



# Chair's Address to Melbourne Press Club



**Adventures in Media Counter-errorism: The challenges of heading the Press Council in an era of technological convergence, social change and stifling surveillance.**

**Melbourne Press Lunch Address  
Thursday 6 August 2015, 12.15-2pm  
Mr Hive Kitchen & Bar  
L1, Crown Metropol Hotel, 8 Whiteman St, Southbank**

## Introduction

As that great former US Vice President Dan Quayle once said, “Before I begin speaking, I would just like to say a few words.”

Thanks very much Mark — both for inviting me to speak today and for that very generous introduction

I should report that I had a gentle tussle with Mark over the precise topic for today’s event. And as is often the case with two people with strong views, we praised each other person’s idea while stubbornly clinging to our own, taking our cues from a wonderful bit of phrasing by Larissa MacFarquhar, who wrote in *The New Yorker* magazine a few years back that:

“Everyone knows how to damn with faint praise, but damning with extravagant praise is a more esoteric enterprise, the more so because it is frequently unintentional”

So ultimately I was won over by Mark’s utterly brilliant and strikingly original compromise suggestion of “The New Press ‘Counsel’: Lunch with David Weisbrot”.

I mention all of this only because the exchange was emblematic of the themes at play since I’ve assumed the role of Press Council Chair five months ago, and have set out to change the culture of the organisation, and in doing so further increase its effectiveness.

Mark’s initial suggestions turned on the Press Council being the industry “watchdog” or in some other way serving as the cop on the journalistic beat — which in fairness is probably what most people in the media and the general public think.

Whereas I have been strongly promoting a counter-narrative, suggesting we are ALL engaged in “Adventures in Media Counter-errorism”, as both the Press Council and industry tries to navigate successfully in an era of great and dynamic change: technological, social and legal/governmental.

This time last year—almost to the day—I was blissfully enjoying my life as a newly minted retired person, sipping a cocktail by the pool at my hotel on Santorini, perhaps the most beautiful and romantic of the Greek Islands. Then my mobile phone rang ...

“Would I possibly be interested”, the headhunter asked, “in being the next Chair of the Australian Press Council?”

Well, I majored in Communications and Politics as an undergraduate and then studied Law as a postgraduate—and all the while envisaging myself as a foreign correspondent and/or a crusading investigative journalist.

I was an editor of my award-winning university paper—remarkably, a daily!—which had a circulation that many contemporary Australian newspapers would envy.

I am a voracious reader of news and current affairs and sport—and I subscribe to a large number of newspapers, magazines, and online publications based in Australia, the United States, Canada, the UK and the Pacific Islands. And I'm even willing to pay for them, if I have to.

And I love a challenge, especially if it involves forcing me to master new whole areas—this was the thrill of leading of the Australian Law Reform Commission, where one year you might be immersed in the architecture and efficiency of the federal courts and tribunals, the next year it was marine insurance, then the handling of classified and security sensitive information, the year after that genetic privacy and discrimination and gene patenting, and so on.

So I metaphorically threw my hat in the ring, which these days is possible with just a few clicks on a smartphone, without even having to put down the drink in my other hand.

I must confess that, being overseas at the time, I was completely unaware of the fraught circumstances in which the Press Council found itself, with a breakdown in relations between much of the Council and News Corp, its major funder.

But if Balmain Boys don't cry, then Brooklyn Boys scare even less easily.

And with all of the diplomatic experience I had gained as a Law Dean and Pro-Vice-Chancellor and a state and federal law reformer, I felt confident that I could create a safe and respectful enough environment for competing interests and ideas to clash and collide—and ultimately for the public interest to prevail.

And I still feel that way—perhaps even more strongly now.

### **The traditional Press Council**

The Australian Press Council was established in 1976—we will celebrate our 40th anniversary in May 2016 with a major international conference on the theme of “Press Freedom in challenging times”, exploring contemporary press freedom issues here and overseas and projecting what's to come over the horizon.

The genesis of the Council was the Whitlam Government's consideration of instituting some form of public regulation for newspapers and magazines, much in the same way that the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) is the statutory regulator for TV and radio broadcasters. In an effort to stave off government regulation, the Press Council was created as the industry self-regulator.

