

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

JOHN F. KENNEDY SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT

JOAN SHORENSTEIN CENTER ON THE
PRESS, POLITICS AND PUBLIC POLICY

THE GOLDSMITH AWARDS

Monday

March 7, 2011

John F. Kennedy, Jr. Forum

Littauer Building

Kennedy School of Government

Cambridge, Massachusetts

BEFORE: ALEX JONES

Moderator

John F. Kennedy School of Government

79 JFK Street

Cambridge, MA 02138

ADVANCE SERVICES
Franklin, Massachusetts
(508) 520-2076

I N D E X

OPENING REMARKS	PAGE
David Ellwood, Dean	3
Goldsmith Book Prizes	
Tom Patterson	7
Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting	
Alex Jones	9
Goldsmith Career Award for Excellence in Journalism	
Alex Jones	21
Frank Rich	23

MR. ELLWOOD: My name is David Ellwood and I want to welcome you to the John F. Kennedy, Jr. Forum here at the Harvard Kennedy School. Those of you that are veterans of this particular evening know that this is one of the great nights of the year. It's a great night in no small measure because we honor the people that do some of the most extraordinary and important work in our democratic nation. They are people that put ally to the frequent concerns that the press is dead soon, we've all been replaced by a Twit or a Tweet or something. That Facebook can bring down governments and therefore is all we need in exchange for a free and effective and independent media.

It is also an opportunity to honor some people that have done exceptional work and to recognize their spectacular ideas. Our honored guest tonight, Frank Rich, of course is someone who has contributed really a lifetime of remarkable service in many different ways and is off to start the next chapter of that remarkable lifetime. But I'm sure we will hear more about that later.

But I want to start by commenting on someone we lost this year, Walter Shorenstein. Walter and his wife, Phyllis, really made all of this possible. They are the reason why we are here tonight. Because twenty years ago the Shorensteins created the Center for Press, Politics and Public Policy, then the Joan Shorenstein Center for the Press, Politics and Public Policy, it has been changed slightly over time, in memory of their beloved daughter.

And the Shorenstein Center of course promotes very serious probing analyses about the news media, about politics and how they interact in critical ways in this country and well beyond. And increasingly the Shorenstein Center is taking the lead in its activities to understand what the next generation of media is going to look like. What do we do in a world where the print media or even the television media have been replaced by other

kinds and forms and so on. How do we go forward?

Walter was a truly visionary man. He was the energy behind much of what we did. Indeed, it wasn't a good week when Walter didn't call. But he was always pushing the school and the center to be at the forefront, to think about the next idea, to figure out how to make the world better. Of course his generosity extended well beyond Harvard's walls. He did things varying from keeping the San Francisco Giants in his home town to fine arts in contemporary Asia. And I'm told that he was the single largest donor to United Way. Imagine, the single largest donor.

But it's been an enormous pleasure to work with Walter over the years and so forth. And now I am very, very pleased to say that we are joined tonight by his son, Doug, right over here and his daughter-in-law, Lydia, and their granddaughter, Danielle, all three here. So we have several generations of Shorensteins yet to come.

(Applause)

MR. ELLWOOD: So let me now turn the podium over to the Laurence M. Lombard lecturer in press and public policy, Alex Jones. Alex, as I think all of you know, is the Director of the Shorenstein Center. He covered the press for *The New York Times* from 1983 to 1992 and was awarded the Pulitzer Prize in 1987. In 1991 he co-authored with his beloved and late wife, Susan Tifft, *The Patriarch: The Rise and Fall of the Bingham Dynasty*. In '92 he left *The Times* to work on *The Trust: The Private and Powerful Family Behind the New York Times*, also co-authored with Susan. And it was a finalist for the National Book Circle Award.

He has been a Nieman Fellow at Harvard, a host on National Public Radio's *On the Media* and a host and executive editor of PBS's *Media Matters*. He's on all kinds of journalistic boards, ranging from the Committee of Concerned Journalists to the Black

Mountain Institute, the Nieman Foundation and many things in between. But most importantly, he is a man who brings a deep and abiding belief in the fundamental importance of this institution which we variously call the press, the media and everything in between. He has led us in our understanding of where we are and I think he will help lead us where we are headed, though God knows where that is, in the years ahead.

I would also say one other thing. That I have the opportunity to make many introductions and many descriptions of people because of my role here as Dean of the Kennedy School. But I always have a twinge of concern when Alex comes up because he is way, way better at that. And so, setting those expectations high, let me now introduce Alex Jones.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: This is one of my favorite nights, as David said. It is a very, very happy night for the Shorenstein Center. It is the night that we get to celebrate the kind of people that we most admire who do the kind of journalistic work that I am very glad to say is still being done. It's the 20th anniversary of the Goldsmith Awards this year. And I look forward to this event, this night, every year with a special kind of pride because I feel that the Shorenstein Center and the Kennedy School at Harvard really do, through the Goldsmith Prizes, do something for journalism, do something to bolster it. And it needs bolstering as I think you will all agree.

The Goldsmith Prize is something that has a very interesting history. Bob Greenfield, then a Philadelphia lawyer, had a client named Berta Marks Goldsmith, who had told him of her intent to leave him her entire estate. Him, her lawyer, her entire estate. He declined to accept it and when searching for a good way to use the money for a purpose that Berta would have approved of. She was passionately interested in good government

and followed the news very carefully and she was particularly outraged at misconduct by people with public responsibility.

Eventually Bob connected with Marvin Kalb, the Shorenstein Center's founding Director, who I am glad to say is with us tonight. And the result was the Goldsmith Awards in Political Journalism, which includes the Investigative Reporting Prize, Book Prizes, Fellowships and the Career Award. Thank you to the Greenfield Foundation, of which Bob is Chairman, and to the board members and to the family. The Greenfield family is really most remarkable. And I am very glad that many of them are here tonight.

Mike Greenfield, who serves as a Goldsmith Judge, and his wife, Elaine Wang, Jill Greenfield Feldman, Bill and Joanie Greenfield, Ben Greenfield and Bill Epstein, also here, Barbara and Charles Kahn, who are Foundation trustees. Without the Greenfield family's support and continued good faith, this night would not be possible. And I would like to ask the members of the Greenfield family and those associated with the Foundation to stand so that we can express our thanks.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: One of the pleasures of this night for me has long been the chance to publicly thank the man principally responsible for the existence of the Shorenstein Center. You heard from David about Walter Shorenstein. He died last year at 95. And while his body finally failed him, his mind was sharp and his will strong right up until the end. Walter made his fortune in real estate by harnessing a bottomless supply of drive and optimism. Those same things plus an enduring passionate concern for his country marked his life.

