ADVANCE SERVICES  
Franklin, Massachusetts  
(508) 520-2076

Press, Politics and Public Policy. And this is a center that everyone in this audience knows promotes serious and probing analysis of the news media, how it affects politics and public policy in the United States and globally. It is also at the forefront now of thinking through a what new media will mean and what old media means, kind of like Old Europe, I guess, except that in both cases they are the central and most powerful part of what we need to do.

It is the vision of the Shorenstein Center and the generosity of the Shorensteins themselves that have made possible this remarkable group of activities and the like.

Now before my introductions, I would like to ask all of you, in absentia, to thank Walter Shorenstein.

(Applause)

MR. ELLWOOD: Now, my only remaining task is to introduce to you the Director of the Shorenstein Center, he is the Bradlee Professor of Government and the Press, Tom Patterson. Tom is the author of numerous books, most recently *The Vanishing Voter*, which look sat the causes and the consequences of declining direct participation. His book on media's political role *Out of Order* received the American Political Science Association's Graber Award as the

best book of the decade in political communication.

And an earlier book, *The Unseeing Eye*, was named by the American Association for Public Opinion Research as one of the fifty most influential books on public opinion in the last half century. He is also the author of two general American government texts, and he has articles that have appeared in many, many places. His research is funded by a range of foundations, ranging from Ford, Merkle, Smith Richardson, Pew, Knight, Carnegie and National Science Foundation.

He has also stepped in this year to take a leadership role in the Shorenstein Center, something he's done in the past, and we are enormously grateful for his leadership, his vision, and all he brings to the table.

Please welcome Tom Patterson.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: David, thank you.

I want to add my welcome on behalf of the Shorenstein Center. If we had waited a few hours we would have welcomed you and given you the white carpet treatment, I guess the snow is coming.

Let me tell you a little bit more about the Goldsmith Awards Program, and how it got started. Bob Greenfield, then a Philadelphia attorney, had an

elderly client named Berda Marks Goldsmith. She wanted to give Bob her entire estate, Bob said no, and started to look around for a more elevated use of the money. She had a passion for clean government, for quality journalism, and a chance encounter that Bob had in Florida with a member of the Kennedy School faculty brought him to Marvin Kalb. And between Marvin Kalb and Bob Greenfield, they put together this wonderful Goldsmith Awards Program, which consists of the Book Awards, the Investigative Reporting Award and the Career Award.

Bob Greenfield is not here tonight, but I think his grandson Mike is here, and I want to single him out. Mike sits on our judging committee, now that might be thought to be a plum assignment, but it is unpaid and it is pretty demanding. For the past few Januarys Mike has given up all his spare moments to pore over the hundred-plus entries, the nominees for the Goldsmith Investigative Reporting Award, and we are deeply grateful for what Mike has brought to that program. And I would like to have Mike stand, and other members of the Greenfield Family who are here this evening, please stand to be recognized.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Marvin Kalb is also here tonight. Marvin, thank you for your role in getting

this started.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Finally, let me add to David's thanks to Walter Shorenstein, he couldn't be with us tonight but he is our benefactor. Walter created the Shorenstein Center as a memorial to his daughter Joan, an esteemed CBS journalist who died tragically young, of breast cancer.

Walter turned 93 a couple weeks ago, I was leaving California at the time, and I am happy to report that Walter is as vigorous as ever. I sat with Walter and came back with a list so long of things to do, suggestions about ways the Shorenstein Center could make a difference, that even if we tried to fulfill half of Walter's ideas, I think we'd be running night and day until he is 94 years of age. But that is Walter Shorenstein, he is a truly remarkable, ambitious and very generous man, and we are very grateful to him.

The first Goldsmith Prize to be awarded this evening, actually two of them, are the Book Prizes, one in the academic book category, one in the trade book category. I, along with my colleagues Matt Baum and Marion Just served as the book prize jury. After we worked through the several dozen submissions this year we reached a conclusion as to which two books were best.



The recipient of this year's Goldsmith Book Prize in the trade category is *Nation of Secrets*, written by Ted Gup, a former *Washington Post* and *Time Magazine* reporter, and currently the Shirley Warmzer Professor of Journalism at Case Western. This is an important book, one that should be on everybody's reading list.

In it, Ted identifies a malignant strain in our culture, the tendency of American institutions to withhold vital information from the very people they claim to serve. It is intelligence agencies employing a blinding array of classification schemes to hide an ever widening set of activities. It is universities using self-serving interpretations of statutes to keep student victims of assault from discovering whether and how their attackers were punished. It is the press casually offering confidentiality to sources, freeing them from accountability and denying readers a chance to judge their credibility. It is judges reaching private settlement agreements with firms engaged in illegal practices, and then locking away the judgement.

As Ted Gup reveals, America's obsession with secrecy is undermining the very values security, privacy, liberty, in whose name secrecy is so often invoked. We are honored this evening to recognize this extraordinary book, *Nation of Secrets*.

Ted, please step up to collect your award.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: As I mentioned, there is a second Goldsmith Book Prize, and it is for the best academic book. This year's winner is *In Defense of Negativity*, by John Geer, of Vanderbilt University. This also is a remarkable book, meticulously researched, carefully argued, it is a major contribution to scholarship on election communication.

John's core argument is that negative advertising has far more merit than is commonly believed. John collected all of the available candidate ads from the 1960 through the 2000 presidential elections, and categorized them by tone, positive or negative. He also researched each ad for its factual accuracy in the claims it was making. Finally, he evaluated each of them for its centrality to the issues of the election in question. It was an exhaustive undertaking, with surprising results. John found that negative ads, as compared with positive ads, are much more likely to be factually accurate, to be based on issues rather than personality, and to center voters' core concerns.

John does not defend all negative ads, some have been outrageous and John takes them to task. But he comes down on the side of negative ads, noting

that they are less likely than positive ads to be puff pieces, and more likely to contain information helpful to the electorate.

I'd like to add that John and I, last month at a Washington University, had a spirited debate on negative advertising. He argued in their favor, I argued against. John had recently written his book, so he was armed with lots and lots of evidence. I had a weaker case, so I did what any political candidate would do in that situation, I decided to go negative. (Laughter)

MR. PATTERSON: On YouTube I found exactly what I was looking for, and I'd like to share it with you.

