Communication Scholars Oral History Project
Annenberg School for Communication Library Archives
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA

MONROE E. PRICE

interviewed and transcribed by

JEFFERSON POOLEY

recorded by

ANDRES SPILLARI

October 18 & November 29, 2017
May 17, 2018

Philadelphia, PA

Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0

BIOGRAPHY

Monroe E. Price (1938–), retired associate faculty at the Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, is a distinguished scholar of international communication. Price has made notable contributions to a variety of fields over five decades of legal and communication scholarship, teaching, and institution-building, including Native American law, freedom of expression, media reform, and cross-border communication in the global system. Price was born in 1938 in Vienna into a middle-class Jewish family, soon after the *Anschluss* annexation of Austria by Germany. Price and his immediate family escaped to New York City in 1939, before resettling in Macon, Georgia, and, three years later, Cincinnati, Ohio, where he remained through high school. As an undergraduate at Yale, Price was an enterprising journalist for the *Yale Daily News*, with reporting trips to the UK, Moscow, and Cuba. After his Yale graduation in 1960, Price briefly worked for the American Heritage Publishing Company in New York City, before joining Robert Wagner's mayoral campaign as an advance man. In 1962, after a year at the University of Virginia Law School, Price transferred to the Yale Law School, where he was exposed to Native American and communications law. The summer after his 1964 law school graduation, Price worked on the Warren Commission report, before assuming a clerkship with Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart. The next year Price served as assistant to W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, before moving to Los Angeles to take up a law school post at UCLA in 1966. Price conducted extensive work on, and scholarship about, Native American law through the 1970s, including a decade-long representation of the Alaskan Cook Inlet Region group. At UCLA, Price revived his interest in communications law, after serving on the President's Task Force on Communications Policy (1967–1968). He soon served as deputy director of the Sloan Commission on Cable Communications (1970–1971), and established a Communications Law Program at UCLA (1972). Price published extensively on First Amendment, cable, and satellite issues in the 1970s and '80s, and was active in media reform initiatives. In 1982 Price was named dean of the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law at Yeshiva University in New York City, where he created the Howard M. Squadron Program in Law, Media and Society. He stepped down as dean in 1991, just as the Cold War global order was in transition. Over the subsequent three decades, Price traveled extensively for international communication projects, commissions, and centers. In the 1990s and early 2000s, much of Price's work and organization-building occurred in the post-socialist states of Central Europe, the Balkans, and Russia. Price helped establish the Oxford Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy in the mid-1990s, the first of a number of such centers he helped to launch around the world in this period. Price led a series of projects for the US Agency for International Development (USAID), the Markle Foundation, and a handful of NGOs, many of them resulting in edited volumes. He developed influential arguments around the "market for loyalties," cross-border media technology, and sovereignty in a trio of solo-authored books: *Television, the Public Sphere, and National Identity* (1996), *Media and Sovereignty* (2002), and *Free Expression, Globalism, and the New Strategic Communication* (2015). In 2004 Price joined the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Pennsylvania, where he founded the Center for Global Communication Studies in

2006. Under the Center's auspices, Price helped lead a series of projects in Iran, China, Jordan, Darfur, and Mexico, among others. Price, who retired from the Annenberg School in 2020, is married to noted art historian Aimée Brown Price.

ABSTRACT

Session One (October 18, 2017)—page 6

The session focuses on Price's family background in Austria and Eastern Europe, his family's escape to the United States in 1938, his childhood years in Cincinnati, and his journalism at Yale. The session lingers on Price's experience in high school in suburban Cincinnati, including reporting for the school newspaper, his experience in a series of part-time jobs, and his relationship to the local Jewish community. Price's visits to, and connections with, family members on both his father's and mother's side are discussed in the session. Price's years at Yale are covered too, with a focus on his overseas reporting, in the UK, Moscow, and Cuba. Price discusses Yale faculty who influenced him, including Harry J. Benda and Charles Lindblom. The session concludes with a brief account of Price's stint at *American Heritage* magazine.

Session Two (November 29, 2017)—page 30

The session focuses on Price's early career after graduation from Yale in 1960. His brief experience at the *American Heritage* publishing organization is discussed, as is his work as an advance man for the Robert Wagner mayoral campaign—including in the context of his ongoing interest in journalism. Price recounts his decision to attend the University of Virginia Law School for a year, before transferring to the Yale Law School, where he was exposed to influential faculty, including Fred Rodell, Telford Taylor, and Charles Reich. A class with Reich, in particular, spurred Price's interest in Native American law, with copyright and communications law also a topic of Price's interest at the Yale Law School. The session focuses on Price's experience at the Warren Commission, helping alongside other clerks to prepare its report, the summer before Price took up a clerkship for Supreme Court Justice Potter Stewart. Price's subsequent year working for Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz is recounted, before his move to Los Angeles to take up a law school faculty post at UCLA. The balance of the session centers on Price's extensive work on, and scholarship about, Native American law in the 1960s and 1970s, including a decade-long representation of the Alaskan Cook Inlet Region group.

Session Three (November 29, 2017)—page 54

The session focuses on Price's engagement with media and communication via a series of commissions and while teaching and writing at UCLA, primarily in the 1970s, through to Price's tenure as dean of the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in the 1980s. Price describes his experience serving with the President's Task Force on Communications Policy in Washington in

the late 1970s. He also recounts the establishment of the UCLA Communications Law Program, under the leadership of Geoffrey Cowan, around the same time. The session includes Price's account of his deputy directorship of the Sloan Commission on Cable Communications in the early 1970s, as well as his work on a citizen's guide to cable television in this period. A sabbatical year in Paris in the early 1970s is touched upon, in terms of its de-centering for Price of the U.S. First Amendment. Price describes his decision to run for a newly established community college board, and his appointment as Referee in the mid-1970s in the aftermath of a major school desegregation case, *Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles*. Price briefly describes his role in establishing and helping to run an L.A.-based Jewish Television Network. The session touches on Price's legal scholarship from the period, much of it focused on communication topics. Price provides an account of his deanship at Cardozo, and describes the background and reception of his 1991 book on AIDS, *Shattered Mirrors*.

Session Four (May 17, 2018)—page 72

The interview covers Price's turn to international projects after he stepped down as dean of the Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law in 1991. Price describes his travel, scholarly projects, and relationships to research centers in Central Europe, the Balkans, Russia, India, and elsewhere, in the 1990s and early 2000s. The establishment of the Oxford Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy in the mid-1990s is discussed. Price recounts his close collaborations with Andrei Richter, Peter Krug, and Stefaan Verhulst. He describes projects for the US Agency for International Development (USAID), the Carter Center's Commission on Radio and Television Policy, and the Markle Foundation. Price's concept of the "market for loyalties" is discussed, in relationship to freedom of expression, media technologies, and sovereignty, and in relationship to a pair of single-authored book—*Television, the Public Sphere, and National Identity* (1996), *Media and Sovereignty* (2002)—and a number of edited volumes.

Session Five (May 17, 2018)—page 96

The interview is primarily occupied with the period after Price joined the Annenberg School for Communication faculty in 2004. Price recounts the circumstances of his appointment, under then-dean Michael Delli Carpini, and the establishment of the Center for Global Communication Studies in 2006. Price describes his and the Center's projects, including projects in Iran, China, Jordan, Darfur, and Mexico. The themes of strategic communication and the freedom of expression, in the context of cross-border communication among and between states and NGOs, is discussed. Price describes his approach to teaching, mentorship, and networking, including the forms of the research center and the edited book. His relationship to Elihu Katz and other Annenberg faculty is described.

RESTRICTIONS

None

FORMAT

Interview. Video recordings at the Annenberg School for Communication, University of Pennsylvania, 3620 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA. Five mp4 files of approximately two hours each.

TRANSCRIPT

Transcribed by Jefferson Pooley. Audited for accuracy and edited for clarity by Jefferson Pooley. Transcript reviewed and approved by Monroe E. Price, Jefferson Pooley, and Samantha Dodd. Transcript 113 pages.

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND CITATION FORMS

Video recording

Bibliography: Price, Monroe E. Interview by Jefferson Pooley. Video recording, October 18, November 29, 2017, & May 17, 2018. Communication Scholars Oral History Project, Annenberg School for Communication Archives, University of Pennsylvania. **Footnote example:** Monroe E. Price, interview by Jefferson Pooley, video recording, October 18, November 29, 2017, & May 17, 2018, Communication Scholars Oral History Project, Annenberg School for Communication Archives, University of Pennsylvania.

Transcript

Bibliography: Price, Monroe E. Interview by Jefferson Pooley. Transcript of video recording, October 18, November 29, 2017, & May 17, 2018. Communication Scholars Oral History Project, Annenberg School for Communication Archives, University of Pennsylvania. **Footnote example:** Monroe E. Price, interview by Jefferson Pooley, transcript of video recording, October 18, November 29, 2017, & May 17, 2018, Communication Scholars Oral History Project, Annenberg School for Communication Archives, University of Pennsylvania, pp. 34-35.

Transcript of Interview conducted October 18, 2017, with MONROE E. PRICE (session one)

Philadelphia, PA

Interviewed by Jefferson Pooley

Q: This is day one of an oral history interview of Monroe Price conducted by Jefferson Pooley at the Annenberg School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The interview is part of the Oral History Project of the Annenberg School for Communication Library Archives. The date is October 18, 2017. Thank you Monroe for sitting down for this first interview. I thought I would begin by asking about your parents back in Austria, where they were born, their life in interwar Vienna, and even your father's business.

PRICE: Well, I learned a lot about this, thinking about it, when I wrote my memoir.[1] And thinking about the two very different strands that they represented. My father was a kind of, the secular, worldly Vienna, that emerged from the nineteenth century and the reemergence of Jews in Vienna, and their rise in the professions, etc. My father's father went to university, for example, which was very special. My mother was from a more rural town in Slovakia—what is now Slovakia. And these represented two different strands of Jewish Vienna, in some way. The kind of religious, more rural, Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the core Viennese, more universal way of looking at things.

My father was in the textile business. His family had been in the textile business. Although his father also had a small newspaper. His father died when my father was five years old, and that was quite unusual. And yet another unusual part about it is that my father's father, my grandfather, married an American, who was his first cousin. And so that prepared us for the future in some strange way.

Q: Can you talk about how your parents met and came to know one another?

PRICE: I think they just met socially, at some dance. There wasn't any OkCupid—and they weren't matched. I think my mother had just ended a kind of love with some Jewish family from Morocco or North Africa, and she met my father and they fell in love.

---

[1] Monroe E. Price, *Objects of Remembrance: A Memoir of American Opportunities and Viennese Dreams* (New York: Central European University Press, 2009).

Q: And your father was in a business partnership with his brother?

PRICE: No, my father only had a sister. As I said, he was really kind of orphaned from his father, who had died, who was a businessman. His uncle, who was a very enterprising person, helped to train my father in the textile business. And they had factories in different parts of Austria, in the weaving business and that kind of thing.

Q: Your own birth was right in this dramatic period in Austrian history. You were conceived, as you wrote, in Vienna, Austria, and born in Vienna, Germany.

PRICE: Yes, I was born after the Anschluss. It was a dramatic period where Austria ceased to be Austria and had become Germany. It was a kind of culmination of 20 or 30 years of change, and I never fully understood, even from talking to my parents, what kind of foreboding they had. Obviously there had been rising anti-Semitism, but I don't think—my parents, like many, many other Jews didn't think it was necessary to be that apprehensive, and to leave. So there they were in 1938—

Q: So in the years leading up to 1938, I don't know if you ever spoke to family members about anti-Semitism that they experienced? Just up to this period.

PRICE: They experienced it. Anti-Semitism was a thing in Vienna. It was an important strain. But it wasn't so overwhelming that people felt, I think, even in those years of the '30s, that they must leave. I don't have a sense that my parents gave thought to this when they got married, for example, in '36.

Q: And by the time 1938 came along, you were born, after the Anschluss, that was in the spring, and just a few months after you were born, Kristallnacht happened, and—

PRICE: Soon after that my father was arrested, and sent to a temporary holding facility for eight weeks or something like that. Obviously, by that time, it wasn't the handwriting was on the wall, but the hands were at our throat, in some ways. And, of course, it was a period in which, it was before the "final solution," and the goal of the Nazi regime was for Jews to leave. And so the focus was on getting my father back, getting the exit visas. Everybody was in a dramatic effort to figure out how to leave, given that that was definitely the goal.

Q: And in your memoir you'd mentioned that Adolf Eichmann was, in fact, in charge of this expulsion in that Vienna region. And based on your research for your memoir, and what your family told you, what was that process of trying to leave? I mean, it involved German authorities, American authorities—it wasn't easy.

PRICE: Well, it was extraordinary because there were all these bureaucratic barriers to leaving. There was an agreement that we should leave, but you had to wind up your assets, for example. You had to present a clean bill in terms of having liquidated your corporate holdings, all other holdings, etc. And that, in fact, was a bureaucratic barrier. For a long time my parents had

tickets, they had affidavits to go to the United States, and I think they had a visa to the United States. And that was because I had this American family, which put us in a kind of privileged space. So we had an easier time getting entrance into the United States. We had a harder time getting exit from Germany—or Austria, or Germany as it then was.

Q: You mentioned that you had this American family connection that was crucial in getting you the sponsorship to get the US visa.

PRICE: Of course, this wasn't true of my mother's family. My mother's family then became stranded and died in the Holocaust—which also was a tremendously important aspect of it for me growing up.

Q: I want to return to that, but before, can you talk about the American family connection that you had, and what role that played?

PRICE: Well, see, it was interesting. It was an interesting problem for me to try to think of myself as having an American descendancy, or think of myself as a refugee. In the 1850s, or thereabouts, two of my relatives came to New York to go to what became the Lexington School for the Deaf. They were teachers of a new method of training the deaf in Germany and Austria, and they had been selected by wealthy families in New York who had deaf children and wanted to have the best possible training for them. And they became the foundation of what was, in a sense, the American wing of my family.

Q: And were they the literal sponsor that got you the US visa?

PRICE: One of the descendants of these teachers, the deaf, the Engelsman branch, had moved to Oklahoma, had become relatively wealthy in oil and gas, and he [A.D. Engelsman] sponsored us and gave us an affidavit. Affidavit meant an affidavit that we wouldn't be a public charge.

Q: And once you did all of that, once your father divested his businesses and paid these onerous taxes and liquidations, your family made its way to Paris and then eventually to the [*RMS*] *Queen Mary*.

PRICE: When you liquidated, you bought your tickets. We had tickets for the *Queen Mary*. And then the question was could we get out and actually catch the boat, as it were. And we were able to do that in March of '39.

Q: Of course you don't remember, as a seven-month-old, any of that trip, but did your parents talk at all about the experience of leaving Austria through France, and onto the *Queen Mary*?

PRICE: It wasn't a celebratory—I don't get a sense of a kind of lavish banquet in Paris to celebrate our exit. I think it was an important time—it was a pleasure, but it was marred by the fact that my mother's parents were left behind. So my father's mother—who was American—

didn't need any visa or any affidavit, and she had left, too. So I would say the leaving was more stressful than it was celebratory. The *Queen Mary* was interesting. I don't know a lot about what happened. I became interested in it because the *Queen Mary* then became an artifact in Long Beach [California], and I always found that an amusing thing.

Q: Right. In part because when you did visit it, it sounded like it didn't express any of those memories you had or memories your parents passed onto you, of the stressful, transatlantic crossing.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: So you arrived in New York City and your parents and you lived in various places, either in or near the city for that year, and you decided to move on, and why?

PRICE: Well, I think it's interesting. Again it goes to this question of who quite we were, and did we know exactly how to navigate. We were, as I say, not unsophisticated, not uncosmopolitan, and not without connections—either in Austria or in New York. So our first place to live was in Long Island, because our relatives in New York thought that's where I should be brought up. And there are pictures of me playing in open fields and grass in Long Island.

I think my father had a hard time finding a job in the United States, and adjusting economically and professionally. My mother, who was a very fiercely independent person, didn't want to be dependent on the charity of our relatives, in some sense, and so they wanted a job. And one of the things that was interesting to me in researching this was the kind of apparatus that existed to help diversify where Jewish refugees lived—partly so that there was a kind of distribution, in some way, and that this was within the different communities. So ultimately there were opportunities in Corpus Christi, Texas, and in Atlanta, Georgia, where people were willing to develop opportunities for refugees who came from New York. And my mother and father chose to go to Atlanta, where they were quickly sent to a city—now well-known—called Macon, Georgia, where my father got a job in the textile industry.

Q: I wanted to ask about that period. I know you were in Macon for three years. You don't have memories yourself of that time, but doing the research for your memoir, you found letters that your mother had been writing, and you mentioned before that most of her family perished in the Holocaust. But during those years—it was during the war—she was still attempting to get them out. Can you talk about that?

PRICE: Certainly I was refreshed myself through reading these letters. And I've often thought about what my mother was like with her parents trapped, and not being in very much correspondence with them and having a sense that their fate was sealed. She had a sister, of my mother, [who] had successfully migrated, and they were in close touch. My mother was doing everything she could possibly do, which she wasn't a friend of the congressman and stuff like that. So that was hard. And I wondered what it was like, how she could both be a caring mother and an anxious daughter at the same time. So that was a big theme of that period of time.

And also her adjustment to—her surprise at a segregated South—was a very interesting thing. She couldn't believe that she was escaping a society that said Jews couldn't go to certain parks, etc., etc., and coming to an America where there were signs saying colored people can't drink at this fountain. She was just interested in it, and she talked about this with people in Macon, Georgia, in some ways.

Q: And do you know if she—when she learned about the fate of her family, and how she learned—was it through those New York newspapers that typically had notices like this?

PRICE: I don't remember exactly how she found out, and she certainly didn't fully believe it until the end of the war. Because there was always hope, and some of these events were late in the war, in terms of the final—sending people to the concentration camps to die. So it maintained itself through the war and then shortly thereafter. There was even some reading of a name that sounded like her mother's, that looked like that she might be rescued and still alive. And that was after the war, in some ways. So it stayed, and should've stayed, a kind of burning issue with my mother all through her life.

Q: And how did that grief and sorrow express itself in your childhood? Do you remember throughout the years how she dealt with it?

PRICE: Well, I think they were forbidden subjects. There was anger, there was real anger of great magnitude about injustice, or different, other kinds of things that were both about her parents but also displaced and moved upon her parents. And it certainly was a narrative that continued through our lives. It was very interesting to me, thinking about this—as I think everyone does—was I the child of my father and his world, or was I the child of my mother and her world? And were they very distinct, and was this an element of how they were distinctive? Because, as I say, my father had this kind of cosmopolitan, secular upbringing, and very few of his relatives died in the war. So there were these very two different lives, and I think they had to work this out between the two of them in some interesting way.

Q: Can you say more about that? The two ways of being Viennese Jews and then Americans, represented by your mother and your father?

PRICE: I think that they probably engaged with the United States in different ways. I don't want to say wildly different ways, but in terms of their acceptance of things, tolerance of change, openness, etc. Probably my father was more open, in some ways, than my mother. My mother was also very adaptable, but very practical. And probably much more of the idea that I have to be prepared for the next crisis that's going to occur—because there will be a next crisis. The more pessimistic, as well as optimistic—they were both very supportive, very welcoming, very gracious about the future. They both, sort of, established in me really important principles, etc. I can't exactly say what the difference is between the two. It's too difficult—not emotionally difficult, intellectually difficult. Maybe I'll figure it out by the end of these discussions.

Q: Well, one difference that you discuss in the memoir is just in terms of the practice of Judaism itself. That your mother was more or less committed to orthodoxy, and that your father was less religious in that way.

PRICE: But the question is, what does that mean for life? For example, my exposure to my mother's orthodoxy gave me a richer understanding of a lot of history's myths and study, and religious practices, and ways of living, and tolerance of different intense communities in the United States and around the world, in some ways. My father's secularism opened me, maybe not sufficiently, to music and literature and things like that. But I think my father's relationship to his American forbearers made that a very interesting narrative to me. As I said, the person who gave us the affidavit had moved to Oklahoma shortly after Oklahoma became a state, in some ways. And I've always, and to this day, don't understand how this person who had a life in New York—not because New York is so great—decided to move to Oklahoma, and go into the insurance business there, and make a life of himself there.

Q: Right. A quintessentially kind of American story. When your own family's resettlement to Macon happened, just to return to that, your father was working at this manufacturing plant as a textile engineer. How was he treated and how was your mother treated, back in Macon?

PRICE: Well, this is probably related to this larger narrative. I think my father was fine. There was some—again, I think calling things anti-Semitic doesn't capture what it is—for a lot of people in Macon had never met a person who was a Jew. So they were slightly mysterious in that sense. And people may not have known exactly how do you learn—but people were very open to this. But my mother, partly because, again, of her stress, etc., saw the dangers of anti-Semitism in Macon more than my father. My father had at one point a kind of dispute, and was slightly threatened physically, and my mother said, We've got to get out of here. That's why we moved to Cincinnati. And I view that kind of outburst as traceable, in some ways, to her own history. So my father might've continued to live in Macon, risen through the ranks of the manufacturing company, etc., but my mother would make a decision, say, That's it, we're out of here.

Q: So can you say more about that dispute that your father experienced. Was it in the factory?

PRICE: It was in the factory. It was over some small matter like, I don't know—my father didn't like the way he was performing a task, or the other way around. I have no idea what the—

Q: That directly led to the decision to leave?

PRICE: Yes. Because it was some threat, a physical threat, or maybe a physical action. But it wasn't sufficient—I don't think it would've been sufficient—and I'm projecting here—to upend my father. But my mother said, This is it. And I can just see my father saying, OK. I can't change your mind about something like that.

Q: So what made Cincinnati the next destination? If your mother had this fear?

PRICE: My father then looked for a job in different parts of the country. Cincinnati had some related textile things that were interesting to my father, and he got a job there. I don't know—it was through correspondence, and responding to an ad, or something like that. And Cincinnati was a very welcoming community in a variety of ways.

Q: And you moved to Cincinnati, into this apartment building called the Warwick.

PRICE: Well, we didn't start there, but we ended up there after a year or so.

Q: OK, well go ahead and, if you don't mind, talk about the Warwick, and your experience in Cincinnati in those early years.

PRICE: The Warwick loomed in my mind as a big—I don't know how big it really was—but to my five-year-old eyes it was pretty big. It had two wings. It was kind of very English, not exactly English manor, but a kind of English building, on 3362 Reading Road in South Avondale, in Cincinnati—which is not far from downtown, the downtown sector. And as I reconstructed it, for some reason or other, a number of refugee families lived in the building. And a lot of my socialization was reading how to adjust through the ideas of the actions of these different families in the Warwick. So there were middle-class German Jews. There were people of different occupations, different backgrounds, different religious formulations, etc.

I remember very particularly a number of things. One was after the war, the arrival of a displaced person, we would call DPs. And this was a shadowy figure, looked sort of like had emerged from a concentration camp. And I can just see her sort of wafting through the stairs and halls of the Warwick, in some way—people also had their numbers on their arms, basically—still had their concentration camp numbers. So there were people like that. So you could just see the next generation adjusting, and different pathways into American culture and schooling and adaptation—assimilation or not, as the case may be. So the Warwick was a kind of school for all of this, in some way.

Q: Since the Warwick was this Central European hothouse, where it sounded like there were even informal divisions between better off German Jews and those Jews from, maybe what we could call Eastern Europe, do you remember anything specific about the food, and the life of the building, the way in which it kind of recreated Central Europe?

PRICE: Well, certainly around the holidays, and around meal times, and holiday meals—Passover seders and things like that—you would get this. There was different forms of mentoring. My mother helped to sort of counsel two daughters of another family in how to—my mother having, I'm not sure why, but having more sophistication about these kinds of questions. But, yes, I'm not sure I have more to say about that.

Q: OK. You spent a number of years there in Cincinnati, through to, I think, around the late 1940s, before your sister was born.

PRICE: My sister was born in '49, exactly. So I was essentially an only child till I was 11 years old.

Q: And at the point your family decided to move out into the suburbs of Cincinnati?

PRICE: Of course, it's all about mobility, about class, about race. Because definitely Cincinnati was a city where race was changing things, etc. In a way, I wouldn't say we were involved in white flight, but looking at it in a large demographic sense you'd definitely say that we were examples of that, in some way. Moving from what became an inner city, to a suburb that was basically white and middle-class, called Roselawn. And I went to a place called Bond Hill School, which sort of moved me from this inner-city school—which was harsh, not—still harsh and taxing—to Bond Hill, where everyone was given a quick idea of aspirations and upward mobility.

Q: And didn't most of the Jewish institutions follow to the suburbs of Cincinnati—the synagogues and the other agencies?

PRICE: Yes, definitely.

Q: You were now in middle school, and you were in a different climate than the Warwick altogether, and you describe in your memoir a kind of, in many ways, typical American early teenage period. And, at the same time, you had been at the Warwick, you had to come from Austria. How did these experiences mix in that period?

PRICE: First of all, again, there was this confusion about how I thought of myself. Because I didn't constantly think of myself as Austrian. I had grown up here, and in Macon, Georgia, in an American environment, in the American Jewish community, in some way. But on the other hand, there was this Austrian overhang. My father was a member of something called the Gate Club—I loved this—gate meaning gateway, in some way. So, the Gate Club in Cincinnati was the club of all the refugees from Germany and Austria. And at one point he was president of the Gate Club.

And I would go to Mount Airy, which was a kind of open fields, where they played soccer, football—football, a marker of this because football was, at that time, only played by Central and Eastern Europeans and Germans. So I would go there, and I never played football myself. But I was exposed to a culture where they remembered the football clubs of Vienna and Berlin, and the Jewish football clubs of Vienna and Berlin. Because the leagues in Vienna certainly were organized that way. So that was an element of it. And also watching the children of the Warwick, as they emerged and entered school, and entered different lives, in some way. I'm not sure that I answered your question.

Q: No, you did, and I'm wondering if during that early period of having moved out to the suburbs, if in your middle school and then your high school, if there was that consciousness of your Austrian past. I mean, lots of other American-born Jews were there.

PRICE: Yes, there definitely was a consciousness. I think I remember, for example, a structure of fraternities in my high school. And I came to realize—I'm not sure I realized it then—that they were organized [unclear] on Jewish fraternities, as opposed to other fraternities—and German-Jewish fraternities as opposed to Eastern European–Jewish fraternities. And for some reason or other, I wasn't in any [laughs] of them. And I think it was because I was in a slightly different category, which was refugee, rather than second generation, etc. Although even there I thought of myself as fourth-generation American, or third-generation American, and in that sense not a refugee. But I was also a refugee.

Q: And do you recall having a thought like that when you were in high school, or is this more retrospective?

PRICE: No, I think I definitely had some thought like this, yes. I'm not sure I articulated it that way, but I definitely could tell that there was something—also patterns of adjustment, like either there was something that I hadn't learned yet, or something that I learned more than others. But more that I hadn't learned yet. I hadn't learned how, exactly, to dress the right way, or, not exactly speak the right way, but, whatever.

Q: So you were clearly energetic and enterprising then, and you had a number of jobs as a high school student and probably in the years before, like being a soda jerk and other things like this. Do any of those stand out for you?

PRICE: Well, I think the first thing was the idea that I should work. That probably came more from my mother than from my father, but it definitely came to me that occupying myself—and, I think, also as a way of understanding—and this is an odd thing, maybe I'm making this up—of understanding the culture. That is to say that work was a way both of earning some money, but also of engaging. And maybe the engaging part was just as important—it was like seeing how things worked and how different patterns worked. So, yes. I'm sure I delivered newspapers. I was a soda jerk.

But one thing I was thinking about recently, was remembering, in the movie theaters in Cincinnati, at intermission, or maybe it was double features, they had garage-sale type things that were on—I think I have this right—early television. And you would bring things in and you would sell them, and people would call in and offer. And I remember selling my sister's bassinet on television at the intermission of a motion picture in Cincinnati in 1951, or something like that. So that was early television. Another thing they had was musical performances in these intermissions, and I produced a—my classmate, Robert Meitus, was a wonderful musician, and I arranged for him to perform at one of these events. And I was very proud of that.

Q: So in both instances, I wonder if you can put yourself back in the shoes of a thirteen- or fourteen-year-old. What gave you the idea to, for example, take a classmate of yours and produce his show?

PRICE: I did a bunch of different things like that. I was very promotional. Maybe, thinking back on my father's Viennese family, which they had a newspaper, which is an important attribute of the family. It was a trade newspaper, but it was very lovely, and the family—we have a special edition that was published on the occasion of my grandfather's marriage to his wife, etc. So that there had been this slightly promotional side of my family that maybe inspired me to think about these kinds of things. It's hard to tell.

Q: Do you have memories of any of the jobs in particular that you did? Like driving a truck, if I recall.

PRICE: It depends on which period of time we're talking about. In high school, as I said, I liked being a soda jerk—a job from which I got fired for eating too much ice cream on the job. I organized something which I was very happy about—I don't know why, how this happened. I went to old age homes in Cincinnati and helped to raise money through card playing for some sort of charitable activities. Maybe I asked them for money for some charitable activity. I can't remember what it is right now, but it was a lovely part of what I did in high school.

Q: In the memoir you mention that you read Thomas Mann's *Confessions of Felix Krull* [1954], published in the mid-50s, and that it had an impact on you. And what was the influence that the book had?

PRICE: Well, it's called *Confessions of Felix Krull, Confidence Man*. And it's not clear to me where this came from, but it sustains itself. The idea that maybe—to put a benign idea—that to some extent everyone is a confidence man. But certainly, to some extent, I was a confidence man. That somehow this was one of the pathways—was slightly manipulating the world, to take facts and information and so shape them that you advanced—not exactly deceiving people, but somehow achieving their confidence. In that sense being a confidence man. And so a lot of these selling things—like even trying to get someone to buy a banana split with everything on it as opposed to just an ice cream cone—is a kind of confidence man activity. Or the idea of trying to persuade people—oh, that was it. Card players to raise money for benefitting Jews in old age homes. That's what it was. So that was a kind of confidence trick, to put yourself ahead, to, in a certain sense, to sell something. And almost all selling is a kind of confidence trick.

Q: And do you think that stuck with you throughout your career?

PRICE: Unfortunately [laughs]. Yes.

Q: And we'll talk about that.

