

Episode THREE.TWO -- MUSIC, NO MASTER, NO CREDIT

Fri, 7/22 12:47PM 48:15

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

people, journalist, ceo, felt, punks, podcast, sources, article, media, purpose, weiser, story, stated, fact, allegations, quote, questions, journalism, asked, charlotte



00:00

This is a sequential podcast, make sure you listen to all episodes in order as we have to follow a strict timeline to be able to tell this story. Thank you



00:25

you were listening to super punk corporate meltdown, a podcast about workers rights, institutional betrayal and corporate retaliation. In the podcast, we analyze a recent case study straight out of the news, a vicious and unnecessary war imposed by an embattled beer company. I'm Kate Bailey. I'm a workplace consultant and workplace investigator



00:45

and I'm for anyone though, the hospitality industry workers advocate



00:49

and this is super punk corporate meltdown. This is episode 3.2 the narrative. So far, we've been talking about the media apparatus and how it can tip the scales, results, resources and lies a much more effective it would seem than truth, facts and evidence. And speaking of.



01:53

On I believe April 6, Weiser came out with a statement and they actually claimed one version of the quote in what we now call, quote, gait. What did you think about that, Charlotte?



02:05

I was in a supermarket in Estonia, when I read that I was just an absolute and utter disbelief

that anybody could ever be that unprofessional was my first thought. Just looking at it, you said something that didn't meet your professional standards. And it wasn't meant to be in public. If it doesn't meet your professional standards. Why did you say it in the first place doesn't meet your professional standards, keep your track shot. That's how most people operate. And I also looked at it and I felt like it was wiser, taking the blame for something that shouldn't have ever been out in the public. Even if this was something that was I said to BrewDog. And it was just an offhand comment. It was run with that was used, it was weaponized. It was used to target people. And the explanation that Weiser gave it was poor, none of it made any sense. Nobody that I know who operates in any professional capacity would ever see that as an explanation or an apology. And it just felt like something hastily. Give them something shut them up. It's done. But all it did was create more questions.



03:20

What just for fun? I mean, what do you think happened with that, quote?



03:25

If I was to say a hypothetical situation, I would say that either somebody at wiser overstepped their professional boundaries spectacularly, and did something that they should never have done as a professional and something they should never have done as a human being. And the CEO ran with it, or the CEO just made it up. Hypothetically speaking, of course, of course, allegedly,



03:53

allegedly, maybe, maybe possibly. We're not sure.



03:56

I'm not sure about any CEOs or companies or directors who promise anonymity, but if I was to create one in my mind palace, that would be my explanation.



04:15

Honey, let's analyze her gait. And let's see if we can actually land on a conclusion here. I want to kick this off. Happy



04:23

to. So we've already discussed the multiple versions that have been circulating and all the replies we've gotten to it. So I would really like to take a look at what Weiser actually issued in April when they finally weighed in in a more official capacity. So firstly, they take responsibility for one version of this quote, and it's not the most defamatory one, like the one that we've

seen in the off comm review that's been circulated repeatedly. Here's the one that Weiser claims, they take responsibility for. That being said this has been the most extreme case we've Seeing of a small group of former employees on a mission to cause damage to a brand. They then go on to say that this was not a part of our independent review, nor quote from Weiser designed to be used externally, but an opinion formed off the back of observing wider activity around the company. That already is quite interesting. And before we even pick that apart, we could mirror that with the very first version of the quote. And so this one was the one that was published by the CEO for BrewDog. On the day of the BBC documentary airing within their shareholders forum. This is where he said, It should be noted in the review process. Why is it I told our teams that this is the most extreme case they have seen of a small group of former employees having such a loud voice when the majority of data from current employees paints a different picture? So obviously, incredibly conflicting statements, the CEOs version from January? I think we've both already agreed about this. But it seems to be the truest version of what happened throughout all of this. I find it very curious, because obviously, this flew way under the radar for everyone at the time. Looking back, the fact that it's openly stated here that at least one version of this quote was given during the actual review process is notable. It's alarming. Next, we can really just go through the whole breakdown because this statement is riddled with inaccuracies and omissions. So I guess I'll just get right into it



06:29

go off funny.



