

## **HOW CORRUPT CANADIAN JOURNALISM CRUSHED A VOLUNTEER GROUP —AND MANY LIVES IN THE PROCESS.**

Professor F. M. Christensen

*Hard to imagine though it may be that anyone would commit, and that others would support, the dishonest and cruel behavior summarized below, the proof is overwhelming, and is available online from lawsuit documents. Through massive deceit and manipulation, reporter Donna Laframboise did all the following and much more:*

- Used threats and false slander to frighten the president of a volunteer group into certain actions she desired.
- Told them that in a book (unknown to them) I'd condoned child sex abuse (the **opposite** of its actual views).
- Hid having done all this from readers, writing that that group held the resulting alarmed meeting on its own.
- Hid from readers the fact that the volunteer group then told her they had discovered her allegation was false.
- Published, through many false insinuations and flat falsehoods, essentially the same allegation in her article.
- Distorted and hid key facts about the group's own behavior, so as to insinuate serious wrongdoings by them.
- Similarly extorted a distant group--unaware of any facts here--into acts that enabled her to publish her libels.
- Hid from readers many facts proving the dishonesty and malicious motives of her friend, her main informant.
- Hid the fact that the other informants had been first groomed, then sent to her, by that friend/main informant.
- Distorted those other informants' words, originally harmless, to insinuate corruption by the group and by me.
- Gave the sources anonymity, citing an excuse she knew was not valid **or** the real motive of some/all of them.
- Refused to communicate with any, despite their emailed pleas, to whom her main informant had not sent her.
- Sought no facts about me from the one person (the president) she contacted who she knew might support me.
- Published nothing said in defence of the group or of me by the president, or in those pleas others emailed her.
- Deceived or manipulated all that she communicated with, to get them to make accusations for her to publish.
- Gave me no prior chance to reply to **any** claims she went on to publish, yet made readers think she'd done so.
- Made readers believe that I had refused to respond--despite my repeated efforts to do so--to her newspaper.
- Destroyed/hid from the lawsuit much documentation that evidently proved she conspired with her informant.
- Kept from readers, contacts and editors many facts that reflected her extreme bad faith and her real motives.

*Despite their moral and legal responsibility for the reporter's actions, the **National Post** and **Canwest Global**:*

- Failed to exercise any meaningful supervision of her, ignoring grave danger signs, in the weeks before publication. (Her own testimony that a certain editor had to authorize her article and its content contradicts his sworn testimony.)
- Ignored pleas, before and after publication, made to them by those whom she planned to defame, then did defame.
- Evidently failed ever to examine her emails and conversation-tapes that prove all of her behavior described above.
- Instead, had their powerful law firms take actions and make threats to intimidate the victims of all of that behavior.
- Engaged in eight years of legal tactics, life-draining to the victims, to escape publicly revealing all of that behavior.
- Offered to settle the suit only after sworn testimony by former **Post** higher-ups began to reveal more wrongdoing. (Then, with **Canwest** facing bankruptcy, I had to give up on going to trial--hence on proving all these facts at trial.)
- Continue--as **Postmedia**--refusing to report settling the lawsuit or to report any of these shocking facts to the public.

*Despite being the local **Canwest** newspaper, despite its quickness to report wrongdoing in other professions, and despite all of the special privileges in law which it gets for thus informing the public, the **Edmonton Journal**:*

- Leaped, when the **National Post** first published about the local group, to print a trivial story of its own, and yet—
- Failed to act, back then, when the group begged **The Journal** to investigate the **Post** reporter's unethical actions.
- Never reported the news that I sued over all the horrid allegations, leaving the public to assume they must be true.
- Spurned requests from the group to publish a letter relating **The Post's** cash settlement and unpublished retraction.
- Refuses to this day to investigate and report on the massive proof now available of all of that unethical journalism.

*...All of which has nearly destroyed the volunteer group, harming the many in need whom they would have aided.*

The lawsuit documents proving all of this are here:

[www.FightForHonestJournalism.ca](http://www.FightForHonestJournalism.ca)

## **Why all of this should matter to you:**

News media in Canada, as in other countries, daily expose alleged incompetent and corrupt behavior: actions by police, government, and many others said to have abused their power. All of us understand the need for this role of "watchdog" by news media: it is just a fact of human nature that unaccountable power corrupts, and there can be no accountability without oversight. On the other hand, how do you know when media reports of wrongdoing are fully, or even partly, honest? For there is no one to act as "watchdog" over journalists; they themselves are accountable to no one. "We are accountable to our readers", they may respond. But on most subjects, they control what their readers hear--the public as a whole usually has no independent way to check on the truth of news-media reports. That being so, the public has no meaningful way to hold the media--and especially near-monopolistic Big Media--to account.

To repeat, you often hear news media reports of corruption. But when did you last see a news report on unethical acts **by** Canadian media? When did they last allege deceitful news coverage or other abuses of the great power they wield, abuses that deceive the public and destroy innocent people? I am not talking here about "taking sides" on an issue: if the **facts** are presented honestly, the public can decide for themselves whether the **opinions** journalists base upon the facts are warranted. I am talking here about distorting, fabricating and/or covering up what actually happened.

"But wait--aren't errant journalists apt to be exposed by **other** journalists?" Not in Canada, it seems, for here news reporters are a very small club. And massively concentrated media ownership here means that a reporter working for Company A may need to work later for Company B--and so had better not offend any of them. Further, at any given media outlet an editor or like power decides what reporters are allowed to tell. Beyond that, journalists have the same motivations as do other professionals to circle the wagons and protect their own. Unlike the case of other professions, however, those tiny press councils have no power to enforce ethical rules, and even membership in them is voluntary. Since journalists are not immune to the tendencies to deceive that tempt all humans, and are accountable to no one, you have good reason to ask why you rarely or never see an exposé of a corrupt journalist in Canadian news media.

Not only do journalists have massive unaccountable power to begin with. Over time they have asked for, and received--especially from courts of law--many privileges that no one else gets, on grounds that they protect "the public's right to know". No one elected them, and yet they claim to represent the people. Surely this gives news media an even greater moral obligation than others have to tell the whole truth and nothing but the truth--and the public has a moral right for them to do so. This especially includes reporting wrongdoing by their own kind.

Aside from the right not to be deceived, members of the public have another reason for concern about news-media ethics. Because they control what the world hears about you, journalists can destroy your good name--or use threats of doing so to silence you. Some of us know this from devastating experience. But most people have no idea how hard it is to fight Big Media, with its huge law firms. You, or someone you know, could be the next to be victimized by all of that power. "You **can** fight City Hall, if the newspaper is with you. But you can't fight the city newspaper." News media in the US often report unethical journalism. But if Canadian news media will cover up even behavior as extreme as is described on this flyer's reverse, when will they will ever report **any** journalistic corruption in Canada?

For two years since the *National Post* settled my lawsuit in private, many appeals have been made to Canadian journalists to report the wrongdoing to the public, to clear the name of the Edmonton divorce-help organization so seriously harmed. It has been in vain--no media outlets have broken ranks to report the story. We were growing fast when we were attacked, but have barely survived since then. Nearly all of the social-services agencies that had been referring people to us suddenly stopped; certain politicians and news-media contacts with whom we had long worked could not afford to be seen associating with us any more. Consequently, a great many individuals that we might have aided have not learned about us, or not done so in time to get help. We believe even deaths have occurred that would otherwise have been prevented. And because no news media outlets will clear our name, this great harm continues.

To learn more about the effects of this case of unethical journalism, one can contact the former group president Rick Fowler at <rickfowler5@gmail.com> or at 780-471-0023. Thank you for caring enough to read this message.