(Whereupon, a brief videotape was played.)

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: I need to tell you, that that ad fails to meet the truth standard that John applies in his book.

(Laughter)

MR. PATTERSON: The student quotes are real, but they are ripped out of context. In reality, John Geer is a much admired instructor at Vanderbilt University. He has won departmental teaching awards, college-wide teaching awards and university-wide

teaching awards. Now he has also won the Goldsmith Book Prize.

John Geer.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: So we turn now to the Investigative Reporting Award. Each year the Goldsmith judges study scores of first rate reports. Their task is to choose six finalists for the Goldsmith Prize, and from them a winner, which receives a \$25,000 cash prize, the other finalists receive a cash prize of \$5,000 each.

Tonight we want to honor all six, in the alphabetical order of their news organizations. Before presenting them, I want to talk a little bit about the selection process. We had a panel this year of six judges, I think they are all here, Tom Fiedler, Mike Greenfield, who I mentioned earlier, Mary Newsom, Bill Powers, Robin Sproul and Stuart Watson. I should add that I was also on the jury, but as a non voting member.

In early January we shipped boxes filled with files of the more than one hundred entries that had been nominated for the Goldsmith Investigative Reporting Prize. And what we asked each of the jurists to do was to pick what they thought were the fifteen best entries out of those many that were submitted.

Then we brought them together here at Harvard in late January, and one by one we went through every entry that had appeared on any judge's list of fifteen.

Many hours later we voted, and each vote was allowed to vote for six entries, except they couldn't vote for an entry from their own news organization. And if there was an entry in that category they also couldn't abstain. So we raised the bar, essentially, for the news organization that was represented on the jury panel.

Then after the six finalists were chosen, we went through them again, one by one, talking about them, discussing their merits, comparing them. And then we took a final vote and that vote required the votes of six of the jurists to pick a winner. It took a couple of hours, but we got there. I think the finalists are outstanding and I want to talk about each one.

The first Goldsmith finalist we want to honor tonight is Joshua Kors, for his two part story entitled "Thanks for Nothing" in *The Nation* magazine, the first time ever we have had a finalist from an opinion magazine.

Army Specialist John Town was serving in Iraq when he was knocked unconscious by a rocket, losing most of his hearing from the explosion. He was

awarded the Purple Heart. But soon thereafter, Specialist Town was dismissed from the Army, and denied disability pay and medical treatment. In fact, as he was being discharged he was handed a bill for more than \$3,000. The Army had decided that Specialist Town's deafness owed not to the rocket attack but to a personality disorder that he had before enlisting. Specialist Town's story makes up part one of Kors' remarkable investigation, one spanning eleven months, of how the Army has mistreated some of its wounded soldiers.

Part two is mostly based on testimony from conscientious military doctors who told how some of their colleagues were purposely misdiagnosing wounded soldiers and those suffering from combat related stress. The reason, the fraudulent diagnoses were saving the Army millions in disability and medical payments. Soldiers medically certified to have had a personality disorder before entering the service did not qualify for benefits. In fact, they could even be required, if they didn't finish their full term of service, to hand back the signing bonus they received upon enlisting.

Kors' story caught the attention of the chair of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs, who called a hearing to investigate the fraudulent

diagnoses. Another congressman put forth a House bill to halt personality disorder discharges, a similar bill was introduced in the Senate. Thirty-one senators, representing both parties, wrote the Secretary of Defense, asking him to investigate the problem. In the end, Specialist Town's benefits were restored and DOD and GAO were instructed to report to Congress on their investigation into the Army's medical discharge practices.

I would like to ask Joshua Kors to stand. And I invite you to join me in saluting him for his contribution.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: When you brush your teeth, I don't mean to get too personal here, but you probably don't even notice the flavor of your toothpaste, and you are certainly not likely to think that your toothpaste might kill you.

*The New York Times'* Walt Bogdanich and Jake Hooker showed that it could, and in fact that people had died from diethylene glycol, an ingredient in antifreeze, used by unlicensed rural factories in China to make toothpaste and medicines. To get their story, these two reporters visited factories in China where counterfeit drugs were made, attended a pharmaceutical trade fair in Milan where counterfeits

were sold, explored free trade zones in Dubai, where fake drugs were sheltered, and chronicled the suffering of victims in Panama, where more than one hundred people had died from the deadly ingredient.

They also uncovered Food and Drug Administration documents, some of them classified, that years earlier had warned of the dangers of diethylene glycol, if China continued to spurn international efforts to stop drug counterfeiters; the FDA's warnings went unheeded. This time, based on their reporting, the FDA took action on its own to halt certain Chinese imports. In subsequent months, four separate congressional hearings on import safety cited their investigation. Their series also prompted Chinese regulators to act, they closed the factory that had made the Panama poison, and banned the use of diethylene glycol in toothpaste, having previously declared the additive to be harmless.

Walt Bogdanich and Jake Hooker's "A Toxic Pipeline" is testimony to the power of well-grounded investigative journalism. Please join me in honoring this team from *The New York Times*. Walt is here.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Jake is on assignment in China, I believe.

*The Palm Beach Post*, and Tom Dubocq,



noticed something amiss in the divorce proceedings of county commission chairman's divorce proceedings, and similar irregularities in the divorce proceedings of another county commissioner, Warren Newell. Their divorce papers included assets not listed on the annual financial disclosure forms that were required to file as public officials. Over a period of twenty months, Dubocq examined thousands of records and conducted dozens of interviews, to discover how the two men had accumulated their wealth. He uncovered a shocking case of corruption.

Commissioner Mazzalotti had amassed a \$110 million real estate portfolio, hidden by shell companies and a secret land trust. Commissioner Newell had pocketed a half million dollars, laundered through his engineering company. And there was more, Newell had steered \$14 million from a taxpayer Save the Waterfront initiative, to a marina where he kept his yacht, and where one of the owners was a business partner.

Newell also played a hidden role in a lucrative real estate flip, voting three times on matters that raised the property's value, which in a little more than a year doubled in price.

Dubocq started reporting prompting federal investigators to look into the case, and this led both

men to plead guilty to corruption charges. Newell got a five year prison sentence, Mazzalotti also got five years, and was required to forfeit nearly \$10 million in property and cash.