06:31

I'll go off Weiser has already heard all of this from me, and they never replied. So it's great to have this on the podcast. For starters, I would say that they stated that they were appointed in October of 2021. However, they were actually appointed in July. This can be verified according to the CEOs own announcement within his shareholders forum. Next, they had given the incorrect Airing Date for the BBC documentary they had said the 21st when it was the 24th, something that both BrewDog and Weiser had been doing was sort of framing the issue of finding participants for the review in a certain way. We know that the punks were purpose letter had about 300 signatories on it. So for a while people were really under the impression that out of these 300 signatories only 24 People responded to arrange an interview with wiser and 15 attended. I believe that this is also stated in their high level findings. But what we later figured out was actually that Charlotte Cooke herself had back in the fall of 2021, stated within the signatories, Facebook group, that Weiser only had 40 available slots for signatories. So why that's being left out and why the numbers are being presented, the way that they are by the companies is really, really curious. And I see it as an omission for sure. Finally, the statement does not address that they had given entirely conflicting statements. The statement came out on April 6, then I believe it was March 15, where they had emailed someone who was inquiring about the quote saying that it was not a quote from Weiser. And it was something to do with the PR advisor that BrewDog had hired externally who had misquoted someone from a press release. Then there's also just the fact that this company wide survey which did not hit all the all of the company, we haven't been able to clarify exactly how many people work at BrewDog. Because that's another statistic that we consistently get different numbers for Budweiser stated that they had spoken with 1800, or that they had reached out to approximately 1800 people of their current staff and who they had actually managed to interview and survey only

accounted for about 45%. So why a company wide survey not an investigation is the foundation for BrewDog argument seems quite odd. And in their statement, they had remarked on the fact that this was an opinion they had given observing wider activity around the company. I think it speaks to their professionalism entirely if they are contradicting their own high level findings, which clearly state that former co workers wanted to use their negative experience for positive change within the company. And then I think it's curious why wider activity around the company is being weighed in on if it's not something that they themselves are privy to, except in closed door conversations.



09:24

I completely agree. And it creates this ethical question around the credible, independent third party that wiser were purported to be in these types of situations. The way that that status is protected is that you don't have closed door conversations about external activities to the activity that you are conducting. You're 100% right to raise these inaccuracies and these omissions and I think the juxtaposition of the original quote, the one from the sea II O, which highlights that in the review process? Why is it hold our teams versus this April 6 statement is jarring? I think it does speak to the professionalism of an organization. And I think, well, we can land because you want to assume, you know, you don't want to assume is the point. But I think where we could definitely land is that something has gone on, and there is some sort of an internal conflict around the ownership of this quote. And my sense is that is because it is such a harmful quote, actually, if it was a totally fine thing for an independent, credible third party to say, and to infer and then to spread and give a legal opinion on then unfortunately, like that doesn't really lend itself to being independent.



10:51

Not really, it also, I mean, in retrospect, it kind of makes their entire report feel incredibly passive aggressive, to be honest with you.



11:01

Because how can both things be true? Exactly? How can both things be true? Yeah, that's the question, right? And, yeah, it even just that being the case, kind of discredits all the premises that they've tried to stand behind. And the thing I think, that I want people to take away here is that this quote, was held up by media institutions as well, and they betrayed workers, really, with a lack of attention to detail around the facts of this, this is a pretty egregious thing. To even find out, it really does tip the scales. And from my perspective, this is what resources look like when you have the resources to tip the scales, right, using an quote, independent, credible third party and, quote, independent, credible journalism. Let's now return to Charlotte Cook, and hear a little bit about her experiences with the media in the last six to seven months. At one point, Charlotte, you had an experience with a journalist. And technically it was punks with purpose, having an experience with a journalist because all of this was being filtered as a collective response. And you are aware of the communications between the group and the journalist. Initially, everything started off fine. You were approached, but then there were some red flags. Can you elaborate on the interactions that collective had with this journalist? Yeah,



