



HARVARD Kennedy School

SHORENSTEIN CENTER

on Media, Politics and Public Policy

THE GOLDSMITH AWARDS IN POLITICAL JOURNALISM

March 5, 2014

Mr. Ellwood: Good evening, everyone. I'm David Ellwood. I'm the Dean here at the Harvard Kennedy School, and welcome to the John F. Kennedy, Jr. Forum. This is always one of the really magical evenings here and it's magical for a number of different reasons. It's, first and foremost, a time to celebrate investigative journalism, which we always worry next year is going to be the demise and somehow or other we always come away even more inspired, more excited and so forth.

And this has been a remarkable year for investigative journalism in so many different ways and so it's particular appropriate that we have these Goldsmith Awards here to celebrate. We obviously have a terrific program here, which I will leave Alex and others to introduce, but I did want to say a couple of things about the Shorenstein Center on Media, Politics and Public Policy. It's this, the kind of work that you do, as well as thinking about what the future can bring and how we make sure the kind of work that goes on here, which is absolutely essential to a well functioning democracy, is preserved and flourishes and so forth in a very uncertain environment.

I wanted to pay special thanks to the Shorenstein family. Doug Shorenstein, who very much wanted to be here tonight but was unable to, just been a terrific friend and supporter and inspiring vision. Of course his father, the late Walter

Shorenstein, who was a very good friend of the Kennedy School and, like all good friends, told us what we could do better all the time, and I'll leave Alex to talk more about the Center and so forth, but the Center itself is and remains one of those places that's absolutely essential, I think, to the future, really to making democracy work because what all of you do or so many of you do or have done is critical.

I just want to introduce the Laurence M. Lombard Lecturer on the Press and Public Policy and the director of the Shorenstein Center, Alex Jones. He covered the press for *The New York Times* from 1983 to 1992 and he was awarded a Pulitzer Prize in 1987. His most recent book, *Losing the News: The Future of the News That Feeds Democracy*, was published in August, 2009. *The New York Times* Sunday Book Review called Jones a bringer of light in the encircling doom. He's been the author, along with Susan Tifft of *The Patriarch: The Rise and Fall of the Bingham Dynasty*, which *Business Week* selected as one of the best business books of the year. So the main thing I just wanted to say is he is someone who reflects on and cares about the media but he's also very much trying and successfully leading the Shorenstein Center in the question of what does the future bring and how do we make sure that this period of transition and opportunity, but also great, great challenge brings us to an even better place? Ladies and gentlemen, please welcome Alex Jones. (Applause)

Mr. Jones: Thank you all very much. This is always a very big night for the Shorenstein Center and, David Ellwood, thank you very much for those good words. This year marks the 23rd Anniversary of the Goldsmith Awards Program and each year we look forward to this as a high point for the Shorenstein Center and, if I may say so immodestly, for American journalism. There is of course a

story behind the Goldsmith Awards. Bob Greenfield, then a Philadelphia lawyer, had a client named Berta Marks Goldsmith, who had told him of her intent to leave him, her lawyer, her entire estate.

Bob declined to accept it and went searching for a good way to use the money for a purpose that Berta Goldsmith would have approved. She was passionately interested in good government, followed the news ardently and was particularly outraged by misconduct by people with public responsibility. Eventually, Bob connected with Marvin Kalb, the Founding Director of the Shorenstein Center, and the result was the Goldsmith Awards in Political Journalism, which included the Investigative Reporting Prize, book prizes, fellowships and a career award.

In 2012, after an extraordinary life of achievement and many, many contributions to the common good, Bob Greenfield died at 97. We mourn him and miss him and tonight we honor him. I believe that the creation and support of the Goldsmith Awards was one of Bob's proudest accomplishments, a pride that his family shares. We are joined tonight by several members of the Greenfield Family and members of the Greenfield Foundation. Ben Greenfield and Bill Epstein, who represented the Greenfield Family in this year's judging; Mike Greenfield; Bill Greenfield, who is Chairman of the Greenfield Foundation, and his wife, Joanie; Jill Greenfield Feldman, President of the Foundation, and; Barbara and Charles Kahn.

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

As David said, I also want to thank the Shorenstein family for its unstinting and generous support of the Shorenstein Center for nearly thirty years. The

Shorenstein Family has been not only a great benefactor but has become part of our family and we are most, most grateful. Our career award winner this year goes to the smart and incisive Candy Crowley of CNN and we will be hearing from her later. But, first, the Goldsmith prizes. The first Goldsmith Awards are the book prizes and making those presentations will be my colleague, Tom Patterson, the Bradlee Professor of Government and the Press at the Kennedy School.

MR. PATTERSON: Each year we award two Goldsmith Book Prizes, one for the best academic book in the field of media, politics and public policy and one for the best trade book. Each prize carries with it a \$5,000 cash award. Before introducing the winners, I would like to identify this year's four judges. Alex and I were two of them, Matt Baum was another, and Marion Just was the fourth.

I'll start with the Goldsmith Book Prize in the academic category. With four judges, there's always the possibility that the voting will end in a tie and we do have a tie, but a two-two vote is not how we got there. The four of us were unanimous in concluding that two equally deserving books should share the prize. One of them is *Changing Minds or Changing Channels?* by Kevin Arceneaux and Martin Johnson, the second is *How Partisan Media Polarize America* by Matthew Levendusky.

By coincidence, both books address the same topic, the media's role in the party polarization that now bedevils our politics. Are Fox, MSNBC and the like exacerbating the problem? I'm sure many of you have a firm opinion on that question but, to a scholar, the question is a hypothesis to be tested, along with competing ones, such as the possibility that partisan media attract those who

already have extreme views. If that's the case, partisan media are not so much fueling polarization as feeding off it.

Both studies find the latter to be strongly the case. People with more extreme opinions are attracted to partisan outlets and they gravitate towards those outlets that cater to their preexisting beliefs. Where the two studies diverge is their assessment of the degree to which partisan outlets influence the opinions of citizens who otherwise would have more moderate views. Both studies find an effect of this type but they differ in their conclusions about the magnitude.

That difference is not a problem for scholars, it means we have more to study. For now, these two books provide the best understanding yet of the media's impact on party polarization. I should note that we've never before had as many as three recipients for this award. Kevin is the only one of the three with us tonight, we have a limited travel budget for this award. I'm kidding.

(Laughter)

We were hoping that Matthew and Martin could also be here, but prior commitments made that unworkable, but we are delighted that Kevin is here. Kevin Arceneaux, please step forward to receive the Goldsmith Book Award for *Changing Minds or Changing Channels?* (Applause)

As I mentioned at the outset, we also award a Goldsmith Prize in the trade book category. This year's winner is *Who Owns the Future?* by Jaron Lanier. Let me share with you a couple of episodes from the amazing life of Jaron Lanier. He started college at the age of 13, drawn to computer science. In his 20s he set for himself the task of popularizing the term virtual reality, it's now heard around the world.