Please join me in recognizing Tom Dubocq, of *The Palm Beach Post*, for his investigative series, "Palm Beach County's Culture of Corruption."

Tom.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: As Americans worried about deadly toothpaste, the Chinese factory workers who made products for the American market worry about life and limb. Their lives are being shortened dramatically by the use of carcinogens, benzene, lead, cadmium, mercury, and other chemicals that go into the making of the cut rate products that we buy. So many thousands of Chinese workers have had their lungs shut down or their kidneys fail that fatal occupational diseases are considered routine, as are the fingers and limbs lost to factory equipment that lacks safety features.

This story was reported in depth by Loretta Tofani and was carried in the *Salt Lake Tribune*. She began the story as a freelancer, visiting more than two dozen factories during five trips to China. To trace the entire chain of responsibility she interviewed Chinese workers, Chinese factory managers

and U.S. importers of Chinese goods. To get a more precise mapping, she asked U.S. Customs for shipping documents, but they denied her request. So she did it the slow way, by cultivating relationships with shipping company clerks and customs brokers.

In her series, Tofani explains the many reasons for the systemic failure to protect Chinese workers, but the main reason is straightforward, it's a heck of a lot cheaper to produce goods when worker safety and health are ignored. Tofani's series prompted Utah's governor to instruct the state's businesses to limit their dealings to Chinese factories that abide by safe labor standards. On Capitol Hill, among other references to her work, a Senate Congress subcommittee hearing cited it as evidence of the need for a bill outlawing imported goods made with sweatshop labor.

Please join me in congratulating Loretta Tofani and the *Salt Lake Tribune*, for the series "American Imports, Chinese Deaths".

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Our next to last finalist is "The Other Walter Reed", a series by *The Washington Post* team of Dana Priest and Anne Hull. They spent more than four months visiting the Walter Reed outpatient facilities, meeting with wounded Iraq

veterans and their families. Their frequent visits did not raise the suspicions of military officials, not surprising in view of the fact that these officials seemed unmindful of nearly everything going on at Walter Reed.

It was a place where wounded veterans of the Iraq War faced neglect, hospital rooms with mouse droppings, cockroaches, black mold on the walls, cheap mattresses. It was a place where numbing bureaucracy could result in unconscionable delay in processing outpatients, lost paperwork and misplaced records. A combat medic who did three tours in Iraq had to bring in letters and photos to prove that she had served there.

The experience of Staff Sergeant John Channon seemed to sum it all up, his eye and skull had been shattered by an AK47 round, and mental disorientation was an everyday reality for him. When he was scheduled to be moved within the facility he was handed a map of the grounds and told to find his new room, he couldn't stand without leaning against walls, and of course couldn't find the new room on his own. And he was not alone, Priest and Hull found many brain injured patients who went unattended for weeks.

And sadly, the situation at Walter Reed was not unique, their series pointed to failings

throughout the military health system. The series had a dramatic and immediate impact, the Commander of Walter Reed was fired, as were the Army Secretary and Surgeon General. Soon thereafter a House subcommittee held an extraordinary field hearing at Walter Reed, many of the soldiers profiled in their series were called to testify. One result was the appointment of a high level commission to examine the care being given to Iraq veterans.

Please join me in congratulating Dana Priest and Anne Hull of *The Washington Post*, for their series "The Other Walter Reed."

MR. PATTERSON: Not since the Nixon Presidency has the White House been so obsessed with secrecy as has the Bush White House. And not since the days of Watergate and Deep Throat have we seen investigative reporting that reveals so fully the workings of a secretive White House, as we do in Barton Gellman's and Jo Beckers's four part *Washington Post* series "Angler: The Cheney Vice Presidency".

Their investigation confirmed that Cheney had played an important role in the Bush Administration's policies towards Iraq, torture, military tribunals, the economy, the environment, and the makeup of the nation's highest court. But their investigation went beyond this, to show that Cheney had

played the leading role in creating particular policies that were later found unlawful by federal courts, or repudiated by Congress.

Cheney exercised his power in clever ways. He had extraordinary control over the flow of information on major decisions, giving priority access to people and documents that supported what he wanted, while blocking what those that opposed his views. Secretary of State Powell and National Security Advisor Rice did not find out until it was reported on CNN that Bush had signed an order, engineered by Cheney, that stripped foreign terrorist suspects of access to any court. Also, they could be confined indefinitely without charges and could be tried by secret courts.

Clever too was Cheney's placement of allies in positions where they could make key decisions without creating waves, and where they could keep an eye on others in the administration who might oppose Cheney's goals.

Clever too was Cheney's use and abuse of legal counsel, if rebuffed by Attorney General Ashcroft, or anyone else in Justice or the White House Counsel's Office, he would find another lawyer and have him sign off on a secret legal opinion, often designed primarily to provide legal cover should patently illegal or unconstitutional action become public knowledge.

Gellman and Becker's series is rich in its details, reflecting the depth of their investigation, a year long effort that included interviews with more than two hundred people, many of whom for the first time shared their notes, e-mails, personal calendars and observations.

This investigative series is not the kind of journalism that will change substantive public policy. But it is the kind of journalism that is rewriting our understanding of the Bush-Cheney era, and Cheney's role within the administration. It will also guide historians in the decades ahead, and it is a series that will be must reading for future presidents intent on maintaining the authority and integrity of their high office.

Please join me in congratulating Barton Gellman and Jo Becker for their series "Angler: The Cheney Vice Presidency".

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Barton is not here tonight, Jo is.

It's now time to announce the winner of this year's Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting. Before I do, please join me in one more round of applause for all the finalists.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: And the winner of this year's Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting is "Angler: The Cheney Vice Presidency" from *The Washington Post*, by Barton Gellman and Jo Becker.

Jo, please step forward to accept the prize.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: It is now my distinct pleasure to introduce Alex Jones, who in turn will introduce our Goldsmith Career Award Winner Paul Steiger.

As most of you know, Alex Jones is the real Director of the Shorenstein Center, I have been standing in for Alex this year due to the illness of his wife. Susan is with us tonight, Susan Tift. Alex and Susan are special friends of ours, and Alex is a special colleague, not only for his leadership of the Shorenstein Center, but for the experience he brings to it, a decade with *The New York Times*, during which he won the Pulitzer Prize, and co-author, along with Susan, of two best selling biographies, one of the powerful family behind *The Louisville Courier Journal* and one of the powerful family behind *The New York Times*. And I am happy to report that Alex will be back in the Shorenstein Director's office in September.

