

Page Denied

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

TOP SECRET

PAO 88-0115

- Distribution:
- Orig. - DCI w/attachments *alb*
 - 1 - D/PAO w/attachments
 - 25X1 1 - [redacted] w/o attachments
 - 1 - [redacted] w/o attachments
 - 1 - [redacted] w/o attachments
 - 1 - Jean w/o attachments
 - 1 - ER w/o attachments
 - 1 - PAO Registry w/o attachments
 - 1 - Ames (Hold) w/attachments
 - 25X1 1 - [redacted] (Chrono) w/o attachments
 - 1 - UCA Registry (Edith) w/attachments

31 March 1988

JUDGE:

You will be addressing the American Society of Newspaper Editors at a dinner at 7 p.m. on April 11 at the National Archives Building.

In the introduction of your proposed speech, you mention that you last spoke to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in 1978, soon after being appointed Director of the FBI. You point out the media's vital role in American society, and quote Osborn Elliott, the former dean of Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism: "Practiced as it should be, journalism provides both the glue that holds our society together and the lubricant that makes it work."

You mention the cooperation and openness which characterizes the FBI's relationship with the media, and then state your thesis (page 2): "There are some very good reasons why the Central Intelligence Agency's relationship with the media is more complicated, and I would like to discuss those tonight. I want to promote the view that certain kinds of information must be protected, shared only with the elected representatives of the American people. And I want to talk about the type of relationship between government and the media that works best in our society -- a relationship of candor and cooperation on particularly sensitive matters."

In your remarks, you emphasize that "protecting information is not the same as hiding it." You discuss the relationship between CIA and Congress and note how the Agency provides information to legislators -- through briefings, written material, and testimony. You refer to the need to be candid with Congress and mention the guidelines that were developed to help those in the Agency provide information without compromising sources and methods.

In pointing out the damage that can be done by media disclosures of very sensitive information, you cite a recent example which is sanitized in the text of the speech. Footnote 4 provides you with classified background information on the incident.

25X1

UNCLASSIFIED WHEN SEPARATED FROM ATTACHMENTS



TOP SECRET

TOP SECRET

You then state that most members of the press are more than willing to cooperate when government officials clearly state the reasons why certain information would jeopardize national interests. You cite the example of when former Secretary of State Cyrus Vance asked The New York Times to hold off on the story about the Canadians who were harboring some of the American hostages in Iran in 1980. You also mention a recent case, in which I asked the reporter of a major newspaper not to publish a story concerning extremely sensitive information about Middle Eastern terrorism. The reporter agreed to withhold the story, and to this day has not published it. Classified background information on this matter is in Footnote 6.

You conclude by stressing that our policy with the media -- like our policy with Congress -- is to be both candid and responsive. You mention that neither the Intelligence Community nor the journalism profession stands to gain from a relationship of suspicion and mistrust, and we will do our best to build the trust necessary to maintain a cooperative relationship.

Your proposed remarks are attached.

Bill Baker

Attachments:
As Stated

TOP SECRET

PROPOSED REMARKS
BY
WILLIAM H. WEBSTER
DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
BEFORE THE
AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS
WASHINGTON, D.C.
APRIL 11, 1988

IT'S A PLEASURE TO BE HERE TONIGHT. THE LAST TIME I SPOKE TO THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF NEWSPAPER EDITORS WAS IN 1978, SOON AFTER BEING APPOINTED DIRECTOR OF THE FBI.¹ DURING MY TENURE AT THE BUREAU, I MET WITH JOURNALISTS ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS AND I HAVE CONTINUED TO DO THAT AT THE CIA. I HAVE ALWAYS BELIEVED THAT THE PRESS PLAYS A VITAL ROLE IN PROVIDING THE AMERICAN PUBLIC WITH THE INFORMATION IT NEEDS TO MAKE INFORMED JUDGMENTS. OSBORN ELLIOTT -- A MAN SOME OF YOU MIGHT HAVE KNOWN WHEN HE WAS AT NEWSWEEK OR WHEN HE WAS DEAN AT COLUMBIA'S SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM -- HAS ELOQUENTLY DESCRIBED THE FOURTH ESTATE'S ROLE IN OUR SOCIETY. "PRACTICED AS IT SHOULD BE. JOURNALISM PROVIDES BOTH THE GLUE THAT HOLDS OUR SOCIETY TOGETHER AND THE LUBRICANT THAT MAKES IT WORK."²