And similarly, when the Gillard Government considered bringing in a statutory authority in the wake of the UK's Leveson Inquiry and our own Finkelstein Inquiry into the Media and Media Regulation, the industry bitterly resisted this as potentially infringing upon freedom of the press and free speech.

In order to bolster the argument that the existing system was preferable to government regulation, substantial changes were made to enhance the Press Council's independence, and powers and to increase and stabilise its budget.

So in its present incarnation, it is now the case that:

- the publishers form only a minority—although, to be sure, a powerful minority—of the 24-person Council (with the majority comprised of the Chair, 10 public members and four independent journalist members);
- the Council's funding is assured on a rolling three-year cycle, and levies are payable by publishers even if they withdraw from the Council during that period;
- publishers are no longer involved in considering and determining complaints, with the task now assigned to panels made up only of public members and independent journalists; and

- as was previously the case, publishers remain bound by the Council's Constitution to cooperate in good faith with the complaints-handling process, including (critically) to publish the outcomes of all adjudications to which they were the respondent.

There are something like 80-100 Press Councils around the world—perhaps 60 of which operate in association with a free press—and few, if any, are in an equal or better position when it comes to cultural independence, adequate human and financial resources to fulfil their mission, and routine cooperation and compliance with their processes.

### **A 'toothless tiger'?**

And yet, if you get most of your information about the Press Council from the Twitterverse, you would quickly get the impression that even the contemporary Press Council is, to use the old lazy cliché, a 'toothless tiger'.

The toothless tiger accusation is never based on any sound data or analysis, and it is never served up with any better alternatives. For example, I recently followed a Twitter thread that: (a) started with a denunciation of a particular publishing company's support for the Abbott Government; (b) denounced as a 'toothless tiger' the Press Council's failure to do anything about this, without reference to the handling of any particular complaint; and (c) stated that the only remedy would be abolish the Council and replace it with a Public Interest Media Monitor, to be funded and appointed by the government. It didn't seem to occur to the proponent or his supporters that this Monitor would be appointed by ... the very government they were bitterly complaining about a few tweets before.

In my view—and I would resign immediately and return to Santorini if it wasn't my honestly held view—the Council is far from a 'toothless tiger'. Maybe more of ... a Terrifyingly Tenacious Terrier. We might not kill you, but we can deliver a serious nip around the ankles that you won't soon forget!

The situation is not helped by the way that Press Council adjudications often get covered—which too much resembles sports or war reporting. So the Press Council is said to have had a 'big win' or a media outlet has been 'rapped over the knuckles', 'censured', 'slammed', or 'lashed'.

Even worse are the articles which tally up the number of adjudications against a particular publisher in a particular year and then suggest that this means 'the war' against that media company is either waxing or waning. Most likely it's a statistical anomaly based on reporting periods, or perhaps there are other more interesting and insightful trends: for example, maybe the editors and journalists in question have actually learned something from previous controversies?

The fact is—although there is plenty of room for improvement at the Press Council, as I will soon discuss in more detail—we are doing a pretty good job on behalf of complainants in resolving their own concerns and delivering targeted remedies in a low cost, low risk system.

(I'd love to ask Joe Hockey now, in a reflective moment, whether he honestly would have been better off lodging a simple complaint with the Press Council than issuing defamation writs and pursuing a high cost, high risk, litigation strategy.)

And we are doing a pretty good job for the broader community in holding the media to account and in working with them to lift standards and performance, in the public interest.

The public's confidence in the Press Council's complaints-handling system seems to be borne out by the statistics. In recent years we have been receiving about 500 distinct complaints a year (10 per week), involving 700 complainants (because more than one person may complain about the same article).

In this past year, the Press Council has experienced an increase of about 13 per cent in complaint numbers—but an extraordinary jump of nearly 400% in the number of complainants, reflecting the new phenomenon of complaint-by-social-media, and at the same time highlighting the fact that the Council and its processes are more relevant than ever in this era of emerging social media.

Typically this involves a campaign on social media platforms, such as Change.org or Avaaz, urging individuals to complain directly to the Press Council, and a template or suggested form of words may be provided. In any case, the growth of online news and social media platforms has certainly raised the awareness and profile of the Press Council across that readership, and we are adjusting our processes accordingly.

## What we do with complaints

Upon receipt, all complaints are subject to review and analysis by the Council's staff and management. Quite often, we need to chase up further details from the complainant or clarify some aspect with the person.