Alex Jones.



(Applause)

MR. JONES: Thank you very much, it is a great pleasure to be standing here at this podium on this occasion. This is, as David Ellwood said, one of the great nights for the Shorenstein Center and the Kennedy School.

And while I am at it, I just want to say thank you to David, to Tom, to all of my friends and colleagues at the Shorenstein Center. This has been a rocky period for me and for Susan and we are both very grateful to all of you for your support and for your very kind wishes. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: And I am also very glad to say that Susan is doing very well.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: When you look at the journalistic career of Paul Steiger it is a bit like viewing the entire saga of American journalism. When he first walked into a newsroom in the mid 1960s there were teletype machines, now these machines were invented in the 19th Century, kicking out copy one lead slug at a time, just the way they had all those years ago. That was the state of things in the 1960s still, this was at the end of a newspaper environment in which multiple dailies still competed in some American

cities, and virtually every town of any size, had a morning and an evening newspaper.

He had been an economics major at Yale and his first job had been as a business reporter for *The Wall Street Journal* in San Francisco. Now think about this, 1966, San Francisco, a rather odd place to start a career in business journalism. I was there myself around that time, given that it was the epicenter of the counterculture.

But nevertheless, Paul got hooked on business journalism, and staked his future on newspapers, which turned out to be a very good bet. Because he came to newspapers at what he has called a Golden Age, in which technology and general prosperity transformed the newspaper business. What had been a set of family owned businesses that were marginally profitable and competed with each other in every town, was transformed into an extremely profitable world of one newspaper towns. And a lot of the gold that poured out of those monopolies was plowed back into bigger news staffs, more ambitious news coverage, and a rather lush life, in which reporters sometimes traveled first class. As you know only too well, those days are gone.

And how golden were those days? Well, Paul tells a story of how as an editor at *The Wall Street Journal* he was told to make some economies in

his budget because of an economic hiccup, not too serious, but still need to make some cuts. When he suggested making his reporters give up flying first class, as they did for any trip over three hours, one of his editors told him that that would set a bad example, because he and the other senior editors liked traveling first class.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: So Paul made his numbers by cutting something else. The good old days.

Paul had a 26 year career at *The Journal*, interrupted by 15 years at *The Los Angeles Times*, from 1991 until the end of last year he was *The Journal's* top editor, guided it to sixteen Pulitzer Prizes, and he has been showered with journalistic honors, including being chairman of the Pulitzer Prize Board.

He has seen the newspaper business rise, perhaps swell might be a better term, and he has watched as the same newspapers that produced that golden age of journalism, have put high quality investigative journalism in real jeopardy, as they frantically try to cut costs in the face of the internet juggernaut.

Now having left *The Journal* at the end of 2007, he is at the forefront of an exciting new journalistic venture that is intended to keep that

golden age alive, at least in part. Paul is now the editor-in-chief, president and chief executive of ProPublica, a nonprofit web-based band of investigative reporters drawn in large measure from those very newspapers that are allowing their investigative teams to disappear or dwindle.

It is particularly proper that Paul is here to receive this year's Goldsmith Career Award, because what ProPublica aims to do is very much akin to what Berda Goldsmith and Robert Greenfield envisioned when the Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting were created by them and Marvin Kalb. In both cases the impulse was a philanthropic and public-spirited sense that those in power must be held accountable. And that high quality investigative journalism was an indispensable way to do that.

In the case of ProPublica, the beginning was a phone call in 2006 from Herb and Marion Sandler, who had recently sold their business, Golden West Financial to Wachovia, and had become \$2.4 billion richer. They told Paul, who was a friend, that they wanted to invest \$10 million a year in supporting investigative reporting and wanted Paul's advice on how to spend it. What he came up with was ProPublica, which is essentially the nation's largest investigative reporting team of two dozen seasoned reporters, chosen

from, he told me just before we came out here, over a thousand applicants who have said they want to be a part of this.

These reporters will tackle what Paul calls deep dive investigative reporting, the kind that is time consuming and difficult and expensive, the time we are celebrating here tonight, and the time that is not being done as much as it should be.

The product of ProPublica's work will be offered free to news organizations that would seem to be the logical outlets for it, free as exclusives for a time, which means that the impact will be enhanced. Then the stories will go up on ProPublica's website for one and all.

You should understand something, this is a radical idea when it comes to the nation's major news organizations. I worked at *The New York Times* and I can tell you that *The Times* does not publish the investigative reports of other news organizations. It does what *The Wall Street Journal* does, what *The Washington Post* does and *The Los Angeles Times* does, and many other newspapers do, it simply won't publish investigations by others. It may publish AP or Reuters wire stories, but not investigations which are thought too sensitive and too risky to entrust to the work of some outlet outside the family.

This is where ProPublica has broken the mold. Because of the stature and trust that the nation's editors have in Paul Steiger, he is poised to shatter this long standing barrier. Bill Keller, the executive editor of *The New York Times* for one, has declared himself open to working with ProPublica. I can tell you that that is huge for *The Times*, huge.

It would not have happened if not for the fact that ProPublica is the creature of a journalist with the stature of Paul Steiger. I think that Paul would agree, that the reception that ProPublica has received from the nation's news organizations is perhaps the greatest personal and professional compliment that he has ever received. I fully expect to see work by ProPublica among the finalists for the Goldsmith Prize in years to come. And I can only say, Godspeed. It is my honor and pleasure to present this year's Goldsmith Career Award for Excellence in Journalism to Paul Steiger.

(Applause)

MR. STEIGER: Thank you very much, Alex. It is a huge honor for me to receive this award and it is particularly gratifying to get it from someone I have admired for so long as Alex. Thank you.

I am honored to get the award and I am delighted to be here at the Kennedy School, especially

at the Shorenstein Center. I am particularly appreciative, looking back at past recipients of this award, twelve out of fifteen of whom are leading figures from television news, that you would bestow this honor on someone who still enjoys the ability to walk down the streets entirely unmolested, unnoticed even.

I am also very honored to share the evening with tonight's winners, and in fact with all the Goldsmith Investigative Reporting finalists. The work was simply outstanding, I know all six of these entries well and it was tremendous work.