It was this public spiritedness that led him to endow the Shorenstein Center as a memorial to Joan, his daughter, who died very much too young of breast cancer. She was

a journalist at CBS. Walter has now been succeeded by his other children, Doug and Carole. Carole is a Tony Award winning Broadway producer. Doug is Chairman and CEO of the Shorenstein Company and Chairman of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

In his eulogy at his father's funeral Doug said that the two things of which Walter Shorenstein was most proud were his family and the Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy. That is our legacy and we are determined to keep that pride intact. Doug and his wife, Lydia, and their daughter, Danielle, are here, as David said, but I want to ask you once again to clap your hands in favor and in thought and in thanks for the Shorensteins.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: The first Goldsmith Awards are the Book Prizes. And making those presentations will be my colleague, Tom Patterson, the Bradlee Professor of Government in the Press here at the Kennedy School.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: Thank you, Alex. We award two Goldsmith Book Prizes each year. One for the best trade book in the field of press and politics, the other for the field's best academic book. But first I want to thank the judges that picked tonight's books. Alex is one of them. Marion Just, Matt Baum, and I was the fourth judge on that committee. Service on the committee has a perk. You get a large, large stack of books free, many of them quite excellent.

We are here tonight to pick the best two and recognize the best two. As we all know the traditional news media face shrinking audiences and declining revenues. Any number of possible solutions have been proposed. New platforms, new ownership structures, cost

and staff sharing between news organizations, foundation grants, even government subsidies.

The winner of this year's Goldsmith Book Prize in the trade category has a different suggestion. He argues that journalists need to better understand their audience. Drawing upon recent studies in neuroscience, Jack Fuller, a Pulitzer Prize winner and the *Chicago Tribune's* Editor and Publisher at one time, argues that today's information rich environment has changed how audiences think about information. And that understanding this change is a key if journalists are to recapture their loyalty.

He calls for a more emotionally rich type of news coverage, one that is strong in its story telling and compelling in its content and yet one that remains faithful to journalists' obligation to inform the public. What is happening to news is filled with ideas and insights. Bill Covich says this of the book. It is one of the most interesting, innovative and important new books on journalism of the past decade. The Award Committee agrees. Jack Fuller, please step up to accept your Goldsmith Book Award in the trade category for *What is Happening to the News*.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: The Award Committee tries its best to break tie votes. This year we were unable to do so in deciding upon the Goldsmith academic book award winner. Not because we had a two to two deadlock on the committee, but because we were unanimous in thinking we had two extraordinary books that should receive this award. One is *When Politicians Attack*. In it, UCLA Professor Tim Groeling shows that journalists are not equal opportunists when politicians go on the attack.

Journalists tend to discount attacks aimed at the other party. Those are routine and not especially newsworthy. Attacks that occur within a party are a different story.

Journalists perk up on those occasions. Tim Groeling's research helps to explain why a political party that controls both the White House and the Congress has trouble protecting its brand. Party squabbles within the congressional majority or between it and the White House are sure to make the news. Think Chuck Hagel and George W. Bush on Iraq. Think Ben Nelson and Barack Obama on the health care bill.

The book lends support to Ronald Reagan's 11th Commandment. No Republican shall speak ill of another Republican. Any partisan who attacks another of the same party is likely to show up on the evening news. Tim Groeling, please step forward to receive the Goldsmith Award for your remarkable book, *When Politicians Attack*.

(Applause)

MR. PATTERSON: The other Goldsmith Academic Book Prize goes to Davidson College Professor Patrick Sellers. His book, *Cycles of Spin*, examines how congressional leaders craft their messages and how journalists respond. The book was a massive undertaking. Patrick Sellers analyzed more than 20,000 public statements by members of Congress and more than one million news stories from a dozen national news outlets and from top local newspapers in 43 states. He uses this and other evidence to tease out the complex relationship between issue selection and position taking in Congress, media coverage of these developments and citizens' response to the coverage.

Cycles of Spin is by far the most comprehensive and sophisticated study ever done of strategic communication in Congress. The book is must reading for anyone interested in understanding the complex relationship between journalists and politicians. Patrick Sellers, please come forward to accept the Goldsmith Prize for *Cycles of Spin*.

(Applause)

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

Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting, which I shall do in alphabetical order by news organization. This year's competition was extremely competitive, I am glad to say. In these difficult times for journalism one might fear that the quality and ambition of investigative reporting would be in decline, but that was definitely not the case in this year's entries.

In addition to Mike Greenfield, the judges for this year's competition were Sandy Rowe, the distinguished former editor of the Portland *Oregonian* and past chairman of the Pulitzer Prize Board and presently a Fellow at the Shorenstein Center, Nicco Mele, a leading expert in the area of social media, founder of EchoDitto, a web consulting firm and a member of the Kennedy School faculty. Mark Greenblatt, a Goldsmith finalist last year and a prize winning reporter for KHOU-TV in Houston and Anthony Williams, the William H. Bloomberg lecturer at the Kennedy School and former Mayor of Washington, D.C.

In January, after long deliberation, the judges select the six finalists and also the winner. We announce the finalists at once, because part of the purpose of the Goldsmith Prize is to call attention to the kind of investigative reporting that all the finalists are exemplified at and to inspire others to do the same. We announce the finalists early so they can publicize it so the word can get around and people can recognize that there is a lot of very, very fine work being done. But we don't announce the winner until tonight.

So it is with great pleasure that I describe the six finalists, each of which in its own way was regarded as extraordinary. The first Goldsmith finalist is the *Las Vegas Sun* for "Do No Harm: Hospital Care in Las Vegas" by Marshall Allen and Alex Richards. The series "Do No Harm" began with the realization that people in Las Vegas with some frequency went to the city's hospitals and bad things happened that were not from the

diseases that sent them there.

These things included preventable injuries, infections caught while in the hospital, surgical mishaps, including deaths. And they found that government regulators and hospital administrators and doctors, the people who should know, were not able to measure the risk that one took simply by checking into a hospital. It turned out that at some hospitals that risk was very high indeed. In the course of its investigation, the *Sun* discovered thousands of cases of preventable harm, including 365 deaths in Nevada.

