

Cut Through, August 12, 2026: **Why the Australian media sensationalises men's violence**
All timestamps are approximate

Jane (00:00)

I've heard directly from women whose children have been killed who've had journalists knock on the door that day ask how they feel. How did you feel when somebody told you your child was dead?

I've spoken to women who've been raped, who've read about themselves in news articles about their rape trial, where they are referred to as liars, as gold diggers. there was one where the defence lawyer in the courtroom was showing photos of her underwear to the jury and saying, Well, why were you wearing underwear like this if you weren't planning on having sex?

Crystal Andrews (00:32)

Hello and welcome to Cut Through, Cracky Spin-Free Analysis of Australian news, politics, and power. I'm your host, Crystal Andrews, and today I'm joined by Jane Gilmour, writer, media reform advocate, and creator of the Fixed It Headline project. Jane, welcome to Cut Through.

Jane (00:48)

Hi Crystal, great to be here.

Crystal Andrews (00:50)

We are tackling quite a heavy topic today in the Australian epidemic of violence against women and the significant role that the media plays in this issue, which we've seen quite clear proof of over the past few months with the coverage of the high profile Victorian man on trial for raping a former employee. Now that he has been convicted and the suppression order on his name has been lifted, we can say that man is talent manager Ralph Carr.

Now, Jane, you've been tracking and correcting the media sanitization of male perpetrators for a decade, over a decade.

Jane (01:27)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (01:27)

maybe you can tell us how did this play out in the car case over the past few months?

Jane (01:31)

So I did quite a detailed study of how the media was reporting on the car trial because the fixed correction of headlines was always quite reactive. A headline would come up and I would make sure that I wasn't going to be in breach of any subjudicy contempt or defamation laws and then correct the headline. This one, because I knew he was quite litigious and I was worried about giving any grounds at all for a mistrial, I decided not to do anything on the headlines as they were coming out, but just to collect them all and establish a pattern.

So what I found in the twenty I think it was twenty-four, twenty-five articles that I collected across the ABC, The Guardian, The Herald Sun one from the age after the verdict, was that the headlines were all either factual, so man on trial for rape, or they were rape myth based, usually about women lie, you know, women make up lies about rape to punish men or to get money out of them, which is this huge myth that a lot of people think is true and is actually proven to be bullshit.

And most of the headlines were based on this idea that women lie, and it was usually coming from quotes from the defense lawyer. So the defense lawyer would make an allegation in an opening statement, or, you know, I put it to you that you are lying. And this would result in a headline that says, Court hears that victim is lying. Victim is a liar, victim has a financial motive to lie. And

This was just an allegation by the defence lawyer, it wasn't evidence. But if you didn't click through and read the article, which if you're not a subscriber say to the Herald Sun, you wouldn't be able to even if you wanted to, all you would see is this headline about how women lie about rape.

And then of course in the end he was found guilty. So the jury that was actually sitting there through every day at that trial and actually heard all of the evidence, they believed her beyond a reasonable doubt, which is a very high standard and a very difficult thing to get in a rape trial.

Crystal Andrews (03:14)

there's been a lot of discussion about the role of the suppression order in this case and and keeping his name sort of out of that coverage for such a long time. but it seems to me that it might not have necessarily made a difference whether he was named or not named in the style of not only media reporting, but I guess specifically the headlines that you're talking about, it does not necessarily require the the alleged perpetrators or in this case the convicted rapist name.

Jane (03:38)

No, it really doesn't. And one of the things that about the difference that I saw in that car reporting between the headline and the actual report, because most of the reports while the trial was underway was standard court reporting, which has very specific requirements about you're not allowed to put in opinion, you're not allowed to put in context, you're not you know, you just this is what happened in court. This person said this and this person said this and that's all you can do.

So usually the articles themselves did put in that context. This was claimed by the defence lawyer, this was done during cross-examination. So if you read the entire article, you would see the context. But as I said, that's depending on you having a subscription and having the interest to click through. Most people, certainly in the research that I've seen, one of the reasons I've always concentrated on headlines is far more people see a headline than read an actual article.