12:25

so this journalist approached punks of purpose via the Twitter platform for a piece that they were writing for a large UK Sunday supplement in the newspaper. They just asked us some questions in general, there was nothing particularly accurate theory or anything, no response to any questions that have been made. Then a few days later, we got an email that came through asking for some clarification about punks for purpose for co founder, Charlotte cook. And again, just to clarify, I am not a founder of punks with purpose, no matter what you may have heard, and so that was my first indication that I'm alright, this is how this is gonna go strap in boys, it's gonna be a wild ride. So answered the questions made it clear that I was not a founder of punks with purpose. And then I think the next day, another email came through, and I was actually ill in Spain with norovirus. So feeling not particularly cheerful, or particularly interested in being nice to anybody. And we got an email through that asked a question stating that the journalist had seen an email that was sent by a former member of punks with purpose to the CEO, allegedly extorting them asked him for blackmail. I have never seen any copy of this document. I don't even know if this document exists. I've got no proof that it was real, I've got no proof it was sent, I've got no proof of who sent it. So I was asked to comment on it, despite the fact that never seen the document, don't even know if it's real, and had nothing to do with the conversation between that individual and the CEO whatsoever. So the only thing that I could do to respond is to say, These things are not connected. This is a false narrative. This has nothing to do with punks with purpose. This has nothing to do with our mission. This has nothing to do with anything that anybody else is doing out there in the world to try and put this situation right. And I find it pretty bizarre to be asked to comment on something that I've never seen proof of even existing. I just supposed to take their word for it. I don't think that's how journalism works.



14:45

Yeah, and I think that it's also notable that this information was clearly so clearly supplied by the other source in the story, which is the other side obviously, and It felt as though, you know, did you respond strongly to this journalist in terms of making it clear where punks was purpose stood in regards to this allegation



15:16

as strongly as I could, nobody a puncture purpose had any prior knowledge of any communication between this individual and the CEO, had no knowledge of any accusations of blackmail, it was the first thing that we heard. And the first thing that we heard was an email from a journalist who's seen, allegedly, the proof, we've never seen it, we've never been involved with it. And we would utterly condemn it as well, if it was true. And yeah, I was just very taken aback that I was being asked to comment on something that didn't involve me, and that I couldn't see any evidence of being true.



15:57

When the article was finally published, did you feel that the rebuttal that you had provided to this allegation was represented in the reporting, or that it said,



16:11

was a representative from Ponsa purpose claims to have no knowledge of this interaction? Which I guess, you know, that's a that's a handy, short way of presenting it. But, again, I was never presented with any proof that this happened. And yeah, I was asked to comment on it. I don't think that that's a particularly strong standpoint to take to say that this has happened, that one person seen it, has it been forensically tested? Yeah. Has anybody got any proof that this was actually sent by the person it's alleged to have been sent by? I think that sounds like a slightly shaky ground to stand on.



16:58

Yeah, and I think it was, at a time when so many former workers were being persecuted as being part of this criminal conspiracy. That if that was this clear allegation of criminal activity, and then there was also evidence provided by punks was purpose that very, very clearly shows what this individuals involvement in the organization was, which was a matter of days, in the summer of last year. It just feels as though that criminal element could be could have been addressed. You know, because it was a core part of the accusations that the CEO had come to the article with,



17:44

it will certainly could have been addressed. And it was basically within the same breath, that accusations of criminality were made. And accusations of court case. Again, I have not been contacted by police or lawyers in relation to this or any other matters. And it just felt like two disconnected things were being put together to convey a false narrative. And I thought that that was unacceptable.



18:10

Yeah. And funny, you also took issue with this article when it was eventually reported. Can you describe the interaction that you had?



18:20

Yeah, so I was also someone who was interviewed by this journalist, my quotes did not appear in the article, they said that they felt it echoed the responses from the other people they had spoken to. So that was completely fine. I didn't feel like I needed to lend my voice. As my perspective wasn't what was important. I did however, take issue with a number of things in the article, one of them being that a person's workplace was mentioned by name. And I thought this was a gross violation of this person's privacy. I think anyone involved in this debate has made a huge effort to compartmentalize their activism or advocacy with their workplace. And what this article was doing was definitely putting them at risk to harassment, it was compromising their right to retain employment. And we, I would say, this is like the the only

time I've really interfered and had anything negative to say to a journalist, the journalist responded to me, and he let me know that both myself and this person that I was advocating for, and as well, the CEO of BrewDog, apparently don't understand how journalism works. And to that, I say, I completely disagree. And I just don't understand how their journalism works, because I found it to be a common courtesy from other journalists that I had spoken with when I asked him for my privacy to be respected, and for my workplace not to be mentioned, they were happy to oblige. So this oversight is when the CEO is discussing some ongoing legal cases that they have going on. And this is where I found it to be quite forthcoming. They were pursuing someone who they had exchanged money with and who the CEO felt he had been defrauded by. And what it seemed like was that the CEO had paid someone to get in touch with anyone he believed to be part of this criminal conspiracy, so to speak. And what I then found interesting was that it then went on to say that Charlotte had been in contact with this person, and it was twisted in a way where it seemed as though she should have felt guilty or that this was a fact that in some way incriminated Charlotte or punks with purpose by extension, and I thought that to be quite odd, because right above that it had been a minute that the CEO himself wanted this person to instigate contact with people.