The paper, by dogged reporting and sophisticated analysis accomplished what the government could not achieve in eight years, identifying and publicly reporting the preventable infections and injuries in Las Vegas hospitals. As you might expect, these revelations were not welcome by the hospitals. Many of them stonewalled but the *Sun* pressed on and slowly the truth began to emerge and the hospital wall began to crack. Eventually 2.9 million records were crunched. But the stories were not just statistics. They were human ones with human faces and they were stories that came with an elaborate and ambitious online component.

It is important that you know that the *Las Vegas Sun* is not published like any other daily that I know of. It is essentially a news rich eight page publication inserted every day into its arch rival, the *Las Vegas Review-Journal*. This was the scheme that allowed the *Sun's* owner, Brian Greenspun, who is with us tonight, to keep it alive as a second newspaper in town. And another part of that scheme was to create a web presence that was hyper local and also hyper sophisticated, which was used to help add muzzle velocity to the *Sun's* hospital reporting.

An array of web elements not only made the information easily accessible, but invited more and more citizens to engage the issue, to tell their own stories and to push the city's

hospitals to come clean and improve. The impact was profound, both from people who had been harmed by hospitals and from hospitals who were pushed and prodded into becoming transparent in a way they never had. May I ask Marshall Allen and Alex Richards and also the publisher and owner of the *Las Vegas Sun*, Brian Greenspun, to rise and be saluted for "Do No Harm."

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Bell, California, is one of those independent municipalities within Los Angeles County like Beverly Hills. Only Bell's population of about 37,000 is mostly poor and Latino. It is located between downtown L.A. and Long Beach. And flew comfortably under the radar of anyone's notice until Jeff Gottlieb and Ruben Vives of *The Los Angeles Times* got a tip that the city's leaders were collecting exorbitant salaries.

So they went to Bell City Hall and asked to see the city administrator, who refused to come out of his office. Then they asked to see employment contracts and minutes of council meetings and were told that it would take time. So they called and called again and began to get the idea that they, like other such people who had made such inquiries, were being stalled and deceived. But they pressed on.

And when they got the information they understood why the city administrator had been so reluctant. He was being paid nearly \$800,000 a year. His assistant nearly \$400,000. The chief of police was getting close to half a million and all the city councilor members, which was a part time job paying a few hundred dollars a month in cities of comparable size, were on the gravy train for \$100,000 a year.

Public fury brought the resignations of the top administrator, his assistant and the police chief, but that was just part of the story. In subsequent stories *The L.A. Times* staff revealed that Bell had one of the highest property taxes in the country, that the city made

income by aggressively impounding cars and squeezing merchants for arbitrary fees. And the victims were mostly poor Latinos who were often undocumented and afraid to protest.

Throughout the investigation the city stubbornly withheld documents and prohibited employees from talking. But as *The Times* investigation ground on the results were sweeping. The L.A. County District Attorney's Office began its own investigation, which resulted in the administrator's arrest along with seven other current and former city officials. The state controller's office ordered cities and counties to post official salaries on the internet and found that Bell had overcharged residents \$5.6 million in property taxes, sewer fees and business licenses.

Perhaps most important, the stories about Bell have inspired watchdog groups and newspapers across the country to begin asking the hard questions about how much public officials are paid. Oh, and in a bow to popular culture, Bell has become the answer on Jeopardy for the name of the city that is a bi-word for brazen municipal venality. Please join me in recognizing the outstanding work of Jeff Gottlieb and Ruben Vives and *The Los Angeles Times* staff.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Laura Sullivan's three part series on the nation's bail bond system on NPR began this way. More than half a million inmates are sitting in U.S. jails right now, not necessarily because they are dangerous, not because a judge thinks they are flight risks, not even because they are guilty. They haven't even been tried yet. They are sitting in jail for a basic financial reason. They can't make bail, sometimes as little as \$50. Some will wait behind bars for as long as a year before their cases may get to court. And the cost to taxpayers to house these folks, most of whom are non-violent men and women

charged with small crimes, \$9 billion.

Laura Sullivan spent a lot of time digging into the realities of the bail bond system. And what she found was not a slipshod and shady enterprise in which people without means fell through the cracks, but a powerful industry that protected its own interest at the expense of defendants, their victims and taxpayers. She told the story of Leslie Chew, a Texas handyman who can't read or write and usually slept in the back of his battered old station wagon.

One chilly December night, when the station wagon was cold, he stole four \$30 blankets from a grocery store and promptly got arrested as he was walking out of the store. When Laura interviewed him, he had been in the Lubbock County Jail for 185 days, more than six months. He hadn't been convicted of a crime. He hadn't even been tried. But he can't make bail. It would have required a cash deposit of \$3,500 and a \$350 bail bondsman fee. If he had the money he could walk out the door. But as he said, 'It was like a million dollars to me.'

The point of Laura Sullivan's series is that in the United States, if you commit a crime and have money you get out of jail quickly. You almost immediately can go back to your job, your family, pay your bills, work, fight your case and according to national studies you face far fewer consequences for your crimes than people without money. That's the fairness issue. But then there is the taxpayer issue, the \$9 billion spent to keep people like Leslie Chew locked up because he can't make bail.

Also locked up in the Lubbock jail, with Chew, is Doug Currington who stole a television from WalMart. He has been in jail, when Laura talked to him, 75 days at an estimated cost to taxpayers of \$2,850. It would have cost him \$150 to get out on bail. Both Chew and Currington have lost their jobs while they have been sitting in jail. Twenty

years ago, nationally and in Lubbock, it wasn't this way. Most defendants were released on their own recognizance, trusted to show back up and the vast majority did show up.

But the bail bonds interests have done all they can to prevent such programs and to thwart other efforts to secure release of prisoners without the bail bond and the bail bond fees that are their rice bowl. It turns out that two-thirds, two-thirds of the people in the nation's jails are non-violent offenders who are there for only one reason, they can't afford bail. The series prompted a huge outpouring from NPR listeners, many asking how to send money to the people in Sullivan's stories and some even including cash with their letters.

This is old school journalism, wrote one listener. Passionate, clear, moving, before the state as it was meant to be. You made me cry with frustration, recognition and relief that somebody is finally telling a national audience what we economically exploited folks have silently witnessed for years. Please join me in saluting Laura Sullivan of NPR for "Behind the Bail Bond System."