It has become fashionable in the news business these days for people to use occasions such as this to reassure the audience that the current crisis of the news business will somehow pass, that readers and viewers will still need and want news, that the internet is just enlarging our audiences, that the journalism business is just going through a rough patch and that it will all be over soon. I'm not going to do that, to do so would insult the intelligence of this august audience. There is, as you don't need me to tell you, a crisis in the business of news, and if, as seems increasingly likely, we are in or near a recession, the inherent cyclicity of businesses dependent of advertising will significantly deepen this

crisis in the months ahead.

Secular declines in classified advertising, financial advertising, retail print advertising and print circulation revenues will be exacerbated by cyclical declines in nearly every form of advertising. Just look at *The New York Times* February Report today, it was chilling. A sense of urgency in confronting these challenges is likely to become even more acute, pressures on corporate executives, already considerable, will intensify, layoffs and other cutbacks will accelerate, as may industry consolidation, which is already moving forward at a pace we would have thought unimaginable just a few years ago.

So I can hear you thinking, thanks for coming, thanks for cheering us up. Of course I don't want to stop there, and I don't think we need to or should, I don't believe the sky is falling for our craft as a whole, although I do think there will be casualties, as are typical in serious business shakeouts. We have not reached the bottom yet.

But I want to spend a few minutes tonight looking beyond the shakeout, talking about where I think growth and renewal in journalism will come from in coming years. There are alternatives to what Russ Stanton, the new editor of one of my old papers, *The*



*Los Angeles Times* recently and memorably called the failed strategy of fight, lose, shrink. Even when our early ancestors were first huddling together in caves, man has felt the need for timely, relevant and accurate information. News organizations are being hammered, and in some cases destroyed, but many aspects of what can broadly be called journalism are thriving as never before.

This year's election season, the most exciting since 1968, has been covered better than any other election in my memory. And while the reporting in the expected places, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *The Wall Street Journal*, the broadcast and cable news networks and news magazines has been strong, some of the very best coverage has come from websites independent of those familiar sources. I am thinking of places like Slate, like The Huffington Post, like Politico, and my new favorite, Real Clear Politics.

More widely, there has been an explosion of information and opinion on the internet, nearly all free, and with far greater breadth than was ever available in newspapers and magazines. The shadings and intensity of opinion are both fascinating, and at times annoying, the reporting, often by non-journalists, of information people care about, from

what Hollywood's bad girls are wearing or not wearing, to whether Dan Rather's documents on George Bush were authentic, is so rapid as to be at times dizzying.

This past Sunday night on *The Journal's* website, I read a full account of the actions leading to the merging out of existence of the banking firm Bear Stearns, before the deal was even announced, and with a tick-tock depth I previously would have had to wait a day or two for.

Last week I was deluged with titillating, and in the end depressing, details about the young woman with whom Governor Spitzer ended his career, including in addition to strong reporting from traditional news organizations, particularly *The New York Times*, photos from her own MySpace page and video from helpful acquaintances, that very recently would have required months to become public, if ever.

So what is wrong with this picture? A lot, of course. The investigative reporting so brilliantly on display in the work of tonight's Goldsmith Finalists, and the correspondence from around the globe that Americans have become so used to, are both under enormous economic pressure, as Alex noted. It is here that the staff cuts are falling most heavily and it is here, I fear, that society will feel most acutely, the agonies of journalism's adjustment to the

web.

There is an accelerating shrinkage of reporting and legal resources sufficient to force powerful people in institutions here and around the globe to disgorge important information that they would prefer to keep secret. The challenge for those who value that process for its crucial contribution to free societies everywhere is to find ways to restore and reinvigorate it.

I envision that revival process as proceeding along some combination of three main avenues, specialization, subsidy and creativity. Let me talk quickly about each one. First is specialization. Some journalistic organizations are already pursuing this path with a model known in some quarters as local, local, local. The idea is that metro and small city newspapers have three principle assets, their name recognition, their local news staff, and their local advertising staff. If they focus both their print additions and their websites on serving the local interests of their audience and strip away all expenses not directed to that focus, the argument goes, they can cut costs and stimulate revenues sufficiently to restore profit growth. In so doing, they would reach down into high school and club sports, book groups and outing clubs, to become community hubs of a

very modern sort, while continuing to perform the watchdog function in the localities they serve.

There are other specializations too, *The Washington Post* on politics, *The Journal* on business, economics and political economy, *The New York Times* on national and international affairs to citing culture, for example. The concept is simple and plausible, the execution challenging.

The second main avenue is subsidy, some subsidy is direct from government, as with Public Television and Radio, or from philanthropy, as with my own new organization ProPublica, which is about a quarter of the way to hiring our 25 journalists. By publishing via the web and through leading print and broadcast media partners, we expect to be able to devote about 60 percent of the \$10 million we will have annually to news and related costs. That compares with about 15 percent at leading newspapers and magazines.

Some advocates for journalism argue that it's time the federal government stepped in to provide broad based news subsidies for newspapers, in the interest of maintaining an objective information flow crucial to the workings of a democratic process. This notion isn't unheard of in our history, the second class mailing permit has long given newspapers and magazines a cost break, borne by taxpayers and other

mailers. I'm not sure there is much sentiment in Washington to adding to that subsidy now, but more power to those prepared to try.

Subsidies can also be indirect, *The Washington Post's* Newsweek Magazine are in some sense subsidized by the robust revenue and profits of its Kaplan Education Division. The prestige of the publications no doubt enhances the marketing power of Kaplan. My own former employer Dow Jones and its *Wall Street Journal*, are enjoying new funds for expansion from the new owner, Rupert Murdoch's NewsCorp, with the expectation that enhancing the power and reach of *the Journal* will be to the benefit of the much larger NewsCorp.

Perhaps the fastest growing large news organization in the world is Bloomberg, which makes the vast bulk of its money selling data and analysis to the investment industry. Its news needs would be amply served by a team 500 to 1,000 strong, it now has more than 2,000 journalists, a size which allows it to cover politics, sports and culture on a global scale, and thus add to the strength of the Bloomberg brand.

This cross subsidy approach has some risk that journalistic values end up subordinated to particular objectives of the broader company, but the challenge can, and I think should be, manageable.