After that, he cofounded a firm that developed the first commercially available visual reality goggles and he led the research team that developed the first virtual reality avatars. Jaron is also a composer, his “Symphony for Amelia” premiered in 2010, and he is a painter. His first one-man show took place more than a decade ago at the Danish Museum for Modern Art. A half dozen years ago Jaron turned his restless mind to book writing. We almost gave him the Goldsmith Award for his first book, *You are not a Gadget*, named by *The New York Times* as one of the ten best books of 2010. We loved the book but concluded it didn’t quite meet the Goldsmith Prize’s eligibility criteria.

That issue arose again this year about Jaron’s newest book, but there was no way we were going to pass on a second opportunity. Jaron Lanier’s *Who Owns the Future?* asks a simple but telling question, why is our information, and it is our information, enriching Google, FaceBook and other tech firms but not enriching us? Every time we go online we freely give these firms information of value to them. Yet, in addition to being denied a piece of the action, we are being buffeted by the destructive economic efficiencies that result from their use of our information.

These efficiencies are helping to hollow out our economy, contributing to job loss and wage stagnation at the bottom of the income ladder while enriching a tiny few at the top. For Jaron, this is a moral issue, as well as a public policy issue. Not surprisingly, his moral concern is a source of unease among the titans of Silicon Valley. Why shouldn’t we, the people, share in the wealth that our information creates for them? Jaron Lanier, please step forward to receive the Goldsmith Book Prize for *Who Owns the Future?* (Applause)

Mr. Jones: Thank you, Tom. It is now my honor to introduce each of the six finalists for the Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting. This year's competition was extremely competitive, I'm 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 with this year's entries.

In addition to Ben Greenfield and Bill Epstein, the judges for this year's competition were Patricia Callahan of the *Chicago Tribune* and winner of last year's Goldsmith Prize; Bob Giles, former curator of the Nieman Foundation, and; Linda Bilmes, Daniel Patrick Moynihan Senior Lecturer in Public Policy at the Kennedy School. No judge is allowed to vote for an entry from his or her own news organization or affiliate. In January, after long deliberation, the judges selected the six finalists and also the winner.

We announced the finalists at once because part of the purpose of the Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Journalism is to call attention to the excellent work that all the finalists have done and to the other great investigative work that is being done, which they represent. So it is with great pleasure that I describe the six finalists, each of which in its own way was regarded as extraordinary. They will be presented in alphabetical order by news organization.

Gary Fox was a prototypical underground coal miner, skinny to the point of looking emaciated and grateful for the work, though he knew the dangers, especially the risk of black lung. He spent more than 25 years working in the mines near Sylvester, West Virginia and, in time, a doctor certified by the U.S. Department of Labor examined him and diagnosed the most severe form of black

lung. The government ordered his employer, the behemoth Massey Energy Company, to begin paying him monthly benefits. But, as usual, the company appealed.

At stake was \$704.30 a month. To avoid paying, the coal company retained the services of the Federal Black Lung Unit of the law firm Jackson Kelly, PLLC, the go-to place of the industry's giants when they want to beat back a miner's claim for benefits. As you might expect, ultimately Jackson Kelly, PLLC won but, as the Center for Public Integrity and ABC News revealed in an in depth report, the law firm did it by withholding unfavorable evidence and other violations of the law.

In the case of Gary Fox, the law firm's own doctor had examined him and found black lung disease, something the law firm never did disclose. Such behavior was standard practice, the investigation found. But even more shocking, there was a parallel cadre of doctors who were considered the ultimate medical authorities on black lung but never seemed to find it, even where other doctors with less prestigious credentials did.

This was especially true of a unit specializing in black lung at Johns Hopkins Hospital, ranked by some as the nation's top hospital. The series was entitled "Breathless and Burdened: Dying from Black Lung, Buried by Law and Medicine." It tells the horrific story of years of the systematic use of sophisticated legal strategies and doctors for hire to deny miners health benefits and their claims for being ill, often miners who had no legal representation at all because no one was willing to take their case against such a formidable array of opposition.

In a year long investigation the team pierced this rarely scrutinized world with on the ground reporting from Appalachian coal country, assembling a massive body of previously confidential documents and creating a new database from thousands of court records. Chris Hamby, the lead reporter for the Center for Public Integrity, had already done reporting on the surprising resurgence of black lung. He heard repeated stories in the coal fields of a federal benefits system that was so stacked against miners that even those with strong evidence of severe disease often lost.

As they dug deeper, the black lung unit of the Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions stood out for its seemingly ubiquitous opinions and consistent findings of no black lung. After studying the research amassed by Hamby, ABC News Investigative Producer Matthew Mosk and Chief Investigative Correspondent Brian Ross dug into the role played by doctors. This included an extensive undercover camera investigation, accompanying miners in rural Virginia where they were examined by a physician commonly hired by the coal companies.

And they confronted Dr. Paul Wheeler, head of the Johns Hopkins unit who, under tough questioning, acknowledged being the coal industry's go-to doctor. The investigation found that, since 2000, in 1,500 cases in which Dr. Wheeler read at least one x-ray he never once found black lung, though in hundreds of those cases other doctors had given that diagnosis and follow up biopsies made the black lung diagnosis certain. Two days after the joint reports appeared, Johns Hopkins suspended the program headed by Dr. Wheeler.

Days later, U.S. Senators said they were using the stories as a guide in drafting legislation to reform black lung programs benefits and the program

itself. The West Virginia Office of Disciplinary Counsel opened an investigation of three attorneys at Jackson Kelly. And Gary Fox, the skinny miner that Johns Hopkins said did not have black lung, reopened his case. This time though the Johns Hopkins doctors would not have the final word. Please join me in recognizing the work on “Breathless and Burdened” by Chris Hamby and Ronnie Greene of the Center for Public Integrity and Brian Ross, Rhonda Schwartz and Matthew Mosk of ABC News. Would they please stand? (Applause)

The investigation that came to be known as “Secrecy for Sale: Inside the Global Offshore Money Maze” began with an investigation of fraud in Australia that sprang a leak, a monumental leak, as it happens. The leak was in the form of some 2.5 million files related to ten offshore tax havens containing details on more than 120,000 offshore companies and trusts and nearly 130,000 individuals and agents in more than 170 countries.

The leaked files provided facts and figures that illustrated how offshore financial secrecy has spread aggressively around the globe, allowing the wealthy and well connected to dodge taxes and fueling corruption. In the files were the families and associates of long time despots, Wall Street swindlers, Eastern European and Indonesian billionaires, Russian corporate executives, international arms dealers and a sham director fronted company that the European Union had labeled a cog in Iran’s nuclear development program.