PRICE: Not unfortunately. Whatever, I'm just being—yes.

Q: Well, since we're talking about jobs you had at the time, I thought I would ask about, and skip ahead a tiny bit, to that summer after your first year at Yale, when you had a pair of jobs, one of which was selling encyclopedias, and the other was at Sears, Roebuck [and Company]—if

I'm not mistaken—and so you described both of them as being important in a way, or giving lessons.

PRICE: Well, first of all, again, they were engaging with American cultures in ways that I think I learned from, about that—and that isn't the key thing in there. But selling grills in Sears and Roebuck meant that I came into contact with family after family after family. Selling the encyclopedias in rural North Carolina—which I only did for a couple days, I think—the training was extraordinary, because it was the trainer who had a vision of what it meant to be an American, what a house looked like. There would be a chart, you were given a chart—OK, here's the front door, here's the living room, here's the couch. Your job is to get from the front door, to the living room, to the couch. So the idea of charting this out and understanding a kind of tactical way of entering the American imagination was contained here.

The other thing was that they used the term "DP." This is really extraordinary. I'm not even sure I put this in the memoir. But for them it meant damn peddler. You have to change from being a damn peddler to being a trusted human being. But in my mind I couldn't believe that the word DP was applied to this. So, at any rate, the other part of it was to understand the key role that teachers played in recommending which encyclopedia a family should receive. And the idea of competition between Collier's, which was, I think, the encyclopedia for whom I worked, and World Book. So all these lessons were so amazingly present in this just small episode of selling encyclopedias.

Barbecue grills was different, but similar. But my favorite anecdote from this period was a woman who came up to me and said, Are you Jewish? And I didn't know what to say, and I didn't say yes. And she said, You sure sell like a Jew. And she meant it as a compliment. You're effective [laughs]. I think she meant it as a compliment, etc., so that was interesting. And I also learned about the process of upgrading people from a basic grill to all the fancy entities that are associated with a grill.

Q: Like a full banana split.

PRICE: Yes, like a full banana split.

Q: And going back to high school, I was curious to ask about what kind of student you were in the classroom. Did you get good grades?

PRICE: Well, first of all, the high school was so important, because I was so fortunate to be in one of these great Latin schools. It was a competitive school—you had to take an exam to get into it. Everybody took three years of Latin. I took six years of Latin. It was Advanced Placement. Everybody was smart. It was just a great—it was a kind of democratic environment in many ways. It's hard for me to know exactly how multicultural it was. It was multicultural. It was ahead of its time, etc. And the principal was a person who became famous because he became Commissioner of Education in Washington, named Harold Howe II, and I can return to him.

So, in this environment, how was I as a student? Thinking of it, whether this is how I was or not is a different question. But I thought of myself as a good but not great student, and I'm not sure what the right answer to that is. I remember my eighth grade math teacher saying, You have a mind like a sieve. So things would go into it, everything would go into it, but also not necessarily be retained. I think I did fine, but I don't think I was one of the top students of the class.

Q: You mentioned the Latin education you had there, and do you think it had an impact, even, given the Latin status?

PRICE: Well, I think Latin was good for a variety of reasons. One was we read the *Aeneid*, and the *Iliad*. We were interested in the history of Rome, and Caesar, and rhetoric—very important kinds of questions like that. It was a discipline. I certainly felt, must have felt enough about it that I took three optional years of Latin as opposed to just the three basic years of Latin. I think it helped the character of the school. It meant that it took seriously the process of education.

Q: Thinking about your Jewish education during this period, you were going, at least earlier going—in fact, all the way through—to Hebrew school, and supplemental Jewish education in the afternoon, and it was, of course, on top of your schooling you had formally. But what do you remember about that experience?

PRICE: Well, I think the interesting thing—and also I can look at this somewhat retrospectively—was the whole process by the Jewish community of how to retain younger people. How to bring them in. It was before—now there are a lot of Jewish day schools. There weren't as many at that time, and I doubt that we would've—I'm sure my parents were so committed to the idea of acculturation, or assimilation in a good sense, that the public school was the right way to go and was the only way to go, practically, at the time. But there was this effort, which was usually painful, and very not exceedingly well done throughout the country, of having these special schools that gave you an add-on education. And that's the way in which Jewish middle-class children were acculturated in Judaism.

So an important part of my existence was watching that over a 10-year, 12-year period. Yes, through, up to the 12th grade, exactly. It's hard to say what the tools were, or how it affects one's perspective, etc., but it wasn't about—and I've sort of thought about this a lot—it wasn't about belief, but it was about history, about duty and loyalty. I mean, it was pounded into you that there's a kind of chain of being, a chain of existence, and you're a part of this and you have a duty to maintain it in some way.

Q: I was wondering about your experience with journalism in high school. I mean, did you work on the newspaper at all? Did you read newspapers that were published in Cincinnati or elsewhere at the time?

PRICE: Well, the newspaper at Walnut Hills High School was called the *Chatterbox*, and I was a member of the *Chatterbox* staff. My editor-in-chief was Jerry Rubin, who became a famous revolutionary. The paper was really an important part of my life, and I wrote interesting stories

for it. I was trying to remember which ones would be examples of this. I tried to write about prisons in Cincinnati. I believe, but I don't have evidence for this, that I tried to write some meaningful journalism for the *Walnut Hills Chatterbox*. Reviews, things like that. And it became important to me when I went to college, but I came to college with a background in writing for newspapers. And I'm sure I read the *Cincinnati Post* or *Inquirer*.

Q: What interested you in joining the *Chatterbox*, and did you have the aspiration even then to be a journalist, when you were in high school?

PRICE: Yes, well, definitely. Well, first of all, I can put it in this romantic past, of my grandfather having a newspaper. And then, I think I learned later, but maybe I learned at the time, but I didn't understand it, that one of my father's uncles had been an editor at a Viennese newspaper, and had committed suicide, had defenestrated, out of—when the Germans were on the other side of the door, in some way. So the idea of newspapers was definitely an important part of my growing up and my life. And being a journalist at Walnut Hills was an important part of my high school existence, and I think I was an adventurous and interesting newspaper person. But I can't remember lots of the instances of this. But definitely it set me thinking about being a journalist.

Q: I thought I would just ask about something that does stretch back into perhaps even Macon, and certainly early Cincinnati, which is that you would take a trip, every year at least, for a week to the Bronx, in New York City, to visit your great aunt Irene Goldstein and it seemed to be kind of a connection back to Austria.

PRICE: There's a couple ways to think of it. One of them was, no matter where we lived in the United States, we thought of ourselves as somewhat New Yorker, New York refugees—refugees from Europe, who should be living in New York, but weren't. And part of this was, that, as I said, both my father's side and my mother's side, but more strongly here on my mother's side, had relatives in New York. And so we came back almost every year in the '40s to Cincinnati, and I spent a week in the Bronx with my, this, Aunt Irene. And that was a really strong set of signals—very different, very much narrower idea of adaptation. She was more classic refugee, sewing hooks on the back of brassieres, helping to polish diamonds, trying to do—just finding any way of which she could, on her own, independently, as it were, develop a kind of occupation, have a period of growth, be independent, and exist in a complex environment with some very important coping skills.

And, religiously, was very orthodox, and I think one of the striking things about coming there was she lived in a two-family house in the Bronx, where the top floor was a rabbi's apartment, and the bottom floor, the living room was the synagogue, and she lived in the back bedrooms. To come there I had to go through the little synagogue, which was the size of a living room—and sometimes, after I was thirteen could make up part of the minyan—and then pass through to the kitchen, and the bedrooms. And every day when I came through I had to kiss the curtain on the place where the Torahs were held.

Q: And can you describe the apartment itself, that your great aunt had?

PRICE: Well, first of all—all these various places were small museums of refugee-ness. Her furniture, for example, didn't come from Vienna, but it came from Cuba. From refugees—not her being in Cuba, but the rabbi's wife had been in Cuba, and had sold their, or had furnished the apartment, with their very heavy, European-like furniture, that had made this voyage, as it were. But I think of it as a place that collected European smells, European tastes, European intensity, and then this very strong religiosity as well.

Q: Do you remember foods from those visits?

PRICE: Yes, definitely. I can think and smell them as I speak. But one of my favorites was her making of—she made wine from muscat grapes. And so there would be bottles and bottles of this fermenting wine. And there would be overflowing things of fruit, and then the special Austrian—she'd also grown up in Austria, but of Slovakian heritage—so the food, there was great pieces of meat, and slabs of meat, and things like that.

Q: And as you walked around the neighborhood with your father, along Grant Avenue and so on, it must've struck you as pretty different from Roselawn, and I suppose you were, in some of those years, in Cincinnati itself, but—

PRICE: Well, you have to make a stronger contrast. My father's relatives lived on East 66th Street. They were already established and, I would say, wealthy, and totally—his, sort of, uncle, I guess—maybe his uncle—had gone to Amherst. There was a continuum between one kind of Walnut Hills High School mobile-ly upward America, and my father's family—New York represented both these things. And the existence of a difference between them, a kind of maximized difference between them, between this very intense tie to Europe, Bronx, and this much more secular, cosmopolitan worldliness of East 66th Street.

Q: Did you find, or did your parents compare, your family life to your father's family, on the East Side?

PRICE: Well, that's probably a really interesting and complicated family history, probably played through the relationship between my father and his sister, in some ways. But it was definitely present, the question of how to live one's life. Because there was my father's family, which was a kind of remote, but really present idea of some way of living. Then there was my father's sister's way of—and her husband's way of—coping with America, and then there was ours. This was definitely a curriculum—let's put it that way—without saying what the courses were, or how to characterize them. It was definitely a curriculum in how to think and how to adjust in this way.

Q: Well going back to Cincinnati, and to Roselawn, and to Walnut Hills, did you have the aspiration to go to an Ivy League school? How did Yale come about as a place where you applied? What was the road to Yale?

PRICE: First of all, to talk about a curriculum, if you were at Walnut Hills High School, you thought about many opportunities. You could think about going to the University of Cincinnati, you could think about going to Ohio State, but definitely it was an Advanced Placement thing, and you were open to the option of the Ivy League. My best friend—or one of my best friends—at Walnut Hill High School was a kid named Morris, Morry Wise. He was from a quite assimilated, sophisticated upper-middle-class or middle-class family, and his parents asked if I would go along with them for a spring looking at colleges, in our junior year. So with him I went to Princeton and Yale and Amherst, etc. And I went to Amherst because my father's—they went to Amherst.

So, the notion of going to these schools wasn't foreign to me. The other thing is that—in the way that the world works—the principal, Harold Howe, whom I discussed, his brother was the Dean of Admissions at Yale College, Arthur Howe [Jr.]. And so I think I applied—I can't remember—to Princeton, Yale, Amherst. Why I thought those were places—maybe I applied to "safe schools" as well, but I don't remember all of that.

Q: I would like to switch over to Yale, and your experience there. I mean, you described it in your memoir as being this training ground for American elites—a kind of rehearsal, was the word you used.

PRICE: Yes, well I thought that Yale—maybe this is true of Harvard as well, and maybe Princeton, in different ways—it was established in such a way that you kind of rehearsed roles that you would play in the world at large. So that gets us back to the *Yale Daily News*—that the *Yale Daily News* took itself so seriously that if you were chairman of the *Yale Daily News* you would become on the editorial board of *The New York Times*—and, in fact, my chairman, Robert Semple, became a member of the editorial board of *The New York Times*. Jim Ottaway, who was my class, and then chairman of the *Yale Daily News*, was part owner of *The Wall Street Journal*, ultimately.

So, people either knew from family relations, or knew that this was what you did—they knew that there was some relationship between how you acted at Yale—not what you studied—but how you acted at Yale. I mean there could be a relationship, if you're going to be a history professor, or something like that. But many people were basically trying out roles that may be foreordained, or may be family-related.

Q: And did you feel like it was a place that was in transition? I mean it had in the interwar years, and before, Jewish quotas, and in the 1950s it was still the old Yale in some ways, but maybe—

PRICE: Yes, I'd say. A friend of mine, a classmate of mine, Danny [Daniel] Horowitz, wrote a book about this period at Yale called *On the Cusp* [*The Yale College Class of 1960 and a World on the Verge of Change*, 2015]. It could be true, in other words—I would say we were on the back end of a turning point. So, it was turning, but we were just on the cusp, we weren't over on the other side.

Q: And how did that play out, in terms of even being a Jew on Yale's campus?

PRICE: Well, I guess it was very important to me, but it wasn't critical, and I didn't feel, walking around, that I was necessarily Jewish. I'm not sure I knew about the Jewish quota. Jewishness came up in a variety of ways, but it wasn't defining, like I couldn't do this or I couldn't that because I was Jewish. I didn't feel that. Maybe it was the fact that there were fewer opportunities available to me for that reason, but I didn't perceive that, and certainly I didn't perceive that in any bitter way, I would say. Maybe I thought that was part of the gentleman's agreement, or gentleman's arrangement. But I persisted—the defining thing was that I kept kosher at Yale, in some strange way. And I may have been the only person in my whole class of a thousand kids to keep, to maintain some degree of kashrut.

Q: How did you manage to do that?

PRICE: You mean how did I arrange for it?

Q: Yes.

PRICE: So I went to the Hillel rabbi my first week, and he said, I don't know how to handle this. No one's ever said this to me. So he sent me to college chaplain, Sidney Lovett, who arranged it. All I did was I didn't eat meat. I basically had a kind of vegetarian diet. So it wasn't kosher like I had kosher dishes, or kosher forks and knives, but it was something that the kitchens arranged, to make sure that I maintained whatever I wanted to do.

Q: You mentioned your classmate Danny Horowitz and I understand that his father, was it William Horowitz, was a Yale alum, and—

PRICE: He was class of '29.

Q: —and he took you under his wing as a mentor.

PRICE: Yes, well, he was an influence. He would, in a certain sense, adopt someone in each class, including, [Calvin] Bud Trillin would be an example, Ed [Edward] Zelinsky, various people who became kind of mythology. And he had a bank in New Haven. He was married to Miriam Botwinik, who was from a family that had made a good deal of money making parts for planes and boats in World War II, and things like that. But he was another role model for me, and that was quite interesting.

Q: Didn't he own a radio station?

PRICE: He owned a radio station. I was part of a phalanx of people on election night, who would go out and get the results from the districts and phone them in, etc. And he almost got a television license. He didn't get a television license. But he was a lesson in what it meant to be a

figure in a town, and a figure in political life. He was very close to Joe Lieberman, for example, who was another one of his adoptees, in some ways. So this mythology kind of created, continued in some way, which is, how to be responsible, what's the relationship between wealth and political duties, between family and city, and things like that.

Q: Well, I thought I would ask you more about the *Yale Daily News* in particular, because it was such a crucial part of your Yale years. And first of all, I'm curious if there are any particular stories that were especially memorable to you. And I'm thinking in part of Cuba, and Paris, Moscow—

PRICE: Some of these were back to *Felix Krull, Confidence Man*. But in a way I'm trying to think of ones that I felt closest to. These are the most, sort of, noteworthy and seem sort of out of kilter with the times, and with the idea of a college newspaper. I had decided to try and cover the Cuban Revolution. I'm not sure how I came to think of this. Well, my first one was when the 707 jet planes came into service—it must have been when I was a junior. I convinced Pan Am that I could have lunch in London and be back at Yale for an afternoon class—and that writing this in the *Yale Daily News* would help convince a whole generation that they should take these airplanes and go to Europe. So I wrote Juan Trippe, who was a Yale graduate, and spelt this out. And we now call this payola, or whatever it is, but they gave me a round-trip jet plane fare to—and that was the first time I'd been been back to Europe, as it were. And I covered—I went to Moscow on that trip.

Q: How did that happen?

PRICE: Well—I'm not sure how I came to want to do this, but I wanted to cover the beginnings of American students studying in Russia. Really I can't remember—it must've been through Firuz Kazemzadeh, who was a professor at Yale at the time. But I put this package together with Juan Trippe paying for my airfare, and then Cosmos Travel, which had a monopoly on travel to the Soviet Union, paying for my trip to Moscow and my stay in Moscow. And I had a wonderful time, really interesting time in Moscow. And I wrote a series of stories about that. Before that—my first venture was to, and this was in 1958, was to cover the beginnings of a civil rights movement in the South. That was the interesting thing, in some ways. I don't know how the hell I came to do this—but I traveled to Montgomery, Alabama, and to Charlotte, North Carolina, and I wrote stories about—and my co-writer was George Akerlof, who won the Nobel Prize in economics, and whose wife is the head of the Fed. And the two of us—he remembers this much better than I do, and I haven't—I've been meaning to sit down and talk to him about it. It was really great.

Q: Can you say more about those stories you wrote about the civil rights era in the South? Were they connected, for example, to your family having moved to Charlotte in around that time?

PRICE: I would say not really. Maybe—obviously, it couldn't be totally disconnected. But of that trip, I remember Montgomery, Alabama, the most. And, again—these were signs of obviously very enterprising journalism, but was it great journalism? I can't tell from reading the stories.

Were these just undergraduate jottings—I don't think they were Faulkner-like in terms of perception and style, etc. And I'm not sure that they revolutionized people at the Yale campus or anything like that. But it was good for—

Q: Do you remember any story in particular that you wrote while you were in the South? Like any event that you covered?

PRICE: Well, I had a long talk with Clifford Durr, who became chairman of the FCC [Federal Communications Commission], or a member of the FCC—and whose daughter later married the future president of Penn [University of Pennsylvania]—but that's a different story. But I think I was really interested in—I'm not sure there were events—it was before the buses and the marches, in some way, so I have to go back and look. But I do remember them as being important. And traveling on buses myself through the South, and trying to figure out how to handle these stories, and what would make a good story. What kind of interviews would be good interviews, what would be telling and revealing about this, etc.

Q: Well, so that experience in the South clearly gave you the sense that leaving New Haven and being enterprising as a reporter would make sense, and so, if I could ask you about Moscow again. What was that time in Moscow after you had, *Felix Krull*-like, got yourself there. Do you have any memories of that period?

PRICE: Yes there are a lot of things that later resonated, like I did an interview with Ilya Ehrenburg. Ilya Ehrenburg was the great—again how this happened I have no idea—he was a great collector of Picassos. And I wrote an article in the *Yale Daily News* about Ilya Ehrenburg, my interview with him, and how amazing it was to be in his apartment filled with important Western artwork, etc. I was interviewed by Priscilla Johnson—I think that's her name. This resonated oddly because later, when I clerked for the Supreme Court, I was the footnote checker on the [Lee Harvey] Oswald in Moscow chapter of the Warren Report. Because the clerks were seconded to the Warren Commission. And a lot of that was about her, because she interviewed Oswald. Moscow was so restricted at the time that she interviewed every American, practically—not probably every American, but almost every American, including Oswald, who was just an oddball guy. And including me, who was just an odd undergraduate journalist. It was such a restricted environment, there were so few people, that she could be a kind of encyclopedic guide to those kinds of people. I wrote about taxi drivers in Moscow. The reason I came was I wrote about Moscow State University and America, the first Americans studying there. How it happened, again, I don't know.

Q: Did you have any sense that you were being watched or checked upon?

PRICE: In Moscow I was definitely being watched, and I knew I was being watched. That was part of the deal.

Q: Was there any kind of evidence you saw of that while you were there?

PRICE: Well, one evidence was when I went with the—this is the question of who I watched by, not whether I was watched—when I got to Moscow—this is a story that amazes me to this day—when I got to Moscow State University—and this is also a *Felix Krull, Confidence Man* story—I went to the room of this Marine, American, who was studying there, knocked on the door and there was no answer. I opened the door and I went in, and I looked at the desk, and—this is an amazing story—there's a telegram saying, Unauthorized Yale undergraduate coming to speak to you. Now how the hell did this happen? How did—I knew I was gonna do this, and I told it to various people at Yale. Yale being a kind of CIA-related enterprise in some strange way, I wasn't shocked. But I was surprised that, in that sense, I was being watched. And when I came back I was debriefed.

Q: By Yale?

PRICE: Yale News Bureau, who had—and I can't remember whether in the room—was somebody from Washington or not. But I definitely was debriefed.

Q: And debriefed—was the impression you had that they were asking questions about national security?

PRICE: Well, they weren't debriefing me because they wanted to write a story about it.

Q: Can you tell me a little bit about the Cuba follow-up. So you had this decision, or this interest in the Cuban Revolution, and how did you manage to get down to Havana?

PRICE: If I get my timing right, which I may not, I'd already had this relationship with Pan Am. So I wrote them a letter saying, Send me to Cuba and I'll write stories about how you can still go down there for spring vacation. This is just after the revolution and the question was, what was going to happen? It wasn't closed yet, but one of the economic interests at stake was, would undergraduates still go for spring break, etc.? And nobody was buying tickets anyway, so it was not a big deal to give me a ticket. When I got to Havana, the first thing I was asked at the gate was, Are you here for the big press conference, press week? And I said, Yes. So I was sped over to the Hotel Nacional, I think it was.

Q: And to be clear, you weren't planning to be part of that press week?

PRICE: I wasn't. I didn't even know about it. It was terrific—here were, I think, two hundred reporters. I was the youngest one. I became very good friends of the oldest reporter. Adam Clayton Powell was there. It was just a wonderful event, and I covered some of the trials in the stadiums. One of the things that I came away with was, what does it mean to be public?—that "public" has a ceiling as well as a floor, that a stadium is not a public place, in a kind of restricted—it's more of a mob place than a public place. And how do you distinguish between the two?

So I wrote about some of these trials, and I wrote about Fulgencio Batista, who had been the president before [in] Cuba—who was the overturned president. And I went to his house and I wrote about his collection of Lincoln materials, and his obsession with the United States, in a way, and stuff like that. So that was really great.

Q: So what was the reaction—

PRICE: —and I interviewed Fidel [Castro].

Q: Can you tell me about that?

PRICE: Well, that's a place where I wasn't gutsy enough. One of the things was Fidel was going to Venezuela. I think that was his first trip. And I got up in the morning, and I went out to the tarmac and interviewed him on the tarmac as he was going to Venezuela. And I'm sure I could've gotten on the—but that was like one step more than I was able to extend myself. But my whole life might've been different had I gotten on the plane with Fidel and gone to Venezuela. But I don't think he said anything. I'm not sure I asked profound questions that led him to say something different. Somewhere I may even have a dying audiotape of this, but I've never actually listened to it.

Q: What was the reaction back at Yale, given that you were writing these stories for the *Yale Daily News*?

PRICE: Well, one reaction was I got kicked out of *Political and Economic Institutions*. I was in a special honors program, which had very few classes, that allowed me to go on this thing. And I think they probably thought I should be spending more time writing research papers, and less time doing my journalism. But I think people loved—students loved it, the paper liked it a lot. Again, it was good, but it didn't change the world, in some ways. That I know of.

Q: What was it like, internal to the *Daily News*, just the news culture, the office of the *Daily News*? Were you in a leadership position?

PRICE: As I said, I think that the *Yale Daily News* was a great paper. My first work there was a more standard investigative journalism. Again, we'd been slightly put up to this—there was a big split over political science at Yale, and Willmoore Kendall, and a couple of the—especially the right-wing guys—were feeling that Yale was going in the wrong direction. People will know this—this is probably famous in the annals of political science. A very good friend of mine, Albert Pergam, who was a brilliant young student of my class, and I did investigative research with surveys on all of the political science departments in the country, and what their view was of the Yale political science department—what the movement was in and out of the Yale political science department. And we did a three-part series, which I think was mostly Albert's analytical brilliance, on whether the department was weak. But we were being used by—we didn't fully know this, I don't think—but we were being used by one or the other parties in this

dispute. But I did that kind of story. And a lot of the people went on to great careers. Richard Rhodes, who wrote about the atom bomb, and stuff like that, was features editor.

Q: How much of your time did you spend at the *Daily News*?

PRICE: I would say I spent a lot of time there. And it was—I set headlines, I helped cut and paste the mockup pages. I mean it was a real training in newspaper-ness. You really got your hands dirty, and things like that.

Q: So you did attend classes as well, and you mentioned just a moment ago that you had this program you were a part of, which I guess would be like a—

PRICE: Yes, it was a great program—I feel, here, more influence than I ever felt before. Because it was run by two great professors, Robert Dahl and Charles Lindblom. It was the two of them and eight or ten students who met once a week, and that was all you did your whole year. And they gave you a reading list, and Sam Bowles was—it was to train you to become a political scientist, or to be on the Fed, or something like that. It was that part of Yale, in some ways. And it was excellent—yes. And I was in it for a year.

Q: You were in it for a year, your junior year?

PRICE: Yes, I just wasn't in it for my senior year—because my junior year I combined it with journalism.

Q: Right, and as a result you were removed from the program?

PRICE: Pardon?

Q: You were removed from the program?

PRICE: It was recommended that I study history.

Q: I see. And was history your major in the end?

PRICE: Yes, I guess. Yes it was—but, as I say, journalism was, in a way, a major for me.

Q: And I was curious to hear whether outside of the *Daily News*, its office, your journalism, whether there were courses, or any particular professors that were especially memorable?

PRICE: Yes, I think especially in terms of communications, there was a guy named Harry [Jindrich] Benda, who himself had been a kind of refugee. He was Dutch, Jewish, and in

Indonesia, and his family—he was interned by the Japanese in Indonesia when Japan occupied Indonesia. His class really—for some reason or other it stuck with me—was about the communications methods of the Japanese in the camp. That is to say, how to organize, how to build a, what the community was like, what the means of communication was between the masters and the slaves, as it were. He seemed to be taken with a lot of the material of how to think about propaganda, communications, and control.

Q: And do you feel like you drew upon it later, when you got back into—

PRICE: Yes, I think, probably I drew upon all these things. I mean, I drew upon—Harry Benda was more—there was another class that I really loved which was on the history of the French Revolution day-by-day, and again, it was very much about communications. I probably wouldn't have used that term before I came here, but it was very much about mobilization, about organization, about disorganization, about symbolism, and about new calendars, new ways of conceptualizing the world, etc. So, yes.

Q: Were there any other classes, or faculty, that stick out in your memory?

PRICE: Not right this second.

Q: So you had the aspiration to be a journalist?

PRICE: I definitely had the aspiration to be a journalist.

Q: And it was your intent—in fact, your first job was to work at *American Heritage* magazine

PRICE: I got a job offer, which I somewhat regret not taking, at the *Washington Star*. But it was conditioned on me going into the Army, and I didn't feel like doing that at the time, which may have been a mistake. So that was my newspaper offer. And then I got a letter from *American Heritage* magazine—and somehow I responded to that—from Oliver Jensen. Oliver Jensen had been a figure in *Time* magazine, and it was a spinoff of three guys from *Time* magazine who started *American Heritage* magazine. This was still early in its career, and I liked the idea so, for some reason or other, I accepted that job.

Q: And that took you to New York City?

PRICE: That took me to New York City.

Q: It's probably a good place to wind down this first session, to ask about that experience as, now, a professional journalist. What was it like that year you spend at *American Heritage*? It was an extraordinary cast of journalists around you—

PRICE: It was a wonderful group, but it wasn't journalism. It was historical journalism. They were pioneering with a different mode. They wanted to popularize American history in a sophisticated way. They wanted to market—thinking of new tools for marketing. As you recall, they had these hard cover issues of *American Heritage*. They wanted to use imagery much more—they were paying a lot of—because they were from *Life*. They wanted to figure out how to make history more vivid through the use of imagery, etc. And they were great, and they were from America's literary tradition.

Malcolm Cowley's son was, kind of, my boss. Eric Larrabee, Richard Ketchum, who was this extraordinary person, who had a great photographic eye, a great makeup eye. And it turned out to be both—and this gets back to *Felix Krull*—both about content, and about sales and distribution. That year I was being trained a little bit on the publishing side, as well as the writing side, but more the publishing side. So, it was more about *American Heritage* books. It was about direct sales. It was about taking your brand and developing games, or Civil War games—like, How do you take the Civil War and turn it into a whole variety of things? But this was all before Ken Burns, etc., etc. So they were pioneers in trying to rethink the packaging and presentation of ideas and writing.

Q: And a good way to wrap up might be this last question about your experience at the *Chatterbox* in high school, then *Yale Daily News*, through to the *American Heritage* magazine, which wasn't exactly journalism. You went, after that, if I'm not mistaken, to work for Robert Wagner, Jr.'s, mayoral campaign, and we can talk about that next time. But my question is, given that you had so much interest in journalism leaving Yale, what was it that changed your mind about sticking with journalism?

PRICE: I don't know if I changed my mind. I just changed my route. Again, I think it was probably, was I going to go into the Army? The draft still existed. Was I going to go into the Army, or was I going to do graduate work? So, I chose to go to law school as opposed to becoming a Marine, or a soldier or something like that. So it was that pragmatic, somewhat ugly decision. I'm not sure it was the right decision, but it was the decision to go to law school. And so I had no pull towards law—but I didn't have a pull toward history PhD studies or anything like that either. So that's the sort of weak and unsatisfactory answer to this question.

Q: Well, we can pick up with—

PRICE: I mean, it looks like a really rational decision, but it wasn't thought through in a rational—and I would say it wasn't an abandonment of journalism. Maybe *American Heritage* had already been some sort of compromise with this. So, yes. I would say the alternate career, and the way law school made sense, was it was becoming more civic. This gets back to the Wagner—even short but intense as it was—which is, the career of being an assistant to someone running for office. It goes back to Bill Horowitz in New Haven, which is more public life, more about public relations, that kind of thing. So I think there always had been this kind of public relations idea in my mind as well.

Q: Well that's a perfect place to end this first session, so thank you so much.

PRICE: Thank you.

END OF SESSION ONE

Transcript of Interview conducted November 29, 2017, with MONROE E. PRICE (session two)

Philadelphia, PA

Interviewed by Jefferson Pooley

Q: This is session two of an oral history interview of Monroe Price conducted by Jefferson Pooley at the Annenberg School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The interview is part of the Oral History Project of the Annenberg School for Communication Library Archives. The date is November 29, 2017. So, when we left off in the last session, Monroe, we were just starting to talk about your post-Yale years. You had taken a job at the *American Heritage* magazine, I think in 1961, which had been launched, maybe a year or two before, by Oliver Jensen. So I was hoping you could talk a little bit about what that was like for you and whether it sparked—or perhaps even dampened—your interest in journalism.