The final pathway is creativity, possibly by people currently in journalism, but, I hate to say it, more likely by people outside the field, or at least by a mixture of insiders and outsiders. Let's be realistic, the two biggest distributors of journalism on the web are Google and Yahoo. I spent an hour on the phone a week or two ago with one of the world's fifty leading billionaires, who made his money on the internet and retired at a young age some years ago. It took him, at most, twenty minutes to suck everything useful out of my brain.

(Laughter)

MR. STEIGER: His idea is for a for profit internet journalistic model, funded by micropayments instead of advertising. That would seem to go against everything we think we know about the web and journalism, you know, content wants to be free and you make your money from advertising or porn. Was I going to argue with him, no. This guy likes the for profit approach, not because he needs or wants the money, but because he thinks that profit making enterprises are more likely to spawn imitators, and thereby create a critical mass. That fits with some new and imaginative ventures I see springing up, such as the for profit Global News Enterprises, the brainchild of Shorenstein Center Advisory Board member Phil Balboni, as well as a

number of nonprofits.

This brings me to my final point. Little that I have said in the last few minutes is definitive, and nearly all of it is highly speculative, some will turn out to be simply wrong, no doubt.

And, Alex, if you post this on the web I am sure I'll instantly hear not only that I am wrong, but flamingly, stupidly and incompetently wrong.

But the larger point is that we need in the news business, to experiment, and to do so, as Franklin Roosevelt once said in another context, boldly and persistently. If we don't take bold risks it's clear now many great traditions will soon come to bad endings. It is in that spirit that I thought I would take the small risk of sharing these tentative thoughts with you tonight. Once again, thank you very much for this great honor, and for having me here in such stimulating company.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Paul has agreed to take some questions. I would ask that you ask a question and not make a speech, and that there is one to a customer. We have microphones here and on the upper landing.

I am going to start the questioning myself, I invite you, if you have a question for Paul, to go the mics.

Paul, as you imagine ProPublica's agenda of investigative work, what sorts of things do you think you are going to be directing it toward? What kind of journalism focus should we expect from ProPublica?

MR. STEIGER: Our mission is to try and shine a light on abuse of power. And of course the vast bulk of the power is in government and business, so we're going to be paying attention to government and business. But we are also going to look at other centers of power, unions, lawyers in courts, universities and school systems, doctors and hospitals, nonprofits, the media even. And with what is going on in the financial markets, you can bet we'll take a shot at that too.

MR. JONES: Any thoughts about, I don't know, Rupert Murdoch?

(Laughter)

MR. STEIGER: Oh, yes, Rupert Murdoch. I mean I retired from *The Journal* on December 31st and started, with terrible planning, in my new gig, on January 2nd, I got to watch a few football games and then go right into something new. And I have not, since I left, had that much chance to exchange information with my former colleagues, they've been busy and I've been busy. But just reading the paper, I



think were seeing the good Rupert, not the bad Rupert.

Unlike just about everybody else, *The Journal* is expanding, I see names I've never heard of with major bylines in the paper. It's obvious they've expanded the Washington Bureau. It's obvious that there is more news, particularly in the A section. And I have seen no evidence of Mr. Murdoch's or NewsCorp's other business objectives coloring the coverage. So, so far, I think it's all been good.

MR. JONES: Yes? Could you identify yourself?

MR. ODARIE: I am Jay Odarie, I'm a student here and at Yale Law School.

I recently read an article by, I think Jack Schaeffer, in *Slate*, that expressed some concern that, sort of the fears a lot of us have about Rupert Murdoch, and that journalism can sometimes be susceptible to sort of where the purse strings are, is just as likely to happen with nonprofit journalism. And my instinct was that he was wrong, but I would love to hear if you could sort of respond to that?

MR. STEIGER: Sure. I mean for those of you who don't know, Herb and Marion Sandler, who are the principle funders for ProPublica, have also given to a number of leftward leaning political causes. And when we had our early conversations about ProPublica, I

made it clear that I find nothing wrong with partisan motivation in investigative reporting, it's just not for me. And that if I were going to be involved we would have to go straight down the middle, I would have to be in charge of the journalism. And Herb and Marion have absolutely agreed to that and you know, it's early days, we haven't published anything yet, but I'm confident we'll be able to carry out that mission.

MR. HILLS: Phil Hills, a Shorenstein Fellow this year.

ProPublica is a pretty exciting idea for journalists, especially with some of them worried about what's going to happen next. Can you tell us, are there others that are now coming up, other subjects maybe, other areas that are thinking of the same model, supported journalism?

MR. STEIGER: I am not aware of any new ones of size, but there are significant existing activities that are similar to what we are doing. The Center for Public Integrity, in Washington, has been around a while, and they do very good work, looking particularly at government and politics. And their approach is to produce major studies on, for example, the effect of money on politics, which can then be used by journalists in supporting their own, tailored to their own publication's reporting. And I think they

serve a very valuable function.

Also in Washington is the Pulitzer Center, which with very little money, does excellent work funding freelance journalists to go abroad and tackle major reporting efforts. And at Berkeley there is something called the Center for Investigative Reporting that is a tremendous training ground for young investigative reporters. They get training both on the campus and there is funding for them for fellows to pursue projects, some of which have been quite outstanding.

So there is quite a bit going on. I would hope that the emergence of ProPublica, if we can have some success, will encourage other people to get in the game, particularly at the local and regional level. I think there is a great opportunity there.

MR. JONES: Paul, you probably, through these applications that you've gotten for investigative reporters who want to work for you, have gotten a better sense of what really is going on in the minds of investigative reporters in this country, and perhaps even abroad, could you talk a little about the portrait that emerges from going through these applications?

MR. STEIGER: Several things, Alex. First, the level of talent is amazing out there. If you're reading clips, as I've been doing until my eyes

get bleary, there is stuff that I've never seen before that the people who can do this deserve an audience. I'm, not to embarrass him, but I'm looking for a young Walt Bogdanich, who I hired at *The Wall Street Journal* from Cleveland, to do, of all things, personal finance reporting. And luckily Walt moved very quickly into investigative reporting. But it's trying to look for that level of talent and it is really out there.