21:01

And I would have very happily put the journalists straight had been made aware of the allegation that a member of punks with purpose had communication with the individual who is subject to legal action. That was a very limited interaction. At no point. Did anybody from punks with purpose, collude in any criminal activity, or condone it or say that we wanted to be part of it? And the journalist just took the fact that the CEO said, I've seen communication between this individual involved in the legal cases and punks with purpose, and didn't even question what that communication said that communication could have been this individual contacting somebody with punks with purpose, and then saying, never contact me again. And I just find that to be a little bit wanting, allowing the CEO to paint a narrative that was untrue, and not questioning it.



21:59

Having spoken to this person, this journalist myself, it was quite interesting. And I remember expressing my discomfort with my exchange with them, only because they weren't very forthcoming with any information that they might already have. And they asked very kind of specific, but very broad questions definitely asked me an open ended, do you think there's a criminal conspiracy?



22:22

And I think a lot of the issue that comes with this is that actually journalists don't fully know the situation. And they don't know the questions to ask to get the full explanation of what's been going on for well over a year and a half at this point nearly, and people are very happy to let them know, but they just go in there with snippets. And this is such a difficult, complex situation, that to only go in with snippets means that you're never going to get to the bottom of what's actually happening. You're not doing justice to people on either side. And, you know, you

can't just write an article, when you don't know who all the key players are, what's going on the web of complexity that's going on behind the scenes, and then present it for public consumption. I don't think that's right.



23:13

Recently, the CEO of the company went on a popular podcast to be vulnerable, allegedly, and discuss the alleged truth about their management style, which was raised in the article, and then mistakes which allegedly did not happen because it's actually a criminal conspiracy and personal vendetta against him. But anyway, he went on this podcast, very popular one to talk about this. Charlotte, you have since engaged with the publisher of this podcast, regarding a right to replay Can you break this down for us?



23:44

Absolutely. So I was mentioned not by name on the podcast. But in reference to a story that I told on the BBC podcast. I asked for a right of reply, which is my legal right. And I wanted to put the story straight, because in this, it's gone. Where am I going? My brain is starting to slow he says like he he, again, tries to link the court cases, right? Pretty much. All right. In this podcast, the CEO discusses both pumps with purpose and the court cases that are currently going through and again, fails to clarify that neither Counsel of purpose nor any former worker that we know of, is involved in any of these cases. And I thought that this was a bit of a lapse in judgment of the producer of the podcast, because this is a perfect opportunity for everyone to get their story straight for everyone to know that what happened in America is different to what happened in the UK what happened with people in private life is different what happened in the workspace. And I asked for a right to reply, I emailed the publisher, the producer, the PR, and the presenter. And apart from a very brief acknowledgement of the receipt of my request, I've heard nothing. And to me, this just feels like children playing a journalism, you don't get to have somebody on to make accusations to have the reputation that the CEO has of making sweeping statements, and then not offer anybody else the opportunity to put their side of the story forward. It's a basic tenant of responsible journalism, that you give somebody the right to reply. And I know for a fact that in this podcast, anybody who's mentioned will be given the opportunity to give a right of reply, because that's fair. That's how it works. And this podcast hasn't done it. And this podcast is big, lots of people read it. This podcast is big, lots of people listen to it. And a lot of people who don't have any understanding of the complexities, again, of the situation will hear and only hear one side. And I think that's fundamentally, deeply unfair. And I don't think that people who can't respect the basic principles of responsible journalism should be putting media out there.



26:21

I think this, again, just drives home the fact that the media can be used as an apparatus for an individual or a company in turmoil to kind of launch these rehabilitative campaigns where, as you know, we hear one side of the story, and particularly, what's notable about this is that all of this is still ongoing. You have the CEO whenever outside us for clarity, saying, well, we can't clarify anything about ongoing court cases. Okay. But then that same individual representing that same company will go on to a massive broadcast, and must communicate, a very carefully

crafted, I guess, collage of the truth. And these media institutions, essentially, if they're not doing the journalism, they are a megaphone, right? If you don't do the journalism to say, Well, is it true? Or what is the truth of that? How should we discuss that? Should someone else be contacted to verify that if you don't do that, you're just a microphone for misinformation? It's reprehensible?