AT THE FBI, WE HAD A VERY IMPORTANT REASON FOR REACHING OUT TO THE PUBLIC THROUGH THE MEDIA. WE WANTED ALL AMERICANS TO KNOW THAT THEY SHOULD COME TO THE FBI WITH INFORMATION ABOUT ILLEGAL ACTIVITIES AND THREATS TO PUBLIC SAFETY, AND THAT THIS INFORMATION WOULD BE TREATED APPROPRIATELY. WE WOULD INVESTIGATE MATTERS BROUGHT TO OUR ATTENTION BY THE PUBLIC AND, IF WARRANTED, THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT WOULD PROSECUTE.

THE FBI'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MEDIA WAS AND CONTINUES TO BE HEALTHY, AND I THINK THE COOPERATION AND OPENNESS WHICH MARKED THAT RELATIONSHIP HELPED BOTH OF US DO OUR JOBS.

THERE ARE SOME VERY GOOD REASONS WHY THE CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MEDIA IS MORE COMPLICATED, AND I WOULD LIKE TO DISCUSS THOSE TONIGHT. I WANT TO PROMOTE THE VIEW THAT CERTAIN KINDS OF INFORMATION MUST BE PROTECTED, SHARED ONLY WITH THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. AND I WANT TO TALK ABOUT THE TYPE OF RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND THE

MEDIA THAT WORKS BEST IN OUR SOCIETY -- A RELATIONSHIP OF CANDOR AND COOPERATION ON PARTICULARLY SENSITIVE MATTERS.

PROTECTING INFORMATION IS NOT THE SAME AS HIDING IT. INDEED, WHAT WOULD BE THE POINT OF COLLECTING INFORMATION IF IT IS NOT SHARED WITH THOSE WHO HAVE THE RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAKING POLICY DECISIONS?

TODAY THE INFORMATION THAT IS COLLECTED BY THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY IS SHARED WITH CONGRESS. FIFTEEN YEARS AGO THE CIA GAVE 175 BRIEFINGS TO CONGRESS: LAST YEAR WE GAVE OVER 1,000 BRIEFINGS ON A VARIETY OF TOPICS. THESE TOPICS INCLUDED ARMS CONTROL, SOVIET WEAPONS, THE PERSIAN GULF SITUATION, AND THE CONFLICT IN CENTRAL AMERICA. IN THE LAST YEAR THE CIA SENT MORE THAN 5,000 INTELLIGENCE REPORTS TO CONGRESS.³

IN ADDITION TO BRIEFINGS AND PAPERS, WE ALSO TESTIFIED BEFORE THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE. I HAVE SPENT A FAIR AMOUNT OF TIME ON THE HILL, LATELY, MYSELF. BECAUSE I KNOW OF THE NEED TO BE ABSOLUTELY

CANDID WITH CONGRESS, AND THE RESPONSIBILITY INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS HAVE TO PROTECT SOURCES AND METHODS, I HAVE ESTABLISHED GUIDELINES GOVERNING OUR DEALINGS WITH MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE. AND I HAVE MADE IT ABSOLUTELY CLEAR THAT IN DEALING WITH CONGRESS THERE IS NO EXCUSE FOR DECEPTION.

I FIRMLY BELIEVE THAT THE OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITIES EXERCISED BY CONGRESS ARE BOTH NECESSARY AND BENEFICIAL. THERE MUST BE A DEPENDABLE SYSTEM OF OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY WHICH BUILDS, RATHER THAN ERODES, TRUST BETWEEN THOSE WHO HAVE THE INTELLIGENCE RESPONSIBILITY AND THOSE WHO ARE THE ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

AS PART OF MY EFFORT TO ESTABLISH AN OPEN RELATIONSHIP WITH CONGRESS, I MEET WITH THE LEADERS OF OUR INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT COMMITTEES AT LEAST MONTHLY. MEMBERS OF THESE COMMITTEES SHARE WITH THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY THE RESPONSIBILITY OF PRESERVING THE NATION'S INTELLIGENCE SECRETS.