PRICE: Well, first of all, it was a kind of compromise between scholarship and journalism. That was the essence of *American Heritage*—and later *Horizon*. I think it was interesting because it was about publishing and the publishing industry, and about New York City. Thinking about it in retrospect, it was about various power structures, various ways to rise in American society through publishing, through books, through not only writing books but accumulating the power of books through publishing companies. Oliver Jensen had come from Time, Inc., and the whole establishment of *American Heritage* had come from Time, Inc. It's interesting thinking of it now as it's being acquired by Meredith. But here's the history of the country somehow embodied in these institutions in New York—not the railroads, not the finance companies, but the publishing companies. And what that culture was like and who streamed in and out of it and in what way.

Q: And at the time, when you were twenty-two or so, were you aware of that kind of shift from the railroads to print institutions like *American Heritage*?

PRICE: I'm not sure about the shift part, but I think it continued one of the educational, important parts of the Yale curriculum, which was, what's America about? How do you succeed in America? Who are the elites and how are they formed? So, in some sense it was a kind of carryover from some part of Yale to some part of New York City.

Q: So the editorial staff of the magazine was pretty star-studded at least in journalistic terms—

PRICE: It was quietly star-studded. Bruce Catton, who's a famous Civil War historian, was there. He was a wonderful writer. Rob [Robert] Cowley, Malcolm Cowley's son, was, slightly, my boss. But that was a good example of a star, and also the son of a star. That is to say, it's part of another learning process of New York, which is the role families play, and things like that. And Eric Larrabee, who was another person who was really important. And someone named Richard Ketchum, who had been, I think, more in advertising and created a vehicle in *American Heritage* in which he took one photograph and then wrote a thousand words about that photograph. And that would be a feature of the magazine. And they were beautiful. It made a big impression on me and on how to style something, how to package it in some way.

The other thing *American Heritage* was doing was moving from writing essays, which they wanted to be aggressively accessible by a larger group—not everybody but a larger group—to a kind of, how do you develop a publishing empire? Do you have books like *The American Heritage Book of the Civil War* [*The American Heritage New History of the Civil War*, 1960], American Heritage games like some version of Monopoly, American Heritage cards, etc. I got involved in that publishing aspect of it as well as the editorial side. At least I got exposed to that.

Q: Can you talk a little bit about what you did on the editorial side for that brief stint?

PRICE: For the editorial side I read manuscripts and I maybe suggested manuscripts. I just came across a note that I wrote recommending a subject or writer, and the response I got from Catton and Larrabee. So I was learning that process in some ways. I think I worked on some of the game-related processes as well. I think I wrote a couple of things which were—either the captions were included or I had my early rejections, and things like that.

Q: When it came to those publishing spin-offs and the notion of having a game and so on, do you remember any of the specifics of what you did and whether those were successful ventures?

PRICE: Well, I think some of them were moderately successful. Again, it was how do you monetize history and popularize scholarship? These were important things—for example, American Heritage Junior History. We repackaged material and books for 15-year-olds or 16-year-olds. And again, I still like what they did and I've tried to get my grandchildren to read these kinds of books as well.

Q: And do you think that this effort to repackage and to take scholarship and make it more accessible, did that have much influence?

PRICE: I think that definitely has an influence, which is—how does one think about writing? What role does scholarship play, impressing some audiences with footnotes and a kind of format? To what extent can you repackage and think about scholarship playing a different role—reaching out to a different community? And certainly *American Heritage* and *Horizon* stood for that question. Also in a nice New York, American way, which was: maintain the integrity of the material, doing it not to become a billionaire or millionaire, but because there's some social

value in accomplishing this. So it was that kind of interesting Yankee aristocracy playing a certain role. And I think, thinking that Time wasn't doing it sufficiently, so they created this enterprise which they thought could do it better. They started by taking over a history journal published by the scholarly historical society, which was trying to do something like it. Heritage came in and bought it and then moved it into a hardcover format.

Q: Do you think that effort to translate scholarship to a public audience and to maybe repackage in the way that they did—even this social mission that you're talking about—stuck with you? Did it influence any of the ways you packaged your scholarship going forward?

PRICE: I think, definitely, it suggested the importance of being able to use and reuse material—thinking about audience, thinking about larger audiences, all of that. Definitely.

Q: Speaking of a Yankee aristocracy, you had described your Yale experience in part as a dress rehearsal for power and leadership. And I wonder if you consider that *American Heritage* period as an extension of the education or something different?

PRICE: It was this small extension of it, with maybe too short but, as I say, a window into thinking about it into the New York framework, the New York publishing framework.

Q: I think right after or maybe even during the *American Heritage* employment you left to help out Robert Wagner's campaign. And of course this probably exposed you to a very different New York—and you were, as you describe it, an advance person.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: So can you talk about what you did for Wagner?

PRICE: That was fabulous and it was—certainly not my initial, but my most important immersion in American politics, in politics. Robert Wagner was a wonderful candidate. I learned many, many different things from him. My advance responsibility was to be with Wagner or [Paul R.] Screvane—it was Wagner, Screvane and [Abe] Beame. This is a typical New York Irish/Italian/Jewish ticket, as it were. I would find out where their next stop was. I would go there, talk to people for twenty minutes, come back and say, Make sure to mention X, Y, or Z. Something like that.

Q: So you're referring to local citizens that you would approach on the street and ask them what a local issue is?

PRICE: Yes. In those days people traveled in limousines. It was a sad day when candidates decided they couldn't stay in limousines anymore and they had to be in Lincoln Town Cars or SUVs or something like that. But Wagner or Screvane would be in the back seat of the

limousine, and you'd whisper to their assistants or whisper to them, Here's something important you could raise in your next stump speech. So that was my advance work.

Q: Then you also would interact with a journalist too, I assume?

PRICE: Yes. Murray Kempton, whom I admired tremendously, was in the campaign. It was one of the great pleasures to hang around and be around journalists, in that sense.

Q: And since you were a journalist as a college student and at *American Heritage*, did you interact with the other journalists on the campaign as an intermediary or—

PRICE: I don't remember so specifically, but I'm sure—now that you mention, I certainly remember working with Murray Kempton and a couple of other people. But I don't think I was feeding stories to them. Maybe I was trying, it's possible.

Q: What about the education that you got there, about—you described it in your memoir as being in a way about tribe politics?

PRICE: Well, as I say, these balance tickets were a really interesting feature. You could see the bones of old New York in this campaign. You could see Wagner harkening back to his father, who had been the mayor. You could see the role that the clubs played. It was definitely an older, established New York, and politically important in that way.

Q: And probably on its way to fading out?

PRICE: Yes, well Wagner himself was reinventing himself as a reformer. It was interesting because he would—I can't remember all the details of it, but that was another fabulous aspect of it—was Wagner redefining himself not as an establishment person because—although he came from an established family—but as a reformer.

Q: Do you remember how you got the opportunity in the first place? I'm also just curious about whether you felt like you caught the political bug, and if so, why you just left after that one campaign—though you did run for office later.

PRICE: Well, yes. This could be a complicated question: Why do I enter in to leave? And I can't remember how I got involved in it. I'll think about it.

Q: Did any of your aspiration to be a journalist get dampened by that experience in politics?

PRICE: I don't think so. It was really New York politics, New York writing. It was exciting.

Q: OK. And it was around that time that you must have been contemplating going to Yale Law School, and you made that choice. One of the things that I was curious about is why you decided to go back to law school when you had this aspiration and interest in journalism?

PRICE: This is—I'm not sure it's embarrassing—but it really had to do with the draft. It was not a conscious decision. I was happily ensconced and doing all these things—but the draft still existed and the question was, Would I serve for six months? That really came up after I graduated from Yale in the first place, when I was thinking of becoming a journalist. And it came up in June or July of that year. So I had to come to a conclusion about whether I would go to graduate school or whether I would possibly be drafted, and I decided to go to law school. And that's why I went to [University of] Virginia [Law School] for my first year of law school. I don't know if you know that.

Q: No, I didn't. So you went to the University of Virginia's law school?

PRICE: Yes, because I decided so late in the year to go to law school, and I wasn't able to go to Yale immediately. I think—this could be apocryphal but could be true—that I had turned down the Yale Law School to go work in *American Heritage* and I couldn't renew it in time for that fall. And so I went to the University of Virginia [UVA], which I loved, for one year and then transferred to the Yale Law School.

Q: OK. Why law school as opposed to other graduate school options you could have done, you know, in history, for example?

PRICE: For some reason or other I didn't think of myself as a PhD candidate historian. So I thought of myself as law—as the graduate school to which I would go.

Q: And with that year at UVA, were there any memorable classes or teachers there?

PRICE: Yes. I thought I had the best legal education in the country, which was a first year at Virginia and a second and third year at Yale. Because I got a really classic first year of legal education from extraordinary professors. But none in the communications—nothing in the communications field as I recall. It was great because I also got a sense of a different part of the country, a different sense of grace, a different community of students, etc., and things like that.

Q: Were there any teachers in particular? I know there were no communication-related classes that stood out, but anything that stuck with you?

PRICE: There were wonderful professors: Charles Gregory, Richard Speidel, Daniel Meador. It was an exceptional and classical legal education.

Q: And then the switch.

PRICE: One of the strange things I reflected on at the time. It was the first place where I was a stellar student. I hadn't been a stellar student—I'd been a really good student at Yale, but not a stellar student. And, I mean, I didn't think of myself necessarily as a stellar student. But at Virginia I ended up at the top of the—maybe it was a debate whether I was first or second in the class. And it was interesting for me to be in that position. I had never been in quite that position before.

Q: Once you transferred to Yale, did you feel—

PRICE: I stayed in that—it was interesting. The dynamic continued in a peculiar way.

Q: And of course Yale had a different caliber of student, plus it had such a different curriculum and intellectual culture than, I would assume, UVA?

PRICE: Definitely that was true. Of course, I thought it was superior—superior for me. But the Virginia curriculum was superior in other ways, etc., I would say. And I'm trying to think what it taught me that's related.

Q: Well, I'll ask a little bit about Yale itself because it was, even then, such an intellectually vibrant law school, especially in the second and third years.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: The courses were wide-ranging and faculty could take them anywhere. I know you mentioned this class by Charles Reich, who sounded quite eccentric—

PRICE: Charles Reich.

Q: Yes.

PRICE: That was a wonderful class and he was a great figure in American law, and a great poetic figure. I'm not sure I mentioned but I remember—the seminar was, I think, on the law of the [American] West or something like that—there were maybe eight of us in the class. Gary Hart was one. I'm not sure Jerry Brown was in the class, but he might have been. Gary Weatherford, who became a great water lawyer—rivers and also Native American as well. And that's where I got some greater interest in Native American law. Because he was asking the sort of conceptual question, which is how did people who were pioneering in the West, how did they think about law? How did they think about institutions? So the thing that I worked on was mining law—so, how ethnographically or anthropologically or within legal institutions did miners think about who owned what, or how do they define things etc., etc. It's the same with water.

Q: It sounded like you worked on a paper on a kind of miners' legal doctrine about mineral deposits being owned by the discoverer at the point of access?

PRICE: Yes, this is a question of who owns the load. Is it under the person who owns the property above it, or is it the person who discovers the kind of vein itself? So this became a difference between mining law in the West and mining law in the East. And there were other examples like that with respect to water.

Q: And it sounds so esoteric, but do you think it had anything to do with how you think about the law—and maybe this has something to do with Austria and coming to recognize your past and so on?

PRICE: I'm not sure I have to go that far. I think the part of the Yale Law School that's stayed with me through a variety of things is how law is constructed. That's maybe a way that connects to communications—so we weren't literalists. We weren't just looking at what the codebook said and what the scholar said and how it came down, but rather how law was formed in public life, and in private life.

Q: I was curious about whether you were exposed in those two years at Yale to any media or communication regulation coursework or anything like that?

PRICE: Sure. Well, I was fortunate enough to have Telford Taylor as a professor. Telford Taylor had been general counsel of the FCC [Federal Communications Commission]. He also had been a prosecutor at Nuremberg. He was one of the young people brought into the administration—like William O. Douglas, etc.—but he was younger. And so he taught a course on the FCC and I don't think this course was taught—and it may be—anywhere else in the country. But it was his philosophical approach, his exposure to these other elements like Nuremberg, that gave him a sense of what bureaucracies were, how decisions were made, what was behind them, etc. And then I think he brought that to bear in the course on the FCC. I'm trying to remember what I wrote for that course. It might have been on localism, but I'm not quite sure.

Q: Yes, I don't know. It must not have been published—

PRICE: No, wasn't published. I don't think it was published.

Q: Do you remember anything about his particular kind of tenets or approach to broadcast regulation in the context of the U.S. Communications Act?

PRICE: Well, I think he was sort of interested in what what was meant by public interest, convenience, and necessity. I'm trying to remember what was salient. One was the whole idea of this structure of broadcasting in the United States, so that each Congressional district would have a radio station, or each community would have a radio station, and then there would be an opportunity for a second one. So one of the questions was this notion of a kind of broad local network and how competition—what role competition played, what role local monopolies played, the formation of networks like NBC, CBS and ABC. So those were very strong elements of this course.

What he brought to bear—for example, in the localism—was the political foundation of this idea of how to distribute frequencies. It was a way to satisfy Congress, as it were, that each community or each Congressional district would have one station before another community would have two—so this was like, how do you deal with equity? Why should New York have seven stations and Philadelphia have one or nine or things like that? So these were all issues that were of interest to him—and I think they must have been very active at the time that he was general counsel.

Q: And that set of, or bundle, of issues around politics and policymaking in the law and how they intersect and so on, that must have been the core of the class, it sounds like?

PRICE: Yes, he was not purely a doctrine guy. It was about why these doctrines were the way they were. So that was very much in the spirit of the Yale Law School. And I think he must have come up from New York once a week to teach this class. And then of course it was the period when Fred Rodell—I don't know if you know Fred Rodell—was a very significant figure. He was a kind of alcoholic ne'er-do-well who wrote a book called *Nine Old Men* [*Nine Men: A Political History of the Supreme Court of the United States from 1790 to 1955*, 1955], which was the first kind of bible of legal realism, which was like, these decisions are just—they're human decisions. You have to know a lot more about the justices to understand the doctrines, as it were. And he also believed in journalism. He hated footnotes. He wrote law review articles without footnotes. And he was an important influence on a variety of people, including me indirectly. But I have friends who became legal journalists and they were sort of trained at the feet of Fred Rodell.

Q: Was he faculty at Yale?

PRICE: He was a famous faculty member. He's a bit forgotten, but he stood for this very critical view—not in the way that the crits—but critical of the kind of style and stuffiness. He stood for the opposition between Yale and Harvard. So he mocked the case method, he mocked the whole—he mocked the kind of religious devotion to a certain way of thinking about law. And he stood for this in a very radical, interesting way. And I recommend *Nine Old Men*—and he also wrote some beautiful, mocking poetry about all of this.

Q: A kind of academic satire?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: So I noticed, looking at your published papers from the period and all the way through the '70s, that you often will start with a clever phrase or something that was absolutely accessible and maybe an aperçu of some kind—in the beginning of each of these articles. I wondered maybe if his influence on legal writing was being felt?

PRICE: It could be. By the way, Robert Bork was also on the faculty, and I took Bork's first class at the Yale Law School on antitrust law. He taught it together with an economist named Ward

Bowman. There are other wonderful people—many, many other wonderful people at the Yale Law School, but the students were extraordinary as well.

Q: And do you remember any particular students who were—you mentioned Gary Hart and a couple of others—but that you interacted with and collaborated with later?

PRICE: I'm very close to the class because I'm the class scribe and I write 4,000 words about the class every year for 50 years. It's my favorite piece of writing, basically—and one of the aspects of that has been to think of the class as it's moved through the years—what changes people have in their careers, etc.

Q: It seems in some ways resonant with the practice that you and Danny [Daniel] Horowitz have to read the Sunday [*New York*] *Times*?

PRICE: Yes, it could be. Yes, that's true. So, the answer is that I'm close to a lot of people in the Yale Law School class.

Q: And though probably it would take too long to list them all, but are there one or two that you've stayed in touch with, especially that you've worked with?

PRICE: I just was saying I was just in Cuba last week. We can talk about that another time, there's not that much—but one of my classmates was Louie Stuchinsky [phonetic], who had grown up in Cuba and left and became a law student at the Yale Law School. And we became very close, and I encouraged him to come teach at UCLA for a short period of time—even to this day I've been interested in his love of Cuba, his sentimentality about Cuba, how he brought his family here and how how he married his 16-year-old sweetheart—and they came to the United States together—how Yale Law School welcomed to him, which was a very nice thing. That's one example, but there are many.

As I say, I was very close, somewhat close, to Jerry Brown, who was the governor and watched him in his early, first administration—how he's matured, how he's changed, how he's enveloped—become a kind of embracing figure of a way to govern—and strong governance in a positive manner.

Q: Right. Well, I am curious if there's any other faculty member that you connected with? And the reason I ask is in part there was this paper that got published, but you must have written it while you were there, because it was labeled as having a prize. It was 1964.

PRICE: A copyright prize.

Q: It was on the "Moral Judge and the Copyright Statute."[2]

PRICE: Oh, yes. That was a wonderful—that was a good example, although I didn't take copyright law at Yale.

Q: You didn't?

PRICE: No [laughs]—and it was a challenge. This is a competition for the best copyright paper—and they had a, I don't know, $500 prize associated. I guess you could win at the law school and then you would compete at the national level. And it was a very important paper—and it does have some relationship to communications about copyright. It was about a more general problem, which is where you know something's wrong, and it doesn't fit within a legal category, and how do courts cope with this. So that's why it's called the "Moral Judge and the Copyright Statute," and it was about the copying of certain characteristics in lamps—Stiffel lamps, as I recall. For some reason or other the statute was unclear about this or had—it was a gap, and the question was, what role did judges play in closing the gap, as opposed to Congress, in closing the gap? And so I wrote an essay on that subject.

Q: So what constitutes the moral judge then?

PRICE: It's not outcome-dependent, but it's whether the judge really tries to determine whether there's a role to play in fixing this hole. And we see it all the time. I can't—I'm not sure I can, right this second, point to an example of this. But this occurs over and over and over again. Some people think there's a kind of pattern, that Congress passes a statute, people live under it, they find flaws in it, and then it has to be fixed, as it were. And the question is, do judges apply band-aids—this is the old debate about do judges legislate, because in a way gap-filling is a form of legislation.

And of course they should. There's a significant role for judges to play in trying to think of how Congress would do this if Congress were doing it. But it's all a series of fictions. But it's an interesting process—a dynamic. And I think I've thought about it in communications law, in thinking of the FCC as being in a kind of conversation with Congress. You could think of judges as being in a conversation with Congress, where Congress plays a role and then the court sometimes "interprets" it but sometimes sort of embraces it or tries to encapture what Congress would have done if it were doing it. This is what I might call a conversation between Congress and the court or the Commission and the court.

Q: And that idea is there in that moral judge piece, in a way, right?

PRICE: It's in there. Yes, I suppose so.

---

[2] Monroe E. Price, "The Moral Judge and the Copyright Statute: The Problem of Stiffel and Compco," *Copyright Law Symposium* 14 (1966): 90–117.

Q: And the interest in copyright, was it merely because there was a prize offered or was there some—

PRICE: I think I was interested in copyright. I wasn't doing this in construction law or something like that. I think I was interested in the field. This is back—thinking of *American Heritage*, continuing that idea of publishing and things like that.

Q: Well, if I'm not wrong, you were the executive editor of the law review and in that role—which probably was linked to your class rank in some way—but was that important to you?

PRICE: It was a very important thing. First of all, it was thrilling to me, because I had come from Virginia to the Yale Law School, and the question was, what would be my role within the dynamic of the *Yale Law Journal*? And there was some sort of contest of who would be editor-in-chief, and I became executive editor partly because of my, then, writing ability. I think the idea was that I could help make it a better-written, more interesting journal. Whether that turned out to be the case I don't know.

Q: And that was your role? As executive editor you did—

PRICE: Well, I was a kind of associate of the editor—and thinking about these questions, and smoothing the process of assigning topics, editing, and getting things ready for publication.

Q: Do you think it had any influence on your own writing style as a scholar in law review articles—but not just those—going forward, working as the executive editor?

PRICE: Yes. Well—maybe I'll put it this way. One of the things that's odd about the law schools, and the Yale Law School, is this idea of student-edited journals, which we don't have in—we have peer reviews and the peers are other scholars. So the idea of student-edited journals—at the Yale Law School, and other law schools as well, but certainly at the Yale Law School, the students saw themselves as capable of taking on the biggest issues and trying to struggle with authors and making sure that the articles were right. And they were real—people worked day and night on the—I would say the *Yale Law Journal* became the most important curricular thing you were doing—was working on the journal. You'd work on it all night and it would be on a very broad array of subjects. It was terrific.

Q: It's sort of an echo of the *Daily News*, I mean very different, but in terms of the role it plays.

PRICE: Yes—no, it was a great role.

Q: Yes, you know, and I think you mentioned somewhere—

PRICE: It's a bit like being a publisher.

Q: You mentioned that you still saw the law through a journalist's eye—was the phrase you used when you were at Yale Law School—that you looked at statutes from a journalist's eye. I'm just as curious if—that was a phrase you used—

PRICE: Oh, well great. I like that.

Q: [laughs] Do you feel like it stuck with you—that you continued as a young UCLA professor applying that sort of view?

PRICE: Well, I think it also goes back to Fred Rodell. It goes back to this kind of skeptical view of the law. It's not looking at the law as seriously as fixed in some ways, or as divinely given, and subject to criticism, and subject to analysis, and also questioning formation theories of how the law came into being and what it should do.

Q: In the case of Western mining, for example.

PRICE: Yes. So I think this probably carried through in many areas of teaching or writing.

Q: So one wrinkle around that time—it must have been during a summer after Yale Law School, after you finished it—but you worked as a researcher for the Warren Commission. And I'm not sure of the exact timing but—what was your role?

PRICE: [Earl] Warren was chairman of the Warren Commission, Chief Justice Warren, and he borrowed—either offered or compelled—I think probably offered—law students, people who had clerkships, to spend the summer before they became a clerk, or something like that, helping in finishing off the work of the Warren Commission. So I and probably several other law clerks went and worked at the Warren Commission. And I was assigned to do footnotes on the chapter of [Lee Harvey] Oswald in Russia.

Q: Oh, wow. And did he do it alone?

PRICE: Definitely. I actually have personal knowledge that he's the only—But it was an interesting experience. One of the things that I learned in footnoting this section is that he was interviewed in Moscow by Priscilla Johnson, who was a journalist who—because the traffic of Americans to Russia was so small—probably spoke to every interesting American who came through—maybe every American, or tried. She had talked to me when I had gone to Moscow a couple years before. So that was interesting for me.

Q: Doing the footnoting for that chapter, was there anything related to your Moscow—not your Moscow visit per se—but was that assigned to you because of your exposure?

PRICE: No. I don't think so.

Q: Totally random?

PRICE: Yes. Unless there's a conspiracy that I don't know about.

Q: And the rest of the summer—since the report was, I think, released in September of that year, you must have been part of the process of finalizing—

PRICE: Yes, I have a copy of the Warren Commission signed by all of the members of the Commission, which is exciting. I hope I still have it—I'm trying to think of if there was anything compelling about it, other than seeing how Washington works, and the kind of formation of public opinion about something—I didn't come away with a more skeptical idea of decision making or anything like—I didn't become cynical as a result of it or an enthusiast as a result of it.

Q: So that was right before you started as a clerk for Justice—

PRICE: Although—I guess, it was interesting in terms of the packaging of ideas—these are the facts, or how do we package this so that it's complete, and it's coherent, and it's acceptable to the American public. So I wasn't engaged in that, but I must have been on the side of it in some ways.

Q: Well, it was right before you were just to start as Justice Potter Stewart's clerk. Right. And was that an opportunity that you applied for or were you tapped to be the clerk?

PRICE: You applied, but basically—yes, you applied. But Potter Stewart's practice was to take one student from the Yale Law School and one student from somewhere else, often Harvard.

Q: Your experience over that year—you knew the preceding Yale Law School clerk—and were prepared, therefore, for the year, more or less. But was it—in his case, did he use his clerks to farm out writing of opinions and things like that?

PRICE: We did drafts of opinions, and we did petitions for certioraries. So those were the two—and we reviewed drafts circulated by other justices.

Q: And when you took that role did you have in mind that you were going to go to a legal professor position beyond it?

PRICE: Not necessarily, no.

Q: Did it help convince you to go to UCLA?

PRICE: I guess. I think as I rehearsed this, I'm not sure that this is the direction I would have taken. But somehow or other it was like I was on a train, ever since I did better than I expected

at Virginia—then I went to Yale and did better than I expected at Yale, and then got a clerkship and etc. So that led me to a teaching position. But I'm not sure that that's the very best possible outcome, but it was OK.

Q: But it was a trajectory.

PRICE: It was a trajectory—yes.

Q: From that year was there any kind of encounter or, I don't know, memory of Stewart himself that you recall, that stuck with you after?

PRICE: Sure. Well, first of all, Stewart was a journalist too, and Stewart loved *The New York Times*. He loved newspapers—and he was a kind of model of a certain civic American, Middle-, slightly Middle-Western. But he was a very decent guy, and not doctrinaire—there were consequences in that he was not one of the leaders. He wasn't the leader on a conservative side—but he was, basically, a very decent—and he was a very good writer. So his idea of a decision was linked to these journalistic goals as well. But also there was this certain idealism to him that was quite interesting and passionate.

Q: And did that connect with his humane treatment of you and others who are clerks?

PRICE: Yes, but I think also—I was just thinking about it because this—the court is thinking now about cell phones and the Fourth Amendment and searches and seizures. And one of his great decisions of that term—I think it might have been called *Stanford v. Texas* [379 U.S. 476 (1965)], but I'm not sure—was a kind of very penetrating opinion about the Fourth Amendment. And he'd gotten a handwritten note from Hugo Black saying, That was a wonderful opinion, Potter—or something like that. Potter Stewart was really proud of getting this note from Hugo Black.

Q: Were there other memorable cases or, I mean, media-related, communication-related cases?

PRICE: Yes, there were a couple of media-related cases. One was *Estes v. Texas* [381 U.S. 532 (1965)], which was about cameras in the courtroom—that was interesting about how to think about trials, and the public. And, oddly, it reminded me of my trip to Cuba because—one of the things I witnessed in Cuba were trials in stadia, a kind of trial against one of Fidel's [Castro] favorite examples of a cruel policeman of the Batista era. And it taught me that public has a limit—that is, a public, it needs to be a certain degree of openness for it to be public. But too open is not public either. This is an idea that I don't think has been adequately explored, but a trial in a stadium is not a public trial. It's something more like a carnival.

And so the Estes case, Estes against Texas, raised these questions for me—which is, what do we mean by the ritualness of a public trial? What's the limit to it one way or another? And it was a case in which the court, for the first time maybe, published photographs as part of the decision—showing wiring, showing a kind of disrupted courtroom, and the idea that the jurors would be swayed by all of this external stuff hanging around. And Stewart, I think, dissented,

and he also described the courtroom in a way that showed that these wires had been sort of hidden. So it was about this process of representing things, use of cameras in the courtroom, use of photographs in the decision. So there are a lot of communications-related aspects of that.

And another—if I can just briefly answer—another case was Ginzburg, Ralph Ginzburg and the publication of *Eros* magazine [*Ginzburg v. United States*, 383 U.S. 463 (1966)]. It was a period in which pornography was still an important issue at the court and the justices were trying to figure out how to get rid of these questions. But *Eros* was a magazine that, I think, was particularly prosecuted because the pornography was interracial. And the question was whether the court would hear the case Ginzburg had been sentenced to. The court was kind of split on this—and Stewart voted to grant certiorari—there was an idea that, if cert was granted, the case might be affirmed and that would be bad. So this actually occurred—so, it was where the right vote was both to grant certiorari so you have a chance to hear, but you should recognize that you might be mauling the law by having a court affirmation of things, so—.

Q: And was he in the majority in that?

PRICE: He wasn't. I don't think so, as I recall, but I'm not sure I remember. I'd have to go back and check.

Q: Right.

PRICE: But so there were cases like that.

Q: You were in Washington for the first time for a lengthy period, right, that year? And you decided to stick around and you served as the assistant to the Secretary of Labor Wallard [*sic*] Wirtz.

PRICE: Willard Wirtz.

Q: Willard Wirtz, excuse me. And what made you decide to take that position? What was the circumstance?

PRICE: Well—it's interesting. It's another journalism plus ladder approach. So the clerk who preceded me, Alan Novak, was a good friend of Fred Graham, who was actually a journalist. He was a journalist for *The New York Times*, etc. Graham had been Willard Wirtz's assistant. He was quitting to do something, and so Alan called me and said, Do you want this job? This is typical, the way Washington works, story. So I figured, you know, that was nice, it sounds like a good idea to me. And it was thinking about the possibility of government service in a different way, much more, I guess, like another—kind of like a New Deal-type Yale Law School, crossing from law into administration in some ways. So working for Willard Wirtz gave me a chance to see how that worked, and fulfilling that dream, as it were. And you would work there for a year and

then Daniel Patrick Moynihan was there, a couple of other people. So it was an exciting—it was post [John F.] Kennedy in the [Lyndon B.] Johnson Administration. It was interesting.

Q: So were you working with some of those figures on policy drafts and discussion and early War on Poverty stuff?

PRICE: Yes, a lot of manpower things—the question of, for example, could you fashion a program to take those—a study which Moynihan did, called *One Third of a Nation*, which described people who were turned down for military duty, often minorities. And the question was, could the government work with that cohort of people who were interested but fell short, and somehow improve their performance so that they could serve in the military and then use that as a way of upward mobility? There were a lot of programs, initiatives like that that Willard Wirtz stood for. And the question was how to how to make them better—how to implement them and get them moving. That was sort of my role. And I was a speechwriter.

Q: Oh, for him as well. OK.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: Was there any particular initiative outside of the manpower project, that Moynihan was working on, that you had a hand in or were helping to at least fix in the sense of getting through?