And you take from headlines information that you don't even necessarily know, goes into your brain and swishes around with all the other bits and pieces that you've picked up to form ideas that you don't necessarily examine.

Crystal Andrews (04:33)

what do you think drives that particular approach to the headlines? Like is this

a directive from editors and media owners? Is it sort of lazy journalism or or perhaps subediting? Or is it really just the nature of the sort of like free and fast news cycle that we have where the click is king regardless of the ethics or the accuracy to the details of that story and it doesn't matter how you get it. I mean, I I know there's a lot of there's a lot of different views on on why this is the case. I'm I'm wondering where you sit on the issue.

Jane (05:04)

I think it's complex. I think it's all of those things that you just said. I think there are traditions in newsrooms that go back decades that are again unexamined. So, you know, we've got to come up with a name, the suitcase murder, when a woman's body is discovered in a suitcase, like the the 17-year-old girl that her family knew as Cake, that was referred to as a suitcase murder. She was utterly dehumanized and sensationalized in those headlines. And it's a habit.

A journalistic tradition that goes again that goes unexamined.

I think there's a lot of other things that go into it as well. I don't think it's as simple as there are malevolent editors sitting around stroking white cats and directing their sub-editors to put out evil headlines. I think it is partly just rushing. I think it's we've always done it this way, so we'll keep doing it this way. I think those rape myths are so prevalent, that idea that that women lie.

Then it just becomes automatic. And I think now we've also got the additional factor of a lot of organizations are using AI for writing headlines, and AI is not really trained on a very strong feminist model of understanding and rebutting readiness. know, the tech bros are not terribly concerned about this. combination of all of those things, and then you add to it with something like the Ralph Carr trial.

It's Melbourne, it's football, it's football related. So obviously all the journalists knew who he was, even though they weren't able to say so. And because he was related to football, he kept being referred to as a high profile man. I'm not a football follower or a part of the

football world. I've never heard of him before.

Crystal Andrews (06:33)

No, neither had I.

Jane (06:34)

no. So I think you'd only have heard of him if you are involved in the football world, which of course a lot of news based organizations in Melbourne are. So there is that connection as well. It becomes a bit sensational, they get a bit overexcited and don't stop to think and don't have that training that says, hang on, what is in this headline? What is it saying and why is it saying it? And just the fact that a defence lawyer made this claim doesn't mean that it automatically belongs in a headline.

Crystal Andrews (07:00)

You know, I actually hadn't even thought of the AI aspect of this until you just mentioned it now. But that is it another alarming avenue that this will continue to go down, even just

Jane (07:09)

Yeah, we

Crystal Andrews (07:10)

for the fact that obviously these AI, generative AI large language models are trained on existing data. And

Jane (07:18)

Mm-hmm.

Crystal Andrews (07:18)

there are unfortunately so many headlines

Jane (07:21)

Yes.

Crystal Andrews (07:21)

that that perpetuate these

Jane (07:24)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (07:24)

these myths and

you know, as I said, sort of downplay the role of the perpetrator, villainize the victim, that as we see more and more media organizations, and this is something that CRICEU has reported on quite a bit, you know, the quite significant deals that the major mainstream media organizations are making with AI companies to sort of integrate products into their editorial process. there could be progress that has been made actually undone.

here in the coming

Jane (07:49)
Mm-hmm.

Crystal Andrews (07:50)
years by sort of the introduction into of of AI into this process, which I hadn't even I hadn't even thought

Jane (07:55)
Yes.

Crystal Andrews (07:55)
of until you brought it up.

Jane (07:56)
Yeah, look, it's very new and I've got no evidence 'cause nobody's got any evidence on how it's what impact it's having, because it's just too new to even know. But it is certainly something that I was thinking about when I was looking at the headlines in the Ralph Carr trial, because you know, people in media have told me that AI is often used for headlines and as you said, that historic basis of headlines about rape trials, it is such a common trope that

AI is going to perpetuate it and make it worse and actually embed it even more thoroughly. And even though we're supposed to have human editors that check the headlines before they go to publication, those human editors are also trained on that traditional idea of, yes, it's a rape trial, so that's how we report it.