BUT INTELLIGENCE PROFESSIONALS, LIKE JOURNALISTS, HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT SOURCES OF INFORMATION. AND WHILE ALL INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES ARE SUBJECT TO CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT, I AM REQUIRED BY LAW TO PROTECT THE SOURCES AND METHODS BY WHICH WE IN THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY COLLECT INFORMATION.

THERE ARE INSTANCES WHERE INFORMATION PERTAINING TO NATIONAL SECURITY MUST NOT BE RELEASED OUTSIDE THE CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT COMMITTEES; THIS INCLUDES INFORMATION THAT COULD JEOPARDIZE LIVES OR INFORMATION THAT THREATENS THE MEANS BY WHICH WE PROTECT OURSELVES. THE DISCLOSURE OF SOPHISTICATED TECHNICAL SYSTEMS OR CRYPTOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ALERTS A HOSTILE NATION TO THE NEED TO DEVELOP COUNTERMEASURES AND CAN SERIOUSLY HAMPER OUR INTELLIGENCE EFFORTS. IN SIGNALS INTELLIGENCE, FOR EXAMPLE, IF ONE SENSITIVE PIECE OF INFORMATION IS PUBLISHED, IT COULD PUT AN ENTIRE INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION SYSTEM OUT OF USE. AN ENORMOUS AMOUNT OF TIME, PLANNING, AND MONEY WOULD BE REQUIRED TO REPLACE IT.

INFORMATION THAT IS PUBLISHED NEED NOT EVEN BE ACCURATE TO DO IRREPARABLE HARM TO OUR INTELLIGENCE CAPABILITIES. LET ME GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE. SINCE THIS IS AN UNCLASSIFIED FORUM, I HOPE YOU WILL UNDERSTAND THAT I CAN'T BE TOO SPECIFIC. NOT TOO LONG AGO THERE WAS A BRIEF FLURRY OF NEWS STORIES PURPORTING TO BE BASED ON CLASSIFIED INTELLIGENCE INFORMATION INDICATING THAT AN ADVERSARY HAD CARRIED OUT CERTAIN MILITARY EXPERIMENTS. THE STORIES WERE LARGELY INACCURATE. YET COMMENTS ON THE SITUATION--AGAIN MOSTLY INACCURATE--WERE ATTRIBUTED TO A NUMBER OF U.S. OFFICIALS. SOME OF THESE OFFICIALS CONFIRMED THE STORY, ONE DENIED IT, AND YET ANOTHER CORRECTED THE INITIAL STORY. THE STATEMENTS BY THESE OFFICIALS SERVED TO HEIGHTEN SPECULATION AND TO SUSTAIN PUBLIC FOCUS ON MATTERS INVOLVING HIGHLY SENSITIVE U.S. INTELLIGENCE COLLECTION TECHNIQUES.

AFTER THESE STORIES WERE PUBLISHED, OUR ADVERSARY TOOK COUNTERMEASURES WHICH ELIMINATED OUR ACCESS TO THIS TYPE OF

INTELLIGENCE. IN SHORT, EVEN THOUGH THE INFORMATION DISCUSSED BY THESE U.S. OFFICIALS WAS INCORRECT, THE NET RESULT WAS A FURTHER LOSS FOR U.S. INTELLIGENCE.⁴

REGRETTABLY, SOME VIEW THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY'S RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT SOURCES AND METHODS AS A THREAT TO A FREE PRESS. I HAVE FOUND THAT MOST MEMBERS OF THE PRESS ARE MORE THAN WILLING TO COOPERATE WHEN WE HAVE CLEARLY STATED THE REASONS WHY CERTAIN INFORMATION WOULD JEOPARDIZE NATIONAL INTERESTS.

LET ME GIVE YOU AN EXAMPLE OF HOW THE PRESS RESPONDED -- QUITE PROPERLY IN MY VIEW -- WHEN LIVES WERE AT STAKE. SEYMOUR TOPPING, THE FORMER MANAGING EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES, WAS INVOLVED IN ONE CASE THAT CONCERNED SOME OF THE AMERICAN HOSTAGES IN IRAN IN 1980. SECRETARY OF STATE CYRUS VANCE CALLED HIM AND SAID HE KNEW THE TIMES HAD A STORY ABOUT THE CANADIANS WHO WERE HARBORING SOME OF THE AMERICAN HOSTAGES. VANCE ASKED TOPPING IF THE TIMES COULD HOLD THE STORY FOR ANOTHER 48 TO 72 HOURS, UNTIL OUR GOVERNMENT KNEW THAT