(Applause)

MR. STONE: When the American economy melted down explanations for what had caused it were initially along the lines of a hundred year flood, an unforeseeable disaster that took nearly everyone by surprise, from homeowners to politicians to bankers. *Pro Publica*, NPR's *Planet Money* and Chicago Public Radio's *This American Life* jointly stood up to investigate that theory. And the reporting assignment went to Jesse Eisinger and Jake Bernstein of *Pro Publica*.

The first story in the series was published in April and detailed how in the run-up to the crisis the hedge fund Magnetar, with the help of major banks, drove the creation of \$40 billion worth of complex securities and then bet against many of them as part of a

strategy to profit from the declining housing market. They created them, sold them to suckers and then made big financial bets that their value would collapse. Magnetar made hundreds of millions of dollars when these securities did what they appeared to have been built to do. They tanked.

It took Eisinger and Bernstein months of canvassing hundreds of people to penetrate the Magnetar veil and to find the small handful of people who had first hand knowledge and were willing to discuss what they knew. As one banker said, when confronted with what he had done, 'I deserve to be fired for this.' When the story hit the impact was immediate. The SEC sued Goldman Sachs for securities fraud in a similar case a week later. Lawsuits were filed. The case was cited on the Senate floor and the wheels of financial reform, such as they could be turned, began to turn.

Another story in August scrutinized the banks themselves. And it too got the attention of regulators. And in a final piece of this series, which is a case study of Merrill Lynch, Merrill Lynch had to be sold because of defiance of inner internal risk controls in stockpiling tens of billions of dollars in unhedged hugely risky securities. When those securities collapsed, so did Merrill Lynch. And it was sold to Bank of America.

Throughout, *Pro Publica* worked with its radio partners at *Planet Money* where a 40 minute radio segment was produced that tied together this complex story and made it accessible. Then *This American Life*, his -- Ira Glass, as you probably know, is the person behind that and Ira Glass became involved and recognized that the Magnetar story had every parallels with the plot to the musical satire, *The Producers*, in which producers find a play that they think is certain to fail and sell it again and again and again to gullible investors.

He commissioned a pair of showtune composers to write and perform, *Bet Against*

the American Dream, which caught the attention of, among others, Frank Rich, our Goldsmith career winner who will speak later tonight. A huge effort was made to simplify without distorting. And among the story telling devices was an easy to follow comic strip and a brief but chillingly hilarious music video that generated more than a million views on YouTube. The goal was to find out what had happened and then make what happened something that people without a finance background could understand. Mission accomplished. Please join me in saluting Jesse Eisinger and Jake Bernstein of *Pro Publica*, Adam Davidson of NPR's *Planet Money* and Ira Glass and Alex Blumberg of Chicago Public Radio's *This American Life*.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: California seems to be an especially ripe place for doing the kind of investigations the Goldsmith Prize seeks to recognize. The corruption of Bell was corruption of a mammoth scale at a local level. Karen De Sá, the *San Jose Mercury News* tackled something much different and truly profoundly disturbing. Her investigation grew out of the insight a newcomer to covering the state legislature in Sacramento had noticed and then appalled by that it was commonplace for lobbyists not only to push their favorite legislation, but to actually write the bills and then present them in committee.

In other words, there seemed to be a virtual takeover of the legislative process by lobbyists that went well beyond undue influence. To put a factual stamp on what she perceived, Karen methodically scrutinized every one of the 9,000 bills introduced in the California Legislature in the two recent legislative sessions. She determined that 37 percent of them, of all the legislation, fell into the unique to California category known as sponsored bills.

These are bills not simply pushed by special interests. They are actually written by them. Lobbyists find legislators to carry their handiwork, showering the politicians with contributions and gifts. And in many cases the lobbyists present the bills to the committees themselves and they line up votes with remarkable success. More than half the bills signed into law over the two sessions she examined were the handiwork of those outside sponsors. It was one of the most original, exhaustive and important examinations ever done by the *Mercury News* and it documented in an unassailable fashion how completely private interest sponsors had taken advantage of largely inexperienced legislators to push their own desires at the expense of the public interest.

The inexperienced point was something else that Karen explored. How much did California's term limits laws matter? The term limits mean there is always a healthy crop of new and inexperienced legislators ripe for the plucking. She did an analysis of a legislative session 16 years earlier, before term limits, and she found that the term limits rules had in fact increased the power of outside lobbyists with a marked increase in sponsored bills since term limits went into effect.

Given California's dire financial situation the series had huge impact and was reprinted all over the state. As Doug Heller, Executive Director of the California organization Consumer Watchdog said, her reporting had framed an issue that had been grossly unattended and grossly ignored. *L.A. Weekly* compared her to Diana, Goddess of the Hunt. Everybody else covering Sacramento for the past decade was just a bit asleep almost all of the time they said.

The series prompted widespread public response in their stirrings of reform and even for changing term limit rules. And as everyone acknowledged, Karen de Sá and the *San Francisco Mercury News* had done a great service to California. Please join me in

recognizing Karen de Sá of the *San Jose Mercury News* for "How Our Laws Are Really Made."

(Applause)

MR. JONES: For their report, "Top Secret America," Dana Priest and Bill Arkin of *The Washington Post* spent two years plumbing something that was almost impossible to plumb and was intended to remain that way. They found a vast top secret enterprise, a mosaic of people and technology hidden in plain sight. So massive that its effectiveness is impossible to determine. They found a world so unwieldy and so secretive that no one knows how much money it costs, how many people it employs, how many programs exist within it or exactly how many agencies do the same work.

They found an alternative geography of the United States unknown in all its dimensions, even to its creators and administrators. What they found was that in the decade after 9/11 a nexus had formed that was a new version of the military industrial complex that President Dwight D. Eisenhower had warned about half a century earlier. This time it was an enormous ecosystem of military, intelligence and corporate interests spawned to keep Americans safe, but remaining astonishingly unaccountable. From their reporting, which was handicapped because much of what they saw was highly classified, Priest and Arkin discovered that more than 850,000 now have top secret clearances to work on counter terrorism and homeland security issues for nearly 1,300 government organizations and almost 2,000 private companies in more than 10,000 locations.

This massive expansion costs on the order of \$75 billion a year, relies heavily on corporate private contractors and has almost no checks on redundancy or measures of effectiveness. To find out what was underway required building a database from the ground up. Priest and Arkin dug through public records, many of them classified. A

dozen digital journalists worked on the project for months creating videos and interactive vehicles that would make their reporting accessible.

