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Justice Roger Traynor

Dear Justice Traynor:

The delay in this letter is because of my negligence in leaving your address at a place where I could not reach it until today. Joe Russin, our producer, would like to join me in the interview on Thursday. If possible our camera crew would like to arrive about 1 PM to set up the lighting so that we can begin about 1:30. The interview itself will be on the air on Friday's Newsroom.

After an introduction concerning the Press Council and yourself, here are some of the questions I plan to ask:

There has been criticism of the concept of the Press Council from the media. What are the main points of this criticism and how do you respond to it?

The Council has no power to legislate or regulate. How can it be effective?

What are the chief areas you expect will be brought to the Council's attention by the public in the way of complaints about the press?

What matters do you expect will be covered in the complaints of the press about government pressure?

If the Council is convinced that there is undue governmental pressure on the press what can be done about it?

Government regulation of the print media is almost non-existent when compared with the licensing requirements in radio and television. Are there satisfactory justifications for these differences?

Does the general public value freedom of the press sufficiently, and if not, why not?

With the criticism of the press having the heavy political overtones it has today, how can you avoid a split in the Council on partisan political lines?

****

I finally came across the opinion on secrecy you mentioned, Environmental Protection Agency v. Mink, et al. It rather guts the Freedom of Information Act for anything the government wants to keep secret by classification. On protective orders, the recent opinion of Justice Kaus in the Younger case makes good reading, especially the footnotes.

With best regards, sincerely,

Marshall W. Krause