 27:37

Absolutely. I also think it's really notable that the interviewer himself states that they listened to the entire BBC podcast, and yet what was cherry picked to address was still historical issues, when so much about the last few months has been about what's going on now. And how are people being retaliated against now in present day, since coming out with all these allegations, and a massive oversight in the interview is not addressing the things that are going on after the airing of the documentary.

 28:11

I completely agree. It's just giving an abrasive leader an opportunity to drive home their agenda, and to continue to embrace that power dynamic, of having access to media who's willing to not check their allegations and just let it happen and not have their finger on the pulse enough to be able to say, actually, the historical stuff is bad. But what is happening today is maybe even worse, because it's part cover up part Shakedown. And part you know, bulldoze until our agenda is the only thing that exists.

 28:57

Absolutely. And the fact that one of the explanations for why this whole situation has occurred, was because people in the UK are jealous. I can't believe anyone even published that. Apparently, in America, they celebrate success. But in the UK, we just want to batter everybody down. Why didn't the presenter ask the CEO? Why in the BBC documentary so many of the allegations and more modern allegations and some of the historical UK allegations came from America? Are those people not supposed to be the ones cheering for him? It was just, again, a megaphone. And when the people who reasonably asked for their right to reply are ignored. That's not media. That's a megaphone.

 29:44

What are your intentions around your right to reply in regards to this podcast?

 29:49

To say what actually happened to say that nobody is involved in the criminal cases or the civil cases to say that I don't feel that I've been apologized to To say the punks of purpose aren't jealous. We, you know, I do not have any modicum of jealousy towards the CEO, that is not a life that I would like to have, and I'm very happy with my life I've worked hard towards and

achieved a lot in Is he really diminishing my achievement so much to say that I'm simply jealous. I don't think that's a particularly mature response or thought process. And just make sure that other people can put their side stop forward. We always wanted to represent both sides, and give people the opportunity to, but that has to work both ways. We don't have the platform, we don't have the media access, we don't have the advisors, we don't have the people who can create an image for us that then we just have to spout off the sound bites, we just want to be able to say the truth.

 30:57

Yeah. And speaking of one other little nugget, that I think, is a little bit of a microcosm of everything that you've just alluded to, and discuss there, Charlotte. And that is, you know, you talk about this like spouting off sort of stuff. But one thing that came up in this podcast that I think might be worthwhile mentioning, and I can do it because I'm an autistic person. But in addition to the CEO, having blamed their bad management style on three things, so far, being on a fishing boat, having a bad relationship with their mother, and also experiencing acne as a teen even went on this podcast, to state that it could be something to do with light autism,

 31:43

I don't think that you can use a disability to explain bad behavior. It's insulting to people with disabilities, and it diminishes what people have done to other people. Again, it's just a I'm sorry, but sorry, you feel that way. But it's a big old bot. And the response whenever anyone has actually criticized us in the media is to send threatening letters and have the articles taken down. And that doesn't help to open up the conversation around disability and difficulty. That just proves again, that the narrative wants to be controlled by one side and one side only. And that's unacceptable. Yeah, that was

 32:29

really notable that those articles, which came from individuals who had heard this comment on the podcast, and some of them were autistic, and some of them had connections with autistic people. And they went on to write about their feelings around this because what I think, as an autistic person, the one thing I'll say, is that these workers that came forward to speak up about this person did not experience his autism. They didn't experience that they experienced, perhaps potentially someone with yet to be diagnosed autism behaving badly. There's a very clear distinction there. So it was very notable that these articles were taken down, written by people who are on the spectrum or who have close connections with people on the spectrum. Because the CEO wanted to be able to use that as a Get Out of Jail Free card. How disgusting. Absolutely.

 33:31

And I think it's also odd, because it wasn't, it's not a fact that's been established yet. It's still something the CEO is waiting to hear back about. And so on that note, I'm not optimistic about it. But I would hope that we then get updated, because I don't think it's fair to throw that out

before it's something that's even confirmed, let alone at all.



33:55

There's also a lot of people on the spectrum who don't have access to the resources to be diagnosed. And it's quite insulting to sort of immediately go out and be like, Oh, well, like I'm working on this way to get out of the situation that I'm in when for other people. It's a very difficult and real experience.