Crystal Andrews (08:36)
I wanna talk a little bit about your fixed it headline project, which you started in twenty fifteen. And for anyone listening or watching who's not familiar, Jane quite literally goes in with red pen to correct sensationalized headlines that blame victims or excuse the violence of male perpetrators.

2015, like as I said, it must be 11, nearly 12 years now of doing this. Have you seen in that time much change in the way?

That the media reports on men's violence against women, particularly like any positive changes, have you seen a shift at all in that time?

Jane (09:35)
Actually I really have and it's it's difficult to say that because you usually I get asked this question in the context of somebody's done something really awful and then you have to go,

Crystal Andrews (09:44)
Mm.

Jane (09:45)

yeah, I know. But actually overall the reporting has improved. It is by no means perfect and there is absolutely still work to do without any doubt.

But what I've seen in both headlines and in the body of the articles over the last 10 years is we have a lot more reporting now on structural issues. So not just why didn't she leave, but actually why didn't she leave? What are the barriers in the way of women leaving abusive men? Particularly reporting on family and domestic violence, I would say, has improved.

So the information that's given to people about the barriers to leaving, about the fact that she's got nowhere to go, that she's got no money, that he has prevented her from having money, he has trashed her credit record, he has made it impossible for her to get a job, and therefore to trying to leave in the middle of a housing crisis is really complicated. lot more people have a better understanding of those dynamics now because of media reporting, and that is because those structural issues are reported far more often.

Like I said, there is certainly more work to do. reporting on First Nations women is, I would still say pretty terrible, but slowly improving that there are amazing reporters out there who are doing that work and who are insisting that other people be part of that work as they should. We are

Getting much better at reporting on domestic violence is a structural issue rather than just an incident-based thing that, that he went to court once, so it only happened once. The reporting does usually put it in the context of this is a pattern of behaviour. this doesn't ever just happen once. I would say reporting on sexual violence has not shown the same improvements. but the other

Crystal Andrews (11:15)

Interesting.

Jane (11:15)

thing that I have definitely noticed is

What used to be just rife through reporting of men who killed their families was he was once he was such a good guy, you know, that he was a caring dad, he was a great guy, he was a loving granddad, all that kind of stuff used to be in almost every single report on a man who killed his wife and children. And I said this in a TED talk, I don't ten years ago, if you kill your wife or you kill your children or you kill anyone in your family, you get voted off the good guy island. Just stop. But

Journalists would always find somebody, he waved at me once when we were putting the bins out, he seemed like a nice Or even a really close friend, he seemed like a nice guy. I was n I'm not a woman, I was never alone with him, I was not in a relationship with him, and I didn't know any of those things. They didn't even include that. It was just s but find somebody who can say,

but he seemed like such a nice guy and include that in the reporting. And it would often make its way into the headlines as well. That doesn't happen anymore.

And that pretty much stopped after the Media Watch episode, which I put in the Craike article, the Media Watch episode on the Margaret River murders, and the man who killed his wife and his daughter and his grandchildren and was referred to as a loving granddad. And Media Watch did an episode that really pulled that apart and challenged it. And I really haven't seen it since then. Which just goes to show that change can happen. And it really doesn't take that much.

Crystal Andrews (12:34)

I mean, I would certainly credit your advocacy as a big driver of that change. And certainly, you know, when I was coming up through journalism and discovered the work that you were doing, like it definitely helped me understand these issues and understand what was going on around me and how to approach those things in a better way. What else do you feel like has been contributing to that positive shift on some of the topics, I should say, and not other

Jane (13:00)

that was really lovely to hear that that you learned from my work when you were coming up. If it had just been me screaming into the abyss, nothing would have changed. There was a huge range of work

Crystal Andrews (13:09)

Mm.

Jane (13:09)

from a massive number of people. So even just on the advocacy side of it, Tarang Shawala has done amazing work on this as well. We're sort of both working towards the same goals in very different ways. I mean Tarang was at that first meeting that I was at back in 2014 as well. So

That work has been done by a lot of people. Rosie Batty had a huge amount to say about the media reporting and she had a massive effect. I think the Royal Commission in Victoria had some effect. There was a lot of not-for-profit organizations who were doing this work before 2014. What was then Domestic Violence Victoria that had all these resources for journalists. So it's been a cumulative process of an enormous amount of work by a lot of different people and organizations.