THE HOSTAGES WERE FREE AND CLEAR. THERE WAS NO QUESTION IN TOPPING'S MIND THAT THE TIMES WOULD WITHHOLD THE STORY.⁵

LAST FALL, A REPORTER FROM A MAJOR NEWSPAPER REQUESTED A MEETING WITH BILL BAKER, MY PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIRECTOR AT CIA, TO DISCUSS EXTREMELY SENSITIVE INFORMATION THAT HAD COME INTO HIS POSSESSION ABOUT MIDDLE EASTERN TERRORISM. BILL ADVISED THE REPORTER THAT WITHOUT ANY DOUBT HIS INFORMATION, IF PUBLISHED, COULD ENDANGER A VALUABLE SOURCE OF INTELLIGENCE AND COULD RESULT IN LOSS OF LIFE. THE REPORTER AGREED TO WITHHOLD THE STORY, AND TO THIS DAY HAS NOT PUBLISHED IT.⁶ THERE HAVE BEEN OTHER INSTANCES IN WHICH THE PRESS HAS WITHHELD STORIES OR WRITTEN THEM IN A WAY THAT PRESERVED THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF INTELLIGENCE SOURCES. THIS COOPERATION IS A RESULT OF THE CREDIBILITY AND GOOD FAITH WE HAVE WORKED TO ESTABLISH WITH THE PRESS.

OUR POLICY WITH THE MEDIA -- LIKE OUR POLICY WITH CONGRESS -- IS TO BE BOTH CANDID AND RESPONSIVE. WE FREQUENTLY SCHEDULE

BACKGROUND BRIEFINGS FOR REPORTERS WHO REQUEST INFORMATION ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENTS. AND, IF WE CANNOT ANSWER A SPECIFIC QUESTION, WE WILL TELL YOU THAT WE CANNOT ANSWER IT AND WILL NOT TRY TO MISLEAD YOU BY INVENTING A RESPONSE.

WHILE SOME MIGHT DISAGREE, I THINK THE WORK OF INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS IS, IN MANY WAYS, SIMILAR TO THE WORK OF JOURNALISTS. INTELLIGENCE OFFICERS, LIKE NEWSMEN, SEEK OUT SOURCES, GATHER AND EVALUATE INFORMATION, AND PRESENT FACTS IN THE CONTEXT OF BROADER EVENTS AND ISSUES. BOTH PROFESSIONS REQUIRE CURIOSITY, FLEXIBILITY, AND STAMINA. NEITHER THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY NOR THE JOURNALISM PROFESSION STANDS TO GAIN FROM A RELATIONSHIP OF SUSPICION AND MISTRUST. BOTH, HOWEVER, WILL BENEFIT FROM MUTUAL COOPERATION AND CANDOR. FOR OUR PART, WE WILL DO OUR BEST TO BUILD THE TRUST NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN SUCH A RELATIONSHIP.

I WILL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY OF YOUR QUESTIONS.

Page Denied

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

April 30, 1987

TOPICAL LIST OF SPEECHES GIVEN BY DIRECTOR WEBSTER BETWEEN
FEBRUARY 23, 1978 AND MARCH 31, 1987

American College of Trial Lawyers* Phoenix, Arizona FBI, AS FOUND ON TAKING OFFICE	3/7/78
112th Session of the FBI National Academy* Quantico, Virginia COOPERATION WITH LAW ENFORCEMENT	3/24/78
National Crime Information Center* Participant's Meeting Washington, D. C. NCIC	3/28/78
American Society of Newspaper Editors* Washington, D. C. REVIEW OF FBI OPERATIONS	4/11/78
Chamber of Commerce of the United States Washington, D. C. BREAKFAST PRAYER MEETING	5/2/78
92nd Annual Convention of the American Newspaper Publishers Association Atlanta, Georgia INFORMANTS	5/3/78
Fifth Annual Judiciary Conference of the* United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals Washington, D. C. PROFESSIONALISM IN THE FBI	5/18/78
William Woods College Commencement Exercises* Fulton, Missouri TASKING THE FBI; PERSONAL RECOLLECTIONS	5/20/78
National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives St. Louis, Missouri CIVIL RIGHTS AND MINORITY RECRUITMENT	6/23/78