34:12

I agree. And I also find it really very jarring that the CEO asked for these articles to be taken down, saying that they misrepresented what he'd actually said about autism. If the response and the scrutiny that you receive after you talk about something isn't what you want, maybe you just don't talk about it in the first place. Maybe you just should have kept stem about the autism if you didn't want people to then comment on it, because it's such a ridiculous thing to say such a preposterous way to try and explain your behavior, and so insulting to millions of people, that maybe you should just reflect a little bit and stay quiet.



34:50

I'd also love to recommend to the CEO that they brush up a little bit about the appropriate language to use when discussing these sort of things because you It was only demonstrative that even though this might be something, he will now need to figure out for himself, he is still ignorant to the subject.



35:18

Now, we do not want to take this down a petty route, we haven't had that much fun on the podcast yet, it's been pretty serious. But I think there's a really good way that we can drive home that the media in these circumstances in these landscapes, these dialogues, whatever you want to call it, is something that takes everyone involved. It takes time, effort and energy, and everyone engages with it, because it is helpful to the cause or the agenda, or you have a responsibility to reply to something that's been put out from the other side, right? But you know what? We've fucking seen some shit over the last year. Fanny, would you like to kick off our laundry list of media institution fails,



36:04

where to start honestly, being condescended to with journalists trying to explain to me how they cover legal liability, which I'm very much aware of. And that was kind of part of coercing me into talking to them. And I just didn't need the speech, then alerting journalists to certain issues that they ignored, and which now I've seen come back up and just sitting here, knowing that they've known about it for six months via me.

 36:30

Yeah, that's interesting, because there have been some pretty serious consequences around stuff that just hasn't been investigated properly. And we've seen journalists, be informed directly by sources and stories, and then just not do anything and then scrambled to catch up to the story later. Like, okay, and I just want to note that we're talking very generally about our experiences here. So this is stuff that could have happened in July of last year, or in January of this year. And we don't want to go down that route of naming people, we're just trying to reiterate how difficult it can be in these circumstances, because you're kind of subjected to this thing, which is helpful. But on their terms only, right? Yeah,

 37:18

completely, then you have the ones who need you to fill in the gaps for them, which I'm, believe me, I'm more than happy to do. But then it would be really nice if you could just engage with me if I'm doing that kind of labor for you. Because I totally understand having to be objective and everything like that. But that's on the journalists, not for me. I've had people ask me, who's rat magnet? Yep. Which is pretty shocking. Yeah,

 37:44

I think that was the same journalists that asked me on a date when it was really obvious who it was, but they said, Who's wiser?

 37:53

Oh, my gosh,

 37:54

I was like, how are you? I mean, this was in the this was in the middle of March. So it was like not, you know, something, you know, and it had come after this, like Grant speech about, you know, following the story and being so engaged, and you know, wanting to do this, the other whatever, like, and you're just like, Oh, my God,

 38:12

then there's, you know, getting engaged by media that, you know, are already talking to, I don't want to say the other side, but getting engaged by media that, you know, they're already working on the story, they already have their ankle, and they want you now to participate and play a part in that ankle. So I've definitely experienced being kind of like coerced, or like I was forced into certain interviews, getting called a sexism activist certainly wasn't a choice of mine. That especially was quite painful. That was where I think I was strung along for three, four days before quote of mine was actually used. And it was about four articles that were awful. And

then the fifth one came, and I don't know anything for sure. But it was like it was though the same journalist. And then it was a completely different tone. And everything that had been built up in the four articles leading up to that had just gotten smashed down. It was so interesting.