Complaint files are then carefully 'triaged' by Council officers, and the more complex or difficult matters are reviewed by the senior management. The experience in recent years has been that:

- just over one third are dismissed; for example, those that
  - express a general dissatisfaction with the media, but do not allege a particular breach of the Standards;
  - are trivial in nature or turn out to be factually inaccurate; or
  - pertain to TV, radio or advertising rather than print or online journalism.
- another one third are withdrawn or discontinued, either because the complainant does not pursue the matter (having gotten the matter off their chest) or further investigation finds little substance in the complaint;
- about 25 per cent have a remedy negotiated by Council staff with the cooperation of the paper concerned; for example, this might involve an apology, the removal or correction of an article, or the publication of a letter to the editor or an op-ed piece;
- about 5-10 per cent of complaints are referred to an Adjudication Panel for determination;
- about three quarters of complaints that get this far result in a decision that the article in question breached at least one of the Council's Standards; and
- the remaining one quarter of adjudicated complaints are not upheld, as no (significant) breach of the Standards has been found.

This pattern is broadly consistent with other industry complaints handling schemes, ombudsman's offices and public regulators in Australia and overseas. It is also broadly consistent with the general legal system, in which the overwhelming number of civil claims and criminal charges are disposed of consensually or summarily, with only a few percent of the most serious, complex and intractable matters reaching the 'pointy end' of the system.

Where a complaint results in an Adjudication, constituent members are bound by the Council's Constitution to publish the adjudication or a summary or both, depending upon the circumstances. All adjudications are also published on the Council's website, and publicised by media releases and tweets.

The Adjudication Panels are independent and operate without fear or favour. Each Panel is currently chaired by one of our very distinguished Vice Chairs: the Hon John Doyle AC, the former Chief Justice of South Australia, and Julian Gardner AM, formerly Public Advocate and Director of Legal Aid in Victoria. (I have not engaged in Chairing panels, at least for the time being, as I believe I can add much more value at this stage by being directly involved in the triage of ALL complaints than in the disposition of a relative handful of matters.)

The remaining panelists are drawn equally from the Council's distinguished group of public members and industry members (former journalists and editors with no current affiliations with publishers). As mentioned above, publishers are not involved in this decision-making process at all. I have sat as an observer at all Adjudications over the last six months, and I am constantly impressed at the diligence, seriousness and judgment of Panel members (even on the rare occasions in which I don't entirely agree with the outcome).

The Council has no power to censor, or to administer a fine, or to punish or ban an individual journalist, or to shut down a publication (practically impossible in any event, since only broadcast media are required to hold a license to operate)—nor is there any interest whatsoever on the part of Council to have any of these powers. (Although I have to admit that occasionally I have a fleeting temptation to administer corporal punishment!) And as mentioned earlier, most other press councils around the world would be jealous of our existing resources and enforcement powers.

## Improvements?

While the system I have described is working reasonably well, there is still a great deal that can be done to make it work even better. So let me tell you about the major initiatives that I am currently leading at the Council, and which I undertake to complete well before the end of my three year term.

### *Streamlining/refining the process*

The most consistent dissatisfaction heard about the Council is the length of time it takes to finalise complaints through adjudication—a view expressed to me by complainants, publishers and Council members alike.

It is also one of the two most commonly expressed complaints about ALL dispute resolution systems, public and private, here and overseas: excessive cost and delay and are always the twin bugbears.

In the Press Council's case, at least, it is a cost-free jurisdiction for complainants, so this is major benefit. Similarly, it is a very cost-effective process for publishers, who would otherwise bear the risks of huge legal costs and damages in defamation actions and related legal proceedings.

However, the current leadership of the Council is determined to make its dispute resolution processes more streamlined and efficient. Having led a major review of the federal court system in Australia (and also in Israel, as a consultant), and surveyed the literature internationally, it is clear that there are no easy solutions or silver bullets—but there are plenty of effective strategies for improving efficiency, which individually achieve some benefits and cumulatively can make an important difference.

Among other things, the Council is working towards:

- upgrading our web-based complaints form and all associated dispute processing software and databases, to capture information much more efficiently and to speed up analysis and reporting;
- improving the triage process, with myself and other senior managers becoming involved earlier and more intensively;
- adding another track to the Adjudication process (as recently approved by Council), with complaints that do not appear to be novel, complex or precedent setting dealt with by three-person panels (rather than the current five or seven) on the papers.