*Not disseminated

Alphabetical Listing

American Automobile Association Washington, D. C.	5/29/80
✓ ABA Annual Meeting London, England	7/15/85
✓ ABA Section of Corporation, Banking and Business Law Washington, D. C.	7/9/85
Abraham Lincoln Association Springfield, Illinois	2/12/79
Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences Cincinnati, Ohio	3/14/79
Air Transportation Association ✓ Washington, D. C.	9/19/85
✓ Air Transport Association Washington, D. C.	9/23/82
✓ Akron Roundtable Akron, Ohio	6/19/86
⊗ Alaska Peace Officers Association Anchorage, Alaska	6/24/81
✓ American Bar Association, Section of Insurance, Negligence and Compensation Law New York, New York	8/7/78
American Bar Association, Special Committee on Lawyers in Government New York, New York	8/7/78
American Bar Association Chicago, Illinois	10/26/78
American Bar Association New Orleans, Louisiana	8/8/81
American Bar Association Panel Discussion San Francisco, California	8/10/82
American Bar Association Chicago, Illinois	8/7/84
American Bar Association National Conference on Law in Relation to Terrorism	6/6/86

American Bar Association, Standing Committee on Law and National Security New York, New York	8/11/86
American College of Trial Lawyers Phoenix, Arizona	3/7/78
American College of Trial Lawyers Phoenix, Arizona	3/4/81
✓ American College of Trial Lawyers Boca Raton, Florida	3/9/83
American Council of Life Insurance San Francisco, California	11/17/86
American Judicature Society Atlanta, Georgia	2/10/79
American Law Institute Washington, D. C.	5/18/79
The American Legion Indianapolis, Indiana	5/4/83
✓ American Society of Newspaper Editors Washington, D. C.	4/11/78
American Newspaper Publishers Association Washington, D. C. <i>Association</i>	3/12/80
American Press Institute Washington, D. C.	6/12/84
✓ American Society for Industrial Security Detroit, Michigan	9/17/79
American Society for Industrial Security New Orleans, Louisiana	9/23/86
American Whig Cliosophic Society Princeton, New Jersey	10/4/79
Amherst Alumnia Association Washington, D. C.	3/30/82
✓ Amherst University Alumni Association Amherst, Massachusetts	6/2/85
Amherst Alumni Association Washington, D. C.	4/29/86
Amherst College Amherst, Massachusetts	5/6/81

OPENING DAY REMARKS

September 8, 1981

Dean Osborn Elliott

Good morning, and welcome to Columbia's Graduate School of Journalism-- the only game of its kind in the world. My name is Osborn Elliott, and I am your friendly neighborhood dean.

I've been wondering how to greet this disparate group--some of you fresh from the Groves of Academe, more of you with a year or two or more of experience in the outside world. I guess the best way to welcome you is as equals, for in one important respect, that is what you are: You are all intelligent enough to believe that, whatever your level of experience, there is more for you to learn about this craft we call journalism.

I think it is also appropriate to welcome you all as public servants-- for that is really what journalism is all about. I hope that you arrive here-- and I demand that you leave here--with that notion in mind. By choosing journalism as a career, you have opted for a calling that is higher than most, and carries with it greater responsibilities than most.

Bankers and businessmen serve their clients and their stockholders and the nation at large by making money make the wheels go round--mostly honorably, one hopes. Doctors try to find ways to help those who are infirm of mind and body--which is to say all of us, eventually. Lawyers, to use an old Harvard phrase, seek to set and administer "those bonds that make men free." Scientists try to help us understand, and to use productively, all the forces of nature. Artists create beauty, and critics enhance our appreciation of it. And statesmen--here I include members of the City Council as well as senators,

prime ministers and presidents--try to make the body politics work--with mixed results.

I could march on through the professions--teachers and poets, prelates and publicans--and even deans. (I was told by a professor a couple of years ago, by the way, upon arriving in academe, that the relationship of a dean to his faculty is that of a hydrant to a dog--which I took to mean, indispensable. Please check out the faculty in the next few weeks, and see if I caught the drift correctly.)