But when this unwieldy trove arrived at the Washington-based Center for Public Integrity and, yes, the same Center for Public Integrity that was also doing the black lung investigation, no one really knew what was there. Under the auspices of the Center for Public Integrity’s International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, an unprecedented, collaborative global team of

reporters and news organization began the staggering task of making sense of the files and then mounting one of the most remarkable reporting exercises ever.

Ultimately, the Center's International Consortium enlisted 112 journalists from 58 countries and 52 news organizations, such as *The New York Times*, the BBC and *The Guardian* to take the material and run with it. This massive effort was coordinated from Washington by a full-time staff of four. Beyond the leaked data, the reporters combed thousands of public records, including corporate filings, property records, financial disclosures and documents produced by lawsuits and regulatory and criminal investigations.

Hundreds of people were interviewed in more than a dozen languages. The result, dozens of stories in scores of nations that cast a blinding light on the global conspiracy to hide money. The secret offshore money system was laid bare, the impact of these stories in the United States and worldwide was as staggering as the collaborative effort. For instance, international tax investigations were launched by the IRS in partnership with the U.K. and Australian tax authorities.

Indeed, upon publication, IRS agents appeared at the International Consortium's offices demanding the leaked data, as did Homeland Security, justice officials and the Governments of Canada, Korea and Greece. The Consortium refused on the grounds of protecting confidential sources, but then the U.S., U.K. and Australian tax offices admitted that they had received the same data one year before the journalists got it, but they had done nothing with it.

All over the world the series of articles has prompted public outrage and then toughened laws on financial disclosure. Civil and criminal charges were filed in

many nations, including in the United States. There were impacts of similar sorts in Britain, France, Russia, Luxembourg, Austria, India and Israel, Germany, Bangladesh, South Korea, Greece and the Philippines. You get the idea, this was huge, and the impact is still unfolding.

Representing the many journalists who contributed to “Secrecy for Sale: Inside the Global Offshore Money Maze” are Marina Walker Guevara, Amelia Diaz Struck and Gerard Ryle, Director of the Center for Public Integrity’s Consortium of Investigative Journalists. Would you all please stand? (Applause)

Last June a remarkable documentary was aired by FRONTLINE in English and Univision in Spanish that began with the voices of six female migrant farm workers. The foreman told my father, said the first to speak, we have no work for you, but I can hire your daughters. And from the moment we started to work in the fields, they harassed us horribly. When she said harassed, what she meant was essentially the widespread practice of raping female migrant farm workers, something that the investigation found to be commonplace from the dusty towns of California’s Central Valley to the leafy orchards of Washington State, from the frozen plains of Iowa to the steamy tomato fields of Florida. In other words, everywhere.

They look at you like they own you and whenever they want they can have you, said another woman. I don’t speak English, I don’t have work papers, so I have to put up with this, said a third. The documentary was “Rape in the Fields” and it was the result of years of reporting and a collaborative effort by the Investigative Reporting Project at the University of California Berkeley’s School of Journalism, FRONTLINE, Univision Documentaries and the Center for Investigative Reporting.

Perhaps the biggest challenge of all was persuading the victims to be so bold and brave as to tell their stories on camera in the face of fear of retribution from the perpetrators, deportation by the government and shame from the cultural stigma of rape. But as one of the women in the documentary said, if I stay quiet, then it is going to continue happening. That is why I prefer to talk about it, so that many people can see themselves in me, so they won't stay quiet anymore.

The investigation was sparked by the curiosity of a graduate student at Berkeley's Graduate School of Journalism who was reporting on child labor for her summer internship. She was in North Carolina and came across a migrant farm worker with seven children who confided that none of the seven had been fathered by her husband, they were all the offspring of her supervisor who had demanded sex in exchange for keeping her job.

Berkeley's celebrated investigative reporting program became curious as to whether this was an isolated incident or a widespread but hidden phenomena. In collaboration with the rest of the reporting team of institutions, a prolonged inquiry began and what became clear was that sexual exploitation against women in the agricultural sector is an open secret in the vast documented and undocumented immigrant community across this country.

Virtually no other media outlets had ever reported on this subject and no government agency seemed to be paying any attention. There were no comprehensive numbers of data on the presence of rape in the fields. So, along with visiting isolated communities and building relationships with shoe leather reporting, the team also began to construct an original database from federal and private lawsuits that were in the public record and then slowly they began finding women who would speak out.

The documentary broke the wall of silence, it publicly identified the perpetrators and, for the first time, raised the issue nationally as to why no one, no one had ever been criminally prosecuted for this. The impact of the documentary reverberated throughout the national press, spurred action by local, state and legislative bodies and has begun to create change in the immigrant communities most affected by this issue. Once considered an open secret, sexual violence in the fields became national news and, perhaps most important, the community itself began to rise.

For instance, California Rural Legal Assistance, which operates on the front lines of sexual harassment in the fields, reports a surge in women willing to come forward and complain. Please join me in recognizing the excellent and important work of Andr_s Cediell, Bernice Yeung and Lowell Bergman representing Berkeley's Investigative Reporting Program, FRONTLINE, Univision and the Center for Investigative Reporting. Would you please stand? (Applause)

Tucked away in a two-story office building in Coral Gables, Florida, was a now notorious company called Biogenesis. It was ostensibly an anti-aging clinic, but it's real business was selling performance enhancing drug, from human growth hormone to testosterone to anabolic steroids. And it's customers? Some of the biggest names in professional sports, including the New York Yankees' \$275 million man, Alex Rodriguez, who had sworn he stopped juicing, as it's called, a decade ago.

Shortly before Biogenesis abruptly closed its doors and its owner disappeared, an employee of Biogenesis gave an extraordinary batch of company records to a scrappy and courageous weekly newspaper called *The Miami New*

Times. The result was a story called “The Steroid Search”, which tore the lid off the role of steroids in professional sports like nothing ever had. In the past there had speeches and congressional hearings and even athletes who had come forward, but there had never been anything like the specifics, the names, the drugs, the works that *The Miami New Times* put before the world.

As a result, Major League Baseball suspended 13 players for their ties to Biogenesis, including Alex Rodriguez. It was the largest round of such discipline in the history of American sports and represented more than just a simple story about cheaters getting caught. The investigation forced baseball to aggressively confront its long simmering doping problems. The day the story was published a senior writer at ESPN wrote five years from now we’ll be looking back at this day and maybe we’ll be saying to ourselves that *The Miami New Times* did more than any of the other efforts to clean up baseball and maybe all sports.

But *New Times* wasn’t through, they published a second story called “Source Code” that exposed a very questionable -- the very questionable tactics of Major League Baseball’s Department of Investigations. This group, staffed by ex-police officers who *New Times* showed, paid witnesses thousands of dollars, intimidated sources and cobbled up a frivolous lawsuit to gain information. Ironically, Alex Rodriguez has used this article repeatedly in court to challenge the damage done to his reputation in the first article.