And the depressing thing is that so many of them have a sense of desperation, that even if they were able to continue doing what they do this past year, that the axe is going to fall. I mean I've talked to a number of people from, for example, Tribune Company papers, telling about the atmosphere there, where Sam Zell, who I have known for many years, Sam Zell, the Chicago real estate magnate who recently got control of Tribune Company, and Sam is a kind of in your face kind of guy. And he has gone to bureau after bureau, telling them they are over-staffed, and you know, encouraging them, I think, to take buyouts. I mean I think that putting the best face on it, what he is probably trying to do is quickly get his costs down so that he doesn't have to keep doing it over the course of the year. But the result is a level of intimidation and frustration and anger that, as someone who spent fifteen years at *The Los Angeles Times* one of

those papers, it just breaks my heart.

So, the good thing is there is enormous talent out there, the bad thing is they are pretty shook.

MR. SNYDER: Jim Snyder, a Fellow here at the Shorenstein Center.

My question is to what extent would you say that taxpayers are subsidizing nonprofit journalism? Nonprofit journalism is getting its money through foundations, and wealthy people contribute to foundations to avoid estate taxes and get, you know, because of the tax breaks. So some people argue that the taxpayers subsidize foundations to the tune of about \$50 billion a year, it's a big item. Is that an inappropriate characterization? When you were talking about subsidies for journalism you talked about the second class periodical rate, and several other things, you didn't mention the tax breaks for foundations who are funding this resurgence in nonprofit journalism.

And then a second question, somewhat related, is where you have a public trust there are obligations. And the way it often works for nonprofits is they have to file a form 990, disclosing certain things about the nonprofits. And one of the distinguishing things about our nonprofits is they have very little information that is disclosed as to where

the nonprofits are getting their money.

So, with ProPublica and the Center for Public Integrity, I think your disclosure of the Sandler's involvement and other funders, it's sterling, but there are a lot of other nonprofit journalism going on in Washington, D.C., for example think tanks have been getting a lot of money for journalism, and they are not really disclosing, it's the same source of funding, you know, where they are getting their money. So, would you support, if we're going to have all this new nonprofit journalism that there be a higher level of mandated disclosure through the form 990?

MR. STEIGER: Well, I think the first thing I want to do is see if there is a good story on this for ProPublica to do, and let the chips fall where they may. And you're right, absolutely right, that in a certain sense, taxpayers subsidize all philanthropy, but that is true across the entire economy, and it isn't just journalism, which is a flyspeck in the total panoply of charitable causes in this country. But I think that there is a commitment to allow tax free gifts to certain kinds of causes, and I think that is generally a good thing. But I hadn't thought about the secrecy that you're referring to, it sounds like an interesting thing to look into.

MS. RUSSELL: I'm Chris Russell, I'm a

Fellow at the Belfer Center.

Could you, Alex mentioned that you had a deluge of applicants for jobs, and also that *The New York Times* had expressed an interest in taking some of your stories, could you talk a little bit more about the marketplace and what response you've had out there, your decision, or explain the criteria that you're going to be using?

And also, are they all going to be exclusives, are you going to mix them, and how do you balance sort of high profile newspapers that one might think have the resources to continue doing this, or hope that they could, versus some of the regional papers we've seen in these Goldsmith Awards produce incredible journalism as well?

MR. STEIGER: Sure. Very good question. Our principle criterion in deciding where we pitch a story is what platform has the best chance of getting our work seen by the people who can make a difference, not necessarily numbers. You know, you could put something on some television shows, for example, and get a decent rating and you get millions of viewers, but they might not be the ones that would be most responsive to this particular story. So that's one thing that we will think about and think about hard.

And secondly, we have gotten a wonderful

response from all of the big print places, not just the newspapers, but magazines and all of the television networks, "Frontline", right here in Boston. But all this is in the abstract, this is before we've produced even a single story, and it's one thing for Bill Keller or Len Downey or the folks at "60 Minutes" to say that they really welcome an opportunity to use our stuff, it's another thing to actually do it.

We are optimistic, the talent that I'm going to be able to put together will produce stuff that they'll use, but we just have to see. And we always have our website, which will be active every day, we'll be on a blog aggregating other people's investigative reporting and commenting on it and following up on it. I think follow up is crucially important, how many times have we seen wonderful investigative stories have no impact because they are dropped by the side of the road and left there and the people who produce them go on and do the next thing. We'll be following up not only our own stuff but, if we think we can make a difference, following up other folks' stuff.

Then after a brief period, you know, a day or two for a daily or weekly, maybe a little longer for a monthly publication, the exclusive goes away and we'll put it up on our own site, archive it, have it



available for search, and do follow up ourselves.

MR. BARDESI: I'm Kareem Bardesi, I'm a second year student here at the Kennedy School.

You mentioned publishers putting pressure on newsrooms to cut editorial staff, I was just wondering if you thought it was possible, maybe this could be a welcome development from an editorial point of view and that maybe in some cases in some newsrooms there is some deadwood that needs to be cleared out?

MR. STEIGER: In my sixteen years of running *The Wall Street Journal's* newsroom, I occasionally heard that refrain from my bosses, and sometimes it was worth listening to. But I think if you go around most newsrooms in America, the process of trying to get more efficient has been going on for so long that there is precious little deadwood in newsrooms in America these days. I mean if you look at the buyouts that for example, *The Washington Post* is doing, there are some people that are still performing at a terrific level that are signing onto those buyouts, the same for *The Los Angeles Times*.

I know that the editors of those publications are bleeding at the loss of these folks, they're not, there is no silver lining. There are times when you get addition by subtraction, but I think in most newsrooms today we have passed that point.

MR. RANEIRI: Good evening, my name is Nelson Raneiri, I'm an alumnus of the Kennedy School, and currently work in Florida for an energy company.

First of all, congratulations to you, to your colleagues and to the Center.

I'm curious, given your background covering corporate America, and now with the focus on the changes in media, what kind of thoughts do you have looking forward with respect to changes corporate America might be looking at, in terms of how they deal with media or just general practices?

MR. STEIGER: Well, in my time in journalism, and with a particular focus on business journalism, Alex made the point there I was in San Francisco in the Summer of Love, and I was filing stories on earnings statements.

(Laughter)

MR. STEIGER: There's something wrong here. But you know, I noticed this, I was out in Santa Barbara for a couple days at the end of last week for a conference on the environment and energy, as a way of, I think this is an important area for coverage and I wanted to get myself quickly up to speed. And all the major corporate players and some of the major government players were there, so it was a good opportunity to do that.