Reaction to the project was unprecedented to *Post*. Top secret America's content on the website got three million page views in three days. Newspapers around the world reprinted the stories on their front pages. Congress got involved. The stories were used to question the incoming director of the Office of National Intelligence, which had discouraged *The Post* from publishing the information in the first place. Secretary of Defense Robert Gates launched an effort to evaluate and downsize the Pentagon's huge but redundant programs. The CIA is in the process of transferring many contractor jobs back to federal employees. The Senate Intelligence Committee has taken up several of the themes launching their own inquiries which continue.

Most important, "Top Secret America" made transparent information that prior to the series was not understood or known, not by the government and not by the public. Please join me in saluting Dana Priest and Bill Arkin and *The Washington Post* for "Top Secret America."

(Applause)

MR. JONES: We now come to the moment when we announce the winner of this year's Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting. I think you will agree that every one of the finalists would be a most worthy winner. And I ask all the finalists to stand once again so that we may applaud their work and encourage them to keep at it.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: It is my pleasure and honor now to award this year's Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting to Marshall Allen, Alex Richards and the *Las Vegas Sun* for "Do No Harm: Hospital Care in Las Vegas."

(Applause)

MR. JONES: As most of you who gathered here tonight know, last week Frank Rich announced he was leaving *The New York Times* after more than 30 years as one of the paper's most prized assets. Like many of you, I suspect, for years I have had a standing appointment with Frank every Sunday morning on *The Times* editorial page. So this news hit me hard. As a *Times* veteran who loves the paper I was also aware that his departure would be akin to Tom Brady leaving the Patriots.

Frank has been for decades one of *The Times*' franchise players. But as I thought about it I began to see that this was very much in the tradition of the way Frank Rich's restless mind and appetite for new challenges works. He is hungry still. He wants to do more and different still. And he has done something quite similar before. In 1994, at the peak of his fame at *The Times* Chief Theater Critic, he decided to change his perceived power to open or close Broadway shows for the power to torment presidents of the United States in an op ed column.

At the time it seemed unthinkable that he would make such a move. After all, he had built his career around cultural coverage. He had been a film and television critic at *Time Magazine*. And before that a film critic at *The New York Post*. This magna cum laude BA from Harvard was an American history in literature, but his passion since childhood in Washington, D.C. was for the arts. Something he wrote about movingly in his memoir *Ghost Light*.

He told in that book how as a child of divorce he had found a refuge in theater, particularly Broadway's Golden Age. After being enchanted by *Bells Are Ringing* when he was seven he wrote that I was now destined to chase my childhood almost exclusively through an accelerating progression of plays, good and bad, that would captivate and

kidnap me. And 38 years later he becomes Chief Theater Critic of *The New York Times*. By that time his taste was sharp and refined and his powers of analysis and his pure writing talent were at flood tide.

He became arguably the most powerful and feared theater critic *The Times* had ever had, perhaps the most powerful and feared critic, period. He could be that enchanted seven year old again when he saw something that stirred his passionate love for theater, something that was never in doubt. And when he found something mediocre or worse, he could be merciless. The Butcher of Broadway. He was called that when he had unleashed that Frank Rich judgment in a brutal negative. But even his critics acknowledged, albeit grudgingly, that he was almost always right.

It was this Frank Rich who had won over his critics and also won the utter loyalty of his admirers who shocked everyone in 1994 and announced he was going to leave theater and write about politics. For five years his column was on the op ed page and then he became the first *Times* columnist to write a regular double length column, something unprecedented, but necessary to keep him at *The Times*. He had grown confined with the single column space. He wanted room, he wanted change.

Last week when I read about his decision, I felt that same restlessness at work. Frank Rich's extra long Sunday column has been the scourge of presidents, be they Democrat or Republican. It has week after week enraged some readers, thrilled many more and been appointment journalism. He made his critiques based on fact and his columns were unusually, I would say, rich in reporting. He was incisive, penetrating, sometimes mean, sometimes almost sentimental, always irresistible.

Frank has announced that in June he will join *New York Magazine* as an essayist writing monthly on politics and culture. He will serve as an editor at large editing a

special monthly section anchored by his essay. He will also be a commentator on newyorkmag.com, engaging in regular dialogues on the news of the week. He will be reunited with Adam Moss, *New York Magazine's* editor-in-chief in one of the most imaginative and ambitious editors in the nation and an old friend and colleague of Frank's from *The New York Times*.

This is a very big day for New York, Adam wrote in his gleeful announcement of Frank's decision. Frank Rich is a giant, a powerhouse critic of politics and culture, a rigorous thinker, a glorious stylist, a skeptic and optimist at the same time. There is no one like him in American journalism. Tonight we are awarding Frank Rich the Goldsmith Career Award for Excellence in Journalism. We had thought it was to celebrate his career at *The Times*. And it is. But it is also to mark the raised curtain of yet another career, another chapter, and one that will no doubt be just as tumultuous and exciting and important. Our Career Winner, Frank Rich.

(Applause)

MR. RICH: Thank you. It's nice to be at the set of *The Social Network*. I am greatly honored to receive the Goldsmith Career Award tonight. And it's particularly delightful to be here with my friend and former *Times* colleague, Alex Jones. And to be celebrating at the Shorenstein Center. I am sorry I never knew the much admired and much missed Joan Shorenstein. But I did know her father, Walter, and know how much he cherished his role in furthering this Center's invaluable contributions to America's national dialogue about the news media, politics and so much more.

My own career in journalism began not too many blocks away. At the height of the Harvard turmoil of the late 1960's and early '70's, I was on *The Crimson* and wrote for and edited its editorial page. The first professional journalist I ever met were Nieman

Fellows of that time, *The Times* reporter Tonly Lukas and Larry Elkin, a stalwart of *Harper's Magazine* in the era of its legendary editor, Willie Morris.

It was a terrible time for America, but an exciting one for journalism. The country seemed to be collapsing under the weight of the Vietnam War. The summer after my freshman year brought the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Robert Kennedy, as well as the riots of Chicago. Universities like this one were buckling in the political fallout. College papers across the country could grab their own parts of the national story and did.

The difference is procedure, if not substance, between journalism then and now are of course astounding. *The Crimson*, for instance, still had a hot type, with a typesetter or two working into the night, after which we would read proofs before giving the signal to start the clanky rolling of the press in the bowels of our Plympton Street office. I don't think it occurred to any of us that there would ever be newsrooms without typewriters and the acrid smell of ink and clouds of smoke. Smoke I might add in the case of a college paper in the 1960's when it's not necessarily from cigarettes.