Then in December a third article appeared, this one called “The Steroid State” which showed how Florida’s Governor, Rick Scott, had deliberately gutted the Department of Health and appointed managers who discouraged criminally charging wayward doctors and pharmacies. As a result, hundreds of anti-aging clinics like Biogenesis operated and continue to operate without even basic

inspections. Several are owned by convicted felons and many employee physicians and pharmacists with long disciplinary histories to sell federally restricted drugs like steroids, testosterone and human growth hormone to anyone willing to pay cash.

There's a sports expression for when someone gets in their boxing ring with someone much bigger and, if you will, kicks ass. It is said to be punching above your weight class. Please join me in recognizing Tim Elfrink and Chuck Strouse of *The Miami New Times* for, without question, punching above their weight. (Applause)

When a baby is born, something is supposed to happen automatically and fast, certainly within 48 hours. The newborn is supposed to have a sample taken which will be sent to a lab so that the child can be screened for potentially life threatening or other dangerous medical conditions. The speed of the screening can be the difference in correcting a condition or living with a chronic disability, if the condition is not immediately addressed, and it can also be the difference, of course, between life and death.

The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel became aware that at many hospitals there was an almost defiant complacency about promptly sending the sample out for screening with sometimes dire results. For instance, two babies born with the same condition in Colorado, one on Tuesday, the other on Friday. Today the baby born on Tuesday is a healthy toddler because the hospital's custom during the week was to send the sample out immediately. But the baby born on Friday is dead because it was the practice, against regulations, to bundle the samples taken before and over a weekend to send the following week. There was no point, the screening lab was closed on weekends.

It wasn't a calculated effort to harm children, it was just cheaper to bundle, cheaper to send the sample by U.S. Mail, rather than courier, or just the way things were done because it was easier to do several at once than to send them immediately or the lab wasn't working. You're heard tonight about investigations that took responsibility for trying to protect powerless people, miners with black lung, immigrant women in the fields, but no one is as truly powerless as a newborn child and it was these innocents that *The Journal Sentinel* team set out to champion.

The investigation was not just local but spanned the entire country and was the first ever analysis of newborn screening effectiveness in the United States. This meant that *The Journal Sentinel* team had to do the kind of research and collection that is normally the province of universities and federal health agencies, but it had never been done. Using Freedom of Information Act laws and persistence to pry free vital information, they built a graceful and intuitive interactive database out of dozens of disparate data sets with little uniformity.

What they found was sometimes horrific. In Texas, more than 54,000 samples, 14.5 percent of them, took more than five days to get to the lab. In Arizona, one hospital had 70 percent of its samples arrive late, even though the lab was a mere seven miles away. In New York, lest we in the East get smug, 40 percent of the samples arrived later than the 48 hour time frame required by state law, and this was appallingly true even at famous hospitals, such as Lenox Hill in New York City.

This 40 percent translated into more than 100,000 samples from babies that failed to meet the state's standard for being tested expeditiously. In just two states, Iowa and Delaware, were nearly all samples routinely delivered to state

labs within the national recommended time frame. Especially disappointing was that many of the hospitals fought to keep their records of sending samples secret, claiming privacy concerns.

The report was published in November and there was an immediate reaction. The American Hospital Association sent out a quality alert to its 5,000 member hospitals urging them to clean up the problem and the Association of Public Health Laboratories did the same. States are moving to add weekend hours to testing labs, improve courier services and increase tracking and reporting. Several states which had guarded the data on screening released hospital -- they had been guarding the data on screening, released hospital by hospital statistics, bringing the total number of states to release that information to 29, with 21 still refusing, but under increased pressure to make the information public.

Thousands of hospitals and dozens of state agencies had ineffective and unaccountable systems for newborn screening and thanks to the diligence and hard work of *The Journal Sentinel*, those numbers are shrinking. Please join me in saluting the work of Ellen Gabler, Greg Borowski and the staff of *The Milwaukee Journal Sentinel* for “Deadly Delays.” (Applause)

I suspect that many of you in this room have seen the movie “The Best Years of our Lives.” It was produced in 1946, won seven Academy Awards for its portrayal of three combat vets who come home from World War II, all three had been affected by the war, one has lost both of his hands. There is drunkenness, divorce, disappointment, depression, but, by the end of the movie, all three of the vets have found their footing and are moving on, presumably into the best years of their lives.

The image of an undaunted and ultimately resilient greatest generation of war veterans is a far cry from the image of veterans of Vietnam, Iraq and Afghanistan. During World War II there was no such thing as a diagnosis of post traumatic stress disorder, we called it shell shock or battle fatigue and it was considered rare and a passing condition that some family time, good food and rest would put to rights. This, as it turns out, is a cruel distortion of the reality revealed by *The Wall Street Journal* series “The Lobotomy Files.”

The Journal's investigation unearthed something appalling from previously undisclosed Veterans Administration files, medical records, military records, archival films and often heartrending interviews with aging relatives of veterans. What they found was that during and after World War II the Veterans Administration lobotomized some 2,000 vets for conditions that were derived from their combat experience, conditions that would today be considered the symptoms of post traumatic stress disorder.

In unveiling this moment in our history, *The Journal* also gave back to the current generation of American vets suffering from PTSD the honorable place they deserve. They are not somehow a lesser generation, they are like those guys who came home in 1945, some of whom were so unlucky as to be caught up in what was almost a fad of dealing with disturbing behavior from the trauma of combat with lobotomy.

The artifacts that this report disclosed are poignant and painful. In 1949 the VA distributed a 37 point take-home guide for families whose son, or husband or brother had gone to war a man but was being returned to them a child after being lobotomized. He may say anything that pops into his head, thus embarrassing you, the pamphlet says. Like a young child, he may say I won't to

everything you suggest. He may masturbate openly or play in the tub for hours and at the same time may not get himself clean.

And, finally, the last of the 37 points, when will he be well, the pamphlet asked. We cannot answer this question. In most cases, of course he would never be well in any genuine way, as the procedure cuts the patient off from reality and himself, making him docile and quiet but effectively ending his life as the person he was. This blockbuster revelation was hailed as hugely important, but of course there was nothing to be done for the lobotomized vets.

Even so, the impact of the series was enormously important to the soldiers of today and their sense of what the true cost of combat is. They are not lesser men than their fellow soldiers from World War II and that is a tremendous gift. Please join me in recognizing the work of Michael Phillips and Matthew Rose of *The Wall Street Journal* for “The Lobotomy Files.” (Applause)

Each year the Goldsmith judges can, at their discretion, also vote to award a citation for an entry that was of special importance but they did not feel fit into the Goldsmith Prize guidelines for one reason or another. This year they awarded a citation to the Reuters series “Unaccountable”, which was a penetrating analysis of the arcane and even bizarre bookkeeping practices of the Pentagon. While the judges ruled that the series was not investigative in the Goldsmith competition sense, it was so important and so well done that they wanted to give it a special recognition.