My point is that there are many interesting and useful and honorable occupations in this world--even deaning--but journalism is almost unique in the responsibilities it imposes on its practitioners. Journalism is, as an old boss of mine, Phil Graham--the late publisher of the Washington Post--used to say, a "precariously intellectual vocation." Graham added: "When I think of a few serious journalists I have known, I know that the jealous demands of excellence in our calling have borne down on them heavily and deeply while also elevating and enlarging them." We hope here at Columbia, by bearing down heavily on you, to "elevate and enlarge" you all.

Like other professionals, when you leave this place you will have your bosses--often crabby editors, if you are print people; or impossibly demanding producers, if you have the looks and voice and talent for electronic journalism. You will, no doubt, run across your share of greedy and narrow-minded publishers and station owners. But unlike almost all other professionals, you will be answering, finally, to another boss. You will be answering to the people. That is why I welcome you here as public servants.

Yours will be the task to decide what is truly important in all the

varied fields you cover; yours the task to probe for that maddeningly elusive quarry that we call the truth; yours the task to tell the doctors and politicians and businessmen and scientists and preachers and teachers and poets and postmen what is going on in their fields and others, and why. Yours will be the task to help set the national agenda--and how huge a responsibility that is!

Practiced imperfectly, as it too often is, journalism can set class against class, race against race, region against region. Practiced as it should be, journalism provides both the glue that holds our society together, and the lubricant that makes it work.

We have, in recent years, seen journalism and its practitioners denounced as nay-sayers and ne'er-do-wells--those "nattering nabobs of negativism" conjured up by that malefactor of ill-begotten wealth, the far-right Honorable Spiro Agnew. And we have seen journalism apotheosized, in the Watergate years, as the protector of all that is good and the exposé of all that is evil. The truth, of course, lies somewhere in between. I would argue, in fact, that one of the unfortunate residues of Watergate is just that kind of knee-jerk negativism that Agnew chose to find so galling.

Too often these days, it seems to me, reporters tend to be automatically distrustful of any person or any institution in a position of power. Too often, a hard cynicism replaces that healthy skepticism that must lie at the core of journalistic work. It is not surprising--after Watergate, after Vietnam, after corporate payoffs, after Wilbur Mills, after Wayne Hays, after Abscam--that this cynicism exists. But it is too bad.

Another residue of Watergate, I'm bound to say, is a certain arrogance on the part of some members of the press--the kind of arrogance that caused the editors of the Washington Post to stick by their Janet Cooke story long

after strong doubts about it had arisen in the Post's own newsroom. You can imagine that we at Columbia, where the Pulitzer prizes are administered, feel pretty strongly about that whole affair.

Journalism has other problems these days--both in print and broadcast. There is, for example, the recent death in the afternoon in Washington--and the daily rape in the afternoon in New York. There is the wink, nod and elbow-in-the-side brand of happy talk that tries to pass itself off as journalism on the tube. There is the disturbing matter of the large chairs gobbling up ever more papers across the land. And there is the big question mark hovering over the sprouting tendrils of cable TV.

All of that leads me back to the teaching of journalism here at Columbia.

We ask ourselves all the time, at this school, how journalism should be taught. We can teach you how to write a lead, and a transition, and how to interview someone and get the juicier quotes up high in the story. We can teach you about cross checking and accuracy. And we can teach you something about the world that you are going out to cover.

But we can't teach you insight or compassion or fairness, and we can't provide you with that "fire in the belly" that any good journalist must have. If you don't have those qualities as you arrive here, and if you feel that you cannot develop them, I urge you to leave this place at once.

If you do have these qualities, or think you can develop them, I welcome you to an exciting and rewarding year--and into a profession that will be ultimately fulfilling.

In a couple of minutes, Associate Dean Carolyn Lewis will be talking to you in some detail about our academic and professional program. Let me dwell for a moment on some of the changes we have been making in the curriculum to

enrich your lives here. First, something we have dubbed as the Issues of the Eighties lectures. These talks will be on such subjects as science, business, urban affairs, politics, and race relations. They will be offered by such professionals in journalism as Beth Fallon and Mickey Carroll, Marcia Chambers and Ken Auletta. And by such expert outsiders as Lou Harris and, I hope, Vernon Jordan. For most of these sessions, we will appoint a student panel to ask the tough questions after the formal talk. And out of each of these sessions will come writing and reporting assignments.