PRICE: Yes. I'm trying to think of what any of them had to do with communications—the Watts riots took place during this period, some OSHA-related [Occupational Safety and Health Administration] activity—working conditions and things like that. But right now I can't remember any specific—

Q: It must have been after that year where you were the assistant, so it was a year after the clerkship, that you took the UCLA job and moved out to California, but—based on at least what I've inferred—that summer before you started was when you did some consulting work for—and excuse my pronunciation—but the Agua Caliente [Band of Cahuilla Indians] tribe in Palm Springs.

PRICE: Yes, Agua Caliente tribe.

Q: Is that how you say it? So and I think it's that summer in between, but how did that come about? You were kind of on your way to LA, in a sense.

PRICE: So there was—again the old network—but there was a professor—a fellow student actually, George Lefcoe, who had become a professor at USC [University of Southern California]. He was contacted about this case and asked for his assistance—to a kind of Long Beach lawyer. And he called me. I'm not sure how he knew about me, but he asked me whether I wanted to

work on this case. So it was a very interesting case involving a complicated—I'll try and make it easy. The main interesting question was that when the railroad was driven through to California, every other section became owned by the tribe and every other section became owned by the railroad company, and development in Palms Springs grew on the railroad land and the Indian land lay fallow. And the question was how to distribute this land to individuals and to the tribe, and whether it should be taxed. That's when I first got into the case.

Q: Those legal circumstances were very strange, but it reminds me in some ways of that kind of Western mining case. And it was the first—or was it the first legal work you did for a tribe?

PRICE: Yes, I think it was the first legal work I did for a tribe. And the question was how to come up with a convincing argument that the land that had gone down to the individual Indians shouldn't be taxed by the community, by the city of Palm Springs.

Q: And did you succeed?

PRICE: Yes, I succeeded—or the lawyer succeeded with some input by me. And that was a good thing.

Q: And when that offer to help out with the case came down, had you already been interested in Native American or Indian law?

PRICE: Well because of Yale—because this course that I had taken with, by Charles Reich at the Yale Law School. I also thought going West it would be nice for me to be involved in things that had something to do with the West.

Q: Of course you would go on to do lots of work for Indian tribes and entities, but I was curious, before getting to those, about UCLA itself. Was that your only choice or did you have a particular draw to California when you made the decision to take the post out there?

PRICE: Well, my wife—she'd graduated from high school in California and gone to Stanford. She wasn't particularly eager, necessarily—and her parents—her mother lived there, her father died. And I had worked in California during one of my summers—maybe one or two of my summers at the Yale Law School, and so I kind of liked it. I liked the life. And UCLA, it wasn't a start-up—I think it was already 10 or 20 years old—but it was in its beginning processes and that was exciting to me as well.

Q: Do you mind a brief digression about how you met your wife originally and what the circumstances were and when that was?

PRICE: Yes, well the first time I met my wife I was dating Nora Ephron, and we were in a Greek—some sort of restaurant, cafe, etc. And Aimée [Brown Price] and Nora had gone to high school

together, and so Nora introduced me to her. But later, when I was fixed up with her, I said I'd met her, and she didn't remember. But I remembered [laughs].

Q: And what what kind of timing was that?

PRICE: It's all when I was at the Yale Law School—so it was in '62, '63, '64.

Q: And so you spent quite a long time at UCLA in the law school—

PRICE: Sixteen years.

Q: —sixteen years and, you know, particularly in those first couple of years, I guess—it was the late 1960s—what was it like being a young professor of law there? Was there anything about the newness of the school that made it, you know, interesting?

PRICE: Well, trying to look at it backwards or through this perspective, I think partly it was about Los Angeles, and Hollywood, and the entertainment industry, and the arts, and how should all these come into the life of a law school in some ways. And even though I was just a young professor there, I was given some leeway—I'm not sure why—to help build these kinds of efforts. So I wanted to embrace thinking of the potential strengths of the law school in a kind of complicated national environment. There were questions of how to change the methodology of teaching, but also how to embrace certain sectors, including Indians and land use—which other people did—but the arts and entertainment law.

Q: So did you and your colleagues—

PRICE: And also one of the things that was interesting about the University of California was a great way of thinking of the relationship between the campuses and economic development and social development in the state. So under Clark Kerr, who'd been a famous chancellor, there was a very public-spirited dynamic between the university and the state, where new campuses would be lodged—the role that that would play in the development of the state. What role the scholarship of the faculty would play in terms of improving governance in some way. So I think that was a fabulous aspect of that environment, and I really appreciated that. I think it was truer than—it wasn't untrue of other universities, but it was true in a very great way about the University of California.

Q: During that same stretch, at least the beginning of the time, the War on Poverty, and the kind of Great Society programs, were spreading around, including the Office of Legal Services.

PRICE: Right, yes. So, I got involved with legal services first. I worked with—one of the grants had been to California Rural Legal Assistance, which was designed to help farm workers. And there was one office that had a rush of Indian potential clients and didn't know what to do with

it, and I helped them think about that. And that led to the foundation of California Indian Legal Services, and we formed an office of that at the law school at UCLA.

Q: So can you just describe that in a little bit more detail? So you were working at this entity that was meant to serve Mexican-American migrant workers, and they had this crush of Indian applicants or potential clients. And so did you propose the Indian legal service spin-off?

PRICE: Yes. What happened—I think California Rural Legal Assistance, which is a wonderful enterprise, recognized that that they couldn't do this alone, and also that there was an opportunity to create an Indian entity. And so, yes, I think I helped draft the proposal for California Indian Legal Services, and I became deputy director of it, I think.

Q: OK and George Duke—

PRICE: George Duke was the director.

Q: —was someone you worked with.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: I was curious about it in part for its own sake, but also it was the first institute or entity that you created, and you went on to create a lot of them over the years. And so I wondered whether—I knew you weren't running it solely—but whether you got intoxicated by it, by having the building and founding—

PRICE: I'm not sure intoxicated would be the right word. But I think it turned out to be a tick [laughs], rather than intoxicated, I'd say. Or an organizing method within another entity to create something that could have a function, and could move forward, etc.

Q: OK, right.

PRICE: And also have someone else who could lead and develop it in some ways. And California Indian Legal Services was an excellent enterprise in the sense, and led to the Native American Rights Fund.

Q: Yes. Can you describe that? I read something—

PRICE: What was wonderful is the California Indian Legal Services, I think, became one of the best legal services offices—and best Indian legal services offices. And then the Ford Foundation asked me to comment on a proposal for an Indian version of the NAACP [National Association for the Advancement of Colored People] Legal Defense Fund. I read it and I recommended something like the Native American Rights Fund, and wrote that proposal with some of my

friends who were working for California Indian Legal Services. Then that was funded and my colleagues took it over, and ran it, and they were great.

Q: OK, and that's indeed what it became and what it is—

PRICE: Yes.

Q: Right?

PRICE: No, I think that—I love that as a small footnote, as it were.

Q: So it sounded like the OLS or the Office of Legal Services paid you to go around and see different legal service agencies and Indian ones in particular?

PRICE: This was also weirdly in the Nixon Administration, but a friend of mine became the head of Legal Services—Terry Lenzner. Terry asked me to help think through a strategy for Indian legal services in the country. I guess it must have been after California Indian Legal Services, etc. So I went to the Navajo Reservation and to Philadelphia, Mississippi, and to Alaska, and to a variety of places, and help set up Indian OEO [Office of Economic Opportunity] programs for legal services for Native Americans.

Q: Based on the model that you had developed—a little bit—and I don't know the timing—could be, I'm just not sure of it—but you had published a paper called, like, "Lawyers on the Reservation," in that period, 1969.[3] And it perhaps was informed by all of this traveling around or else—

PRICE: I think it's informed by all the traveling—

Q: And then that probably doubled back on to the California—

PRICE: Yes, and to Alaska. I don't remember when I wrote that, but it was more my reflections on what was different about being a legal services lawyer for Indians on reservations from urban poverty—the mindset, basically, had been to move from urban legal services directly to the reservation. I was trying to show that there were different strategic opportunities and different historical necessities that could make these programs stronger.

Q: You used the phrase "the landed poor" to distinguish between, say, the urban poor, for example. And, you know, this turns out to play a huge role in the Alaskan case, of course. But I was wondering if you found yourself, in the very late '60s, doing lots of this Indian legal work? And you put together a case book and all of this.[4] If you had gone back to the Yale Law School—

---

[3] Monroe E. Price, "Lawyers on the Reservation: Some Implications for the Legal Profession," *Journal of Law and Social Order* 161 (1969).

[4] Monroe E. Price, *Law and the American Indian: Reading, Notes and Cases* (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1973).

you had this one course—did you have in mind that you would have such a central part of your early legal career being around Indian law?

PRICE: No, I don't think so. No—more likely communications than Indian law.

Q: Right, that's what I was wondering, but a series of opportunities came up and they built off one another—

PRICE: Right. I think that's true, and also they were just exciting. Also, I'm not sure when I started doing this work with this law firm called Munger, Tolles & Olson LLP or then called Munger, Tolles and something else. But it's where I think I learned from my summer work—that's why the "landed poor" question came up, which is—what's the role of excellent legal counsel, with great financial acumen, and how do you transpose that collection of benefits from Rockefellers to the Navajos. And it had to do with what were the generations of lawyers for Native American entities, etc., and how that developed over time. So that was part of the "Lawyers on [the] Reservation" article.

Q: And your Yale law professor, the famous legal realist Rodell, if I'm pronouncing—

PRICE: Fred Rodell.

Q: —Rodell. The notion that he had about law does seem to apply to the particular circumstances, the peculiar ones that reservations face and their opportunities that are there but very hard to access.

PRICE: Well, I think maybe another way it ties to communications is that I learned the importance of narratives in legal representation. So this is a question of who's your audience in making law, Congress. And what's the story that you want to tell? How romantic is it? How emotional is it? Who does it bring along? How does it build constituencies? And things like that. So, that relationship between narrative and lawmaking was an important aspect of probably every field, but it was certainly important of Native American law.

Q: Was there a particular intellectual challenge involved given the mix of claims and treaties and legal precedents?

PRICE: I wouldn't say it's singular in this respect, but it offered an opportunity of both technical questions and narrative questions. On the technical side, there were these complicated interrelationships between federal jurisdiction, state jurisdiction, and tribal jurisdiction. And the question was how to learn to—I don't want to say—how to look for lacunae that would lead to opportunities—my favorite example of this—well, there were two examples. One was Muhammad Ali, before he was Muhammad Ali, when he was looking—when the states were refusing opportunities for him to fight because they would get in trouble, etc.—could he have a bout on a Native American reservation? And so that was an early exploration, that never

happened, of trying to understand what tribes could do that would be economic opportunities that presented because states wouldn't do them. Gambling became a good example of this.

Q: And you mentioned a second example.

PRICE: Yes, a friend of mine was experimenting with a novel way of building buildings out of what was called Composite, which is some plastic plaster material. And he couldn't get a local jurisdiction to allow him to build this, to do a test of this house. So a California tribe was found that would do it. But again this was playing, trying to play, with openings that law might provide for economic opportunity.

Q: I was wondering if your motivation for doing this work, in addition to all the other reasons, had anything to do with your refugee background or your Jewishness. I mean, you mentioned Felix Cohen as a role model.

PRICE: I was kind of interested—well, my weirdest way of thinking of this was that these reservations were all about assimilation and preservation of culture. So the question was, was there a place in American society where Navajos could be Navajos and what role would law or other structures play in permitting differentiations based on culture? So, to some extent some similar things could be said about religious groups or other cultural groups, etc. And so I was somewhat interested in Native Americans as playing the same—a different version of songs of assimilation and separateness.

Q: And Felix Cohen?

PRICE: And then the other thing was—yes, Felix Cohen was the great scholar of American Indian law. I'm not sure I'd make too much of the kind of chain of his Jewishness, but it was of interest to me.

Q: So the long legal relationship you ended up having with this Alaskan entity, and it was called the Cook Inlet Region, [Inc.], or still is, and began, it sounded like to me, in the early 1970s after a law had passed, the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act [1971]. You had visited Alaska when you were doing this OLS tour, but how did you come about that opportunity to represent the new entity that had been created after the law?

PRICE: Well, I think that I made some contacts when I'd gone up to study—it was actually a really important visit having to do, as I was saying, about legal services. But while I was there, one of the issues was whether easements would be provided for a pipeline that would go from Prudhoe Bay down to the south of Alaska and then shipping oil. I was asked this question whether all these groups had signed easements. And I suggested that maybe they were invalid because they had not been given adequate consideration, economic consideration.

And that led to the stopping of the building of the pipeline, which gave the tribes leverage in terms of getting this 1971 bill passed. And I had recommended some lawyers to represent the

tribe in this, etc., which was fun. But probably through that process I had been called about some involvement of the Cook Inlet Region and then that led to a long career—a decade of representation with them.

Q: And in particular, with this settlement, where they were able to essentially acquire—or were granted—real estate across the United States that was actually valuable and not—

PRICE: This was very exciting, but I think, again, this is about the mix of narrative and technique. And the question was—the Native Claims Settlement Act divided Alaska land assets among these 40 large and small Native corporations, and some of the land that Cook Inlet got was environmentally sensitive, and so had little economic value. And the question was, how could Cook Inlet's dowry of land, or assets, be changed to make it more economically favorable?

So that was the role—one of the roles that I played was helping to negotiate a settlement with the Department of the Interior, where Cook Inlet would exchange its environmentally sensitive lands for economically more extraordinary lands. And it led to this very weird aspect in that settlement, which was terrific, in which Cook Inlet could exchange its lands for bidding rights for federal surplus property in different parts of the country. So then we would then go to auctions and we would bid on land in Hawaii or Washington, DC, and stuff like that.

Q: And so the corporation became this landlord of lots of very valuable property. It sounded like there is a broadcasting-related focus there—

PRICE: Yes, and that was the other thing which brought these together, which is fabulous, and that was—there was an FCC policy to encourage minority ownership of television and radio stations. I helped Cook Inlet posture itself so that it would be a partner in this. And actually that occurred. It came to own the New Haven television station [WTNH, 1986], and it became the largest minority owner of television stations in the country. And then it went from there into some of the spectrum auctions, and things like that, after my time.

Q: Was there ever any connection between those ownership stakes, on the one hand, and programming of any kind, or interest in minority-related or Indian-related programming?

PRICE: Interestingly, the answer is no. Probably no is maybe the right answer. I remember when Cook Inlet acquired the New Haven station, they said, We're only going to change one thing. We're going to make the weather map so that Alaska is big and the United States is small, rather than the other way around. Which is not—they didn't do that but it was a good line.

Q: Alaskan chauvinism. Yes. Well, it sounded like you kept working on behalf of that entity for decades, that you may indeed still have a relationship?

PRICE: No, I would just say a little over a decade. Then I moved to New York and it was inconsistent with my work as dean of the Cardozo Law School.

Q: Oh, I see, OK. And you continued to publish in the area. You wrote a few papers in the mid–1970s on various Indian law-related topics. But it seems that that represented, maybe the last of the, at least published, scholarship on this topic—aside from updating the case book and so on. So is that more or less accurate that the Indian—

PRICE: Yes, sadly so—yes. I'm trying to think if it flowed into anything else. But I would say that's a relatively correct picture.

Q: Well, this is a perfect time, then, to wrap up this second session. And what we can pick up next time is the communication and regulation law interests starting with [the Alfred P.] Sloan [Foundation]. So around the same time, so thank you so much.

END OF SESSION TWO

Transcript of Interview conducted November 29, 2017, with MONROE E. PRICE (session three)

Philadelphia, PA

Interviewed by Jefferson Pooley

Q: This is session three of an oral history interview of Monroe Price conducted by Jefferson Pooley at the Annenberg School in Philadelphia. The interview is part of the Oral History Project of the Annenberg School for Communication Library Archives, and the date is November 29, 2017. So, Monroe, when we left off the last session we were talking about your work in Indian law. What I'd like to do, though, is go back a few years to the late 1960s to pick up the thread of your work on communication and media regulation and law, and in particular the President's Task Force on Telecommunications [*sic*: Communications] Policy that you worked on in 1967, I believe. So, could you—

PRICE: Around then.

Q: Yes or around that time anyway. So, how did that come about and who did you work with and what kind of work did you do?

PRICE: I guess that there was a decision, partly because of the question of what should happen to the Bell telephone company [i.e., AT&T] and what the structure of media and communications in the country should be. Lyndon Johnson appointed something called the President's Task Force on Telecommunications [*sic*: Communications] Policy with Eugene Rostow as the chair and Alan Novak as executive director. And Alan Novak had been a clerk for Justice Potter Stewart, and my colleague at the Yale Law School. And he assembled an extraordinary team of scholars, many of whom wrote continuously in the field, and I came on as a junior researcher, as it were. These were economists, political scientists, and they were thinking about whether the company should be divided, should be split, etc., and its relationship to television and to cable, which was just coming more into the picture.

So that was a thrilling experience for me and it was the first time I was seeing it at this sort of elevated level and in a comprehensive way—and also, the idea that you did a kind of systematic, broad analysis, multidisciplinary, and came up with recommendations that would then be enacted in some way. That model was a very important model. And among the people who were researchers was Richard Posner. Richard Posner was brilliant then as he is brilliant now, and as I recall the way the commission worked—there were like a hundred reports done. They

were all stacked up. Dick Posner sat at one end of the table, he sat at a typewriter, he read all these reports and funneled them into a report, which was then issued.

There was some controversy, which I can't remember now, about the economics of the report. And I'm not sure—it's not as famous of a report as it should be, because of some division of belief on some of its recommendations. I can't remember what that problem was right now. But the main thing, for me, was getting involved with cable and trying to begin to understand the relationship between cable and broadcasting, the general history of the idea of competition in the industry and how competition should work, what the goals of competition were, the idea of trying to reach many channels as opposed to a few, and how that should be orchestrated. It was sort of a window into the next few decades.

Q: Well, you were exposed there, clearly, to the legal, the regulatory, political-economic aspects of broadcasting and also the emerging cable, I suppose. This is a tangential question in a way, but were you exposed to or aware of, or were there any representatives of, the new would-be discipline of communication itself? Or were these folks like Rostow, Posner, and others, who were from adjoining social science or legal disciplines that—

PRICE: I think more of that. Yes, I would say more of that.

Q: And you weren't conscious of anything like a field of communication in this period, right?

PRICE: Yes, I don't think so.

Q: OK. And given that you had been exposed and interested in media- and communication-related legal topics, way back at the Yale Law School, and had written a few things about copyright, and even artists' rights to their income, and that sort of thing—did this telecommunications task force do anything to steer your interest in making this a primary focus of your career?

PRICE: It certainly shaped it up as a central focus—whether it was primary or secondary, it depended on what would happen at UCLA [University of California, Los Angeles] and what kind of emphasis I would have in course assignments, etc. But, definitely, it set the stage for that.

Q: You did go to UCLA almost immediately after this—

PRICE: Yes. I might have been on the UCLA faculty already. I think I was.

Q: If it was overlapping, it sounds like, you were just about at that point when you had started to do lots of Indian legal work, both scholarly and in litigation, and you had, in this period, also, I presume, course assignments at UCLA as a new professor. You talked a little bit in the last session about how you and your colleagues wanted to adapt UCLA a bit to its environment, including its entertainment environment. And I was curious if you had any role in adapting entertainment law in particular into the push—

PRICE: Well, I adapted media law.

Q: OK.

PRICE: Is that OK?

Q: Yes. Yes, that's perfect.

PRICE: No, I set up a clinic at UCLA law school on media law and policy [UCLA Communications Law Program], basically, and recruited Geoffrey Cowan to head it. And that was a very important element of my life, was establishing it and then getting Geoffrey to run it.

Q: And what year was this, roughly speaking?

PRICE: It's around the same period, 1967 to '70 or '71. I'm not sure. And Geoffrey moved to Los Angeles, to UCLA, to run this program.

Q: To run this. And it was mostly integrated into the law school's curriculum—or did it have a kind of external-facing role as well?

PRICE: Yes. I think the way it worked was that this entity—I can't remember the exact name of it—took cases, and it was tied to the public interest law movement. And so it was a kind of public interest law movement in the communications field. So you had the couple famous ones in Washington, DC, and you had Geoffrey running this project in Los Angeles. And it had a very good string of directors. Geoffrey was the director, and then Charlie Firestone was a director, and a couple of other wonderful people.

Q: So it had this clinical role?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: It had a teaching aspect as well that the students would rotate into it?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: Presumably it was existing alongside the California Indian institute [California Indian Legal Services]?

PRICE: Legal Services, although that Indian Legal Services moved out to a reservation in Southern California. The Escondido.

Q: I see. Got it.

PRICE: On to a reservation [in] Escondido.

Q: You would be teaching formal coursework too, that was on media law, outside of the clinic?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: OK. For example, courses like?

PRICE: It would just be a general course on media regulation in the United States.

Q: Got it. It was around that time that you must have been asked, probably on the basis of the task force work in 1967, to be part of this new [Alfred P.] Sloan Foundation–sponsored project, this Sloan Commission on Cable [Communications], which was of course a new emerging technology then. And you were the deputy director of the Commission.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: Did that take you out of Los Angeles?

PRICE: I think I spent I spent a year on the East Coast working on that.

Q: OK. Regardless of the exact way in which you were tapped, you moved to the East Coast, and what was it that you did as deputy director? The famous report came out the next year, *On the Cable: The Television of Abundance*.[5]

PRICE: I did a lot of the shaping of it, the commissioning of papers for it, maybe some of the editing of it, and I did an appendix or two myself. But it was a lovely experience. Again, what I learned from the telecommunications task force was this idea of a kind of general overview. This was less economics-driven, less high-tech professional, in the sense of the telecommunications task force was. But it was more engaged with—it was more of a cultural communications entity on the cable. One of the things I liked very much was, I did an appendix on citizens' uses of cable television. Which then led to the—

Q: —led to the 1972 book that you did.

PRICE: Yes, exactly.

Q: I want to talk about that in a couple of minutes. When it came to the Sloan experience, what was your day-to-day role there? I mean, I know you helped shape the actual report.

PRICE: There was a staff. So we shaped the report, we prepared reports for the commissioners, prepared for their recommendations, drafts, and reviewed drafts of chapters and that kind of thing.

Q: And in some ways you were doing the kind of publishing work that you were talking about having been exposed to at *American Heritage* back a decade earlier and some of that packaging—

PRICE: Yes, although one of the Sloan representatives was Steve White—I think that's his name—who was a literate New Yorker who was hired specifically for his talent, and sort of general writing. Because I think the Sloan Commission wanted very much to have a book that could be read, that was lyrical some ways.

[5] Sloan Commission on Cable Communications, *On the Cable: The Television of Abundance* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971).

Q: It is, in fact quite well-written. And what about the commissioners. Did you interact with any of them in extensive ways?

PRICE: I did. I mean, I don't have long-standing relationships with them, but yes. I would say the commissioners were important. Leonard Tow of the Tow Center [for Digital Journalism, Columbia University] was one of the commissioners, for example [*sic*: Tow was not a Sloan commissioner].

Q: And any others—

PRICE: And he must have been a kid, right?

Q: Right. He must have been. Any others that were influential on the commission itself?

PRICE: I have to look at the report to refresh my memory.

Q: Right. OK, that's totally fair. During that period, clearly, you were getting more and more invested in—

PRICE: —in communications, in communications policy, in a kind of analytical approach in thinking about the transformations that were taking place. I mean, that was what was quite interesting, was the whole idea of moving from the three-television-network model to the television-of-abundance. One of the really interesting questions, as I recall, was, when does the system crack? Does it crack at five channels or eight channels or a hundred channels, etc.? That kind of thing.

Q: Well, and it is a pattern that seems to have stuck, at least through to the 1980s, that you've worked on emerging technologies that were in some cases, like broadcast satellite, not even actually in play yet.

PRICE: Right.

Q: And the legal ramifications and complexities that they would probably bring and regulatory challenges. Right? And so that pattern seems to have started in Sloan?

PRICE: Yes. Actually, I just remembered—something keyed it off—an article that I wrote later called "Requiem for the Wired Nation."[6] I'd been involved both on the wired nation side, and then on the requiem—we still haven't finished the requiem side, but we're still playing with both the idea of a wired nation and the idea of a requiem for a wired nation.

Q: Can you just expand on that a tiny bit?

PRICE: Well, the wired nation is this romantic, utopian idea that if we just wire things up or internet things up, etc., all problems will be resolved. Medicine will be better, education will be better, democracy will be better. These were the arguments that were made to invest in the

[6] Monroe E. Price, "Requiem for the Wired Nation: Cable Rulemaking at the FCC," *Virginia Law Review* 61, no. 3 (1975).

shift to cable, the shift to satellite, and certainly the shift to internet. It's been interesting to watch that same pattern occur across each of these innovations. We're now getting into the requiem side, which is Uber not getting the delivery of the miracles of the wired nation that existed in—supposed to exist in cable television, or in satellite, or in—maybe the Internet's dangerous. Maybe it's not the be-all and end-all of everything. Although, it seems pretty good.

Q: Well, the Sloan report did have a bit of that wired nation character to it and even a bit of optimism, but it was rooted still in a focus on minority broadcasting or programming, I should say, and the public interest.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: So it had that strong character—as did your 1972 follow up, which was not Sloan-sponsored, but Markle [Foundation] and—

PRICE: United Church of Christ [UCC].

Q: —sponsored. That book has a striking introduction, if I remember right, where you talk about how radio was essentially an opportunity, in some ways like this wired nation notion, that became commercial.[7]

PRICE: Yes. Right.

Q: The same thing happened with broadcast television. Here, as you put it, was a third chance. So what was the—

PRICE: I don't know if that was my phrase or John [Wicklein], my co-editor—who's a wonderful guy who became dean at the Boston [University] School of [Public] Communication.

Q: OK.

PRICE: John Wicklein.

Q: Right. You and your co-author, then: What was the idea behind this? It seems to have come out of maybe the appendix that you did—

PRICE: It probably came out of the Sloan appendix. But I think United Church of Christ. That was Everett—

Q: Parker.

PRICE: Parker was a great man. He's an apostle of citizen use of television. He believed that television could actually produce good things, and that if we all worked hard at it, it would change in micro-ways that were his positive society. He asked us to assemble examples of this, so that communities would have a guide to how they could intervene in cable television

[7] Monroe E. Price and John Wicklein, *Cable Television: A Guide for Citizen Action* (Philadelphia: Pilgrim Press, 1972).

franchise proceedings, and then [produce in] ways that would further these goals. And that was a wonderful effort. I liked that a lot.

Q: How much collaboration was there with Everett Parker? He wrote the foreword but I didn't know if—

PRICE: He helped inspire it, but I don't think he worked on the day-to-day.

Q: OK.

PRICE: It wasn't a commissioned project. It was just John Wicklein and I.

Q: It really did have this character of being a how-to, a guide for citizens, right?

PRICE: Yes. Very purposeful.

Q: And even translated federal regulation and likely regulation for the local communities. Did you hear about its impact in any concrete way? I know it got translated in different ways, but did local communities use it?

PRICE: Yes it got translated into different foreign languages to be used elsewhere. It was a time in which there were a number of practices in groups around the country, so it was a bit of a movement—and some of it continued with some of the same people, somewhat graying and somewhat institutionally related—not in assisted living but it's just short of that. And so there was a community. Yes. I learned from the community and I think the community benefited from some of this cross-pollination.

Q: It's a project that, though it didn't happen at the same time, I thought I may ask you about. That project, the book from 1972, and your attempt—I don't know if it was half-hearted or not—to create a Jewish television channel, or brief attempt to do that—or Jewish Television Network.

PRICE: Was that at the same time? It was later.

Q: No, I think it was more like 1980 [*sic*: 1981].

PRICE: Yes, that was later.

Q: But it seems like—

PRICE: Yes. I think that came about—yes, I think it's influential because I had this in the back of my mind. I had these practices in the back of my mind, and the opportunity came up in Santa Monica to think about ways in which the new Westinghouse-acquired cable system could be more responsive with the objective of gaining benefits from the Los Angeles City Council. I suggested this Jewish Television Network as one way of doing this. Then I did a lot of the things that I wrote about in the book, and it was harrowing [laughs]. It was so consuming, and the

question was—it was very useful for the people involved, but it takes over your life. It was only by escaping to New York that I could terminate my relationship with this.

Q: OK, and did it ever get off the ground as a going concern?

PRICE: It did get off the ground, and I would say there's some channel now which inherited some of it, etc., etc. I would say it wasn't a brilliant, fabulous success, but it performed. It had a relationship to Allentown, Pennsylvania.

Q: Is that right?

PRICE: Who's the great donor at the [Allentown Art] Museum? Philip [Berman]—I'll try to remember the names. But his daughter, who had helped to finance it, and she ran it. She and her husband ran the Jewish Television Network for a while.

Q: Right, I know who you're talking about. OK. That's fascinating. You did escape to New York, and I want to ask about your shift across the country in a minute, but before that, and leaving aside the *Television of Abundance* for a moment, in 1972 you ran for public office in Los Angeles?

PRICE: That's true.

Q: It was for, it sounded like, a community college board?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: And what was the motivation and how did you do?

PRICE: Well, the community colleges in Los Angeles were run, I think, by the city or something like that. The state established a Board of Governors with seven people. So there were fourteen openings for runoffs. But this was a new board with no incumbents, and so 118 people ran for these jobs. I came in eighteenth out of 118. I got more votes than anybody past the first page of the ballot—so it was alphabetical, and everybody who got elected was an A or a B, more or less. So that's the way it worked.

But part of the reason I ran was that my friend Jerry Brown ran. I thought it would be really fun to either serve with him or if he could run, why couldn't I run—some democratic ideal like that. It also had to do with the quality of Los Angeles, which is a very open society and unlike New York, where everything was regulated by clubs and things like that. It was very hard to enter—back to the Wagner-Beame-Screvane [New York City mayoral ticket]. You could see the domination of the political tribes, as it were. In Los Angeles things were open, and so I thought I would just go for it. It was a very exciting experience.

Q: There's something *Felix Krull*–like about that, in a way too, isn't there? The idea of just becoming a politician on the lark.