### *Changing the Culture: from policing to education*

Whatever benefits those procedural refinements may deliver, they are likely to pale in comparison with the benefits that will come from cultural change and a belief that the maintenance of high standards in the industry must be a shared enterprise.

As I mentioned at the outset, for most of its history the Press Council has been perceived as the 'watchdog' or the 'cop on the beat'—in other words, its presence might tend to discourage poor journalistic practice by putting the fear of God into publishers and practitioners, giving the public an opportunity to bring complaints, and then whacking those unfortunate few whose alleged transgressions happened to be complained about.

And publishers and journalists who pride themselves on their professionalism clearly do not relish the experience of having to publish a negative adjudication.

But focusing on a particular breach of Council's Standards in the past and then publicising it probably channels too much of energy, attention and resources on the aberrant case—the roughly 40 cases in any particular year that go all the way from initial receipt to final adjudication.

And since it's such a relatively small number, most journalists, editors and publishers may feel that those aberrant cases have nothing to do with them.

What we need to do instead is to create a different culture: one that is collegial and intelligent, that continually learns from experience.

As a career academic I am devoted to the idea that people are educable, especially where it's greatly in their own interest to learn.

(Although my dedication to this ideal has sometimes been put to the test. I vividly remember a conversation with an under-performing law student some years ago, whom I felt compelled to fail twice. When he tried to enrol for a third time my exasperation got the better of me and I asked him, given his obvious intellectual ability, what the real problem was: "Is it ignorance? Is it apathy?" To which he replied, "Frankly Professor, I don't know and I don't care!")

When I was at the NSW Law Reform Commission in the early 1990s, I designed and recommended the system that is now used across most of Australia to handle complaints against lawyers. One of the most striking features—and failures—of the old legal self-regulatory system that has been replaced is that each case was treated in isolation. The paradigmatic complaint was from clients reporting that their lawyer was failing to keep them informed of the progress of their case, and would not return phone calls. So the Law Society would write a letter to the solicitor ... and hear nothing back. A few months later they would write another letter ... and hear nothing back. Then after several more months, they'd write to the recalcitrant solicitor threatening to suspend his or her practising certificate unless they responded within a week—which the solicitor usually did, stating that he had called the client and gave them a progress report.

The Law Society tended to mark this as a “case closed”. In fact they should have regarded this as clear evidence of poor communication and practice management skills on the part of the particular lawyer. And given the large number of these sorts of complaints, the Law Society should have seen this as clear evidence of a systemic failure needing urgent attention, with articles in professional journals and the development of preventive and remedial educational programs.

We urgently need to move away from the system of punishing individual transgressions in our industry and feeling that such action alone maintains high standards across the entire profession. While the need to identify and sanction poor practice will remain, there are much better strategies for achieving industry-wide improvement, and reassuring the community that this is the case.

I have also witnessed considerable interest and enthusiasm from newspaper and online editors and managers in the Press Council developing and directly providing education and training programs for working journalists, cadets and others, on the Council's General Principles and Specific Standards, and on emerging media law issues, such as metadata retention, secrecy laws, whistleblower laws, terrorism laws that may entangle journalists, and the like.

### *Setting Standards*

Last July, after a period of refinement and consultation, the Press Council approved a revised set of eight General Principles (GPs) that set out the Standards of Practice expected of member publications (from 1.8.2014).

The GPs are now very good: they are clear, concise, sensible and practical, and compliance should not be onerous or unnatural for working journalists, even under pressure. (For example, the GPs are now couched in terms of publications “taking reasonable steps to comply”, rather than rendering every issue black and white, comply or breach.)

The eight GPs cover the areas that any journalist—or indeed any member of the public who gave it some thought—would readily anticipate. Paraphrasing here, this includes:

1. reporting should be accurate;
2. promptly correct material found to be inaccurate or misleading;
3. present material with reasonable fairness and balance;
4. provide a reasonable right of reply;
5. avoid intruding on reasonable expectations of privacy, unless doing so is sufficiently in the public interest;
6. avoid causing substantial offence, distress or prejudice, unless doing so is sufficiently in the public interest;
7. don't obtain information by deceptive or unfair means, unless doing so is sufficiently in the public interest; and
8. avoid or adequately disclose conflicts of interest.