But I saw CEO after CEO after CEO, and it just occurred to me how much more media adept and media confident corporate CEOs are than when I first started. It's clearly become part of the job to be able to go on television and be on panels, and talk to reporters. I mean they spin just like politicians, and they're getting to be almost as good. So I think that that's one manifestation of change.

Change that I anticipate with the current debacle in the credit markets, and the general political climate, during my career covering business and economic and political economy news, I've seen the pendulum swing from the '60s, when we had a highly regulated economy to the recent past, when we've had, we've gone to an almost, not entirely, but an almost laissez-faire economic regime, the market is king.

And I see that pendulum starting to swing back, and it will do it in fits and starts, but the intervention of this past weekend in the Bear Stearns deal is not out of step with some of the things that have gone on in the past, for example in 1998, when long term capital management beached up, there was a similar kind of move.

But this time I see the swing back going farther, it's pretty clear that there were some fairly obvious regulatory steps in the mortgage market,

particularly in the more esoteric securitized aspects of the mortgage market, that a more aware Federal Reserve could have dealt with, and nipped a lot of these problems in the bud. I think there is going to be more pressure to put in structures that do that kind of thing. So I think that's another change to look for in the future.

MR. JONES: Two final questions.

FROM THE FLOOR: I am in the mid career program here, and I also was a Fellow at the Center for Public Leadership.

I was also an investigative journalist for more than fifteen years in Latin America. As you pointed out the very grim situation of investigative journalists here in the United States, but it's much worse in the developing countries, it's really incredible the crisis there and how almost all the media there are cutting any in-depth investigations or in-depth journalism. Then I wonder if your ProPublica would have an international agenda, because the democracies there are really suffering from the lack of investigative journalism and good quality journalism?

MR. STEIGER: That's a very good question, and it's a situation that I am very well aware of. One of my other roles is as chairman of the committee to protect journalists, which as you know, is set up to

try to keep journalists from getting killed or jailed or beaten in foreign countries. And as worried as we are about encroachments against the First Amendment in this country, the lives of journalists in many other countries are much more challenging than they are here. And that also goes to the access to documents and the requirements that people of power, both in business and in government, disclose at least some details about their operations. And it's much, much tougher in the developing world, generally speaking, than it is in the U.S.

We can't afford to put that on our plate in the first year, that doesn't mean we won't go abroad in search of a story, we are set up to do that, and I am looking to have people with language skills on our team. But for the first year or so we are going to try to focus hard on topics that are of interest to an American audience. Because with our size, that is about what we can handle. And if that means we should go to China or Venezuela or Zimbabwe, we'll do it.

MR. MARR: Good evening, Jonathan Marr from here at the Kennedy School.

We've spoken a lot on how ProPublica is a innovation in terms of supply of investigative reporting, but I was wondering, seeing as we are here at a school of public policy, if you may say a few

words on how you think we could actually instigate the demand for good investigative reporting, if you have any ideas?

MR. STEIGER: There are several ways that demand reflects itself, in the for profit arena it reflects itself in circulation and hits and advertising revenue. In the nonprofit arena it manifests itself in terms of people expressing themselves, and you know, you can go on blogspot with your own blog or go on somebody else's and say, I saw this thing on ProPublica and it blows my mind, when are you guys going to do something about it?

And I mean that sort of thing, it's a small, simple-minded piece of what can be, response in Congress, response in regulatory agencies, but if individuals respond to something we see, that we produce and they see, that's the way the democratic process is supposed to work and that will encourage other people like the Sandler's, and they are not the only ones with big fortunes made in the last twenty years, it could inspire other people like the Sandler's to make similar contributions.

MR. JONES: You've been very patient, so why don't you go ahead with the last one.

MS. TOFANI: My name is Loretta Tofani.

I live in Utah now, so I'm wondering to

what extent will ProPublica do investigative stories in the western part of the United States or in other parts of the United States?

MR. STEIGER: I'm going to answer you in a way that having been through a few of these conversations with other talented journalists that I'm not sure you're going to like, we are going to put people on airplanes, coach, not first class, all over the United States.

But I think it's very important, at least in the first two or three years, that we have everybody in the newsroom in New York when they are not out actually reporting on a story. Because we are trying to create a culture, we are going to have a range of experience on our staff. And I've just found it so important, I've seen it again and again in my years at both *The Journal* and *The L.A. Times*, it's important to have people bounce off each other on their way to the elevator. And once we create that culture we can think about having virtual contributors from Salt Lake City or Boulder or El Paso or Boise, but not now.

MR. JONES: I suspect you could probably get a job there if you were really looking.

MS. TOFANI: If I move.

MR. STEIGER: We'll sign you up.

(Laughter)

MR. JONES: Paul, we have two things for you. First, we have something that I think will be absolutely precious to any Yale man, we have a Harvard Kennedy School Shorenstein Chair for you to put in your office.

(Laughter) (Applause)

MR. JONES: And what looks like a Harvard diploma, with the Goldsmith Career Award for Excellence in Journalism. Again, thank you so much.

(Applause)

MR. STEIGER: Thank you. Can I just say one thing?

MR. JONES: Sure.

MR. STEIGER: When I was an undergraduate in New Haven, President Kennedy visited, he got an honorary degree, and he said now I have the best of both worlds, a Harvard education and a Yale degree.

(Laughter)

MR. STEIGER: And I can now, as someone whose first wife and oldest daughter are both graduates of Harvard, now I can say I have a Harvard degree to go with my Yale education.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: I want to remind you that tomorrow morning at 8:30 we will be gathering for a seminar on the state of investigative reporting. The



finalists and the winner of the Goldsmith Award and also Paul will be hereto take part in that, I encourage you all to come if you can. We will have a light breakfast at 8:30 and then we will start at 9:00.

And with that, let me again thank you for being here, thank you for joining us on this very special night.

Congratulations to the finalists, to the winners, and thank you especially, . Paul Steiger. Thank you all very much.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, at 7:32 p.m., the session was concluded.)



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: TOM PATTERSON, Moderator

In the Matter of:

THE GOLDSMITH AWARDS

Date: March 18, 2008

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts

\_\_\_\_\_  
Martin T. Farley  
Advance Services

03/31/08  
Date