PRICE: I wouldn't say it was a lark. I would say it was because a lot of the people, certainly all the younger people who were trying to make it in Los Angeles, each of them saw potential. Everybody was advancing in different ways. So this seemed to be one exciting way to open up. It was back to my idea of, if I'm in LA, I want to be of LA and part of LA. I learned a lot from this process. Later I became the Referee—the desegregation case [*Crawford v. Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles*, 1970]—I know you're not jumping ahead to that. But I think there's a relationship between running for office, trying to understand the politics in the demography of Los Angeles, and functioning as Referee.

Q: Well, maybe I will ask you about that right now because—I do want to circle back to the openness and social fluidity of LA and California in particular. But it was *Crawford v. The Los Angeles Board of Education* [*sic*: *Board of Education of the City of Los Angeles*] back in 1970. But you weren't involved until maybe 1976 or '7?

PRICE: Right, because that was the litigation of it. I came at what's called the remedies phase.

Q: So you were appointed by a judge.

PRICE: A judge.

Q: OK. What was your role as a Referee? What does that mean in practice?

PRICE: I think my role as Referee was basically to ensure, to the extent possible, that the parties worked towards an operational decree as opposed to just debating it forever. In other words, these are very complicated decisions. They can go on and on. They're very technical. They involved a lot of architectural aspects but also mechanical ones. It involves bussing, knowing all the routes, knowing the capacity, understanding what the obstacles, etc., etc. So my job was to shadow in a way the superintendent of schools, work with the legal parties, etc., and just do the best I could to help to move it along with very little authority or just the implied authority of the judge.

Q: You were remarking that in some ways it was connected to California's openness, that your motivation to be part of this and maybe even the desegregation cause itself had something to do with your interest in it?

PRICE: Well, going even back to what I said about Clark Kerr and the university. I think it was a time when these institutions felt that there was a positive role in building California. There were aspects of it, including deseg', which are related to that.

Q: Then the media clinic and of course the Indian services are in the same vein.

PRICE: Terrible to look back on all this sort of false sentimentalism, but it's good.

Q: Right. Well, the wired nation and its requiem—

PRICE: Yes, Ralph [Lee] Smith, who wrote the book called *The Wired Nation* [1972]. I think the Sloan Commission was an important bridge in some way. As I said, the idea of changing

television in a way that allowed the achievement of some of these goals that had been imprinted into "public interest, convenience, and necessity" in a different way from the traditional FCC [Federal Communications Commission] approach.

Q: Right.

PRICE: What we call a structural approach.

Q: Yes, I want to ask about that, because there was a paper you wrote in the late 1970s, or it was published then. It was oriented around the idea that the Fairness Doctrine was perhaps under threat, and that you made an argument that a content strategy of regulation ought to be replaced by a structural strategy, and elaborated some ideas around that concept.[8] But maybe you could say something, because it did animate lots of your writing over the—

PRICE: Maybe. I guess this question—you can even apply it to deseg' or something like that—which is, How do you structure things so that good results flow out of it? As opposed to behavioral or content-related interventions. So this could be a larger-scale idea of what structure should look like, how constructions could be more beneficial to produce the kind of consequences. So, this was a dream, which may or may not be valid, that having more channels is a structural approach. Then the question is how does that work, and to what extent do efforts after that—which re-monopolizes, which re-concentrates—interfere with those structural outcomes? So we're dealing with those questions today in some ways.

Q: Right. Reading that 1979 [*sic*: 1978] paper about—in one case you use the analogy of federal land ownership as a way in which regulatory authority could be imposed in this more structural way on, at least, broadcasting in the form of—and you were kind of speculating—things like the classification scheme and frequency allocation or even segmented licensing, you float as an idea. When you were writing on these topics, were you writing for academics or for policymakers or both?

PRICE: I would say both, but policymakers were an important constituency, or maybe this small band of public interest lawyers. I was on the margin of it, but people like Charlie Firestone, all the wonderful guys in Washington, DC. So maybe I was trying to help enrich those alternatives.

Q: Well, and earlier, in the mid-1970s, you were writing on satellites and the prospect of direct satellite broadcasting. Maybe you could say something about how you got involved in the topic. There was a committee of some sort, that seemed to have NSF [National Science Foundation] funding, that you contributed a paper to, that became a 1975 book that your essay was part of—the book being the *Direct Broadcasting from Satellites*.[9] You wrote a paper that was

[8] Monroe E. Price, "Taming Red Lion: The First Amendment and Structural Approaches to Media Regulation," *Federal Communications Law Journal* 31 (1978).
[9] Monroe E. Price, "First Amendment Constraints and the Direct Broadcast Satellite Controversy," in *Direct Broadcasting from Satellites: Policies and Problems* (Eagan, MN: West Publishing, 1975).

published as a journal article too—it's completely fascinating—about satellites' transnational transmission and the First Amendment context in the U.S.[10]

PRICE: This was an important stage for me. I was writing shorter, communications-related pieces that I thought tried to convey ideas that were different from law review articles, that were more like communication studies papers, although maybe not properly contextualized. But again, it was this whole process of technological change and how it relates to an existing legal format. This is still true today, the question of whether the existing rhetoric, the existing categories, are commodious enough to relate to new technologies and new geopolitical realities. I think that when I got to the international as opposed to the national, I think there was more interest as well in the geopolitical as well as the technological—and to see how the two of them intermesh.

Q: How did you get involved at the practical level in the project, or at least this committee's work, to tackle this topic?

PRICE: I'm not sure I can remember—maybe because of the Sloan Commission or the telecommunications task force [President's Task Force on Communications Policy]—probably so. I can't remember who was doing that NSF study.

Q: It was a fascinating period because, I guess, the satellite technology was on its way, people thought, and the geopolitics, particularly Cold War geopolitics, and also America versus the rest of the world in terms of the flow of information, seemed to be at the forefront. Your paper looked at the First Amendment in particular. You make this contrast between the First Amendment in principle and the First Amendment in practice, and that the First Amendment in practice actually is more commodious in that sense.

PRICE: I mean, it allows for degrees of changes. It's not absolute. I think that's been a long-time interest of mine. I'm not sure I gained the day on that kind of question. But yes, I've been interested in how exceptional the United States is with the First Amendment, or what other criteria govern the behavior of states and individuals, as opposed to the Constitutional First Amendment.

Q: In that case you cite Ithiel de Sola Pool a few times.

PRICE: Yes. He became very important to me.

Q: Yes. I was curious about how you first encountered his work and what his influence was.

PRICE: Maybe. I'm sorry I'm a little confused about how all these things fit together, and when. But part of it was the RAND Corporation—even during the Sloan period—and the telecommunications task force. I became—and then at UCLA—some friends with the RAND people and some of the RAND people were doing communications policy. I think that the task force had given RAND money to do some work on this. Obviously, you can see the tie between national security and the satellite policy. I did a RAND paper on community broadcasting in

[10] Monroe E. Price, "The First Amendment and Television Broadcasting by Satellite," *UCLA Law Review* 23 (1975).

Hawaii with Herbert Dordick and Wally [Walter] Baer, who became a writer in this area as well.[11] So that became a way that I got interested in these issues. I think the IBI, International Broadcasting [*sic*: Broadcast] Institute, came later, but I'm not positive about that.

Q: A little bit later. And what about Ithiel de Sola Pool and your exposure to his writings?

PRICE: So then I got invited to one of his salon sessions there. For some strange reason I dedicated my cable treatise to Ithiel de Sola Pool.[12] He was one of the few people who really was riding this train of trying to understand the implications of new technologies for altering the communications policy in the country. So, he played that, I think, important role in training people and in developing a vocabulary for it, etc. Technologies of freedom came later as an idea, I think.

Q: It makes sense. I was thinking about Herbert Schiller and Dallas Smythe, in the context of your satellite work, a few years later when there was this debate at UNESCO [United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization] over the free flow of information on the one side, and communication sovereignty, as Smythe sometimes termed it, on the other. A conflict that eventually made its way to [the] Annenberg [School for Communication] and the *Journal of Communication*. Were you involved in any of those debates?

PRICE: Not just now, but I've been trying to sort that out in my mind. I certainly was involved a bit with Herb Schiller. I don't think I was deeply engaged in the UNESCO debate.

Q: Right, the UNESCO free flow of information.

PRICE: I was involved in a little bit or in some ways, but I certainly feel that I've been more involved more recently, in a way, than I was then.

Q: Over the decade when you were at UCLA, before you left for [Benjamin N.] Cardozo [School of Law, Yeshiva University], did you attend conferences that were communication-related, that is to say, like any of the ICA [International Communication Association]?

PRICE: I think I may have gone to one ICA, but it wasn't a regular thing that I did. I'm trying to understand why I wasn't more involved in MacBride—or was I? That's another thing.

Q: Right.

PRICE: That irks me, that I can't figure that out. As it turned out one of my classmates, who was an owner of *The Wall Street Journal*, James [H.] Ottaway [Jr.]—very nice guy—was partly responsible for the drive that got us out of UNESCO. I hate to admit it, but it was true. He helped found the World Press Freedom Committee, and he funded the individuals at the World Press Freedom Committee who raised the flag that the MacBride Report [*Many Voices, One*

---

[11] Herbert S. Dordick and Monroe E. Price, "Community Channels: A Pervasive Experiment in Waianae" (unpublished working paper, RAND Corporation, March 1970).

[12] Daniel L. Brenner, Michael I. Meyerson, and Monroe E. Price, *Cable Television and Other Nonbroadcast Video: Law and Policy* (New York: Clark Boardman, 1986).

World, 1980] was antagonistic to American interests, etc. That ultimately led to the United States withdrawing from UNESCO.

Q: Wow.

PRICE: So, not everybody was perfect.

Q: No. That's fine. Well, I'm thinking of your identity at the time, as a scholar. Were you identifying mostly as a legal scholar first?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: OK. That identity was maintained through to your decision to take up the deanship?

PRICE: I think another way this arose was in my first sabbatical, which must have been around 1972. I went to Paris, partly because my wife, Aimée Brown Price, was finishing her dissertation on Pierre Puvis de Chavannes, a French painter. So my job was to take care of the kids and try to do some research. So, because I was in Paris I did research on international communications, and I spent a lot of time with French broadcasting, and with the internationalization within Europe of broadcasting and broadcasting policy.

I went to meetings there as a scholar, and legal scholar. I think that also helped turn me from being America-centric to understanding European perspectives on a lot of these questions on how to conceptualize the world. So, it was much more about public service broadcasting, and in a much more large-scale way of the architecture of media systems. As opposed to the architecture that I had been taught at the Yale Law School, by Telford Taylor, of all these local radio stations, and false localism, and things like that. So I think that period in 1972–73 was very important in terms of shifting my own scholarly interest and my colleagueship.

Q: It struck me, in reading the work from the mid-1970s, that you were very sensitive to the imbalance in flow of information from the United States to the rest of the world, including Europe, and what Smythe or Schiller, I should say, would call cultural imperialism.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: And maybe some of that sensitivity came—

PRICE: Right. But I didn't get, somehow—I certainly wasn't politically engaged as—and I didn't have the kind of political zest that Schiller and Smythe had. Why, is a different question.

Q: The First Amendment exceptionalism of the United States was put in relief, I'm sure, by the sabbatical in Paris.

PRICE: Exactly. So those were key events that, the President's telecommunications task force, the Sloan Commission, my sabbatical in Paris. These were all key aspects of this.

Q: You were named the dean of a very young law school in 1982, and made a big career change—and a large geographic change too—joining Cardozo [School of Law] as its dean, which, if I'm not wrong, had only graduated its first class in 1979.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: You had already had experience running, or helping to run, a pair of institutes, some commissions, but you hadn't had any comparable deanship role at UCLA or anything like that. So, what were the attractions of the post and how did you go about making the choice to move across the country?

PRICE: It's complicated—may even have been erroneous, by the way. But there were a number of things that were appealing. One was, oddly—this is a weird way to think of it. I had an extraordinary life in Los Angeles, and I thought I would never move, and this would be my entire life. That seemed slightly intolerable. So I tried to think, Where would I ever move and under what circumstances? And this seemed a pretty good way to come back to New York—as a break. I think we thought that it would be better for my kids to live in New York than in Los Angeles. I think Aimée thought, from an art historical perspective, it was better to be in New York than LA. My parents were in New York. So there were a variety of factors. There wasn't any great single factor involved.

Q: Was the idea of having a more or less blank canvas with the school?

PRICE: It was somewhat appealing. Yes.

Q: Once you did move, and take up the position, in addition to just trying to increase the school's stature, did you have particular emphases, specialties that you wanted to encourage?

PRICE: Some of this in entertainment law, some communications law, not Indian law. The Innocence Project started when I was the dean, developing clinical legal education. Those kinds of things, etc.

Q: And with the communication law in particular—I know what became the Howard Squadron Program in Law, Media and Society was a big component, and is, at Cardozo. But did you make the choice to emphasize media law, for example, because, again, it was an adaptation to the place it was?

PRICE: It was good for me and it was also important in the environment.

Q: OK. Right. Because it was New York City—

PRICE: Because it was New York City.

Q: —and had this context.

PRICE: Whether I was able to do as much there, as I could do at UCLA, is another question, but there it was. It was good.

Q: What was the experience like taking on such a large role in 1982, as the dean, day-to-day? Did you still manage to keep up writing and teaching?

PRICE: I tried to do some writing and I wrote a book about free expression and AIDS, oddly enough.[13] I don't know if you saw that book. But it also was oddly about free expression and information, in some ways.

Q: Yes. I wanted to ask you about that. It was published a little bit later in the decade, but you wrote this while you were dean, of course, until 1991. So, that was *Shattered Mirrors*, and I will ask you about it now, because it is such a different book than the other writing you had done up to that point. It was, in a way, a kind of cultural history and prognostication as well, in a broad scale, but though oriented around AIDS.

PRICE: But it's really related because it was looking at AIDS as an information problem—a cultural problem—which is, how does the government get information to individuals? How does information alter behavior? What kind of intervention can be justified or looks restrictive in terms of what can be said or must be said, and where it should be said? So that's what I saw the book as trying to accomplish, thinking about those kinds of questions.

Q: You had these three cultural mirrors, you called them, and that first long section is about popular media representations, in a way, and their link to freedom of expression—?

PRICE: You've read it much more recently than I have, but yes [laughs]. But you can see how it's nicely related to work here, although I'm not sure it ever found its market—not market in a financial way. But I'm not sure it found its audience. It may have been too late or too early, I can't remember exactly which. But it is related to a lot of health communications and Annenberg communications-like questions. So I didn't see it as out of context.

Q: Right, although it was—since it was well before Annenberg—

PRICE: Yes. No, I mean out of my previous—it was a different style of writing, I would say.

Q: Yes.

PRICE: It was also, in a way, related to the arts because it's more about background imagery.

Q: There's close reading of films and magazine articles, and it's a different kind of analysis than anything you had done. In the mid-1980s you had published a more or less traditional, only in the sense that it was a treatise, on law, but on video—

PRICE: On cable—

[13] Monroe E. Price, *Shattered Mirrors: Our Search for Identity and Community in the AIDS Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

Q: —cable law.[14]

PRICE: Yes.

Q: —and that had the character of a more typical legal scholar's publication.

PRICE: Right.

Q: So this project, how did it come about? The AIDS one, I mean, the *Shattered Mirrors*?

PRICE: That was totally my invention. I wanted to write something. I guess I was moved to write—I wanted to think about this crisis, or perceived-to-be national crisis. I was definitely interested in the question of government's role in regulating imagery. I later thought of this when asked, What am I interested in? This is like a First Amendment question, it's the regulation of imagery—that imagery is regulated in some ways by the FCC, in some ways in art law, in intellectual property. But this issue was an important one in terms of how images in society affected rates of AIDS and things like that.

Q: Right and the book, since it didn't have the template of being a kind of typical legal scholar's publication, how was it received in the world of media law, or the world of communications?

PRICE: I don't think it was received in the world of media. I'm not sure how it was received. It was received well by me. It had an interesting publishing history. Did Harvard publish it?

Q: Harvard University Press did.

PRICE: Harvard Press published it. Before that it was going to be published by Basic Books, and it had been completely edited, and then my editor quit—not because of the book—he retired or something. Saul Bellow's son [Adam Bellow] became my new editor. He's now a quite famous editor. But he didn't understand what I was trying to do, and he wanted me to do it differently. And so I moved to Harvard as a result of that. But, I mean, if I had stuck with him maybe it would have been a bigger—what was his name? Do you know? He's a quite famous editor.

Q: Right, I do know—Saul Bellow's son, yes. So, that in a way, being published in 1989, was a watershed in part because the Berlin Wall fell that year, and I only say that because the post-Soviet world came along a couple of years later, and your own work, both scholarship and institution-building, changed, and in the direction of post-socialist work.

PRICE: Yes. Right.

Q: And you will talk about that more next time, but I did want to, before we wrap up, go back to your Cardozo media law-building there. How did the emphasis on media and communication law come about? Did you do fundraising for it? Was this a conscious strategy?

[14] Daniel L. Brenner, Michael I. Meyerson, and Monroe E. Price, *Cable Television and Other Nonbroadcast Video: Law and Policy* (New York: Clark Boardman, 1986).

PRICE: Yes. Well, again, it was a general melding of my interest and opportunities. I worked a lot with Howard Squadron, who was the Squadron of the Howard Squadron—actually, Rupert Murdoch was involved, because Howard Squadron was Rupert Murdoch's lawyer. He had helped on the citizenship question when Rupert was acquiring stations—one issue was whether he was violating the citizenship [rule]. And Howard Squadron, who was a wonderful media lawyer, and a wonderful lawyer, had Rupert as a client. So Rupert was somewhat indebted to Howard Squadron in the New York way. We had a dinner to establish this Squadron Program and Rupert Murdoch helped to get people to buy tables and stuff like that. And the program was named after Howard Squadron.

Q: Right. OK, and what did it consist of, in a practical way?

PRICE: We had some grants. It never became the real theater of my interest in media law. But it did student-related things, like it developed internships. It still does provide summer fellowships for students who are interested in media law to experiment with opportunities. It did some filings at the FCC—those kinds of things.

Q: So when you turned to write *Shattered Mirrors*, I wondered if your decision to write a book that was broader in its scope and more ambitious in its range—and certainly not a typical legal scholarship treatment—if that represented a kind of restlessness with media law?

PRICE: No. It represented a couple things. One was I then, and still, want to find ways of writing in a more human voice. My memoir is like that.[15] *Shattered Mirrors* is like that. Now I'm experimenting with ways about writing about art that I collect, that is more human. So I would say it was my effort to find that—and as also a condition of being dean—and wanting to write five hundred word segments. This was the kind of book that I could develop ideas for and then write when I was off the phone.

Q: Did the life of the deanship strike you as rewarding one? I mean, you decided a couple of years after that to move on.

PRICE: It was generally rewarding. I liked building the institution, and I liked engulfing myself in New York, in some elements of New York, and working with the bar association—things that law school deans did, in some ways. None of which were tied very much to communications policy. So the deanship was interesting in a way of creating, I would say, which I find here as well. That one thing I like is working with, helping careers of, individual students, and showing them things that they otherwise didn't think they could do. I did some of that at UCLA, and I did see some of it at Cardozo. That's the part I like, maybe the most.

Q: That's an appropriate place to wrap up this session. I think for the fourth session we'll pick up with the institution-building you did post-Cardozo, or at least post-deanship, I should say, in the post-socialist context next time. But thank you so much.

---

[15] Monroe E. Price, *Objects of Remembrance: A Memoir of American Opportunities and Viennese Dreams* (New York: Central European University Press, 2009).

PRICE: OK. Good.

END OF SESSION THREE

Transcript of Interview conducted May 17, 2018, with MONROE E. PRICE (session four)

Philadelphia, PA

Interviewed by Jefferson Pooley

Q: This is session four of an oral history interview of Monroe Price conducted by Jefferson Pooley at the Annenberg School in Philadelphia. The interview is part of the Oral History Project of the Annenberg School for Communication Library Archives, and the date is May 17, 2018.

Thanks for joining me, Monroe. We ended the last session talking about your book *Shattered Mirrors*, published in 1989.[16] That already was a departure, in a way, from legal scholarship. So two years later, it was 1991, you ended your term as the dean of the [Benjamin N.] Cardozo Law School [Yeshiva University]. Your career in the 25 years since then hadn't looked the same as it had before. The biggest change—at least it seemed to me—is that you turned your attention to international themes. Of course this was a period when the Berlin Wall fell and the Soviet Union dissolved. So I guess I just was curious if you could talk about that period from 1989 to the early 1990s, as it affected your career.

PRICE: Well, as I ended my deanship the question was, What would I focus on? What would I be interested in? At that time I did a kind of victory lap to Hong Kong. We had set up a number of summer schools at Cardozo, and I visited them in Amsterdam, Moscow, China, etc., and that helped launch me into thinking about issues more on an international sphere. I certainly thought about it before, but this intensified it. I think the combination of the development of information technology and the change—geopolitical considerations—opened up this tremendously interesting space.

I think one of the first things I remember had to do with efforts by USAID [United States Agency for International Development] or USIA [United States Information Agency], even at that time, to bring people from Central Europe to the United States. In a sense this helped develop their appetite and their skills in "democracy building." Democracy building became the flavor of the day.

A group came from Hungary—and Hungary was an interest of mine. So I spent some time with Hungarian dissidents, now politically interested, and hosted them in New York. That was one of

[16] Monroe E. Price, *Shattered Mirrors: Our Search for Identity and Community in the AIDS Era* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989).

the first things, and that got me also interested in USAID. USAID made available—sort of sprinkled and fertilized the ground for thinking about the relationship between U.S. institutions and transitional institutions.

Q: When was the Hungarian gathering? Was that around 1991 or '2?

PRICE: Yes it was, exactly. For example, even now I'll be visiting András Sajó, who's just retired from the European Court of Human Rights. He was on one of these trips. He was helping to develop corporate law in Hungary, and spending time at Cardozo studying it. He's now gone on to very distinguished grounds, as have other people from that period.

Q: So you were already getting linked up with folks in the post-socialist Central Europe arena, but how did you get involved in Russia itself? Was it through the Carter Center's Commission on Media Law and Policy [*sic*: Commission on Radio and Television Policy]?

PRICE: I had had some summer schools in Russia, in which I developed contacts with Russia—developed ways of thinking about the relationship between law—even in the Soviet Union—and law in the United States. But the Carter Commission was a real breakthrough. It was a very bizarre effort by Jimmy Carter and [Mikhail] Gorbachev—I guess, originally—to create an environment in which executives and programmers from Russia—or the Soviet Union, as it then was—could meet with counterparts in the U.S. and have a dialogue about this stuff. It was in connection with Ted Turner and CNN [Cable News Network], which was flowering.

It was an intriguing fiction of a moment to have this kind of commission that was supposedly ten Americans and ten Russians and post-Soviet guys. I was, in a sense, brought in by the Markle Foundation, which helped to fund a lot of this. It was thrilling for me to witness this effort that was fictively cross-cultural. It was very hard to understand what relationship there would be between media practices in the United States and media practices in all these developing institutions. That became a really interesting theme all the way through, which is, How mimetic was it? Was the idea to create equivalents of *Good Morning America* or other things and transpose those to other broadcasting environments? But that was a great thing, and it met every year in alternative years in Russia and in Atlanta, Georgia [laughs].

Q: You mentioned that the Markle Foundation both helped support that effort and that supported your particular involvement. How far back did that Markle Foundation—?

PRICE: I think it went pretty far back into the early '80s. Edith Bjornson was the program officer there, and Lloyd Morrissett was kind of the director of the effort. He stood for broadcast reform, broadcast policy change in the United States, and supported it. He supported some efforts even at UCLA [University of California, Los Angeles] when the UCLA media law program was dealing with the FCC [Federal Communications Commission], etc.—that kind of thing.

Q: The Carter [Center] Commission on Radio and Television Policy—you mentioned that it met every year in alternating locations. Did your previous work on commissions like the Sloan [Commission on Cable Communications] back in 1971 resemble this at all?

PRICE: They helped, but they couldn't have the same outcome. It wasn't a commission that was going to say, This is what should happen to broadcast television either in Russia or in the United States. By the way, it led to my developing one of my favorite things, which was the *Post-Soviet Media Law and Policy Newsletter*. That was a vehicle designed to inform me and also maybe inform other members of this commission about what was actually happening.

It used facilities like the BBC [British Broadcasting Corporation] effort to gather news about broadcasting from around the world—used in a certain sense. It was an aggregator, as it were. It was a primitive aggregator of information. So I and Peter Yu, who was my assistant, helped develop this newsletter, which I think for a while served as a kind of warehouse of information that people used.

Q: Can you say more about how it emerged from the commission? So you were involved in 1991—or 1990 even—when it got established, but the newsletter was started in 1993. Was there a relationship forged along the way?

PRICE: I think it had to do with my sense that no one knew what the hell they were talking about. In other words, there were these efforts to discuss relationships. There was also efforts like—Internews was just being founded at the time, IREX [International Research & Exchanges Board] was getting started—as efforts to help shape media in these then-developing countries, as it were. I think there was not enough of a factual basis of what was happening on the ground. So the effort was to try to remedy that to some extent.

Q: What about the actual particulars of the newsletter's launch? Was it something that was helped by Markle itself? Did the idea get hatched at one of these commission meetings?

PRICE: I don't think so. I think it was just a clumsy way, which had, really, in my view, some wonderful output—of providing an information base for people who wanted information. Now, not everybody wanted—most people thought they knew what they were doing, and they had a vision for what the media should become, and they had a [vision] of what the dynamics were. So it was not necessary necessarily for them to get more information about it.

But at least it was my view that it would be good to try to track forms of censorship, or follow the making of media laws in Russia. This ended up in a volume. We basically took issues of the *Post-Soviet Media Law and Policy Newsletter* and created a book, which was in a certain sense an anthology of this—was with Peter Yu and Andrei Richter.[17]

Q: Maybe you can say something about your meeting Andrei Richter in particular. I presume it was through the commission that you got to know him. And what your early collaboration was.

PRICE: Before that, I remember, one of the great things was what was going to happen to the fabulous state television entity. So you had Russia's Channel One, which had thousands—tens of thousands—of employees, and Channel Two and Channel Three. One became, in a certain

[17] Monroe E. Price, Andrei G. Richter, and Peter K. Yu, eds., *Russian Media Law and Policy in the Yeltsin Decade: Essays and Documents* (Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands: Kluwer Law International, 2002).

sense, [Boris] Yeltsin's channel. One—there was an independent entrepreneur, who I'll never forget meeting one day at a commission meeting in St. Petersburg, who said—we were talking about how to get better television on Russian television—he said, I want *Miami Vice*. What I want is material that will prod the Russian people, and make them more entrepreneurial and individualistic. I don't want soap operas. Soap operas is what we've had, they're designed to put people to sleep, to make people accommodate. So my goal in independent television is to provoke, and *Miami Vice* is the exactly right vehicle for doing this.

Andrei Richter was a young associate of the commission, of Ellen Mickiewicz, who was the American anchor of the commission. He and I became fast friends and remain so. He helped to found a center on media law and policy [Media Law and Policy Institute] at Moscow State University, and then has worked for the Organization of Security and Co-operation in Europe [OSCE], [as] the Representative on Freedom [of] the Media. We had stayed in very close touch, and I think the Moscow center was an example of a kind of center-mania on my part, which was—especially after Oxford [Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy]—to create a kind of set of these centers, in a variety of contexts, that would interact and would be a network, as it were.

Q: Well, I definitely want to return back to that idea of a network of centers and Oxford and the rest. Before that, I guess, if I could even go back and ask a question that might be unfair in a way. But it seems, just reading through your published work in the 1990s and 2000s, that you shifted away from a narrowly legal form of scholarship, even though you already had been pretty expansive, and that you also moved from the United States primarily, though you'd done some work outside the United States, to a much more international focus. I guess my question is, that shift to comparative media law and policy, was that conscious? Was it something you decided to shift into, or was it more the result of circumstances, like being asked to join this commission and meeting Andrei and the rest?

PRICE: Well, I think it was always there, in the sense that—ever since I'd gotten involved early on with the International Broadcasting Institute, and recognized that there were not enough scholars in the United States who were thinking in a non-exceptional state. That is, most people thought the United States had it all. This was the story of broadcasting and the story of television and radio—maybe there was the BBC, but that's it, basically. There was a need—there was an opportunity—to think more creatively about it. I think the book that I did on television in the public sphere and national identity was earlier.[18] I can't remember when.

Q: It was in 1996. So it was in this period.

PRICE: It was in this period. So, I think a lot of it was influenced by my year at Oxford. Some of it had been influenced by my sabbatical in Paris in '72, and basically getting a sense of French television and Dutch television at that time. So I would say the basis with this was even in '72, basically.

[18] Monroe E. Price, *Television, the Public Sphere, and National Identity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

Q: OK, good. You mentioned, before, that there was this kind of USAID, but much wider than that, interest in democracy promotion. Media assistance was sort of a subset of it, you could say, and that you got involved in it through the [Carter] Commission, but also in a number of other projects over the next decade, many of them in transitional countries, like the post-socialist states of Central Europe. I was curious about what—if you recall a project that stood out in that period that was funded by USAID or another—?

PRICE: Well, there was the book *Democratizing the Media, Democratizing the State* [*Media Reform: Democratizing the Media, Democratizing the State*] with Stefaan [G. Verhulst] and Beata [Rozumilowicz].[19] So that was an effort to collect essays that had something to do with the relationship between media change and changing the state. So you basically had this idea of the '90s—certainly in the early '90s more on Hungary, Poland, etc., then later on the post-Soviet period. So this became a kind of fertile ground for seeing the development of the institutions that thought about these kinds of questions.

There were a lot of, as I recall, lonely visits to Montenegrin villages or Polish towns or Ukraine, etc. There was a kind of repetitive incantation, and, it seemed to me, the duty of the local agents were to round up people to come and hear this recitation, as it were, as to what should happen—how to have recognition of human rights and more democratic media.

Q: Yes. There is this wonderful essay from 2009 you wrote, that I think it's called "Media Transitions in the Rear-View Mirror."[20] But you're recounting some of that experience in the 1990s and asking whether the, as you put it, industry of democracy promotion and the media assistance subdivision of that actually made a difference. You talk about market interventions and local conditions perhaps being more important than any expert-driven advice that was supplied along the way.