In the past couple of years, we have added some new courses of study--cultural criticism, which is taught by my old Newsweek colleague, Peter Prescott; and business and financial reporting and writing, offered by the experienced journalist Chris Welles and Ron Krieger of the Chase Bank. This year, Professor Penn Kimball will be offering a multiple-point course in urban journalism. Another new course is called "Race, Racism and Reporting: The People of New York," and will explore the ethnicity that is so central to this city, and for that matter to the country as a whole. Not so incidentally, this course fits into my definition of journalism as the agenda-setter for our society; I happen to think that racism is still a blight on this nation, and I think it essential that we journalists keep that unfortunate fact to the fore.

One of the most important courses that all of you will take is offered on Fridays by Professors Fred Friendly and Benno Schmidt. It is called Media, the Law and Society. In this course you will be exploring not just such legal matters as the First Amendment, libel law, and rules of privacy--but probing deeply into the ethics of journalism and its central role in the workings of our Republic. Not to mention the thought processes, and set of mind, that

distinguish a journalist from a lawyer or a businessman.

And a journalist is different--for one thing, in his work he must find the proper distance from the seat of power. Someone wrote that "the concessions a journalist has to make in order to be on the inside are constantly at war with truth and realism. There is no simple formula that will save him from seduction or error. Yet in the tension between the two, good journalism is forged..."

Walter Lippmann addressed this problem, in a farewell speech when he gave up writing his newspaper column back in the Sixties. "A long life in journalism," he said, "convinced me many presidents ago that there should be a large and space between a journalist and the head of a state. I would have carved on the portals of the National Press Club, 'Put not your trust in princes.' Only the very rarest of princes can endure even a little criticism, and few of them can put up with even a pause in the adulation."

This establishing of distance, of course, is as important in covering City Hall as it is in chronicling the doings of world leaders.

Now, a personal note. I spent more than thirty years in the practice of journalism, almost half of those years as the editor of Newsweek. I consider myself to have been unbelievably lucky. I can imagine no pursuit that can be more gratifying than journalism, and none that could be more fun.

So work hard here--you'll have to. And for heaven's sake, have fun!

Page Denied

Next 10 Page(s) In Document Denied

portrayed by television in a docudrama — will register in the minds of the people who saw it, and the truth of what actually happened in Atlanta is going to have one hell of a time catching up.

The media's presenting of a form of reality that is more fiction than fact is extremely dangerous and seductive, because fiction is neat and life is ragged.

The making of the docudrama, *Roots*, is instructive here. Originally Alex Haley, the author, was to come into the story from time to time as a kind of narrator. The story would then go back to his biography of Kunta Kinte. These intermittent insertions of reality were to continue throughout the drama. Halfway through the production, the pro-

ducer of *Roots* came to Haley and said, "Alex, Kunta Kinte is murdering you. There is no way that you, as a real human being, can stand up to the dramatic force of Kunta Kinte." Haley immediately understood. He took himself out of the play, and the fictional drama went on.

There are plenty of historical examples of civilizations going crazy in the midst of great demands for rationality. That really is where your responsibility lies. You must meet those demands.

Mr. Jefferson said that the whole of government is the art of being honest. We are now putting a lot of emphasis on the art. I think we ought to put more emphasis on the honest, especially about the facts.

PART I: PUBLIC INFORMATION, GOVERNMENT, AND THE MEDIA

Secrecy and the Public's Need to Know

DONALD McDONALD (*Acting Director of the Center; Editor of The Center Magazine*): Who is competent to draw the line, and how can it be objectively drawn, between government information that should be kept secret and that which the public has a need and a right to know? We have had examples in the fairly recent past of some of the news media deciding that the government's request for secrecy was out of order and unnecessary. I refer specifically to the Department of Defense's request to some news organizations last fall not to publish or broadcast details of a planned launch of a space satellite.

MEL ELFIN (*Former Washington Bureau Chief, Newsweek magazine*): The Secretary of Defense ripped into the *Washington Post* in an effort to hide a real secret. The *Washington Post* had printed nothing that had not been known for a long time. Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger picked an easy target in the *Post*, a publication that people would believe had done something wrong. He did that in order to offer a little disinformation as to the real nature of

the launch. The talk in Washington was that the press held back on what probably is a real national security secret involving the shuttle — something that had nothing to do with what the *Post* ran — and that Mr. Weinberger picked on the *Post* in an effort to mislead the Russians.