These broad General Principles may be supplemented by the development of Specific Standards, to be applied in particular circumstances.

Perhaps the best known and most successful of the Specific Standards is the one governing the reporting of suicide and attempted suicide. We are all familiar with the new and more sensitive approach: the word suicide

is rarely used, the method of suicide is almost never disclosed (to avoid copycat actions), there is no moralising or titillation, and there is always information at the end of the article about hotlines and crisis counselling.

And based on the run of complaints and feedback from members of the general community, peak associations, advocacy groups and experts, there are a number of other areas in which media practice could be improved to serve the broader public interest. All of these are driven by changing circumstances, whether technological, social, or commercial.

In the coming year, I intend to take to Council draft proposals for Specific Standards on:

- reporting of family violence: to ensure greater sensitivity towards victims (including past victims), to ensure that victims are not blamed; and possibly to curtail the level of detail, especially where children or other vulnerable people are concerned;
- reporting of child sexual assault: with similar parameters;
- respectful reporting around LGBTI individuals and issues (eg use of the Poynter Institute Guidelines);
- respectful reporting around race and religion;
- labelling/disclosure requirements around the publication of so-called 'sponsored content' or 'native advertising', so as not to mislead readers about the nature of the material, but recognise the commercial realities of maintaining a viable industry.
- **possibly**: the appropriation and publication of online photos (eg from Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat and other social media), especially where this concerns children's privacy; and
- **possibly**: the so-called 'right to be forgotten', with the need to balance the relevance of stale/sealed/expunged convictions versus the improper alteration or erasure of history.

### *Broadening the membership*

The Press Council is justifiably proud of the breadth and depth of its membership, encompassing all but one (Seven West) of the major newspaper and magazine publishers in Australia, 850 mastheads, and 95% of circulation.

The Council has also done a reasonably good job in accommodating the digital revolution, including the associated online websites of traditional/mainstream publishers, as well as the new generation of online-only publishers. I believe that 16 or 17 of the top 20 most-visited online news and current affairs sites are members of the Press Council (such as NineMSN, Mumbrella, New Matilda, the New Daily and Crikey.com, as well as News' and Fairfax's online operations) and we are in active talks with a number of new entrants. (For example, The Daily Mail Online and Huffington Post Australia are likely to be admitted at the next meeting of Council.) Others publishers who have seen the benefits of the Council's complaints system and of being part of the self-regulation, standards-setting and advocacy processes have also expressed keen interest in joining.

However, there is still a glaring—and I would say unforgivable—gap in the Council's membership: the thriving 'ethnic press', that reflects the reality and vibrancy of Australia's multicultural society.

The current leadership of the Press Council is strongly committed to engaging with the ethnic press in Australia and encouraging the Council's inclusiveness, both in terms of formal membership as well as in access to Press Council programs and activities. For example, we have just arranged for the translation of the Press Council's General Principles, and some other key literature, into Mandarin.

Next Friday (14 Aug), I will be hosting a press conference and luncheon in Sydney with Chinese newspaper and website proprietors, editors, journalists and community leaders to kick off serious talks about how we can advance these matters.

We have also identified the Australian Vietnamese, Filipino, Greek, Italian, Indian, Korean, Serbian, Turkish and Arabic-speaking newspapers and communities as promising ones with which to meet, and will soon begin to do so.

### *Advocacy for free speech and freedom of the press*

The traditional view of the Press Council, dating from the first Chair, retired High Court Justice Sir Frank Kitto and shared by my immediate predecessor, is that the Press Council's role in advancing freedom of the press

should be largely restricted to its complaints handling function, which ensures public confidence in the integrity and standard of media practice.

But times have changed, and I must now respectfully disagree. Freedom of speech and freedom of the press may have a strong cultural hold in Australia, but they rest on flimsy legal foundations.

The first express legal protection of free speech came in the US Constitution's First Amendment (1789-1791), which provided that:

“Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.”

In the wake of the horrors of WWII and Nazism, the UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 (Art 19) provided that:

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.”

And this was reinforced in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR 1966, in force 1976), which protects freedom of expression — but calls for “national, racial or religious hatred” to be prohibited by law.