I was really curious about the fact that you were doing, during this stretch of time and into the period in the 2000s, on-the-ground work, at least as parts of grants, to train journalists or to consult on media law and policy in these places. At the same time you were—you had a kind of ability to detach and think about, and comment upon, the process from afar with almost ironic and maybe later jaundiced attitudes. I don't know if that's fair or not. But I'm just curious about that double role of actually partaking as a practitioner and commenting on it from above.

PRICE: It's really interesting. I think you've noticed something—I think I've noticed, but maybe not sufficiently and it continues to this day, I think. It's great to be involved. I think to be involved one has to be partly a believer. But I think this has been true generally, which is both being a believer and being slightly cynical about being a believer. I think these are important qualities, and it's very hard to find the right mix of those qualities. I was just writing an essay for the Center for International Media Assistance, which is coming out in a book, and I think that also captured this. Which was, How can you articulate these deeds in a way that helps them get

---

[19] Monroe E. Price, Beata Rozumilowicz, and Stefaan G. Verhulst, eds., *Media Reform: Democratizing the Media, Democratizing the State* (New York: Routledge, 2001).

[20] Monroe E. Price, "Media Transitions in the Rear-View Mirror: Some Reflections," *International Journal of Politics, Culture, and Society* 22, no. 4 (2009): 485–96, http://repository.upenn.edu/asc_papers/150.

support from their institutions—Congress, for example—and at the same time maintain some level of integrity and critical observation?

Q: Yes. Among other things, it involves code-switching to some extent, depending on the audience you're writing for, or speaking to, probably. I just was thinking of—there's a great section in that 1990—no, I think it was the 2002 book—about metaphor.[21] You call it, I think, tropes of restructuring, the way that little pieces of language would latch on and be the locus for workshops and conferences and funding, and so on—on the one hand. So you're kind of reflecting on the power of language to shape this policy-intellectual mix. On the other hand you're doing it—you're actually part of it. You are on the ground writing the grants and helping implement the policies.

PRICE: Well, thank you. That's quite interesting. I like it. Then the question is, Is there some overarching synthetic theory that helps to bring these two things together? So I think it's at least these three levels. One is actually engaging, and doing so not cynically, but recognizing that—even though one may be questioning it, there's some value in the process, in the education, in the exposure, in the theorizing. Yes.

Q: Yes, that makes sense, and it made me—

PRICE: By the way. Hungary, all these places, now become larger texts for this process, because you have enthusiasm and then you have cynicism, then you have aversion, as it were, and a kind of bleak—sometimes bleak—outcome. It's hard to tell where we are now in Poland and Hungary and elsewhere—and in the Soviet Union, in Russia.

Q: Right, especially in relationship to kind of Western expertise—

PRICE: I've wanted to have a conference called What Did It All Mean?—what did that decade mean in post-Soviet environment? Can one look backwards from this point? Also the regular, the kind of turn towards, prohibition of these NGOs [non-governmental organizations] or regulation of them. As if governments looking back on these fifteen years have said, We're not sure that we like the activity of these U.S.-engineered NGOs.

Q: That just reminds me of that book you already mentioned a little bit, the one that was called *Media Reform and Democratizing Media.* It was a collection called *Forging Peace*.

PRICE: It's a different one.

Q: I'm sorry. Yes—I'm confusing that. It was a different collection—excuse me—called *Media Reform*—I had it correct the first time. In that book you do, with your co-editors, seem to say that there's no strong link that can be established between establishing Western-style media

[21] Monroe E. Price, *Media and Sovereignty: The Global Information Revolution and Its Challenge to State Power* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002), chap. 3.

with relatively open policy and norms, in the absence of established law and other changes—that the connection between media reform and democratization wasn't clear in every case.

PRICE: Yes. Some of this came from an early thing that I was fortunate to do, which was *The Enabling Environment for Free and Independent Media*.[22] Which tried to suggest—that was more of the Kool-Aid, it was less critical but more inclusive—to say how complicated the institutional environment is that leads to freedom of media. It's something I'm thinking about.

Also [C. Edwin] Ed Baker wrote most clearly about this question, which is, What's the relationship between a theory of democracy and a theory of the media? One could turn that and say, Particular governmental forms are a function of what media systems are available—so the interplay between the capacity, if there is such, to develop media and the form of government is still yet to be explored.

Q: Perhaps the initial NGO/USAID notion that there would be a straightforward connection turned out not to be?

PRICE: Well, it's hard to say—I mean, this goes to China as well or to—I think that's the other rhythm, which goes from the early post-Soviet days, to transitions, to then late '90s, and then the shift from Europe to the Middle East—Afghanistan, etc.—as a further theater for the development of these ideas.

Q: I really do want to follow up about Iraq in particular, maybe in our next session.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: Going back in time a little bit, to the early 1990s, I don't know if you taught a course at Yale at the time. But you published in the *Yale Law Review* [*sic*: *Journal*] this article on "The Market for Loyalties."[23] It was 1994 and that article, I think, was an important one. But it also, it seems to me, that market for loyalties idea, as you evolved it over the decades, was the spine in some ways of the 1996 book on the public sphere [*Television, the Public Sphere, and National Identity*], the 2002 book on *Media and Sovereignty*, and even, in some ways, the 2015 book that came out recently [*Free Expression, Globalism, and the New Strategic Communication*].[24] I just wondered if you could say how you came to develop this idea of a market for loyalties, and even the context at the time at *Yale Law Review* [*sic*: *Journal*]. You mentioned at one point a student, Gary Greenstein, who might have helped out a little bit.

PRICE: Yes. He was—you know, the law journals are student-edited. It's one of the great, extraordinary distinctions between law as a discipline and the social sciences, is that these

---

[22] Monroe E. Price and Peter Krug, *The Enabling Environment for Free and Independent Media: Contribution to Transparent and Accountable Governance* (Washington, DA: US Agency for International Development, Office of Democracy and Governance, 2002), http://www.usaid.gov/democracy/pdfs/pnacm006.pdf.

[23] Monroe E. Price, "The Market for Loyalties: Electronic Media and the Global Competition for Allegiances," *Yale Law Journal* 104, no. 3 (1994): 667–705.

[24] Monroe E. Price, *Free Expression, Globalism, and the New Strategic Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

young students helped to shape the articles of the faculty, and the Yale Law [School] students certainly see themselves as equals or superiors [laughs] in this process. So I'm glad you acknowledged him. He was very helpful in the shaping of this article. It, in some ways, goes back to propaganda theory, to work that you've been engaged in, etc., which is how to think about both the illusion of the function of media in society and the forces that helped to shape it and link it.

I think there, I was very much affected by the Dutch system, which I learned about in the early—in the '70s, basically. The idea that a media system—however it looks, however the kind of shell of democratization exists—exists, in a way, because of agreements between power centers in the society. The question was how to capture that in a phrase, and a way of thinking about—not looking at it under the umbrella of free expression, but more under the umbrella of how forces think about and alter media and society. The market for loyalties came out of that idea, in some ways.

Q: Could you say what you mean by the notion of market for loyalties?

PRICE: As I say, I think a lot of this did link to my sabbatical in '72 when I was in Paris and learning about the British system, learning about the German system, and seeing the German system being the product of post–World War II compromises—the relationship between the German states and the federal government—about some different agenda than free expression, autonomy, individualism.

So I was trying to think of how that applied in the United States. Was there a market for loyalties here? It seemed clear to me that this was not a goofy idea in thinking about European media systems—certainly wasn't strange thinking about totalitarian systems. The question was, Could one introduce this in thinking about the American system as well?

Q: Then, in the 1994 article, and the book that follows—this book we were already referring to, *Television, the Public Sphere, and National Identity*, in 1996—it's applied not just to the United States but around the world. It's sort of made more interesting because of rapid geopolitical change, on the one hand, and technological change. That book is so interesting because you set up a, I don't know, like a period in which—from maybe the teens, in the twentieth century, to the late '60s—in which there was a more straightforward relationship between the state and the media, broadly speaking, not just the United States. And that with satellites and cable that this relationship or the coupling kind of frayed, and that it was continuing to fray thanks to developments in geopolitics and technology.

PRICE: Right. No, I think this was also related to my work on the President's Commission on Telecommunications Policy [*sic*: President's Task Force on Communications Policy] and the development of satellites. I think I was amazed at seeing this kind of threat to sovereign-based markets for loyalties. It brought into high relief how these markets function and how they could be affected. And then, something that's interesting to me is resilience—that is to say, how do these arrangements reassert themselves—or not, as the case may be.

So satellites presented a great case study in thinking about existing markets for loyalties and how they could be broken and torn asunder. Certainly the post-Soviet period was like this as well. So, looking at Russia, from ’91 to the present time, you can see this whole process of existing markets for loyalties; existing cartels; breakup of those cartels; reassertion of them; and new forms of dominance. I’m still puzzled and interested in how the internet—can you talk about this in an internet age as opposed to satellite age, etc.?

Q: I don’t know if this is a fair reading, but it seemed to be that you came to believe that states were more resilient and capable of adaptation to these shifts in the markets for loyalty over time—from the ’96 book, in which you seemed to be a little bit doubtful that states could adapt well, to more a sense that states were capable of being resilient.

PRICE: Some states can and some states can’t, and how that process takes place—so China and Singapore are one end of this. Russia is toward that end, but doing it in a very different way. Then some states—I sometimes think the things that we call failed states are states that have failed to figure out how to be resilient in this way.

Q: Right. OK, that makes sense. That’s one way of defining a failed state.

PRICE: It’s one way. It’s not perfect—

Q: So you’ve been writing about freedom of expression and freedom of speech throughout your career, and including in this period. It seemed that maybe it does touch on your 1972 sabbatical year, but that I detect a kind of, almost an irritation with the free speech, freedom of expression, free press absolutism as a kind of universalist idea. That continues all the way up through your writing now, both referring to the U.S. context of regulating cable or the international context of exporting freedom of expression and free speech doctrine. Is that fair to say?

PRICE: I think it’s fair. It’s definitely fair to say. I just edited this book called *Speech and Society in Turbulent Times* with Nicole Stremlau.[25] Nicole has been a big influence on this as well, as a terrific person who tries to think about different conceptions of the role of speech in society. This goes to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [1948], which is slightly critiqued in this book by an Iraqi scholar, who sees the Universal Declaration as a kind of struggle between a Christian idea, and a Islamic idea, of the role of speech and society, looking at Charles Malik, who had been a deputy to Eleanor Roosevelt. So this is a kind of massive task to think, Are there legitimate alternative ways of thinking about the role of speech and society, and do those alternative roles have the dignity of being alternatives in some way?

There are two different questions here, one is: I’m not, I don’t want to, I’m not ready for a lecture on free expression. The question is, Is freedom of expression—to put it in the scholarly

[25] Monroe E. Price and Nicole Stremlau, eds., *Speech and Society in Turbulent Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

framework—is freedom of expression, as an idea, a way of organizing or affecting markets for loyalties? That was the way I dealt with it.

So, for example, to what extent was exporting the idea of freedom of expression, a way of questioning the existing cartel in the foreign environment and allowing American or other Western entities to enter? So freedom of expression plays this role not as an ideal but as an instrument, in some ways. Then the question is, How does it function at home—does it have this instrumental aspect of it?

Q: It might with industry co-optation and good-faith belief.

PRICE: Different interpretations. One of my favorite ideas was whether the First Amendment is a common market, that is to say, it was designed to facilitate the flow of ideas within the United States, but is not a market, is not necessarily. This goes back to the Russian intervention in politics, the idea that it's a free flow across borders is still in question.

Q: It reminds me of that debate in the late '70s around free flow of information and cultural sovereignty and UNESCO.

PRICE: Right, yes, the UNESCO declaration. All these are related to different kinds of markets—the current debate is whether you can be a country if your borders aren't defended from people coming in. Can you be a country without borders that protects ideas from coming in? So this is an element of—interesting to trace in history of the United States.

Q: You follow that thread, that question all the way through to the present, it seems to me. I was just going to ask about, to return back to the mid-1990s. You already mentioned the center-mania, but it seems like, if there was such a thing, that it got underway in the mid-1990s when you co-founded, anyway, the Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy at Oxford. It was 1996, and I think you co-founded it with Stefaan Verhulst.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: Can you tell me how that came about and what was the backstory to the center?

PRICE: Well, I think it started with, certainly in the '70s in my sabbatical I had. But then in '91, after I stepped down as [Cardozo] dean I had a sabbatical at Oxford, and I thought about this whole process. Then, at the end of that year, I think I gave a talk in which I suggested a kind of approach to scholarship and action which would be like the Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy. Then I started in '96, '97, and with a grant from the Markle Foundation, actually, and hired Stefaan Verhulst as co-director. He's a wonderful guy, and we had a wonderful partnership in trying to develop this Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy. One of the things we did was conceptualize a network of centers that would work together—some of that has come to pass. There are a lot of centers that have come to pass without that.

Q: Did that idea for this network of centers come about early on in the formation of the Oxford program?

PRICE: It was a goal. It was partly unrealized. But we certainly tried to do it in Hungary, in Russia, in a variety of other places, and we still—the tick of doing these centers still exists. As a result of the Moot Court [Monroe E. Price Media Law Moot Court Competition, University of Oxford] there's a center in India called the Centre for Communication Governance that came about through this. Whatever. Yes.

Q: Right. OK.

PRICE: We'll put it in different grant applications as ways of thinking and developing talent.

Q: Yes, it is a kind of scholarly vehicle.

PRICE: Hungary is another place where it still exists. It's now called the Center for Media, Data and Society [Central European University].

Q: That's right. Well, I am curious about that, and it didn't get founded for a few years after this one, I guess. So, back in Oxford, were you spending time in Oxford for much of the year? Where were you located as this got underway? It seems like in this period of '96, '97, '98 you were all over the place. You were in Australia for a semester, if I'm not mistaken. You were at the [Freedom Forum] Media Studies Center in New York City. You were at Princeton, at the Institute for Advanced Study for a year, soon after that. You were at Cornell, at least for a bit, Yale as well.

PRICE: It was fun.

Q: How did you manage, just as a physical human being, to be in all these places at once?

PRICE: I'm not sure. I probably wasn't. It's like the Elihu Katz joke about Isaiah Berlin. God is everywhere. Isaiah Berlin's everywhere but Oxford, where he was supposed to be. I remember meeting the new chancellor at Central European University, who expected me to be there. I'm hardly ever there, but I'd been on the phone, I'd worked with them a lot in trying to develop their center—and it was great, it was good.

Q: So with the Oxford center or the Oxford program, when you got it started there, was the intention to focus mostly on post-socialist and transitional societies? Was that the interest of Markle and—?

PRICE: It went from being the interests of Markle to more—because Markle then changed. Just at that moment Markle itself changed and Zoë Baird became the director. It became much more American-focused. So I think DFID [Department for International Development (UK)], USAID, the Council of Europe, Bosnia, the Balkan Wars, all these things were really factors of the '90s, etc.

Q: So, as the Oxford program got underway, the shift wasn't, or I should say the focus wasn't, just on the post-socialist Central Europe but instead conflicts in the Balkans and other issues that arose in the international arena? Since we're talking about the Oxford program, how did the Monroe Price Media Law Moot Court [*sic*: Monroe E. Price Media Law Moot Court Competition] come about? I know this isn't around this time—

PRICE: This came later.

Q: —but I'm just curious since we're talking about [Oxford].

PRICE: It was very nice—we had a summer program at Oxford called—which still goes on—now it's called the Annenberg-Oxford Program [*sic*: Annenberg-Oxford Media Policy Summer Institute], and also had media law assistance, in which we brought people from around the world to Oxford for training and study, etc.

There was a kind of local instant moot developed by David Goldberg and Dirk Voorhoof, etc. It's part of this program. They then enlarged it to become a moot court program in Oxford, and they named it after me because I had started the Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy. So that's the evolution of the moot. The moot has then developed grandly.

Q: So just returning to that theme of you globe-trotting and being everywhere—in conferences, workshops, lectures—a kind of frenetic pace. I'm curious if the fact that around this time, the mid-1990s, when the World Wide Web was becoming online and the internet was popularized, whether this played a role in enabling you to be everywhere at once or be placeless in that sense?

PRICE: Well, I think, definitely the internet obviously changed how one thought about oneself and one's set—community as it were. I think it's true for academics generally—academics thinking of themselves as part of an institution, and then suddenly being able to be even more a part of their own network than they were before. It's always important which network they were part of, but this way, enlarged their capacity and facilitated their capacity. I think the internet basically enabled this to happen, to flourish, so to speak.

Q: In particular, in your case, did you feel like—?

PRICE: I definitely felt empowered. I felt it was amazing. I still feel thrilled when I can get up in the morning and communicate with Nicole Stremlau in South Africa, and Andrei Richter in Moscow. It's very exciting. Whether this can build something is another question, and how an institution should use this to build strength, etc.

Q: Around this time in the late 1990s—and you already mentioned this—you were working on an *Enabling Conditions* project that—

PRICE: *Enabling Environment for Free and Independent Media*.

Q: Exactly. Maybe you could just say how that came about and what the project entailed.

PRICE: Well, there are a couple of nice opportunities when people asked me to write something. So the USAID, because it was becoming invested in this area and being looked to, was trying to develop some framework for thinking about how people should think about it. So, I was asked to write a paper and it culminated in this *Enabling*—with Peter Krug—on the *Enabling*

Environment for Free and Independent Media. It was translated in a bunch of languages, and I think it had some impact in how people thought about the process.

Somebody else asked me to write something on—and this was an Oxford project—public service media in transition. With Marc Raboy, we looked at different case studies of how outside entities, and inside, were trying to reshape public service media in this transition. That was a very important project to me, for example.[26]

Q: The *Enabling Environments* project before that, was it underwritten, also, by Markle?

PRICE: No, I think it was underwritten by USAID.

Q: You mentioned somewhere that Ann Hudock—that she was, I think, a Democracy Fellow at USAID at the time, and that that project, in some ways, emerged from conversations with her.

PRICE: Yes, that's definitely the case. She stayed a good friend. I'm not sure where she is at the moment.

Q: What were the conversations, more or less? How did they lead to the project?

PRICE: Well, I think that it was how to be terse. She was helping to educate me and Peter [Krug] on how to package it in a way that would speak in the acceptable language of free and independent media, but recognize the complications and the areas for regulation. So, it had to be direct; it had to be consistent with American policy; it had to be instructive; it had to look possible. These are all interesting limitations—and the whole paper had to be thirty-five pages long, or something like that. It was a great exercise.

Q: So in a way it was its own, to use your phrase, trope of restructuring?

PRICE: Yes, in a way.

Q: It became one. And what was its reception?

PRICE: I think the reception of it was very good—I don't have the metrics that people now have, so I can't say it was cited five thousand times or anything like that. But I got the impression that it was useful. I wouldn't want to overstate it, because that would be giving in too much to the idea that these ideas have consequences.

Q: Which you expressed some doubt about.

PRICE: I have some doubt about that, yes. Actually, in a way, it's consistent and inconsistent with the market for loyalties idea. So you have these two things, as you point out, working at the same time, which is—I don't want to say pretending—with conceptualizing it as if there are processes of change that relate to ideas of freedom of expression, at the same time writing

[26] Monroe E. Price and Marc Raboy, eds., *Public Service Broadcasting in Transition: A Documentary Reader* (Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands: Kluwer Law International, 2003).

about the notion that these systems are developed by power in the societies, and that this is kind of cosmetic of democracy development.

Q: So to the extent that they're cosmetic, you—in that 2009 paper I mentioned, where you were looking in the rearview mirror about the transitional societies, when you described the drab conference rooms with locals who are rounded up to be participants, the fictitious nature of those gatherings. Is your view that the expertise, and the report writing, and the grant making, and so on, that ultimately other forces were more important in these societies' transitions?

PRICE: Other forces were very important. Ultimately, maybe it's trying to have the other forces—it's a kind of etiquette of media. So the other forces themselves have to come to appreciate the etiquette of free expression. So they can transcend it, they can obliterate it, but they can maintain some sort of nodding familiarity with it.

Q: If the nodding familiarity merely—

PRICE: I think that's very important.

Q: Yes. I mean, is it merely an embrace of the rhetoric of these tropes or do these other forces—adopting that language and notions of freedom of expression—does that change them in some way?

PRICE: I guess you'd have to think of different contexts or symbols. In India and Pakistan, even in China, what's the relationship between these two discourses or other competing discourses? Is there—in thinking about China, it's not necessarily the discourse of free expression, but is it their discourse of—is there a Confucian discourse that affects the media in some way? So, can you look at it in addition to, brutal or not brutal, as otherwise constructive? So, yes, these still remain puzzling, very puzzling questions.

Q: In this same period, you were also getting involved in post-conflict media questions, like those in Rwanda and Bosnia, where it was arguably the case that media enflamed attentions—and in the Rwandan case maybe contributed to the genocide. You were interested in, or brought in, to talk about, and think about, write about the ways in which these post-conflict societies could limit or not media.

PRICE: I think, there again, there was a fortuitous moment when UNESCO asked me—when I was at the Freedom Forum center—

Q: Yes, the Media Studies Center.

PRICE: —Media Studies Center, to write a piece about four conflicts for Free Press Day in whatever year that was. That got me involved, more, in the Balkans—and in this idea of not post-Soviet transitions, but post-conflict transitions. Which became a different body of knowledge, different body of literature, etc. It led to *Forging Peace* and that, I think, has also

been a very helpful book.[27] Then that led me to thinking about this in Iraq, which is really exciting, so you have that shift.

Q: With the work before Iraq, but with Bosnia, the Balkans, and Rwanda—just thinking about the typical or let's say the doctrine that floated around in the 1990s around freedom of expression and Western-style media institutions—how did that bundle of ideas mix with the realities in Rwanda after the genocide or in Bosnia?

PRICE: I'm not sure I can say much about Rwanda, but it, certainly in the Balkans, introduced me to a new kind of cast of characters and new ways of thinking about this. This is also true in the *Forging Peace* post-conflict areas, which is—and led me to think about, in a way—this is odd—but occupation in Japan, the United States and Japan. That is to say, How does one think in a large way about post-transition success and failures, and what mode of governance is most effective?

So I was trying to rehabilitate occupation as a way of thinking about these questions. I was also meeting new figures like Simon Haselock in Bosnia and—through my reading in preparation of the UNESCO project—watching how he tried to reshape, for the [EU] Special Representative for Bosnia-Herzegovina, the media there. Then that led to my interest in his way of thinking about these kinds of questions.

Q: What were his way of thinking?

PRICE: Well, I think he did—I'm not sure how consciously he did this, but pretty consciously. He had this kind of way of wrapping coercion in the mantle of consensus. So the whole notion was that you should have self-regulation instead of government-imposed regulation. So he created entities—this is an odd way of thinking about and I'm not sure he would—in which were kind of imposed self-regulation. That is to say, they were self-regulation in advance of the capacity of the society to self-regulate—was a kind of formula that I think he internally had. So this took place in Kosovo. He went from being the Special Representative's communication director, Bosnia to Kosovo, and then he went to Iraq, etc. So we developed these techniques and this kind of ideology of how to think about the media.

Q: OK. Well, that idea of self-regulation is—

PRICE: It's kind of hallowed in some curious ways. It's still played out in the UK—this is really the Leveson Inquiry, which is, We need to have self-regulation as opposed to government regulation. So the idea is that government threatens coercion—in the British context, until self-regulation takes place. Self-regulation takes place in the shadow of this threat of regulation. In the Kosovo context, it's an imposed institution which we could call a self-regulatory institution but is really imposed, as it were.

[27] Monroe E. Price and Mark Thompson, eds., *Forging Peace: Intervention, Human Rights, and the Management of Media Space* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2002).

Q: Imposed in part because of occupation and also because the institutions haven't yet formed.

PRICE: Yes. Also the appetite for self-regulation isn't there, and the kind of self-conception of the media. So all these things play themselves out in the '90s in these various places.

Q: So I don't know how it was possible that you were also working on this Indian project. When I say Indian, I mean the Subcontinental India. That you were—I think it was for USIA, the US Information Agency, giving a lecture tour in India, but also working on a broadcasting in India project, around this period, in the late 1990s.

PRICE: Yes. Well, that was interesting.

Q: So can you tell me about how that got started and who funded it?

PRICE: Well, the broadcast reform—well, the tour was a USAID tour. The other thing was, I think, funded, curiously enough, by News Corporation, which had an interest in the debate in India over broadcast reform. So I and Stefaan Verhulst were there to think about how to enrich the debate, let's put it that way. That led to this book on *Broadcast Reform in India*, basically.[28] But maybe that was the height of chutzpah of some sort, which is, How can you enter India, think about the history of broadcasting there and then, in a certain sense, write and make a contribution to it? So that was what we tried to do—I think it also was an effort to—another extension of Oxford, which is how to play in a different global sandbox.

Q: Did you think of your home location as being Oxford in this stretch of time or was it still New York and Cardozo?

PRICE: Well, I definitely was at Cardozo, but in a way I was very much engaged with and thinking about Oxford.

Q: Since a lot of the work in this period was USAID, or foundation funding, or the State Department—we've talked about this before—but the early Cold War period when the U.S. government, in various guises, funded a lot of communication research in the 1950s, especially in conjunction with foundations, I wondered what your reflections were on very very different post-Soviet context of the U.S. government being interested in spreading democracy and other ideals at the same time as being engaged in what at other points you kind of discuss as sort of cross-border strategic communication. So being a scholar who's reflecting on those questions, but also being funded to carry out some of that work, what do you make of that?

PRICE: Well, I think in my enacting it—whatever, thinking and trying to reflect on this, I think I try to hold both these ideas in mind at the same time. I think in some of the things that Oxford did, like the Annenberg-Oxford [Media Policy Summer] Institute, I think we tried to cope with these tensions. We bring people from Pakistan and India, Iran, etc. I think we try to explore

[28] Monroe E. Price and Stefaan G. Verhulst, eds., *Broadcasting Reform in India: A Case Study in Comparative Media Regulation* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998)

these different levels—both maintain the idea of some aspiration, some critical analysis, etc. But I'm not sure that answers your question.

Q: Yes, I don't know. It's just a question in terms of what—I assume that any initiative that is both scholarly and also funded by donors, whether they be foundation, or funders, whether they be government, that you have to either balance or mix, and separate out, work that is of a certain intellectual rigor, from the client-delivered product. I don't know how you—

PRICE: Well, I'm not sure that's the distinction I draw, between intellectual rigor and the USAID-delivered product. I would say, How can I, or people who are playing in this field, advance complicated ideas and further understand the ideological framework in which those ideas have to be furthered, and also pursue good goals as well? I mean, it's not as if my objective is to avoid free expression. It's quite the contrary. So I think it's how to engage in complexity, but with the kind of aesthetic of free expression always being present in some way.

Q: Yes, that makes sense—that especially if there are tropes that you feel like you need to work within, that you can then advance complexity through that framework, inside the limits of your funders' language. Is that fair?

PRICE: Yes, I think that there's—let me reflect on it, I'm not sure.

Q: Yes, it's just that it's an interest of mine, and you were—

PRICE: I think it is an interest that we share. I think this whole—so I've been looking at your essay [on] propaganda and the shaping of communications policy in the United States. So it both tries to find a narrative that isn't obvious from the outset, but it doesn't necessarily defeat another kind of narrative that's taking place. So I'm not sure.

Q: No that makes total sense. At this time you were also, Monroe, doing work on domestic regulation like *The V-Chip Debate*.[29]

PRICE: Yes. But I think the V-chip is of a piece, because V-chip, to me, was an exercise in this tension. First of all, it's in this tension between regulation and free expression, between thinking about cultural outcomes and effect of media on children, and doing so in the context of an environment in which "free expression"—I use quotation marks here—dominates and is supposed to underwrite every step, and on the role that Congress plays in all of this. So again, it's an example of self-regulation in the shadow of regulation.

Stefaan Verhulst and I were engaged in this during the period on the V-chip, and transnationally in the Bertelsmann efforts to develop ideas of self-regulation, on the early internet, as it were—so this had to do with early inquiries into dangerous and offensive speech on the internet.

[29] Monroe E. Price, ed., *The V-Chip Debate: Content Filtering from Television to the Internet* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1998).

Q: That came out of the project that you worked on with *The V-Chip Debate*?

PRICE: No, these were parallel.

Q: I see.

PRICE: They all have to do, in some ways, with content, with rethinking the media, with regulation, and combining free expression and regulation in some way.

Q: It seemed like sometime around the late 1990s you were working with Stefaan, too, on a European version or at least a European study that looked at parental control of television?

PRICE: That was all through the Bertelsmann project. Bertelsmann, for several years, brought together scholars who were thinking about these kinds of questions.

Q: It just strikes me—

PRICE: That led to the book that I did with Stefaan on self-regulation.[30] One of my favorite phrases which is, Who is the self in self-regulation?

Q: What was the answer to that?

PRICE: I'm not sure what the answer to that is [laughs], but it was a good phrase.

Q: So that led to the self-regulation volume as well—the Bertelsmann project.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: OK. You've done so many edited volumes, especially since 1990 and that period. Is this a form that you particularly like, and does it have a kind of natural connection to conferences and gatherings? Is that why you've produced so many, and so many influential edited volumes?

PRICE: Well, it's probably a lazy man's way of writing, in some ways. So that's one response, I think, which is that it seems easier to edit than it does to write, but that then turns out not necessarily to be the case. I think it's an important way to collaborate, it's an important way to build networks, it's an important way to reward, to help people along in their careers. I think all those things are true in edited volumes.

Q: In the case of the late 1990s, in this project of thinking about establishing centers—the center-mania—really got underway in the early 2000s, it seems like. One of the first centers that, at least, you founded outside of Oxford, as far as I know, is the Stanhope Centre [for Communications Policy Research] in London. What was the story of that?

---

[30] Monroe E. Price and Stefaan Verhulst, *Self-Regulation and the Internet* (Alphen aan den Rijn, Netherlands: Kluwer Law International, 2005).

PRICE: The Stanhope Center is a funny story. There are two things. The Freedom Forum, which had been a supporter, and I had been at the center in New York, decided one day to pull out of its global efforts. It had a center in Hong Kong, and in New York, and in London, in Argentina, and somewhere else. I always thought that—do you remember the name of the mogul who's the head of the—

Q: Oh, Newman.

PRICE: Allen—

Q: Oh, [Al] Neuharth.