WALTER MEARS (*Executive Editor, Associated Press*): The Associated Press agreed to hold off on that story. We were one of the four organizations that did. In retrospect, I'm not sure that we weren't had. The request was not made directly to me, so I don't know what was said in that conversation. But I am inclined to agree with Mel Elfin that there was a bit of crying wolf for reasons that escape me. I think the government damaged the process by doing what they did.

WILLIAM THOMAS (*Editor, Los Angeles Times*): When AP was briefed by the Department of the Defense — and the *Post* wasn't briefed as I recall — the briefing must have convinced Lou Boccia, the

methods is a particularly sensitive form of information.

Another has to do with endangering national security in a broad sense. If you give away our backup position in arms control negotiations with the Soviets, you may hinder the reaching of an arms control agreement that might ensure the peace of the world.

McDONALD: So what do you do when somebody puts that to you? Do you try to verify that publication will in fact endanger arms control negotiations?

SCHORR: Maybe as big a story as any here is, who the hell are these people in the government who are torpedoing the government's arms control efforts and are willing to leak this information apparently without purpose? Once they have leaked, they have leaked. I am not myself in the business of saying, please, shield me from this knowledge. Once we have that knowledge, we have a problem, and we are close to publishing it.

EUGENE PATTERSON (Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, *St. Petersburg Times*): Whether or not something involves national security, there is another element in the press's operation that the public does not realize motivates the media as much as it does, and that is basic morality. Is it right to print this, and that is basic morality. Is it right to print this, or is it wrong? Are we being used by somebody when we are big boys who should know we are being used? The question is not only, does it hurt national security to publish? It is also, is it just or unjust? When the FBI came to see me at the *Atlanta Constitution* to tell me that Martin Luther King, Jr., was carrying on with women, and wanted to know why I wouldn't print it, I said we don't print stuff like that. I said the news here is that you are doing this to Dr. King, or attempting to do it. And you know, in Dr. King's lifetime, no newspaper, not even the most segregationist sheets in the South, ever printed what the FBI was trying to peddle. We don't do things like that. For us to have printed what the FBI was trying to do to Dr. King would have been to permit them to do it. So, nobody printed it until after his death. Then we all printed it, so that the public would know what their federal police force was doing. But we did not play into their hands during Dr. King's lifetime.

SCHORR: You are absolutely right. The big story was the way the FBI was manipulating and being

manipulated. Not only did they talk about Dr. King's women, but they also tried to spread stories about Communist connections. The way in which the FBI began to take an active part in trying to smear and ruin the reputations of people was probably as big a story as we have seen in that whole area.

PATTERSON: On Dave Lawrence's question — what have we printed that did endanger national security? It is a very short list. I think we endangered security in World War II when the *Chicago Tribune* published a story indicating we had cracked the Japanese code. I don't think security was damaged, because the Japanese never picked up on it. But there I think was a case.

On the other hand, when I was at the *Washington Post*, and we got the Pentagon Papers, we pulled in people like Chalmers Roberts, Murray Marder, Don Oberdorfer, George Wilson. Among them these people had a century or more of service in their specialties. They knew, from following the Vietnam war, what might be sensitive and what might not. They had a bale of material that we did not print. For instance, electronic surveillance. We knew that that was fairly sensitive stuff, so we just set that aside and never printed a word of it. We do self-censor. I don't think the general public in America knows this.

TOPPING: There is no question that when lives are in jeopardy, particularly during a military operation, we do not publish. I was involved in one case that concerned some of the American hostages in Iran in 1980. I had no hesitation when Cyrus Vance called me and said he knew the *Times* had a story about the Canadians who were harboring some of our hostages. He asked if we could hold the story for another forty-eight or seventy-two hours, until our government knew that the hostages were free and clear. There was no question in my mind that we would withhold the story. That is part of our responsibility. We all accept that.

ELFIN: We had that story for a year, and I haven't to mention it in a kind of offhand way to some body at a dinner party once. Later I got a call from Warren Christopher. We sat on it for a year. But right now the shuttle case is probably the most front-center thing. The press simply printed what was known about the shuttle and has not endangered anything.

Page Denied

Next 5 Page(s) In Document Denied