The citation reads as follows: For the past 20 years America’s largest government agency, the U.S. Defense Department, has flunked its annual financial audit. In this damning exposé, Reuters shows why it matters. Reporters Scot Paltrow and Kelly Carr detail how the Pentagon uses thousands of obsolete,

half century old computer systems that lead to widespread fraud, expense duplication and underpayments to ordinary soldiers in the field.

While Congress continues to appropriate hundreds of billions of dollars every year for sophisticated new defense technology and weapons, the Pentagon is unable to keep track of the costs or to account for how it spends its \$565.8 billion annual budget. The Goldsmith judges wish to recognize this important piece of explanatory journalism with a special citation. Please join me in recognizing the superb work of Scot Paltrow and Kelly Carr of Reuters for “Unaccountable.” (Applause)

We’ve now come to the moment for awarding the winner of the Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting. Before we do that, I would like to ask all the finalists and the citation winners to stand one more time so that we can once again recognize their invaluable work, please. (Applause)

This year the judges awarded the Goldsmith Prize for Investigative Reporting to “Breathless and Burdened: Dying from Black Lung, Buried by Law and Medicine” by The Center for Public Integrity and ABC News. (Applause)

There’s an unspoken convention among journalists that you don’t literally call a political figure a liar to his face and its corollary is that you don’t simply declare something said by the high powered person being interviewed on camera that he or she is wrong. My favorite moment of the past presidential debate season was the moment when Candy Crowley was moderating a debate between Mitt Romney and Barack Obama, broke that convention. She did it respectfully and without a sneer, but she did what I think journalists should do in such a situation. She put accuracy ahead of convention.

In case you didn't see it, Mitt Romney asserted that President Obama had taken days to declare the Benghazi attack an act of terror. The President interrupted and said it wasn't true. Mr. Romney then doubled down and insisted that it was true and, at that point, Candy Crowley stated, essentially as a fact checker, that the President had in fact declared Benghazi an act of terror the day after it happened.

Never one to miss a moment like that, the President then cracked, can you say that a little louder? (Laughter)

The moderator had the good taste not to do that, but it was typical of her to have risen to the occasion and used her voluminous experience, knowledge and commitment to the facts to set the record straight in the first place, something that Mr. Romney complained bitterly about later. I, on the other hand, was cheering. Candy Crowley is CNN's award winning Chief Political Correspondent and hosts what many feel is the best Sunday morning high powered interview show, "State of the Nation with Candy Crowley." This at 9:00 a.m., in case you have missed it, it's terrific.

In 2012 she became the first woman to moderate a presidential debate in two decades and I genuinely wonder if a male moderator would have done what she did. But lest you think that she has it in for Republicans, she was an outspoken voice at CNN discussing last August how CNN's then proposed and now canceled documentary on Hillary Clinton would make her life, Candy's life, more difficult. This is a commissioned documentary from people who are not in the employ of CNN, she told Politico.

It's not me, it's not Wolf Blitzer, it's not John King, it's an outside documentary group, but we're with CNN and so this is not a story where the

nuances are well received, particularly by Republicans. Such clear eyed frankness was vintage Candy Crowley. After graduating from Randolph Macon Woman's College in Lynchburg, Virginia, she began her broadcast career at a Washington, D.C. radio station, became White House Correspondent for the Associated Press, then moved to NBCTV in Washington and then on to CNN.

She has covered presidential campaigns since Ronald Reagan and her pivotal role in CNN's America Votes in 2008 won a Peabody Award. She is one of the savviest and most incisive political analysts on the air, is a laser sharp interviewer and an inspiration, especially to other women who want to rise to the first rank of journalism. She is also a human being, as you would expect. Dana Bash, CNN's Chief Congressional Correspondent, was interviewed about the best advice she had ever gotten as a journalist. She cited what she called Candy Crowley's three B's.

She said that when Candy's sons called at work and she was busy, she had the three B test. Was it broken, burning or bleeding? (Laughter)

If not, she told her sons she would call back soon. I will add a fourth B, Dana Bash said, brilliant. I concur. It is my honor to present the winner of this year's Goldsmith Award for Career Achievement, Candy Crowley. (Applause)

Ms. Crowley: Thank you all, very much. Let me just first say to be here on the same program, listening to the work that the other winners have gotten for books they have written and you investigative journalists makes me remember, right, that's why I became a journalist. I mean I applaud you again, it is an honor to be up here with you all in the audience. Your work is spectacular. (Applause)

So, like many times when I'm asked to speak places, I said to the -- our PR person, well, what do they want me to talk about? And she said, well, whatever is

on your mind, which is a really dangerous thing to say to me, as any of my friends will tell you, because I will tell you what's on my mind and, by and large, so of the people don't like it. So what's on my mind of course is how I should tell my daughter-in-law that it's okay to say no to a three year old without criticizing her parenting skills. (Laughter)

So, see me after this program if any of you have any great ideas because that's really what's been occupying me. But I figured, well, I can't talk for 15 minutes about that, so let's, looking at other things that people asked me to talk about, what it's like raising children as a single mom for the past three decades, and indeed that was a challenge. They sometimes say, well, listen, can you talk about what's going on in Washington? You already heard about the traffic jam.

And often times it's about who is going to win the election or what's going on, but let's wait until September for that. So I thought what I'd do, what I opted for was a quick look, and I promise you it will be quick because there's time for Q&A, so if you want to know about any of those other things, do let me know, is to talk a little bit about the state of journalism, present company totally excepted because, again, you guys are amazing.

I once saw a Lily Tomlin one woman show. For those of you who don't know who Lily Tomlin is, she is a comedienne, and she did this whole riff on what I worry about, I worry about this, I worry about that, and it was hysterical and, for instance, she said at one point I worry that when I give my credit card to the department store cashier the message will come back kill her immediately. (Laughter)

Which I always -- I thought it was a brilliant show and so I was thinking about what should I talk about, knowing that we'd have examples of the best of

journalism, I thought I would kind of be the downer of the group and I'll tell you a little bit about what's worrying me about journalism at this point. And I want to be a little careful because, to me, it kind of boils down to internet and the challenges that we face and I don't want to be the old lady dressed in black petting her cat in the book store complaining about Kindle. (Laughter)

So somehow I want to, first of all, embrace the internet because it's amazing. I imagine that the investigative journalists here could regale us with story after story about what they found and how they found it and what great use it is, and it is for me as well. I mean, I believe in the dissemination of as much information. I would like some of it to be more truthful but, indeed, it is an amazing, amazing thing, what we now have at our finger tips.

At the same time, I think it has presented us with a lot of challenges as journalists that we haven't quite yet figured out how to do and I think we lose things in the process. I think it's an amazing tool that is not always used well. So I worry about that we are not talking about the things that touch people's lives and what we've -- I recommend to you a Pew study from about a year ago that looked back at the campaign. And, by the way, not everyone totally agrees with his assessment of the debate, but that's a whole other story.