PRICE: Yes. So he had this kind of, in my view, narcissistic idea that the foundation will exist at whatever time zone you're on. So his notion was you'd have a living room with all these clocks—this is going on in Hong Kong, this is going on here, etc. So one day, as rich people do, they just change their mind and said, We're out of this business. They decided—they had existing leases on a variety of real estate. So I called them up, probably at Stefaan's suggestion, and said, The Oxford center, we'll take over all your real estate, and run projects in your unfulfilled leases. They said, No, but you can have the London office. So, the gestation of this was that they had this facility, which was a ballroom and three offices, overlooking Hyde Park. It was incredibly gorgeous property, but there was no money. We had—I don't remember if it was a year or two years, or three year lease.

Q: They gave you the lease?

PRICE: This is just before I came to Annenberg.

Q: Right. Did they give you the lease for free?

PRICE: They just gave me the lease for free, but we didn't have money for toilet paper—actually, toilet paper was a good example of this. I didn't have a grant to run things, so I sort of pasted something together. But it was a wonderful facility, and I shifted, for a period of time, my emphasis from Oxford to the Stanhope Centre.

Q: Were you physically located there in London?

PRICE: Same sort of way. I used to spend the summers there, etc. Christian Sandvig was there, and Nicole Stremlau, who was a graduate student—I met her through the Stanhope Centre. It did some very nice things.

Q: Was it staffed at all or was it mostly postdocs—

PRICE: It was a pick-up. Yes.

Q: —and people who were in the London area who could come and gather?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: At one point I saw something about the Stanhope Werkstatt.

PRICE: This was Christian Sandvig and his friends. They wanted to develop a kind of facility that thought creatively about the role of ideas in product. And so they modeled this after the *werkstatt* [workshop], which was a kind of Viennese or Bauhaus notion of how to think creatively about products and society. So, it was an eccentric—I mean, for example, this is early on, under Christian Sandvig's leadership, he wanted to have—sounds like nothing today—a kind of hotspot in Hyde Park, create a kind of modern equivalent of Speakers' Corner using Wi-Fi potential. So he did that. So that's something that anybody can do now anyway, but it was just a pioneering venture on his part.

Q: So, what was this space like in any given moment? Were there people in there? Like Christian might have been a full-time employee?

PRICE: There were people. There were people who came and spent months there. There were people who spent days there. I think a lot of the work in the Balkans, etc., arose during that time. It was just a way of thinking. It still exists as a kind of charity. It's an idea, and it still has some minor functions.

Q: So it's almost like a way station or a crossroads in a way?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: And not affiliated with a university?

PRICE: It was not—for a long time we tried to figure out how to affiliate it with a university, but we failed. Then, at that time, I was somewhat—I'm not sure why—in exile from Oxford, so it was my English slot.

Q: I see.

PRICE: Now that has changed.

Q: Is Stanhope a benefactor or was there some other reason it was called the Stanhope Centre?

PRICE: It was called Stanhope Centre because it was on Stanhope Place.

Q: OK. So how did it end up getting funded? You have this free lease for a couple of years?

PRICE: Then we ran a number of grants through Stanhope, the overhead, so it still has some funding capability, and so it's available and useful for certain things.

Q: I think one project that might have gone through Stanhope, if I read correctly, is this kind of regional media support in Russia. There was a two-year program in Russia that involved training

editors and journalists in regional centers, media outlets, and so on, and that seemed to have gone through Stanhope as a project.

PRICE: It could be. Yes.

Q: I mean, but it also involved the Oxford program, and European Union was a sponsor, I think, Internews.

PRICE: Well, I think a number of the cases, the idea was how to create something that would facilitate achievement of these goals by these institutions by [unclear] places like that.

Q: So it is in a way a kind of technology, if you will, if you use that phrase loosely?

PRICE: What, Stanhope?

Q: Stanhope, yes, as that kind of technology of scholarly policy communication.

PRICE: Yes, it was a facility, as well as—

Q: But a mode maybe, a way of thinking, is what you said.

PRICE: Right. Yes, so this goes on to this day. Nicole Stremlau is trying to think about how to do this in Johannesburg. So, these centers grow up and develop.

Q: So, yes, I really think you already answered this question, but since beginning with the Oxford program and then Stanhope, and eventually Annenberg, and soon after that Budapest, and probably others if you include Beijing and so on—that you began a decade-long, I think of it as, march through the institutes or creation of centers of various kinds, and ended up then stitching them together as a network of centers with some others that you weren't directly—

PRICE: I would say two things about that. One is, I had my own little center-mania, but this is a time in which wonderful centers developed and totally outclassed whatever I was doing, like the Oxford Internet Institute, which Stefaan and I helped them a little bit at the beginning. But it's flourishing. One of the things that's been interesting to me is, What are the things that make institutions strong and survive and sustained? So this may have helped to catalyze some things but they're developing on their own.

Q: At the same time with Berkman [Klein Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University].

PRICE: Yes. Independent of me, Berkman, etc., of course. Some of the centers that I helped to develop became flourishing on their own, like the one in India, etc.

Q: So granting all of that—

PRICE: So, all of that is great. Yes.

Q: So granting all that, I just still am curious about—one thing is that lots of these centers, including the ones given your involvement, that you helped establish, but also Berkman and others came out of law ultimately. Even if they all didn't have that character. I wonder if there's any reason that this particular corner of academia produced this center form, not just you but others in the late '90s and early 2000s. Why law?

PRICE: First of all, let's examine whether that's accurate phraseology. I think one of the questions is, lawyers seem more purposeful and more result-oriented. They may be analytical but the question is, What's the outcome? What's the policy, etc.? I think they get more engaged in the policy debates. How does [this] relate to [Robert W.] McChesney and Victor Pickard—all of a sudden this flurry of centers at Annenberg, which is like, OK, how do we turn this into something that's achievable in the world? So what's the ideology of that? How does that change the academy, in some ways?

So in a way Annenberg is a kind of laboratory for thinking about these questions, and maybe Kathleen Hall Jamieson in the Annenberg Public Policy Center is another example, which is like, OK—we want to be able to say to our donors, We've made this difference in this way. It reminds me of a conversation I had at Oxford in the early '90s at lunch. I asked somebody what they'd published and they said, That's just like you Americans. We think. We're not paid to publish, we're paid to think. So, now it's beyond that, we're not paid just to publish but we're paid to have an effect, to have a policy outcome, and I think law is a strong motivation in that direction.

Q: Because it strikes me that the centers that you created, and some of these others, they're outside of traditional academic departments, at least for the most part. They're self-consciously extra-departmental, and they're also self-consciously public-facing, and policy-facing. I don't know if they are in a way some kind of academic form that benefits from being detached and untethered from departments?

PRICE: It's an interesting question. So I also think they're kind of gossamer, in some ways. Some of them aren't, some of them now have buildings and they have endowments and things like that. Some of them are quite fragile. Some of them are—sometimes there's the heavy hand of the academy, that is to say, the academy has its own tropes of what products should look like, their own vocabulary, which can be quite stultifying in some way. I think that was one of the benefits of Stanhope or the [Oxford] Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy, that it was able to develop its own language, its own approach in that way.

Q: Because it was a form that wasn't already predefined?

PRICE: Well, it's also interesting to see whether, in these entities, people are advancing to tenure, and whether they're measured by tenure standards, or whether they have some different framework for evaluation and self-evaluation. So I would say that's another reason to be both within and skeptical about relationship to academic departments.

Q: Just thinking about the ten years. Given that—we'll pick it up in the next session, Annenberg and the Budapest center, and so on—but you did build this network of centers over that

decade, and you were traveling around, writing like crazy, lecturing, producing edited volumes, and all the rest. It made me think back to something we talked about in the first session of this oral history, which was *The Confessions of Felix Krull* [Thomas Mann, 1954]. Did you have a sense of, when you went after the Stanhope space for example, have that sense of just creating and then filling it in afterwards?

PRICE: Yes. Definitely. I'm happy to accept the idea—but in a sense it goes back to this multi-level way of thinking about things. The question of being a critic as well as an engaged human being, respecting the academy but trying to be slightly outside of the academy, developing human talent in a way that's consistent with the disciplines of graduate study and also outside of that, in some ways. Yes, so I'm not sure how close that gets to [*The Confessions of*] *Felix Krull, Confidence Man*, but he hovers, probably, through it all.

Q: Yes, and the ability to be in both worlds at once, in the case of those two modes is—

PRICE: Well. Yes, I guess that's the question. But I think it has its limits, in some ways, and I think that that's another interesting question, which is—so one of the issues is whether this—how this discourse sours in, or has its limits in, Russia and China. So if you look at the '90s and think at the end, basically this discourse is discredited in some way, or barred. That leads to this *Speech and Society in Turbulent Times*, it leads to thinking about—looking at Iraq now, even after the most recent election, which is, What's the shaping of the media system there? I'm not sure how that relates, but I think it relates.

Q: It does provide a bookend for this first session, thinking about the discourse of the '90s, the democracy promotion—

PRICE: Yes, hitting a wall, in some ways.

Q: Hitting a wall. Partly it was the crash, but also just backlash in a way, right?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: Distrust of the West.

PRICE: So, I guess the question is, Was this a discourse of the '90s? Even recently I've been interested in what's called the Freedom Online Coalition, which is countries that further a particular idea of the internet, and the way it should function in society. It's encouraged by the U.S. State Department, under the [Hillary] Clinton administration. That's another Clinton, in the State Department, not Clinton as president. So what happens to the Freedom Online Coalition idea of the internet in the world? How is it justified? How is it furthered, and what wall does it come against, etc.? Does there have to be a new way of thinking about these questions in the future?

Q: If that discourse hits its own wall.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: Yes. Well, thank you for your discussion of the 1990s all the way through to the Freedom Online Coalition—and we will, in our next session, pick up in the early 2000s.

PRICE: OK. Great. Thanks.

END OF SESSION FOUR

Transcript of Interview conducted May 17, 2018, with MONROE E. PRICE (session five)

Philadelphia, PA

Interviewed by Jefferson Pooley

Q: This is session five of an oral history interview of Monroe Price conducted by Jefferson Pooley, at the Annenberg School in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The interview is part of the Oral History Project of the Annenberg School for Communication Library Archives [ASCLA], and the date is May 17, 2018.

So, Monroe, last time we were talking a little bit about the institutes and centers that you had founded and the idea of a network of those institutes and, to back up just a tiny bit, I was curious about your own network. We talked about how the internet itself helped in some ways to expand scholarly reference groups and enabled scholars to have networks that weren't geographically bound. I recall that, somewhere, Michael Delli Carpini, then Dean of the Annenberg School, described you as the most networked person in the world. My question is, How do you generate and maintain such a broad network? I recall that there's this Dunbar number of 150. You've heard of this too, probably, where the human mind is not supposed to be able to keep more than 150 people in mind. So, I guess, even at a practical level, I'm just curious how you are able to generate and then maintain such a far-flung and large network.

PRICE: Let me say, first of all, I think it's somewhat—it's certainly hyperbolic. It may be a substitute for substance. That is to say, [a] network, as a way of developing personality in some way. The other thing is good assistants. I could go back and blame everything on my refugee-ness, which is to say, somehow or other, it's my way of finding an identity and keeping it, holding that identity—or holding on to friendships or something like that. It's something I love to do. I have loved to do it.

I now see myself as having what I call a yellowing Rolodex. That's an interesting characteristic of my present state of mind, either forgetting or not knowing or whatever. But it's also been true that these various instances, even the Moot Court [Monroe E. Price Media Law Moot Court Competition, University of Oxford], the institutes itself, are generating efforts—are ways of identifying loose relationships with lots of interesting people, who then mature in some way. It's a kind of slight educational philosophy as well.

Q: Since you mentioned an educational philosophy, teaching takes place in the classroom, and I do want to ask you about your teaching at Annenberg and elsewhere, but do you feel like you do mentorship in teaching through networks?

PRICE: Somehow or other I feel—I felt this way at law schools as well—that what I was trying to do was, in a certain sense, change the student—not just provide information, but help to shape [them]. It's sort of like an enabling environment. What does it take to become the next stage of being, etc.? How do people come and present themselves at law school or here at the Annenberg School, and how does the institution shape them, etc.? I think Annenberg has been really great at that. It's really important. Many faculty members, maybe all of them, feel that way, that they're helping to create and enrich a next generation, series of scholars, etc. What does it take to do that effectively?

Q: So for your own network creation and maintenance, do you self-consciously bring in younger scholars and invite them to conferences and visiting fellowships and that kind of thing, in order to cultivate something like an enabling environment?

PRICE: It's also sort of the dinner party theory of bringing things together, which is, Who are the people who should be around the table? How do you experiment with getting different mixes of ideas? What kind of experiences build on each other? What's the right mixture?

We're just putting together the class for the Annenberg Oxford [Media Policy Summer] Institute this summer. The question is, How many Americans should there be? How can we go out of our way to make sure they're people from the Middle East? Things like that.

Q: I guess it's a related question, because you are traveling a lot, you're preparing courses, you're communicating with this wide network. You also are writing a lot. I'm curious, even, what your writing practice is. Do you write regularly, is there a set time—you're traveling so much—how do you manage to—

PRICE: I was thinking about this. Frankly, I think I'm at the sharp end of—that's why I'm doing more editing now, less writing. I think that has to do with age, in some part. I don't remember even having a regimen. In other words, the idea sometimes has been to take a period off to write, to write short pieces that I can fit into a daily schedule. But now I think of editing in the same way. I think of the dinner party, putting together an institute, which is, How can different voices be brought together?

Q: Speaking of writing, in 2002 you published this book called *Media and Sovereignty*.[31] I think it did end up having a role in your arrival at Annenberg somehow. But the book itself was both a self-contained work, but it also has evidence of your projects from the mid-1990s through to the early 2000s in it. So is there a way you approach a sole-authored book like that?

PRICE: Well, I think that it becomes partly an accumulation and revision of articles and things that I've written around the way. It also allows me an opportunity to summarize and bring to

[31] Monroe E. Price, *Media and Sovereignty: The Global Information Revolution and Its Challenge to State Power* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002).

bear different projects, so, What did I learn in Kosovo? What did I learn in Iraq? What have I learned from different experiences that enrich or alter a kind of overall theory of communications?

Q: So it's a stock-taking, in a way, and updating. Since you wrote in that '96 book about *Television, the Public Sphere and National Identity.*[32] That was '96. By 2002, there had been not just projects that you'd learned from but also massive technical and geopolitical changes. That theme of the "market for loyalties" is picked up in the book. But of course the context is different even from the mid-1990s. How did your sense of the state's adaptation to the changes in their ability to narrate their own societies' legitimacy, how did it change over those years?

PRICE: Well, I bring into this, also, the third book on freedom of expression, globalism, and strategic communication [*Free Expression, Globalism, and the New Strategic Communication*].[33] I think, again, it was shifting more towards purposefulness, state activity, in a sense. I guess thinking of this kind of combination of the internet, and free flow on one hand, and propaganda and power on the other hand. In a certain sense, you've had both of those develop in different ways. So the idea of the internet and social media, and there's this idea of which—I'm not sure who helped think about this—if you think of radio, television, satellite, you go from chaos to confusion to control, and this may be true of different technological developments. The question is, Will that model apply in the internet as well? So, is the internet like radio in 1914, or something like that? So I think these books go through this arc as well. Strategic communication becomes the kind of code word for rethinking about propaganda.

Q: Right. I'm very curious about that idea of strategic communication. It doesn't appear, to my knowledge, in that 2002 book, or if it does, it's not a central theme, at least under that name. But you do talk about this metaphor of cartels.

PRICE: Yes. I'm not sure it's a metaphor.

Q: Ok. It may, in fact, be a literal description. But if there is a theme of kind of states adapting and resilience emerging, how do those cartels work and who make them up? I know it's so specific and it's a shifting constellation, but could you expand on that idea of cartels?

PRICE: Well, I articulate it in terms of who are sellers in the markets for loyalties and who are the buyers. So, the sellers are powerful entities that seek to shape and transform large-scale attitudes in a society. These can be within a national society or now, more and more, across borders. Foreign states themselves can be strategic communicators in third states, which is—I think encapsulated oddly in a phrase—what stake does one state have in the media system of another state? So these sellers in the market for loyalties, these entities that try to transform, are like sellers in other markets, who both compete and collude. I've often thought, if you think about the automotive industry, the dream of competition in the United States is the opportunity to collude and maintain a market share. Can this apply to ideas as well as to objects

[32] Monroe E. Price, *Television, the Public Sphere, and National Identity* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).
[33] Monroe E. Price, *Free Expression, Globalism, and the New Strategic Communication* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015).

and commodities? So that's what I sort of explored. It's a bit of a fantasy, but I think there's something to it.

Q: Well, that is the major theme, or one of them, in that book, about how it's not merely competition, but it's collusion and cooperation and coalition-building.

PRICE: An example of this that I like had to do with major religious groups agreeing with networks in the 1950s to allocate the national time so that there'd be a morning show for Catholics and a morning show for fewer minutes for the Jewish community, etc. But nothing for evangelicals or, certainly, for Islam. But evangelicals were an original group that saw collusion or felt collusion, and felt a cartel of major established religions and fought that cartel. So it's an example of an excluded group learning and mastering the system, and then taking advantage of opportunities to break in and reshape it.

Q: That dynamic keeps going on.

PRICE: Yes, that dynamic keeps going on. Yes.

Q: In the Dutch system, you already referenced it last session, but the pillarized—

PRICE: The pillarized system—which isn't as effective anymore because of [the] European transfrontier directive [European Convention on Transfrontier Television] and other technological things—would be a mechanism by which the state, in a sense, organizes as a means of repairing conflict—some mode of sharing and cartelizing time. This is true in Lebanon now, it's true elsewhere, where a resolution of conflict is to allocate power over the media in some way.

Q: And not just power over who holds the presidency and the prime ministership, etc.

PRICE: Yes. It may mean the state holding all the power but it may be deflected in some other way. This is playing out in Lebanon at the moment, which is, Will they shift to different kinds of system—will it be a sectarian, etc.?

Q: Right. One of the themes that you developed in the 1990s but that shows up in the book is about the open and closed terrain of the public sphere. This distinction, which is totally interesting and novel—

PRICE: Yes. I haven't been able to go very far with it. But it's something I think is quite interesting, which is to say that we have a need for a closed terrain where we can communicate with each other in privacy. But we also have a kind of theater of communication in which there is an effort to reach beyond one's own efforts. So, what's the right balance between open and closed terrain of speech, and how is this open and closed terrain defined in some way?

Q: You were also discussing how it might be shifting in the broad sense, maybe thinking across national contexts—that there is a shift toward more closed terrain and less open terrain.

PRICE: Yes. Or how does surveillance play into this? Does surveillance make all closed-terrain speech open? Or is it a different way of defining what's closed and what's open, in some ways?

But it strikes me again, going back to the notion which we hold of free expression, that one of the hidden issues is this closed and open terrain. It doesn't map exactly across freedom of expression.

Q: No, in fact, it kind of complicates it. There was another contrast in the book in 2002, between constitutive and instrumental approaches to media law.

PRICE: I'll try to remember what that is. But I think, again, it may go to cultural identity and diversity, which is, To what extent is media law defining and segmenting and, basically, ensuring—so public service broadcasting, maybe even the Fairness Doctrine, but pumping—I often thought about, if I can remember the aspects of it, the use of force, the use of law, the use of subsidy, the use of negotiation, to shape a media system. So, in that extent, it goes to the constitutive to the instrumental.

Q: You reference in the book a lot about information intervention, which in some ways is a precursor to, maybe, strategic communication—to some extent, right?

PRICE: Yes. You could think of information intervention transnationally, of course—which is, as I say, the United States or some other government recognizing the stake it has in the formation of a media system. If it's trying to forge democracy–building, it intervenes in some ways. But we have many forms now of intervention, including NGOs [non-governmental organizations]. NGOs are now seen as instruments of information intervention and then treated that way by the target society or government in the target society.

Q: Right. Of course, I'm just tempted to ask about your current thoughts—but I'll get there in a way in a moment—about strategic communication and across borders and the shift that's taken place since 2002. But I'm going to resist that temptation. I did want to ask you about something. It's a little off-topic, but in some of your writings you refer to Ithiel de Sola Pool. In passing, I think, you've mentioned *Technologies of Freedom* [Pool, 1983]. I'm just curious whether he's been influential to you.

PRICE: It's an interesting question. Again, I noticed a reference to him in your writings [gestures toward interviewer]. I wasn't close to Ithiel de Sola Pool. I was interested in the fact that he was exploring a lot of the same questions. He was shaping a kind of center to think about these kinds of things at MIT [Massachusetts Institute of Technology]. I wasn't linking totally to the narrative that you're depicting of a kind of alternative history of communications theory. But I think some of that was attractive to me, without knowing it in the way that you knew it. But it had to do with, probably, this shaping of the International Broadcast Institute community of scholars across different countries, and maybe this relationship to government, which I wasn't, I don't think, privy to it. But it was interesting.

Q: Yes. In his *Technologies of Freedom*—

PRICE: But the *Technologies of Freedom* itself demonstrates this play between the trope of democracy and control, in some ways.

Q: Exactly. OK. So I think we should turn to Annenberg and how you got to Annenberg. Even that very first course that you taught. It may have been in 2002, or 2003. I think it may have even been—

PRICE: It was a class.

Q: It was a class, and it was by the same title of, *Media and Sovereignty*, at Annenberg. Do you know how you were first invited? Was it Michael Delli Carpini?

PRICE: Well, I was first invited prior to Michael Delli Carpini to teach a class. I think it was by Elihu [Katz] and Barbie [Zelizer], who were teaching a seminar, and they invited me down for the seminar. I was teaching the seminar. During it, they got more and more enthusiastic, and they were interested in my having a longer, possible relationship with the school. Nothing happened for a while. Michael became dean, and Elihu suggested that—here was the issue, which is a very Annenberg-like issue. Annenberg prides itself on being the top communication school in all categories. They had just been evaluated, and they ranked first in this, first in that, first in the other thing. But on international issues, they ranked lower than number one or, maybe, number two or number three. This is something which they didn't like. So the question was how to correct for that, how to see internationalization as being a purposeful aspect of the Delli Carpini deanship. So he called me and asked me to help him do that. That led to my coming here.

Q: What year was this, roughly, when you heard from Michael and started talking? Maybe 2004?

PRICE: When I came, it was the year before. In other words, there wasn't a big gap between his talking to me and my coming.

Q: How did the idea for the Project, as it was originally called, for Global Communication Studies come about? Was that his idea, your idea?

PRICE: I think it was an interaction between the two of us. It built on, How could I come? How could there be an organized way for Annenberg to announce and develop in this direction and be a focal point for activity and interest—a kind of way to telegraph to students and to faculty that Annenberg was going to strengthen this area? I think that was Dean Delli Carpini's goal and objective. This is a good way to do it.

Q: Then, when you arrived, you had this title that wasn't like a regular tenured, full-time faculty member—that differed in some way because of your [Benjamin N.] Cardozo [Law School, Yeshiva University] appointment?

PRICE: Yes. Partly it's because—I don't know—it's a weakness on my part, which is, I never can see far enough into the future. Everything looks temporary and, of course, I was already 60-something when I came here, so I wasn't—I thought of this as three or four years. The question was, Was I going to go back to Cardozo, etc.? So that led to my status here. I had a choice of how that would be done.

Q: Got it. Given that you had this project underway, it probably wasn't full-fledged initially, right? I mean, there had been a gap between when you've arrived and when the Annenberg Foundation seeded what would become the full center?

PRICE: Yes, well, I think the dean funded the project, which was fine and could have continued. It so happened that at that time, the foundation, for reasons I was sure about were above my pay-grade or something like that, said to the dean, We'll give you an endowment, you recommend a couple of alternative ways to realize this, and we'll choose. They chose the Center for Global Communication Studies [CGCS].

Q: That happened in, I think, late 2006. It was up and running soon after.

PRICE: Right. Because, when I came, I brought activities that I was already engaged in. The center just heightened what the project was doing.

Q: So what was the model? Was it what you had already helped create at Oxford [Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy] and Stanhope [Centre for Communications Policy Research] and other places? What was your vision for the CGCS?

PRICE: Well, I think what was different about CGCS was that it was partly graduate-student driven. So, you both wanted to enrich the lives of the graduate students, but you wanted to go with their interests. So if there were more graduate students who were interested in the Olympics, we would help to develop projects like that. I say, prior to being here, it was largely my initiatives or my interests. Here, it was a kind of melding of things that I was interested in, subjects that I was interested in, and student-driven interests. And maybe even faculty-driven.

Q: One aspect of that student-driven interest must have at least been expressed in the Annenberg-Oxford [Media Policy] Summer Institute. How did that get underway? Was it already in existence?

PRICE: It was a Cardozo-Oxford—it now became more Annenberg students and even more inflected away from law to law and policy, in some ways.

Q: That remains—

PRICE: It remains. The question—it's now in its 20th year, I think. The Annenberg-Oxford project.

Q: What kind of teaching did you do once you arrived here as a faculty member?

PRICE: I taught a seminar every semester. The seminar, often, was a melding of these different projects in some way, but exploring the larger issues of media, information, and society. So a lot of it was media and sovereignty, I would say, and internet issues. Also, I was trying—I'm not sure this is successful—to supplement other aspects of the curriculum, in terms of making it more international in my definition of what that means—which is different from other people's definition, maybe.

Q: In the system that existed, as like a bucket system, were you—

PRICE: I think I was in the policy bucket.

Q: Yes, the institutional policy bucket. OK. Did you have particular graduate students in those early years that you worked with closely that you—

PRICE: I did and still do to some extent. Yes. Like Chris [Christopher] Finlay, Briar Smith, who was originally a student, then became not a student, up to now, to Sandra Ristovska—various students through the years. Some of them were obviously other people's students as well.

Q: What about how the center was run? I mean, you had staff and you had visiting scholars—

PRICE: In thinking about it at the beginning, I thought, What's the relationship of Annenberg to China, for example? How can, given—even with the endowment—somewhat limited resources—in the Annenberg sense, "was limited" is, well, a relative term. How can one foster, and what should the way of fostering, relations with China be? So it turned out that there's something called the China Scholarship Council, and China sponsors PhD students and young faculty to come to the United States and elsewhere in the world to study many different subjects. We developed a kind of reputation—it's hard to evaluate—with PhD students from China. So every year, towards the end especially, we had three or four PhD students from China. This has created a little community in China, people who are related to Annenberg. Among themselves and with some Annenberg students, I think it affected demand for Annenberg PhD education among Chinese students and improved the application rate and our capacity to evaluate. One of the things that has been interesting was, and is, Annenberg able to attract and properly evaluate candidates from China and did this kind of process change and shift that? So that would be an example of an interest and how to realize it.

Similarly with India, was there a way to expose PhD students at Annenberg to some richer relationship to communications policy and thinking about the media and society—communications policy, but thinking about the real, central aspects of the culture programming at Annenberg, with respect to India, etc.? So how does one do that? How does one change the mix of scholars who lecture here? The geographical spread of students, of faculty, etc.—I think that was all part of Michael [Delli Carpini]'s vision, and I hope that the center helped him to some extent with respect to that.

Q: Did you have staff who helped throughout the years, any particular staff members that were significant?

PRICE: Yes, I started with Susan Abbott, who was someone who I'd worked with very closely at Cardozo and who had helped at CEU [Central European University] in Hungary. She was really instrumental in shaping CGCS, in helping our relationship with thinking about Washington. That's another aspect of it, which is the operating on a demand side. That is to say, this is something which has been interesting to me, and maybe goes back to my, so to speak, refugee background, which was that research—it would be interesting to think of research as a commodity that's marketable. That is to say, I think maybe Kathleen [Hall Jamieson], others think about this as well—Bob [Robert] Hornik and Joe [Joseph] Capella—which is, How can you tell from the demand side what kind of research is needed and wanted?

So the center, notwithstanding the endowment—and I think we tried to [develop] a more self-financing arrangement—what was the world interested in and willing to pay for in terms of thinking about policy-related research? Susan Abbott was key in developing that idea, and then Briar [Smith] was, and Laura Schwartz-Henderson, who is still, amazingly, working on the Internet Policy Observatory.

Q: When there were no opportunities for external funding identified, was it often the case—almost like Paul Lazarsfeld, another Austrian refugee, back in the ’30s and ’40s and ’50s—where he would survey the market for funding in government and commercial funding, and then take advantage, in a way, of what the client wanted. Deliver on that but also, in a resourceful, adaptive way, come up with questions that were his own, and that were stimulating independently of the client?

PRICE: Well, I’m not comparing myself to Paul Lazarsfeld, but I definitely think we were trying to be imaginative, creative, cliché-like boundary-pushing recipients. So, yes, the Iran media grant was a good example of this, where it’s not even clear to me that the government knew exactly what it wanted. I can compare this to—I’ll talk about in a second. But we were trying to think of creative ways to enrich discourse on media and communications issues within Iran. We had to think very hard about how to do this in a way that wouldn’t imperil people in Iran who were dealing with us. We were trying to think of creative ways of redefining what discourse meant.

That was a really rich and interesting experience. I think the output of the Iran media program, which is archived, is probably interesting in this respect. I’m going to compare it to my efforts, believe it or not, to work in North Korea. Because USAID [United States Agency for International Development] had offers for funding, but they were very constrained. There was really no room for creativity. It was all defector-related in some way. So I don’t think we presented ourselves as being a very attractive grantee. But it would have been amazingly wonderful to be able to think about those kinds of issues.

Q: Can you even say more about the Iran example and how it unfolded?

PRICE: So the Iran example was a substantial grant during the period of CGCS. It was always difficult to know what “the donor wanted.” Because the donor probably wanted richer discourse, but it was very difficult to achieve that. So the question was—my goal, for example, was to think of ways of working with departments of communication in Iran, of having some exchanges of students with Iran, of having more collaborative scholarship. All these things happened to a small extent. But they’re very, very difficult to have happen.

But I can tell you, and it’s not exactly related, but it’s not totally unrelated. The Moot Court, which we have talked about a lot, has teams from all over the world. It had two or three teams from Iran. I think that’s related to the fact that we had this interest in Iran media over the years. I’ve had long discussions with the Iranian students who come to the Moot Court. I think I’ve seen ways of what we’re trying to accomplish being accomplished through that.