(Laughter)

MR. RICH: We also strongly believed that journalism was an honorable calling, a crucial pillar of our democracy. Watergate and Woodward and Bernstein had not quite yet arrived. But just in our own back yard and the confrontations between demonstrators and the police in Harvard Yard and the student strike that followed, we had history in the making to cover. We investigated the fissures and failures in university governments that were exposed by the ensuing chaos and the reforms that followed.

My Harvard commencement week coincided with *The Times'* publication of the Pentagon Papers. *The Times* brave stand in publishing the secret history of the Vietnam

War and defiance of the Nixon Administration's effort to shut it down was a beacon for us, as were other glorious examples of American journalistic history, from the muckrakers, the progressive era, to the courageous reporters and editors of the civil rights era. A number of my fellow *Crimson* editors went into the profession, me included, without for a second questioning either the profession's merits or its prospects for survival or its ability to provide us with a decent if hardly extravagant living.

One of my friends on *The Crimson* was a dazzling Mike Kinsley. And his career is as good an indicator as any of the dizzying changes that have occurred since. After school Mike went into print journalism, notably at *The New Republic* in *Harper's*, before branching out into a career in television punditry at CNN's *Crossfire*. But by the mid 1990's he was getting restless. And to the surprise of almost everyone announced that he was decamping from Washington, D.C. to the other Washington, Seattle, to start an online magazine, publication, webzine, no one knew what to call it then, at Microsoft.

It was soon named *Slate*. Few in the business, his friends included, knew what to make of it. And some felt threatened. When Mike wrote an op ed piece on another subject for *The Times* after moving west in 1996, the paper's editorial page editor, who will remain nameless, refused to let him mention *Slate's* web address in his italic author's identification. *The Times* didn't want to give this internet fad too much credibility. Mike rightly pulled the piece.

Perhaps the most amusing fallout from Mike's move to Seattle was that *Newsweek* put him on the cover posing with a big flopping fish at Pike Street Market. *Newsweek* of course was owned by *The Washington Post* Company. Now *Slate* is owned by *The Washington Post* Company and a few months ago *The Post* sold off a decimated and unprofitable *Newsweek* for a dollar. *The Times* got over its web phobia fairly quickly and

now has a website as dynamic as the paper itself at its best, which to my mind, is as good as newspapers get.

But *The Times*, a unique institution in America is one of the lucky survivors of what has been a tumultuous era of change. And even it is still wrestling with how it can make newspapering a profitable business as paper itself inevitably slides away in the digital age. That question, how do you make money when information yearns to be free hovers over an entire industry, including television journalism and even the web itself.

Already the casualties have been many. Whether you look at the network news operations or at most American newspapers beyond *The Times* and the *Wall Street Journal* or at news magazines like *Newsweek* and *Time* where I worked in the last gasp of the pre-Time Warner era, the near extinction of foreign and even domestic bureaus is shocking. Without on the ground news gathering, how can there be journalism, no matter what the delivery system, whether a full fledged publication, online or off, or broadcast or webcast or Twitter feed or Facebook page or whatever.

Without the often slow and costly process of investigative journalism how will we ever know what is really happening in our government or in corporate America or even in our local civic institutions? These are business riddles that some very smart people are trying to crack. I have some confidence that they will succeed even as papers as we know them change beyond recognition and that network television news as we know it fades with its rapidly aging audience.

But the answers will not come overnight. There will be much trial and error and some journalistic institutions will suffer as many already have. Yet it's the history of modern communications that the most apocalyptic predictions of doom, a feature of every period of traumatic technological change don't come true. Television was supposed to kill radio,

and for that matter, the theater and movies when it transformed American life in previously unthinkable ways in the late 1940's and early 1950's. But the other media did survive, smaller in some instances, but often smarter.

Indeed, NPR, sparked in part by its innovative journalism, is one of the greatest success stories of recent years reaching new peaks in listenership, even in the post television internet age. Assuming that there is a market for news that is accurate and comprehensive and I believe strongly there is one, the news business will eventually flourish, no doubt in business models we can't quite imagine yet. Does anyone remember how people laughed when there was first talk of pay TV in the 1970's? Free television had been an inalienable American right since the birth of the tube. No one would have believed that in a relatively short period of time most Americans would be paying for television, sometimes even voluntarily when it came to premium or specialized programming.

As to the content of journalism as opposed to the economics, there is much to be excited about for all the gloom that's endemic to newsrooms, especially these days. In this regard let me speak for a second about *The Times*, which I can do perhaps more objectively than ever since I am moving on from the paper next week. In almost every way I can think of *The Times* that is being produced today, even with all the various economic exigencies of recent years is superior to the one my friends and I were devouring in *The Crimson* newsroom for decades ago.

That was a two section paper with sporadic in depth investigative work, bare bones business and sports coverage and almost no coverage of the culture of American life as opposed to its official business. The lively writing, the so called new journalism that was then flourishing at *Harper's*, Clay Felker's *New York*, Harold Hayes' *Esquire*, Jann

Wenner's *Rolling Stone* and before that in the recently defunct *New York Herald Tribune* had barely begun to filter into *The Times* gray pages. The kind of vivid reporting, both in depth and in the quality of the writing that *The Times* has brought most recently to its coverage of the roiling revolutions of the Middle East simply didn't exist back then on a regular basis in *The Times* or any other American newspaper.

Looking beyond *The Times* it's not hard to find countless other examples of journalistic enterprise, some of which again build upon and surpass those of the pre-digital era. Certainly all the nominees tonight are perfect examples of this. And other examples turn up in odd and very disparate places, whether it be in online, scrappy online news operation like *Talking Points Memo* or two relatively new organizations, *Bloomberg News* and *Huffington Post* that are bulking up rapidly, or even at the *New York Review of Books*, an establishment print institution born during the strike that downsized the New York newspaper industry for keeps in the 1960's.

The variety of voice today in all these places is more diverse than could have been imagined even a couple of decades ago. Yes, this is also the age of Fox News. But the Fox News audience is self-selective and self-contained constituency that tunes in because it knows it will get the entertainment product it wants. Partisan cheerleading sponsored by a major political donor with man of its party's own leaders and potential national candidates on the payroll as so called news personalities. Few sentient viewers will wander into this programming by accident and be brainwashed into believing they are watching real news.