When they looked back at the campaign, what the Pew study found was that when -- that the opinions as voiced on Twitter were put up against, on major events, presidential debates, presidential statements, primary nights, when the Twitter trend was looked at up against public polling, which is broader, what they found was they almost inevitably were the opposite. When Twitter found that such and such a statement by the President was brilliant, the public polling was usually the opposite and there was sometimes 20 points difference.

Now, Twitter obviously trends a lot younger, I think 50 percent of their adults are under 30. It tends more democratic. It is not polling and yet I think that somehow, and I don't want to pick on Twitter, but social media in general, it's like we have whole segments about trending. We are all looking at what's trending, well, where is it trending? It's not trending in my household in Missouri, I can assure you. It's not trending in Michigan where I was born and still have relatives.

I have a bunch of nieces and I remember in 2004 one of them called me and said, well, Aunt Candy, what are you doing tonight? I said, oh, I've got an interview with John Edwards tonight and she said oh, my gosh, oh, that's so cool, oh, you do? Well, what time? And I said 7:00. She said, oh, great, and I thought wow, this is good because she is not exactly a political junkie. I thought, well, that's really good and so we -- the interview was over and I called her and said what do you think? She said I thought you were going to talk to that guy who talks to dead people. (Laughter)

And I said what? She said you know, Jon Edward, he talks to dead people. So we are not always -- they are not always in touch with us, in general, as a news media, and we are certainly not always in touch with them, and that's sort of a light handed way of saying, look, there are, I looked this up, 241 million active Twitter users, the last time somebody put out a believable statement, and that means like once a month they actually tweet, as opposed to the watchers.

There are 7.1 billion people in the world. I feel as though we are sometimes following the social media as the shiny thing. I think it's a great place to find tips and I think it's a great place, if you trust the source, to see stories. It is just -- I mean and I'm on Twitter and I like Twitter as a tip sheet. What bothers me is

how we are all sort of being pulled by it and how we all sort of react to it when in fact -- and I think we are shutting out sort of a large portion of the country, this country and in fact the world.

Now, it was -- I mean was there anything cooler than social media during the Arab Spring? No, there really wasn't. Is there anything cooler than finding out how someone whose life is so completely different from you and light years away culturally and geographically and finding out how they feel? There's nothing cooler than that, but I do feel that this sort of trending stuff takes us off what a journalist is supposed to be, which is to find out like what's important out there? What can we be doing that's interesting that will change people's lives?

I mean everybody sitting in here that was nominated or won an award changed people's lives and, to me, that was the exciting -- that's what I like, to make a difference, who doesn't get born and try to find some way to make a difference and I think sometimes that we let social media drive us, sometimes in ways that turn out to be very productive and sometimes in ways that eat up two, and three and four days for nothing. I worry that the speed of social media is pressuring daily news into putting something out before it actually passes what used to be really stringent rules on.

I worked for the AP early in my career and their whole thing was get it first but first get it right. I think sometimes we forget about that and I think, look, it's pressure, it's not -- I don't hold the viewing public -- I don't hold anybody blameless, but I -- the pressure to get it first is nothing compared to getting it wrong and what you undergo that way and I just feel as though the pressures is intense because the adrenaline, I think any journalist will tell you the adrenaline of a breaking story, there's just nothing quite like it.

And when you see something start to pop, I mean how many times have you heard in news stories, well, this -- a tweet from this tarmac or a tweet from here and it's kind of a, you know, the starting gun and you can hear it and you feel it as a journalist, but it also pushes you, I think, in ways that sometimes we need to sort of step back. When the plane crashed in San Francisco, I think it was San Francisco, not too long ago, it happened actually on my watch and one of the things that I'll point out is that while the tweets were enormously helpful and you could find people and track them down and you could verify stories and you could -- you knew kind of what runway people were on.

But the original tweets were wrong about no deaths or about the plane completely demolished, no passengers off, and we got conflicting reports, so it's not a news source. Social media is not. I mean I know we used to laugh all the time about I'm not a professional, I'm a journalist. And I think that there is some truth to that because I do think that people with a natural curiosity, etcetera, certainly can convey information, but when you then convey it to a larger audience, I think that sometimes we rush too quickly and forget about get it right and then report it.

I worry we are becoming, and when I say we are, I mean media, I worry we are becoming companies that promote ourselves. So if you go to -- I resisted Twitter and, to a certain extent, Instagram. Instagram I'm totally baffled by, but I'm getting there. Because I find that they -- we use them -- I don't think people sign up to follow your Twitter account because they want you to tell them when you are on TV, and what happens is it becomes this kind circular thing where you go, hey, I'm on TV now but be sure to catch me on Twitter and don't forget Instagram and also FaceBook.

And then you go to FaceBook and it goes, hey, thanks for coming to FaceBook, don't forget to see me on TV, and so it becomes this thing where we are just-- (Laughter)

Ms. Crowley: And I get it and I understand. You say, hey, here's a really good interview, this guy told me something I really thought was amazing. I think that's certainly valid, but I think at some level we haven't been able to figure out how to take these different forums and make them something more than watch me do this and watch me do that and here's what you missed on TV. I mean I think that there are ways to use those. Have I figured them out? No, but I do think that I feel as though and resisted for years putting, hey, here's who I'm having on the show and here's someone.

I mean we do do it from our -- someplace else. We do it from our show's Twitter account, not my Twitter account, but, because I feel -- I said I don't think people signed onto my Twitter to -- some of them signed on to yell at me, but some of them sign on because they actually want to see if I know something or what my take on something is. And so I think there needs to be sort of more thought on what are these different venues? I used to tell people all the time, young people getting into journalism, and I'd say well what do you want to do? And they'd say I want to be on TV, and I go well that's not -- that's a forum, that's a venue. If you want to be on TV, go to Hollywood.

What you want is you want to be a journalist and if you want to be a journalist, TV is one way to do that. And it used to be you were either on TV or you were on radio, sometimes those intertwined, or you were in print. Having been on all of those at different times, they all are a slightly different animal that you can do things with. I think that there, again, that there are ways that we

could use these forums that I have yet to figure out. But I tweet to talk to you about my TV, to me, seems not a great use of it.

The other thing is I worry about collective thinking among reporters. It's like boys on the bus writ large. There was an article after the first debate, I think, the first Romney versus Obama debate where someone, a reporter in the press room of the debates, and these are just -- I mean they are just gigantic rooms full of people with their computers, who reported that, rather than listening to the debate, more reporters were following it on Twitter, and I get it, I get why you do that, but then it becomes the truthiness that gets into your head has to be somehow swayed by what you are seeing on Twitter.