The ICCPR or its equivalent is enshrined in Constitutions or statutes in US, UK, Canada, NZ, Europe, PNG and most of the Pacific, most of Africa, most of Asia (including Hong Kong, Art 27)—but remarkably not in Australia. (Although Victoria and the ACT now have Human Rights legislation.)

In an attempt to partially remedy this glaring anomaly, in 1992 the High Court of Australia (per Mason CJ) in *Capital TV* case ruled that there is an implied protection of political communication in the Constitution, as an essential element of the system of democratic and responsible government.

Unfortunately, the traditionally fine balance has been tipping steadily against freedom in recent times. We've had 40 'anti-terrorism' laws passed, often with insufficient Parliamentary scrutiny of the potential effects on free speech and press freedom.

Among other things, amendments to the ASIO Act (introducing s 35P) now make disclosure of information relating to a “special intelligence operation” a crime carrying a maximum penalty of five years' gaol. How do you know it's a “special intelligence operation”? Well, we'll tell you after we arrest you. But then you can't tell anyone else. (Who knew that modern day Franz Kafkas would have a future in legislative drafting?)

I have already publicly described the new metadata retention laws as a crushing blow to investigative journalism and freedom of the press.

Sadly, these laws received bi-partisan support, with significant opposition in the Parliament only from the Greens and some Independents, like Andrew Wilkie (a former intelligence analyst).

We have seen a Parliamentary committee seriously consider so-called 'ag-gag' laws imported from the United States, in which animal welfare campaigners and journalists who expose the patently brutal and unlawful treatment of animals are themselves to serious criminal liability—in other words, punish the whistle blower, not the perpetrator!

On Monday I was pleased to read that one of the first ag-gag laws, in Idaho, has been ruled unconstitutional by the US Federal District Court for impermissibly stifling speech “that advances significant public interests” in animal welfare and human health and safety.

Similarly, under the recently passed Australian Border Force Act 2015 s 42, 'entrusted persons' (public servants, doctors, lawyers, social workers) employed by the Australian Government who disclose “protected information” (such as allegations of malpractice or abuse) risk 2 years' gaol. So again we punish the bearer of bad news rather than those who let down or actively abuse vulnerable people in our care.

In these circumstances, it is not sufficient to hope that publishers will be successful in resisting these incursions, and the Press Council must take a stand in favour of free speech and press freedom liberty.

Similarly, the Press Council must actively work to diminish private or civil obstacles to investigative reporting, press freedom and free speech. Again, we are well behind comparable nations here. The United States has long had constitutionally-mandated restraints on defamation law, especially where the person concerned is a 'public figure'. The United Kingdom has new legislation that provides an effective balance between protecting the reputation of ordinary citizens and recognising the role of the press in a democratic nation. And so I have pledged to lead a process, commencing soon and culminating next May, to develop a Model Uniform Defamation Law for Australia of which we can finally be proud.

### **The challenge for the press**

Let me end with something of a challenge for the media.

I am happy to commit the energy and resources of the Press Council to these campaigns, because I believe they will be vital to shaping the sort of society we leave to our children. The media has an especially critical role to play in an era in which the major political parties risk vacating the field, providing too few ideas, little vision and even less moral leadership.

But the basis for according a high priority to press freedom is that we need freedom of speech and an unfettered press to hold the powerful to account and to facilitate the contest of ideas; in other words, to provide the oxygen required to maintain a thriving democracy and a vital society. It is NOT a smarty-pants tool to poke fun at the powerless and the dispossessed, or to secure the right for some of us to be bigots.

There is a great deal of very high quality journalism being produced in this country, by some very fine journalists and editors. But I do worry about whether the press will be able to resist growing commercial and competitive pressures and continue to match rights with responsibility.

So while we fight together for greater freedom of the press, media outlets must redouble their own efforts to facilitate the contest of ideas, including by publishing material that is complex, controversial, unpopular or poses difficult or painful questions. If the journalism we all admire 'speaks truth to power' and 'holds the rich and rich and powerful' to account, then lets pledge to produce that sort of journalism, even if it gets fewer clicks than celebrity goss.

It will be so much easier to campaign successfully for press freedom if the community is convinced that this power will be exercised fairly, intelligently and in the public interest. Thanks so much for your kind attention.