Fox viewers are there by choice, precisely because it reaffirms their own reality and won't challenge it. If Fox affects other news organizations only to the extent they allow themselves to be goaded into sinking to its level. When they do so they should be held

accountable no less than Fox. This isn't to say that even our most responsible news institutions, old or young, or infallible. The failure to vet the propaganda campaign that took America into war in Iraq is a black mark on the nation's journalistic history, including at *The Times*.

But *The Times* and some of the others who made similar mistakes learned from this failure, owning up to the errors and making significant institutional and personnel changes to try to fix what was clearly broken. The greater transparency that has spread since that fiasco, whether in the form of public editors at news organizations or more importantly in the broader array of checks and balances that online scrutiny brings, not just to news organizations, but all other institutions in the Wiki era, all of this is a major change for the better. It's hard to believe that not long ago most news outlets didn't even have a daily listing of corrections.

What also gives me hope is simply the sheer number of smart, brave and determined young people who want to go into journalism. Not a week goes by when I don't hear from or meet college students or recent graduates who are just as starry eyed as my cohort was back in my *Crimson* days. They have swallowed the same Kool-Aid we once did and refuse to listen to their elders bleak prognostications about journalism's future. They do, however, want to rethink journalism for a new age, as well they should. Indeed, among the reasons I chose *New York Magazine* for my post op ed journalistic home was its innovative translation of its print vitality to the web, so much so that *The Times* was moved to hire its web designer to take over nytimes.com next month.

Of course back when I was in *The Crimson* we were determined to reinvent journalism too. And indeed, my first real job in the profession was to join with some alumni from various college papers to create an iconoclastic muck wrecking weekly

newspaper in Richmond, Virginia. *The Richmond Mercury* only lasted a few years. But it did at least a few things that that stodgy old confederate capitol hadn't seen before. And it shook up or at least jostled some of the city's intense power structure.

Right this minute there are experiments like ours going on everywhere you look, whether in so called traditional media or in new media none of us could have remotely imagined back then. But with the same underlying aim of holding the powerful accountable and of exposing stories that might otherwise never be told. As I happily and proudly accept the Goldsmith Award tonight, I do so with the absolute certainty that many more accomplished journalists will be accepting this honor in the year to come. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Frank has agreed to answer questions. There are microphones here and up here and so forth. If you would line up at the microphone and identify yourself and, please, make it a question and not a statement or a sermon especially. And I am going to take the liberty of asking the first one, which I would suspect is on just about everybody's mind.

You had in your platform on the op ed page of the *Sunday New York Times* perhaps as powerful a voice in place to express your views politically as is imaginable. And you've decided now to give that up to go to *New York Magazine*. How did you -- what do you see that you are heading toward, Frank, that persuaded you to make a choice that you have made?

MR. RICH: Well, some of it you have described in your introductory, your lovely introductory remarks. First of all I have never been interested in so called power, a lot of which I think is exaggerated in many of the jobs I have had in journalism. But I do bump

up against the forum and one I keep having creative experiences as a journalist and a writer. And I could have kept on being a drama critic until I retired and I could have done the same in this job. Actually in this one, to my amazement, 17 years, three years longer than I was a drama critic.

But I felt I wanted to leave it when I was proud of it and I wanted to write about the same things longer, deeper I hope, better, fresher and without the gong of a deadline essentially every five business days hitting me in the neck. And so I had been thinking about it for a couple of years. And about a year ago I started talking to friends of mine in the journalism business as well as friends and editors of *The Times* about what I wanted to do next. And in the end the choice was pretty clear to me.

Adam Moss, who took over *New York Magazine* relatively recently as six years ago and sort of restored it to the Clay Felker legacy and is now going beyond it is one of the two most creative editors I have worked with in journalism. The other is one we both worked for at *The Times*, Arthur Gelb, who hired me at *The Times*, and Adam had an instrumental role actually in inventing what became my op ed column to begin with. I was chafing at the bit. Drama critic, I started out trying out columns, including at *The Times Magazine* where he was the editor and in fact completely reinvented that magazine. It's now being reinvented again some years after he left. And he had ideas that pushed me. And I wanted to be pushed again.

My passions haven't changed. Politics and culture, I'll write about many of the same subjects, I hope to add more to the mix. But I really wanted to write more and less, less preoccupied with sort of the bottom line opinion, which is sort of the way I felt when I left theater criticism. It's not interesting to me as a writer to not like the Bush Administration, or not like the musicals of Andrew Lloyd Webber, as the case may be in

my odd career. Opinions are cheap. Anyone can have those opinions and they can be right or wrong. It can be debated.

What interests me is indeed constructing an essay and trying to learn something and trying to convey a bigger argument and connect the dots in general of politics and culture. A big lesson for me was last summer Bob Silvers, another great editor who has edited *The New York Review of Books*, since its beginning asked me to write a piece about Obama. It was a take two of John Alters' book. I had no time to do it, the job is so relentless. But I sort of eeked it out over four or five weekends. It was a 4,000 word piece. My column at *The Times* is 1,500 words.

And there was nothing in that piece that I couldn't have written in the op ed column for *The Times*. But just having the room to really develop an argument better, not be glib, which column writing in a newspaper forces you to do because of the deadline and the controlled space, I found kind of exhilarating and it convinced me, I was already on this path, that it was time for me to hang this up while I still enjoyed it and while there was still time to have another act.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi, I'm Joel Engardia. I'm a mid-career student at the Kennedy School. President Obama has said that his views on gay marriage are evolving, but he's not there yet. I'm curious how you got there. I mean, what is the evolutionary process that an intelligent, liberal, straight man like yourself must go through before accepting that gay relationships are equal to your own.

MR. RICH: Well, it's a very apropos question, because it again involves -- it involves two things. First of all, it involves the theater. When the AIDS epidemic hit and was invisible and people were dying hidden, the word AIDS actually for too long a time could not even be mentioned in *The New York Times*. While I was there you couldn't use the

word gay, for many it was shocking. One place where it started to surface, although a bit clandestinely, was the New York theater while I was covering it.

People started dying mysteriously. In fact, the first person I knew of died of AIDS, I'm not sure it was even called -- it was a classmate of mine from Harvard, not from *The Crimson*, who I knew casually was a press agent in the Broadway Theater. But then artists started dying and I thought here's a whole sort of civil rights issue. I grew up in Washington, D.C. All those issues were very familiar to me. This was very unfamiliar. And as a kid I had worked in the theater. I had been a ticket taker for a Broadway house in Washington.