And for it to replace listening to the debate and seeing for yourself what you think the lead is and how you think messed up, and all of that, to me is sort of an abandonment of journalism and, again, to me it's kind of now everybody is on this bus and we are kind of looking at Twitter to see, to take a pulse and, to me, journalists take notes, they don't take pulse. They find stuff out. I worry that we are watering down our product. I used to -- I bet Brian can tell you this but I used to spend days putting together a TV spot.

Now it's like when do you need that? An hour and a half. Can you do that? I mean that's not easy to do a TV piece in an hour and a half, even if it's breaking news, and so now you are, hey, can you tweet that? Can you blog that? Would you do a radio podcast? Could you write a little something for the dot com and we need the TV piece by this and can you do live that? Now, can you do it? Sure, you can do it but, again, I worry a little bit that what's happening is when I -- you were either in print, or you were on TV or you were in radio when I first started in this business.

Now, I get the economies of what's going on in the news business, but now newspaper reporters are doing video and we are doing wire stories and radio stories and podcasts and you have to think maybe a couple of days to do one TV spot was a little lengthy. Maybe that's too much time but if you are doing all of this in a given day, what are the possibilities for mistakes? What are the possibilities that you are not stepping back going, whew, let me take the 50,000 foot view and figure out what this is about.

I had a dear friend, Charles Bierbauer, who used to work for CNN and who is now a teacher down in South Carolina, a professor down in South Carolina who once said to me that somebody came rushing in and said, hey, can you do this and can you do this and can you do this and make that short? And he looked up at them and said I don't have time to write short, and it's really the truth because when you, in order to kind of bring it down, there has to be some thought between here and send.

I also worry, and I've worried about this a long time and this is not necessarily something that -- this is only something the internet enhances, I think, through the commentaries and the social blogs. I worry that we distort the people that we cover. I worry that the humanness of people we cover is lost in the sort of unforgiving space of the internet where there is no inflection and there is -- there is obviously in streaming video and all that, but if you are reading.

And I remember one time Hillary Clinton, and this was some time ago, and I think it was when she was going to run for Senate and someone said, wow, I mean there's this story and that story and that story, the people just don't seem

to like you and she said if I read all those stories about me, I wouldn't like me.

(Laughter)

And that made a huge impression on me because I thought, wow, like what is it like to be covered? You don't want to know, let me tell you that. It is not comfortable, you're -- people have motivations and I think somehow this gets enhanced on the internet where people can fire off a clever little 140 character long tweet and it makes -- it's clever and so someone else -- it's my favorite tweet and pretty soon we have made caricatures, sort of flat caricatures out of people. And now I'm talking politicians, who are not -- the parts are so much better than the whole and I don't know that people see that.

I think it does explain why people reelect their representatives and their senators so often is they know that their part seems okay, it's just somehow when it becomes a whole in Washington. So I think it is incumbent upon us to kind of remember all of this. There is not a soul to the internet in the way that there are in people. And I think to mis-characterize or paint these kind of crazy portraits of people does not do the public process any good and it doesn't do journalism any good.

You have to be a good guy or a bad guy, you have to be a cool witch with a B, as Barbara Bush would say, or just -- it is too easy. We too easily fit people into the 140 characters or into the blog or however, into the clever little whatever it is that you're writing. So we started this thing at my Sunday show which we call "Getting to Know", and so you would be surprised how hard it is getting people to do this, and I say I'm just going to ask you questions about your life. We are not doing it for TV, we are putting it on our web site for "State of the Union."

And so it will say “Getting to Know Lindsey Graham” or “Getting to Know So and So” and then questions like -- like I one time asked Lindsey Graham because he did it and I said so if I walked into your house and saw your living room, like what would be on the floor? And he said, oh, a lot of crap. (Laughter)

Okay. Now, so this -- so suddenly he’s not this sort of southern conservative guy without a sense of humor. It gives you a little, just a little seasoning to who these people are, to make them less flat. Just one final quick story about this because this is something I’ve struggled with a lot in the profile pieces that we do or in the -- how we describe, the adjectives we use to do great writing and how do we describe this person or how would this person, when they saw it, see that?

You need to be honest. I’m not arguing that we need to be all sweet and love these people, I just think that there’s more to most of the people that we present as public figures than we are letting on or that we even know. But I had -- I did both John Lewis and Herman Cain for “Getting to Know”, and I interviewed John first and, I mean let’s face it, this is a walking, living hero and legend, a man who faced death more times than anybody ever should have to for the civil rights fight.

I asked him if he was ever afraid and he said, no, I really wasn’t. I said so you’re being beaten by men on horseback and thrown into jail for the nine-thousandth time and you’re not afraid? And he said no because I knew that this was a system that had to change. Herman Cain comes on. Herman Cain, I don’t know how many of you know his background but he -- one of the things that happened early on in his life was he was asked to be what -- he too was from

Georgia and was asked, I think, the South anyway, was asked, listen, will you -- would you like to be one of those that gets bused in high school?

And he talked about it to his father and his father said I don't know how you can pay attention to your studies if you are all involved in this. I want you to get good grades, I want you to go to college. So Herman Cain didn't join and didn't -- said no, I'm going to stay at my black high school. He goes to the Navy and I -- and at one point he came up to Washington and I said to him so I hear, Mr. Cain, that you cut your own hair, is that true? And he said -- or you used to cut your own hair. He said no, I still do. I said you cut your own hair? Why do you do that?

And he said I'll tell you, I was in the Navy, and he had a fairly high position in the Navy, something to do with intelligence I think, and he said I came up and I was walking in Virginia, assuming this is the '60s, and he said I saw like a barber shop and I really needed a hair cut. I went in and there was three black barbers and I sat down and he said in the South, you just sit down there and you wait for one of the guys to have an empty chair and then you sit up, and he said so I'm sitting there and they've got three guys in the chair and one of them leaves, but somebody walks in and the barber motions that guy.

And he said it goes on a couple of times, so I go up to the black barber and I go okay, is there a different system here? I mean what's going on? He said we don't cut black hair here, we can't cut black hair here, but if you go on the other side of the Sears and Roebuck, there's a black barbershop over there. And he said so I went to the Sears and Roebuck, and I got myself some hair clippers and I've been cutting my hair ever since. And I thought I get both of them now. Like there's ways to fight the system.

You are either the individual who fights it within your own life and becomes Herman Cain, and starts Godfather and does all those things he did, or you are John Lewis who says I'm going to change the system. So you either beat the system or you change it and they are valid, and I thought these two stories like explain so much about these two men to me and their positions and how they view things so differently. And I feel like that sort of conversation gets lost in our instant media days.