Q: Another project that was in the early years, anyway, was around the Chinese Olympics. If I’m not wrong, you had a conference.

PRICE: That was very much related in a certain sense to media events and Elihu Katz. Again, this is a good example of internationalizing, of melding together a number of strengths and trying to overcome weaknesses. So, here the question was looking at the Olympics as a media event. Again, collaboratively trying to get essays on it, etc., and working closely with Daniel Dayan, who was Elihu's collaborator in *Media Events* [Dayan and Katz, 1992].

Q: You two ended up editing a volume on it—

PRICE: We ended up editing a volume.[34] It came together—I'm trying to remember the key phrase—but using Daniel Dayan's theory of palimpsests, of seizure, of capturing, kidnapping the Olympics. I think that was the idea. Again, it gets back to, maybe, the market for loyalties, which is, Here's a platform, the Olympics. Who is trying to capture it—to use it as a way of changing public opinion within China, outside China, etc.? So the book became a series of essays about that problem.

Q: About the kind of narrative and counter-narrative, from Western journalists—

PRICE: Yes, and the mode of contestation and the mode of gaining control, in some ways.

Q: Right. What was the collaboration with the Communication University of China in Beijing?

PRICE: So that was a really good example of the benefits and complexities of trying to work with a Chinese institution. So we had a good relationship with this interesting institution called the Communication University of China. But their emphasis was on the Olympics as a triumphant moment for China. So they were probably less interested in these complexities. Ultimately, we had conferences with them, but they were not collaborators on the book.

Q: But they did end up with some longer-term collaboration with Annenberg?

PRICE: Yes. Although it wasn't in a kind of memorandum-of-understanding way. So there's still collaboration with them. I see scholars from there to this day, and help them in some way, work with them.

Q: So if you don't mind [Price coughs] that we want to just go back a tiny bit, because we haven't really talked about Budapest and how that Center for Media and Communication Studies [Central European University (CEU)] came about. It was 2004. But I'm sure there's a backstory to that, too.

PRICE: Well, actually, I was working with a young, incredibly bright and wonderful deputy to the rector, a guy named Victor Böhm. The question was how to strengthen CEU, how to give it a greater international profile and make it more interesting on some of these issues. So we, together, agreed on helping to shape the Center for Media and Society [*sic*: Center for Media and Communication Studies]—now called [the Center for] Media, Data, and Society. Then we had conferences there. That was, I think, before Annenberg, basically.

---

[34] Monroe E. Price and Daniel Dayan, eds., *Owning the Olympics: Narratives of the New China* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009).

Q: Yes, just before—

PRICE: —just before Annenberg, yes.

Q: What was your role?

PRICE: Yes, I think I was called chair of the governing board [*sic*: Advisory Board]. There's still a governing board, and I'm a member of a small governing board. It's now, of course, autonomous. It's self-directed. It's run by a guy named Marius Dragomir. It's one of the more successful enterprises in this regard.

Q: Did you see it, when you were helping to set it up back in 2004, as in the mold of Oxford and Stanhope?

PRICE: Yes, all of these—getting back to the marketing aspect of it—the question was, To create something in the post-Soviet space in Central and Eastern Europe, it could be an attractive hub for donors who are trying to develop institutions relating to the media. So CEU was a natural for this kind of thing. I think it's been helpful to it. I think the center has contributed to CEU in this respect.

Q: It hasn't been an academic department exactly, right? It's always been a center that doesn't grant degrees in media and public policy.

PRICE: [Drinks] Right. I think the question has been—in CEU there's a long debate about, Should there be a communication—was this a way-station to develop a communication department? It might be. CEU has so many different issues and problems, it's hard to know. For a while it became part or related to a department of public policy or school of public policy. That's now under revision, but the center is stronger than ever. But how it interleaves with all these other institutions is still up in the air.

Q: There was a conference there, if I'm right, back in 2005. So right around the time when it was started. It was called Re:Activism, and it had people like Lawrence Lessig and Saskia Sassen and [Yochai] Benkler and Jimmy Wales.

PRICE: In no way would I take credit for that. But there were several—there was an extraordinarily interesting scholar in Hungary named Péter György, who's not at CEU but at Eötvös Loránd University. He had brilliant graduate students at the time, and they helped to shape this Re:Activism program. Julia Sonnevend, who's now a professor at the New School, was one of those forces.

Q: She was one of the graduate students in Hungary?

PRICE: Yes.

Q: OK. I didn't know that.

PRICE: We met in Budapest. She then went to the Yale Law School for a masters degree. Then she applied for a PhD in communication—

Q: —in the Columbia [University] program that I went to.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: That's interesting. She's obviously then been writing about media events in a global context, too.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: I guess I had the sense that, maybe, the notion of a network of centers, especially when CGCS was underway, that Philadelphia was something like a hub.

PRICE: I think one could say—one could emphasize that too much. In other words, in my mind there might have been a hub. But I don't think in the world there was a real hub. Stefaan [G. Verhulst] and I prided ourselves on producing proposals. I wanted to do a book called *The Unfunded Proposals of Stefaan Verhulst and Monroe Price* [smiles]. One of our proposals was for such a network. We never got it funded. We always tried to operationalize it. So it's an idea. As an idea, it has some effect in the world. But none of the nodes think that they're part of some network [smiles], even if in our minds they are part of a network.

Q: Well, I think I read somewhere that, at CEU with the center, that there was an East of West project?

PRICE: There was a journal, I think, which Julia Sonnevend was on the editorial board, called East is West [*sic*], I think.

Q: East of West. It seemed like it was almost predicated on the idea of creating a network of media and communication research centers in Central Europe.

PRICE: Let me maybe put in a different way, which I'm seeing in different contexts—there's often an illusion or aspiration of rationality, like, Let's have a network. I can see this now in international media law—in fact, the center was involved in this at one stage—which is like, Can we get all international media law together and on a website, or can we bring everything in some rational fashion? There's a project, I think, by Berkman [Klein Center for Internet & Society] to have all the centers of something—

Q: —Internet and Society—

PRICE: —together. To some extent that works, but to some extent it's an illusion that it will ever really work. So I think this idea of a network is just that. It's an idea that's helpful, and there are informal modes of collaboration—but, I think, informal and almost unconscious modes of cooperation. Sometimes they're stronger than conscious ones.

Q: Well, thinking back to Annenberg itself, and over the last—I guess it's been a dozen years or so—are there faculty members that you worked with, or were especially friendly with over the years? Elihu Katz might be one, I'm guessing. Could you talk about Elihu Katz and your relationship with him?

PRICE: Sure. Well, I think Elihu, first, is inspirational. He also brings together for me, I think personally, just many strands in my life—at least emphasizes them in different ways, or accelerates them, or epitomizes them. So bringing together a kind of cultural, religious, political, skeptical—I think that may be one of the most charming aspect of him, the kind of humorous and skeptical, combined with the accomplishment and serious nature. So, these were all models for me and they were really great. Also, I think, he had an understanding of the world and the interconnection of scholarship and regions and things like that that's wonderful.

I was just looking at Marwan Kraidy's postdocs that he's got for next year. I think he has a different vision of this but a really attractive and interesting vision—in a sense, more harmonious with traditional scholarly goals of culture and communications, as opposed to policy and communication. But Marwan was also interesting in that respect. I worked a lot with Barbie [Zelizer], and I think there was a kind of effect of this center on the—even mildly, but to some small extent—on the Annenberg culture scholars [Scholars Program in Culture and Communication], in broadening out Barbie's reach and Barbie's international definition. That's been wonderful. I think it's been interesting to work with other aspects of the university. Kevin Platt and Slavic studies, for example, or [William] Burke-White and now Perry World House. So, one of the interesting things was to watch Penn asserting it "global-ness," and to see how hard that is or what the culture is that makes that really work. And was there a way that Annenberg and the center could contribute to that?

Q: Did you feel like there was an informal community of globally minded—

PRICE: Yes, it was really interesting to see how it changed. At the beginning, it was not as sophisticated as it has become. I think Amy Gadsden and Ezekiel Emanuel and other people have really brought the globalized aspect of it to a new level. It's interesting to see. The Provost's Office was helpful to the center. I think the center is helpful to the Provost's Office in this kind of globalization process.

Q: Just picking up the thread with Elihu Katz. He also has been interested so much in the relationship between media systems in the nation and community, and he has written about how he laments the segmentation of media over time. He's reprised this thesis. The whole "media events" notion itself is concerned with this question, at least the main thread of it is. So, do you have a conversation ongoing with him? Daniel Dayan, obviously, worked with you on this China project. But do you have a conversation with Katz around the relationship of the state and media systems and technology?

PRICE: [Drinks] Hmm. It's an interesting question. I would say it's sporadic but maybe, quietly, it's there. He recently talked to me about your own work and encouraged me to take a greater interest in your work. Maybe it relates to these kinds of issues. It certainly relates to his work in Israeli television and things like that. So I'd say it's an ongoing discussion. It's probably less intensive now than it was when he was here.

Q: That's fair. Yes. One question I had was, since you had been working on media topics of one kind or another, all the way back from after Yale Law School, even at Yale Law School. But you probably—or, I'm curious to hear whether you ever thought of yourself as a communication

scholar? Once you came to Annenberg, whether the fact that there is this madcap, but semi-organized discipline, or would-be discipline, of communication—and people call themselves communication scholars. Did your relationship to that change? Did you ever identify like that?

PRICE: No, I think that's an interesting question for me personally. Going back, since, at some strange point, I thought of myself as a journalist early on and maybe more as a journalist than a scholar, certainly—that helped in this kind of morphing into the communication scholar. UCLA [University of California Los Angeles] didn't have a communications department or journalism department at the time. So I didn't identify with—I never went to the ICA [International Communication Association] or anything like that. I was amazed, coming here, and going to the ICA from here, that I had suddenly became a communication scholar, just by dint of being at the Annenberg School—talk about Felix Krull [Thomas Mann, *The Confessions of Felix Krull*, 1954]. This was a great discovery, which is, it's like putting on a new costume. Like, here I am. I'm not sure how it affected my work or anything like that. But, definitely, I could become a communication scholar, legitimated as such, just by dint of being at the Annenberg School for Communication. That was a privilege. It was a little bit of a—it wasn't a burden. But it's been interesting, even now, going to the ICA and thinking, How am I engaged methodologically, etc.? But, definitely, I'm perceived as a communication scholar.

Q: What about among legal scholars who work in communication policy? Do you still see yourself as a legal scholar?

PRICE: It's interesting. I see less of that. I've been involved in it a little more through the Columbia project on global free expression [Global Freedom of Expression] in the last several years—and maybe want to revive that to some extent. I'm not sure how much. I'm just reading Steve Shiffrin's book on the First Amendment [*What's Wrong with the First Amendment?*, 2016]. I think if [C. Edwin] Ed Baker were still alive, I'd probably do more work with him in this field. But, yes, I also haven't returned to the domestic fold. So most of those people are engaged in domestic issues. It's interesting how—either purposefully or negligently—I've avoided the domestic issues so that I can think of myself more as whatever I am.

Q: So you said either purposefully or accidentally—which is it, or do you not want to say?

PRICE: Well, I'd say some of it is purposefully, because the American issues are such a draw. I was thinking about this with respect to the contest between Comcast [Corporation] and [The Walt] Disney [Company] for control of Sky [Group Limited]. One of the things I was interested in, maybe opportunistically, was what it means for a company that's as American as Comcast to become an international player. What does it require in terms of cultural change for the management? How does it have to rethink its relationship to regulators? So, here's a company that's been amazingly clever at dealing with the FCC [Federal Communications Commission]. How does that relate to dealing with the European Commission, if at all? So, I was just thinking about it as a way of re-entering this field, although I'm not sure I will.

Q: Along only barely related lines, once you started full time at Annenberg, you remained affiliated with and are still a professor at Cardozo.

PRICE: Yes.

Q: What has your relationship been with the law school there, over these last dozen years? Do you still teach there?

PRICE: I'm actually slightly revisiting this at the moment. But the answer is—I'm going to put it this way. As a former dean, I wanted to see myself as an ornament, as like having some—like my portrait is there, I helped to pick Squadron Fellows. I have a couple of kind of superficial relationships. But I have an affection for Cardozo and from time to time I go to talks there and stuff like that, but not enough.

Q: I had never asked you, back two sessions ago or in the last session, about the Squadron program [Howard M. Squadron Program in Law, Media and Society]. So I don't mean to take a detour. But I tried to research when it was established and how and so on. Was this in the 1980s?

PRICE: After I became dean, of course I wanted to develop a media law program there. Howard Squadron was a kind of personage in New York politics. He also represented, famously, Rupert Murdoch and, in fact, represented him on the question of whether Rupert Murdoch was a proper licensee, because he wasn't—he was getting a citizenship. I can't remember what it was. But as a consequence of that, Cardozo raised funds for this program, partly from News Corp.—not from News Corp. but from contacts in the old way that we'd raise money. The program was named for Howard [and Margaret Squadron].

Q: Was it named and funded around the time that you stepped down as dean?

PRICE: No, it was in the middle. It's not heavily funded. I feel, of all the places I tried to develop, it wasn't sufficiently developed there. It's like a law school. So it's partly careerist, which is like, How do students get jobs with television stations, or as in-house counsel at [*The*] *Wall Street Journal* or stuff like that. And that's all interesting, but it was domestic and it also, for some time, served to get some of these initial grants from USAID. We developed this summer institute at Oxford, which now is here [at the Annenberg School].

Q: It started there at Cardozo.

PRICE: Right.

Q: So I was really curious about the Iraqi project and how it started and what it taught you—and even in the context of the evolution since. So how did that Iraqi project get underway? Who was your new sponsor?

PRICE: Who was my what?

Q: Well, sponsor, or I guess there was a national commission for media and communications in Iraq [National Communications and Media Commission of Iraq]?

PRICE: Well, I described part of the evolution of this, which has to do with my observation and then friendship with Simon Haselock, who was a British Marine, who became the special

assistant to the commissioner [Deputy High Representative for Media Affairs in the Office of the High Representative] in Bosnia Herzegovina, then became a Temporary [Media] Commissioner in Kosovo and went on to something else. Then, I think I got a call from Internews, which is this kind of, I guess, the premiere or maybe the second—that's another question, which is the structure of the industry of media support for democratic institutions. So, in this industry, there are two major players, IREX and Internews. Internews started very small, but it's become a huge bandwidth of all that stuff.

I think they called me, and they keep observing when their services are going to be needed where. So after 2003, Internews realized that there was going to be a heavy emphasis on post-occupation or occupation Iraq. I had conversations with them at the time, about a conference that would lead up to whatever happened. So there was a conference, I think in Egypt. I helped Internews, to some extent, think about this. I suggested to them that they call Simon and then Simon became one of their principal advisors.

There was a kind of very complicated—speaking of cartels—arrangement between the US and the UK over who would fund what kinds of activities. Simon got retained to think—for Internews, I believe, though I'm not quite sure—about the future of media policy in Iraq. Building on his journey from conflicts in Bosnia, to Kosovo, to Iraq. Then I became part of the group that helped to support this, over the next several years. That had several components. One was—and this goes back to the structure of democracy development in these institutions—what should the regulatory agency look like? What should the overarching statute look like? What should the public service broadcaster look like? So these were architectural elements of post-conflict reorientation.

Q: The timing vis-a-vis the other institutions being solid in other norms—I'm saying non-media-related institutions—might have been a question. I am just referring to the fact that, in other writings you've discussed how setting up—

PRICE: Yes. You mean like copyright and all that stuff. This here became related to the question of occupation and elections. So this is when the US had a kind of occupation attitude towards—and was setting up institutions, and before turning it over to the legislature prematurely or something like that. So it was very interesting to see—it goes back to all of these questions that we've talked about, because it went to how differentiated can it be? To what extent do you use the same words but have different complications? One of the most amazing elements of the Iraq thing, as far as I was concerned, was that it was hard to find humans who would perform the jobs [smiles], like commissioner of—like the five-person commission. Who decides on who's going to be the members of the FCC? How do you interview them, particularly in this really dangerous time in which the decision-makers—given that they, like the occupation, the Westerners, could hardly go outside of the Green Zone? It was hard to know who people were, and things like that. So amazing elements of that—

Q: Was any of the self-regulation approach attempted, given that you'd been writing about that and thinking about it?

PRICE: I would say, the same kind of—I'm calling it a fiction, but I mean it in the best sense, which was, We're going to set up an agency that will foster self-regulation at such a time as that is possible. But it engaged in, for example, issuing broadcast licenses. So there was a kind of effort to democratize the media in that way. So some of that actually took place—having an entity that gives out broadcast licenses. I didn't deal very much with the press side of it, more the broadcasting side of it.

Q: What kind of staying power did any of the statutes and institutions like that one have? Did they stick around, post-occupation?

PRICE: They stuck around. They still stick around, I believe. I'm not that aware of the details of it. But I was thinking about it. I was going through the names. For example, Muqtada al-Sadr did well. I was trying to think about, Do I have anything to say about this? He was a factor during this time in 2003. He was a young upstart. But I thought he was actually saner and more directed than many of the other, I'm not going to say corrupt, but people who didn't have as much of a kind of ideology and movement behind them as he did. So I was very impressed with Muqtada al-Sadr, actually, at that time. So, yes, I would say that there are elements of these institutions that still exist.

Q: Did you come away from the Iraqi experience, having already done lots of work on media assistance, if you want to call it that kind of thing, more or less confident about—

PRICE: Less.

Q: You used the word pathology.

PRICE: I would say less. By the way, when I came here, one of the first people who came here was someone who's half-Iraqi, half-Iranian [Ibrahim al-Marashi]. But he spent a year here and we worked together. He's taught in Spain and elsewhere, etc. We did a number of things together about the Iraqi media law. So there's a little scholarship about this, but not enough.

By the way, it was such an intriguing time for a variety reasons. One was, as I say, this question of what is the nature of an occupation in changing media law? How did our occupation in Iraq differ from, say, the occupation of Japan in this respect? How ideologically driven was it in different ways?

Q: In different times, even.

PRICE: Also, what was the relationship of the Defense Department to the State Department, in terms of post-transition or transitional governance? What was the relationship between the British participants and the Americans participants in shaping this media system?

Q: It's like Germany, all over again.

PRICE: Yes. What kind of backup—there wasn't a division in that respect, but there was a division of functions like, You get the media, we get something else or something. But I remember very specifically, for example, a task force from *Good Morning America* coming to Iraq and replicating *Good Morning*—saying, OK, here's what you do. You need a show. Here

you're going to have anchors [smiles], and you're going to have jolliness, and you're going to have this kind of set. Stuff like that. So they replicated *Good Morning America* in Iraq. There was a huge, there was a billion dollars for media development in Iraq—almost all wasted funding. It's actually really terrible.

Q: So does that make you disillusioned about media assistance as a project?

PRICE: It makes me, certainly, realistic about it. I'm trying to think of where to think about it now. Is it to think about Syria? What are the victims or subjects? Is it Yemen? So you get this kind of decline from, like, Kosovo, Bosnia, Iraq, Yemen, Somalia. So media development in Somalia is an interesting thing, interesting to see.

Q: It's not post-conflict yet.

PRICE: You mean, the conflict's not over.

Q: Right, and the state's nonexistent.

PRICE: So, yes, it's an interesting subject.

Q: There were a couple of other projects, and I don't think it's necessary, unless you found it to be a really important or interesting one, to talk about each of them. But, speaking of the Middle East, there was another USAID Jordan project that you were involved in and that was, I guess, after Iraq. Or maybe concurrent with it.

PRICE: It was after Iraq.

Q: Yes. OK. 2006.

PRICE: That was interesting. The question again was, Was there something that could grow out of it—that would be useful at Penn and at the Annenberg School, etc.? There it was more media law–related and the question was—we brought some judges here and some professors here. There was some student involvement. But I don't think it developed as strongly as I would have hoped.

Q: There was a Darfur project as well, right?

PRICE: The Darfur project was interesting. Because it was a way of trying to experiment with deliberative democracy. I don't know if you know that project at Stanford?

Q: [James S.] Fishkin?

PRICE: Fishkin. Yes. So we were trying to use the deliberative democracy approach to thinking about compromises in the Darfur crisis. Some of it worked, and some of it didn't work.

Q: Did you actually bring folks into a room in that—

PRICE: We did some smaller versions of it. We never fully did it. But that was, I would say, an example of me trying to be a communication scholar and fuse it on top of all this other stuff. It worked to some small extent, but not sufficiently. But there's still—I don't know. Internews is

now working in South Sudan, for example. It's unclear to me what this means, but one of our alumni from CGCS is now in South Sudan, and is trying to think about media development there. So, again, what this means in a zone which is still highly conflictual, and civil war—but, for example, several people from South Sudan have come to the Annenberg-Oxford seminars. So all these things still operate in a kind of pot of interrelationships.

Q: Even today, yes. There was a Mexican project on transparency and, I think, information access.

PRICE: So that was a project on freedom of information. Mexico had pioneered, with an entity that was kind of an appeals board, to ensure that every department was basically fulfilling the goals of the freedom of information act. This was a novel entity, the Mexican approach. So we were asked by the Hewlett Foundation to evaluate that. Which we did. But that was, again—the question was, Did these add up? Or were they just one-off kinds of things?

Q: What was your opinion?

PRICE: This was more like a one-off.

Q: OK. I noticed that you—speaking of that industry around news and media training, and the NGOs involved with it, like IREX and Internews and so on—that you had done this really interesting edited volume on evaluating the evaluators, basically.[35] This more specifically about kind of the ratings around freedom of the press. Freedom House, Reporters Without Borders. That project sounded really fascinating. I don't know where it came from, or was it also commissioned?

PRICE: It was partly from discussions I had with Susan Abbott, who was working with me at the time. We were basically fascinated with this question. It was also a question of whether the Annenberg CGCS, the Annenberg project, would get involved more in evaluations. Was this a field that fit with the Annenberg idea of communications in society, with methodology? Also, was there a greater need for thinking about evaluations? It also has to do with the issue of fiction or like fiction and reality. So it seemed to me that a lot of the evaluation is built in, almost, in all these projects, but it's not clear what happened to these evaluations.

Evaluations weren't looked at as a source for study like, Should PhD students be looking at evaluations independently to see how they conceptualize the project, whether they were effective, etc.? I think we also were concerned, wanted to have some way of critical purchase on Freedom House evaluations in some way. This goes back to the question of what—Freedom House is largely about the formalities like, What is the media law in the country? Not how much information there is. One of the things that always intrigued me was, In what societies were there informed citizens, and what was the relationship between informed citizenry and the formal system, or the actual system?

[35] Monroe E. Price, Susan Abbott, and Libby Morgan, eds,. *Measures of Press Freedom and Media Contributions to Development: Evaluating the Evaluators* (New York: Peter Lang, 2011).

So evaluating the evaluators was about many of those kinds of questions. I'd say a later thing that we were involved in, that I was very proud of, was a very small involvement, is in Rebecca MacKinnon's Ranking Digital Rights project, which basically tries to be, not a Freedom House, but a different kind of metric to thinking about major companies in the internet space. We helped at the beginning to nurture that.

Q: I didn't know that.

PRICE: That was related to the evaluating the evaluators project.

Q: Speaking of the internet—and I know we're just going over a lot—but internet governance is a topic that was almost purpose-built for you to get into, I feel like. You, I think with Stefaan, did some work on self-regulation and the internet. Is that correct? In the mid-2000s?

PRICE: Well, we did, I think, partly through the Bertelsmann Foundation. But then, later on, especially Stefaan, ICANN [Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers]. He was very interested in it. Markle [Foundation] was very interested in making sure that there was involvement from around the world in this new civil society of ICANN, etc. They sponsored people coming from Africa or India, etc. They were interested in developing nodes of engagement in these places.

CGCS did some work in that respect as well. Then we had a period in which we were working with the Internet Governance Forum on internet governance questions. We did some work on multi-stakeholder, whatever multi–stakeholderism means. Again, the same kind of question, which is both being slightly cynical about multi-stakeholderism and supportive of the idea of multi-stakeholders.

Q: Yes, I guess CGCS had—the Internet Policy Observatory was its name, the name for that project—

PRICE: The Internet Policy Observatory was, again—I can't remember who, how we invented this idea of an internet policy observatory. It came out of the European Media Observatory [*sic*: European Audiovisual Observatory] in Strasbourg. But the idea would be a kind of place to investigate different issues in internet governance. It's just terminating now. Laura [Schwartz-Henderson] and I have been just working on a number of final papers coming out. I just edited one with Laura, for Laura, on Chile. So this was definitely a CGCS kind of issue. It's been a great networking thing. We've just had four seminars—one in India, one in Africa—on research methods for people in the region to think about internet policy objectives.

Q: It seems like a classic place where there's a discourse of international norms and multi-stakeholder ideals on the one hand, and national and corporate players on the other, and that this dual level that you're talking about—in which sometimes the discourse is seized as a strategic communication instrument, but that it nevertheless matters.

PRICE: Yes. Maybe this is a place where they're replacing the older trope. This is one place where older tropes are being replaced by newer tropes, like multi-stakeholderism and some flourishing of civil society. The question is, How do you bring scholarly approaches to this in

some ways? The Internet Policy Observatory has been a great institution, a wonderful institution. Laura Schwartz-Henderson has made it into something really superlative. It will end in a month or two.

Q: Wow. Well, I was just thinking of the fact that right after that you published the free expression book. It was *Free Expression, Globalism, and the New Strategic Communication*. I don't know if it's fair to think of it as a trilogy, like I mentioned earlier, but I think of that 1996 book on television and the public sphere [*Television, the Public Sphere, and National Identity*] and the *Media and Sovereignty* in 2002—that this is sort of a third installment asking the same questions. We briefly touched on it, but we passed it by, which is the question of how this idea of strategic communication came to occupy the center place of that book. You've been talking about the themes underlying strategic communication, but this is a new label, or new-ish. If you want to say anything about the cross-border nature of your meaning of strategic communication.

PRICE: One way to think about it is to think about Article 19 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which uses the phrase the right to "receive and impart information, regardless of frontiers." The question is, Do we really think that there is a right to receive and impart information "regardless of frontiers"? Is that central to our conception of free expression, that that be true? How does that relate to sovereignty? And how does it relate to abiding ideas of free expression.

So, in part, strategic communication has to do with the effort by large-scale global communicators to, basically, to erode, to engage in persuasion, "regardless of frontiers." And who that is, who those are, and what are the forms of resistance to that? So, I guess I see, now, both the technology of ensuring some version of "regardless of frontiers," and I see these kinds of structures of resistance, even in the West, certainly, but before that in Russia and China, etc. So I think this third book tried to explore that to a large extent.

Q: You use this great rephrasing of Max Weber's idea that the state is defined by the monopoly of legitimate use of force, to refer instead to the control of narrative or the control of information flows.

PRICE: Yes. This is a scary idea, but—

Q: How far would you take that as a definition of the state?

PRICE: Yes. Well, how far from whose perspective? I think it's definitely the case that states to some extent are, I think, a collection of stories about themselves. The ability to constrain the narrative—it has to do with monuments. It's getting close to my stuff on art and propaganda, which is, What are the mechanisms to, and to what extent are they necessary, to have this kind of stable, or dynamic narrative, that is a kind of boundary of the mind, in some way. This notion of frontiers—"regardless of frontiers"—is important for that subject in some way.

Q: As a normative question, do you think it follows that states should have some right?

PRICE: This again goes to the question of, What are the mechanisms? So there's more consensus on the idea that the state should help nourish and encourage narratives about itself. This gets back to monuments—a positive side of monuments, in some ways. Or a positive idea of public service broadcasting. So the BBC is a way of cushioning, of pillowing a society against counter-narratives in some way.

Q: Or Netflix.

PRICE: Or Netflix. So that part we like more than the idea of banning things. But this is all over the question of "Did Russia interfere in the 2016 election?"—the idea that much more information intervention, as part of a global sense of conflict.

Q: So that, is the idea of information warfare a good one?

PRICE: Without a specific definition, but it's definitely part of this idea. I don't know how much you know about the China One Road One Belt initiatives [*sic*: Belt and Road Initiative] or something like that, which is a kind of Marshall Plan of the mind. So think of the Marshall Plan as a large-scale initiative to wrap a notion of the US in the world, and think of a Chinese equivalent of that, which is now the One Road One Belt initiative. Which is very important, probably not as understood as it should be in United States. But it's a bid by China to help reshape the way China is perceived and also the way different elements of the world define itself. So I see this happening, this being these kinds of large-scale efforts, currently and in the years ahead. That, I think, is a new form of strategic communication.

Q: OK. I guess as a final question, unless you have something you'd like to bring up, I thought maybe returning it to Annenberg and to also your personal and scholarly life—your wife's art history interests and your own recent teaching and thinking around art and propaganda. You mentioned it a moment ago. You've taught a class at Annenberg this year. Maybe you could speak to how that relates to this longstanding question of the media system, changing technology, and the state.

PRICE: Well, I'm not sure I could do all of that. But there's some small things. I've been, together with Barbie [Zelizer] and Emily [Plowman], I'm thinking about a small exhibit on prints and drawings from East Germany. This has made me think a lot. I've also just returned from an exhibit at the Harvard [Art] Museums on German art from 1943 to 1955 [Inventur—Art in Germany, 1943–55, 2018]. These are all about technology, identity, strategic communication—or not so much strategic communication as identity and persuasion in some ways. I'm attracted by the question of which technology and which form of visual representation works at a particular time in a particular context.

Then, in this course, it's how museums embody this. These are different institutions for thinking about these kinds of questions. Which of these coexist nicely within an institution like Annenberg? Is this mainly about voting and democratic practices? We certainly think about culture and communications. We think less about art museums and art. But these long-term ways of building attitudes and building persuasions, I think, are things that are central to the way I've thought about this stuff, in the way the school thinks about them.

Q: Well, thank you so much. It's actually been an amazing privilege to hear about the arc of what is a remarkable life. Thank you for sharing—

PRICE: It's my pleasure. It's been especially my pleasure talking with you about these kinds of questions. You allow me to think about this and give it new dignity and new order in a life that I think has been filled with disorder [smiles]. So you helped me think of it as having some sort of design. Whether it's intelligent design or not is another issue. Thanks a lot.

Q: Thank you.

END OF SESSION FIVE