I realized that there were gay people around me, some of whom actually I put in my memoir, *Ghost Light*, who were like parental figures to me but who never told me who they were. It wasn't even talked about. When I was an undergraduate at Harvard I never knew anyone who was openly gay. Obviously there are gay people here. Adam Moss, of all people, played a crucial role in this. Adam, I had never heard of him. It was before he came to *The Times*, was a young editor at *Esquire* during one of its good periods. And he called me up out of the blue and said I want you to write a piece about how -- what straight culture makes of gay people. This was right after Rock Hudson died.

It was as the AIDS crisis was really exploding. I didn't want to write the piece. It was a long 10,000 word piece. I was covering one bad play after another and had to keep my attention on *Moose Murders* and things like that. But he was insistent. He was a kid, he was in his twenties. I had never heard -- I literally didn't know him from Adam. I also didn't know that he was gay, which he happened to be. He did not tell me that until after I had turned in a first draft for the piece.

So it had a big influence on me and also it captured me as a subject and has ever

since. And indeed it was that piece published several years before I left the drama critic's job is exactly what started me on the path of realizing the cultural stuff I was writing about had a larger political intersections with the news and other things. So it's sort of all come full circle. The gay marriage piece, or same sex marriage piece of it is a relatively, from my point of view, minor. I know it's a big political fight, but it's a minor aspect if you believe in full equality for gay people, then of course they should have the same rights in marriage.

I think what you hear from Obama and many politicians whom I suspect are much more sympathetic to this point of view than they want to let on is a kind of political dance. During the 2008 campaign, John Edwards -- does anybody remember him?

(Laughter)

MR. RICH: I'm sure he had many great appearances here. But he was against same sex marriage and some other gay rights issues and Elizabeth Edwards went on television and said, well, I'm further along than my husband is and our children are further along. And Obama is sort of doing that stance, but I think it's all kind of a charade and I think it's happening. It's not going to happen overnight, but it is happening pretty fast. And I feel very excited about it and invested in it, both as an American and then someone who has devoted a lot of time covering it and as necessary will continue to devote energy to covering it.

(Applause)

FROM THE FLOOR: Mr. Rich, about a year ago you did a column which you tried to link the Tea Party demonstrators on Capitol Hill with the perpetrators of Kristallnacht--

MR. JONES: Kristall what?

FROM THE FLOOR: Kristallnacht. Some may think you went too far but I encourage

you to keep up the rhetoric. Spare no expense. You can link them with Holocaust and genocide, people on the right, but it only serves to discredit you and I find it amusing. The same goes for your attempts to smear Republicans and Tea Party demonstrators with the stench of racism. I would like to ask you this question.

MR. JONES: Do you have a question?

FROM THE FLOOR: Can you imagine what rhetoric you would have engaged in had Tea Party people engaged in the kind of mobocracy attitudes and displays we have seen in Madison lately? What rhetoric -- would you have spared any rhetoric in characterizing and denouncing and smearing Tea Party people who demonstrated?

MR. JONES: Thank you for your question.

MR. RICH: First of all, I don't think that the rhetoric that has been going on at Madison, yes, Hitler is all the rage now. There is no question about it. And we can thank particularly Glenn Beck, I think, who has done more to resurrect Hitler as sort of a joke trope than anyone since Mel Brooks. But the Madison demonstration is on both sides, both the Tea Partiers and the labor people are rowdy. They are not that rowdy. They are not as rowdy as what happened here, for instance, in the 1960's. And the rhetoric is pretty standard issue on both sides.

MR. JONES: If I may, before we end I want to ask you as a political pundit commentator and prognosticator if you would at least put on that hat for a moment. When you look ahead at 2012, Obama will be the nominee for the Democratic Party. Who do you think is apt to be the candidate for the Republicans and how do you see the elections shaping?

MR. RICH: I'm very, very loathe to predict. So I'm going to do this -- and it always comes back to haunt you. And I think to answer the second question first, Republicans

obviously do not have a candidate. So we do not know who the candidate is. The establishment front runner, Mitt Romney, has one problem. People just don't like him. And it reminds me when John Connally ran for president and spent all that money, it was covered in *Time* and the former Governor of Texas and then got like one delegate. People just -- so he's clearly the establishment candidate of the Republican Party but he has a lot of problems because of his version of shall we say Obama-care up here and everything else.

Then I think Huckabee is leading the polls. Is the financial base of the Republican Party going to invest, much of which is on Wall Street, invest in Mike Huckabee? I wonder. Anyway I just think that's a problem. And I think what is going on is conservative commentators and conservative establishment is realizing they've got a problem. So they don't really have anyone. They don't have a horse. Now, one could emerge. As we know from Jimmy Carter or even Barack Obama people can emerge somewhat later than this, but there is clearly no front runner.

I think it's probably Obama's to lose. But anything can happen in politics in a week, as I'm sure as is on the walls here somewhere. So it's full -- part of the fun of it is not knowing what is going to happen. That's why it's fun to write about.

MR. JONES: Good luck.

MR. RICH: Thank you very much. Thanks for having me.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: I got a note that told me that Steven Drummond who is here who is the producer of the NPR segment that Laura Sullivan was here. I was not aware that he was here and I didn't call his name. But any of you who know anything about radio know that the producer is an extremely important person. So Steven, stand up.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: I also want to publicly, before we break, I want to thank especially Alison Kommer, who organizes this event for the Shorenstein Center along with all of the staff at the Shorenstein Center. This is a big day and they did a great job. Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. JONES: Tomorrow at 10:00 o'clock on the fifth floor of the Belfer over here, Bell Hall, we will have a survey of investigative reporting featuring all of the finalists that you have met here tonight, at least in a tangential kind of way. They will be there to talk about the state and future of investigative reporting. It's always a fascinating event. I thank you all. I congratulate all the finalists and the winners. We are very glad to have you and we are very proud of this event. I hope you are going to be here next year to join us for more. Thank you, very much. Goodnight.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, at 7:28 p.m., the event was concluded.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the preceding transcript is an accurate record based on the recordings of the proceedings taken:

Before: ALEX JONES, Moderator

In the Matter of:

THE GOLDSMITH AWARDS

Date: March 7, 2011

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts

03/17/11

Allyson Farley

Date

Advance Services