I'm sorry to have been such a downer after we saw all these great -- these folks doing great work. I just think that my bottom line here is I think this is an amazing tool that we now have in front of us that opens up so much information and I would never -- and so many forums for people to talk, and speak and discuss, but I think as far as journalism is concerned, I worry that so far the internet has mastered us, rather than us mastering the internet. So I look forward to kind of -- I don't know how we do that, but I trust, again, looking at this great talent in here, that we are going to figure it out. So thank you all very much for coming tonight. Thank you for this. (Applause)

Mr. Jones: We do have time for a few questions. I know we are later than we normally are, so we'll just have a couple, but I do want to invite questions. Yes? Let me remind the people asking questions make it a question, make it short.

FROM THE FLOOR: I'm the director of the Knight Science Journalism Program at MIT and I think journalists in this room have these worries as well and the question that I'm just going to ask you, so who do you talk to when you have these worries in TV? Who can you go to and say, listen, aren't we doing this too much or doing that too much?

Ms. Crowley: Well, look, are there others who share my concern at CNN? And NBC or CBS -- absolutely they do and, again, you don't want to be the cat lady. You don't want to say, oh, that's terrible and really in the great days, it was much better, but you do want to try to get a little under control. I don't tend to offer advice to the corporate executives at CNN or anyplace else, they've got enough advice coming at them. But I try -- look, what are you in charge of ultimately? Your bailiwick, right?

What you can control, what you can make different on your side or on your program and that's kind of -- it's bigger than me and I'm not really sure how to go about it, although I always thought -- the other thing I thought was we have yet -- I don't know how many of you know what the Good Housekeeping Seal of Approval -- ever heard of that? Okay. So it was this thing like, hey, this is a great toaster and they would give it the --. I think we need one for the internet so that people would go, you know, go here, okay, they are accurate 98 percent of the time, which is better than 100 percent of these other sites.

And so you would -- there would be some way. Now, of course we all know that whoever the committee is would immediately become controversial, but I mean I do think that there are things that can be done, but I think perspective is everything. Hey, look at what's trending on social media. However, we should point out that there are six billion other people that haven't chimed in yet. I mean something not quite that sarcastic, but along those lines I think is something, just to give it some perspective while we try to wrestle it to the ground and figure out how to make it work for us, rather than it working us.

FROM THE FLOOR: Hi. My name is Max and I'm a member of the John F. Kennedy, Jr. Forum Committee. We met earlier. And I want to ask you a question

about the debate that you moderated this last election cycle. Principally, what would you say motivated you to jump in and put in the fact and what did you feel about all the reactions to your decision?

Ms. Crowley: I wish I could tell you what motivated me. I mean, in the end, two points. One is that at some point, and really it's going to quickly that -- and I'm really -- there's this guy talking in my ear saying okay, Romney has now talked three minutes less than President Obama because President Obama talks so slowly that Mitt Romney always got in more words but less time, so you were constantly sort of listening to that. I was very aware of the people in the town hall because they really had been there since 7:00 in the morning and it was very clear that I wasn't going to get to most of them.

And so I was trying to kind of move things along and I do remember thinking, oh, they are going to get wrapped around this axle, yes you did, no you didn't, yes you did, no you didn't, and it was at one point when Governor Romney looked at me and it was sort of one of those, now, looking back on it, I think maybe he was talking about why is the President interrupting me? I mean you don't know what he's thinking and so, honestly, I just said it.

Now, I just want to be really specific. Number one, the question of Mitt Romney's was about, in the Rose Garden the next day, you did not call it an act of terrorism when in fact act of terrorism does appear in the transcript of that thing. Now, what is also generally missed is that when the President said, Candy, could you repeat that? I said but it is also true, Mr. President, that you people took weeks to get off this idea that it was an act -- that it was some tape that somebody had made.

Now, we also learned that, to another network, earlier, the President had declined to call it an act of terrorism. Now, it was on the cutting room floor, so that was not out in public, and it was true that Susan Rice and others had. So I did say, listen, because I thought that was sort Mitt Romney's point and he got stuck on this one little Rose Garden detail, which I thought, well, the broader point is you people walked away from this and said, oh, it's some tape.

The reaction. So I don't know why. I mean I just -- it was natural to me. I will also tell you that everything that happens on that stage is so much less on the stage than it is on TV. And we all know that TV makes things bigger, but there was at one point, right after it, somebody came up and said, oh, well you should have seen our -- you should have seen our lines. So they have okay, women feel this was a good point, women don't feel this was good, so there's little things under the screen, and the men feel this way and the men --.

So I said what do you mean? And they said every time they charged the -- they charged you at the podium, the women just went down and so did the men, and I said who charged me at the podium? They said, oh, you know, when Mitt came up and I said, honestly, that did not feel like they were charging me at the podium. This felt like two men, and I have to tell you I have all sons, so it felt very familiar to me, the kind of stalking-- (Laughter)

I thought I've seen this in my living room. So there's like -- there's just this time when I -- they said, oh, they were so angry with each other and I thought, well, I didn't -- I mean I got that the stakes were really high and that they were both charged up and the adrenaline was running, but I didn't get this I thought President Obama was going to hit him. I said really? Because it doesn't feel that way on stage, so it was very different.

I would say in terms of the reaction, first of all, I do want to tell you that there was a man on that stage who came up to -- the first man to shake my hand when that debate was over was Mitt Romney and say thank you very much, so I -- he was as gracious as he absolutely could have been on that night. I was -- I'm not aware of what's going on on Twitter and all that kind of stuff. So the only thing that really ever bothered me about it, because a little bit comes with the territory, is the motivation.

I don't mind people saying she shouldn't have done that, that's not what -- okay, fine, that's -- sure, you get to -- that's fine, you get to say that, or I really thought she should have been better at saying to the President you guys spent two weeks blaming it on this tape and you threw him in -- more fulsome explanation of the President or I loved it, whatever it happened to be. What I didn't like was and she did that because she supports the President or she did that because -- they don't know why I did that.

And I also think that this is -- and I did it because it, as you can see, I can't -- because it came up and I said no because I specifically remembered the phrase because, by the way, we talked about it at the time. But, so I think the other thing that is wrong, and this is not on the internet, this is on politics, is that we have gotten into this motivation thing. You are doing that because you hate children, you want old people to die. You're going wait a second, wait a second. Argue what happened, argue policy, don't argue motivation because you never know what's in another person's head, so don't assume that you know why somebody did something.

So that's the only thing about it, politics ain't beanbag, as they say. I would rather not be in the middle of it, but that's how that goes. It was a privilege. I

had so much fun, I would do it in a jack second again. But I didn't like the motivational part because I thought you just don't know me.

Mr. Jones: Candy Crowley, thank you so much. (Applause)

It was great to have you. I would like to, before we close, I would like to remind you that tomorrow morning at 9:00 all of our finalists and Candy will be there with us. We'll talk about how they did what they did. It will be what I would call shop talk at its highest level, and I hope you'll come.

Thank you all for being here. Congratulations to all of the journalists. Candy, we loved having you. Thank you all very much and we are adjourned. Thanks.