39:07

Yeah, I remember that that was completely bizarre. That was also the same publication where a journalist reached out to me for comment for a piece that they were adamant was coming out late in the week. But then it was published that same day, which resulted in another journalist calling me and accusing me of trying to get PR for my business, which given I'd worked hours for them encouraging sources to cooperate because it felt like the safest thing at the time. And I felt like they always knew that I was just wanting to help those individuals. It was just so offensive to me on both sides. Both journalists breaking the trust and crossing the line and sort of revealing their agenda, and that they don't really care. They they just want the comment and then they're going to do what they want, which so wrong. And here's another point. I feel like many of the journalists taking an interest or being assigned these stories over the last year, have had a complete lack of awareness of A, how transparent their agenda is, and be what you're asking people who, for many of them are essentially whistleblowers, right. In a different circumstance, they could be classed as whistleblowers. And these people are putting themselves and their lives out there, I think reflects really poorly on journalists, when they seek the most salacious, most gut wrenching of the stories, but then also refuse to go deeper and understand that these stories people are telling a yes important and crucial on an individual level, but that people are telling them to highlight workplace issues. And it's not enough that these journalists will state well, I'm an investigative reporter, you can feel safe with me if they go on and off stupid questions that leave sources. You know, wondering if you haven't read this article literally from yesterday, because you're asking questions that were addressed in that article, and you just assume that this source is going to go on record named. That's a bad situation. And then these journalists get pissed when the sources will ask for legal coverage, which by the way, they're not really asking for much because journalism can only cover what is on the record. I mean, there are so many other legal liabilities to consider that. And the other thing is, they then get resentful when the source gets scared or intimidated, because they're not able to provide that legal coverage, or they're not willing to do the backdoor encrypted channel meet up or things like that the source gets scared and intimidated. And then the journal gets resentful. And in that resentment, they'll be like us when it's when it's fun, but they kind of get really passive aggressive and resentful. This has happened on countless occasions, and then they apply pressure on the source to go on record. And on top of that, these journalists rarely consider that there are more than one of them in someone's DMS. And this situation is creating pressure for sources on top of a situation that is already completely pressure filled. I think honestly, the last year has shown me that with a few notable exceptions, that there has been a genuine lack of care for the sources and the types of stories that they're coming forward with. And it's not a game. It's not clickbait. It's stuff that you have to really commit to and investigate and be able to verify, not just that one salacious story. Because this isn't gossip, you can't have Aussie stories, you need to understand the pressures on the sources and coming forward. And then try not to act butthurt when that impacts you, your careers being threatened. No, it's not these people's lives, their security, their personal sense of privacy is being threatened, your career is going to be fine. And the only time this year in this last year that I've raised my voice, who have been remotely overly emotional directly one on one with someone outside of the circle that was experiencing this was when I called a journalist of a very prestigious masthead, as they love to remind me to rage at their treatment

of a source. I mean, I really went off and I don't regret it. Because it was the second source that had been treated like cattle in this little sensational game that journalists seem to have going on



43:39

completely. I mean, as you said, it's a lack of care. It's also lack of urgency with a story like this, and with a company like this with the means and clearly with the PR training. So things could change from day to day, the stories could evolve immediately. And then, especially in this case, where sources have been so heavily under fire and targeted in such visceral ways. It's not it shouldn't shock anyone that being asked to sit tight is not really a tempting option.



44:14

Great point. And, of course, there are some stories that are going to naturally require that people sit tight, well, things verified and things are investigated. But over the last year, there's been many, many stories. In fact, the majority of stories which are actually reflective of what the source is living and experiencing at that time, and can be verified pretty quickly through primary sourcing. But no, if that doesn't fit the journalists timeline or their cat and mouse game, then forget about it. Forget about the fact that sources reporting to the media can offer them whistleblower protections. Forget that companies coming off to sources will literally keep doing it if they are not exposed publicly. because they can. And also, there's just yeah, a total disregard for the fact that these stories rely on momentum to keep the public up to date. And let's be real, to keep the public interested, and to keep them factually abreast of what's happening so that they can follow the story. And this is where the media really loses, because sources then just feel denigrated, and like their stories mean nothing. And like what is happening to them means nothing. And this just draws me into the topic, that social media is such an important tool to be able to keep the pressure on the situation, to be able to keep demanding answers of badly behaved companies. But as we've seen over the last year, fact checking the fucking media as the expert in social media community work, Fanny, could you talk a little bit about social media? In this context?



45:58

I think when used properly, it is crucial. And I think it's such an untapped resource because people use the internet so irresponsibly, but when used well, I don't see why a social media account can't be respected. They are, every person that's listening to this probably follow some sort of social media account that provides them information that they trust, and that they to believe is legitimate. So while mine provides information, it also does have that element of free speech and community response. And I don't always turn police because there's the shareholders forum for that. I think it's completely fair when I then see an article that's littered with inaccuracies, wrong dates, wrong information. And if I'm able to provide it and better yet with a source, then I don't see why not. So that isn't at all to say that these things shouldn't be investigated by the media because, of course, there's reliable media out there. It's more to draw attention to these issues so that they can be further pushed and investigated.



47:12

Were going to conclude this episode of Super punk corporate meltdown. But we felt it was really important to have a conversation about the role that media plays in these situations. The practice of journalism and the commitment to integrity and facts and bringing it to the public is very important, but it also plays a role in a super punk corporate meltdown.