But it's been patchy and fragmented, much the way the Australian media environment is fragmented and patchy. know, there's there's so many different organizations. You can find some journalists and get some really brilliant ethical reporting. So I'd look at people like Nina Fennel and Jess Hill and Hailey Gleason, who've done amazing work.

And still have terrible reporting by other journalists from other publications or even from within the same publications. So it's not necessarily about g we need good reporting, it's that we need

to raise the bar of all reporting so that we're not actively causing harm. So I've heard stories from people who, for instance,

a man kills what one of his children or his partner and his child, and people in her family find out because journalists have taken their photos, photos of the kids and photos of the woman off social media and published it before the family's heard about it. I've heard directly from women whose children have been killed who've had journalists knock on the door that day ask how they feel. How did you feel when somebody told you your child was dead?

I've spoken to women who've been raped, who've read about themselves in news articles about their rape trial, where they are referred to as liars, as gold diggers. there was one where the defence lawyer in the courtroom was showing photos of her underwear to the jury and saying, Well, why were you wearing underwear like this if you weren't planning on having sex?

Are you sure you're not lying? So there is genuinely harm done both by the legal system and by the media's amplification of the harm done by the legal system. So it's all working in tandem together. And as I said, I haven't seen a huge improvement in reporting on sexual violence.

But I think a lot of the reporting on domestic violence and family violence has improved because of advocacy, as I said, of a massive number of people and organizations.

Crystal Andrews (15:43)

my side in this, I I do kind of see digital media ecosystem and social media platforms as also playing a role here. And

Jane (15:52)

Mm.

Crystal Andrews (15:52)

I'm a little torn. I think on the one hand you can see that they have been quite beneficial in helping to raise awareness among the general public and media consumers about work like yours and Tarang's and and the wonderful work of journalists like Nina Fanel and the other.

This you mentioned,

Jane (16:08)

Mm.

Crystal Andrews (16:08)

you know, raising awareness of that work and and pointing out almost from a media literacy point of view, like teaching people how to interpret

Jane (16:14)

Mm-hmm. Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (16:15)

and read these headlines has been very helpful. on the other hand, it has also, I think, accelerated the ability for media organizations to spread a

a headline which may be sensationalized

Jane (16:27)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (16:28)

and overly simplified far and wide and have far more people than even before

Jane (16:32)

Yes.

Crystal Andrews (16:33)

see just that and not actually see the story itself and the details of that reporting. how do you

Jane (16:39)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (16:39)

see that the impact of social media here? Like what's the balance of benefits and the drawbacks?

Jane (16:43)

I think it's almost impossible to quantify because as you said, those headlines spread across social media and they often spread in screenshots. So there's no way of tracing them. You know, if you're just counting views or reads on a website, that's one thing, but you can't count the spread of headlines because it's image-based. I think social media has done for this what it's done for so many other things of polarized. So as you said, the

Work on a lot of social media by a lot of different advocates and journalists and organizations that puts a lot of information out into the public that they wouldn't get any other way. So I think that media literacy and literacy about the dynamics of gendered violence has really changed things. But then on the other side, there's the social media people and organizations that are really pushing those myths. So

To go back to that one that was present in all the headlines about the Ralph Carr trial. The myth that women commonly lie about rape, that most rape allegations are false, that women have a motive to lie because they somehow make money out of making a rape allegation, which is just such a mystery to me. that one gets spread a lot by what we call the manosphere, which I assume most of your audience will know, but that loose conglomeration of of

Crystal Andrews (17:56)

Yes.

Jane (17:57)

web content that's directed towards hating women really. Those myths get spread a lot through there and when you start spelunking through them, I mean it's some of it's just gross, you really need to shower afterwards. But certainly those myths are prevalent and they use headlines like the ones that I was talking about as evidence because it makes it look legitimate.

You know, this was reported by a news organization about a trial. This must be real. This is not j we're not just making this up. So it adds legitimacy to what is otherwise just an emotive argument. I think it's it's harder to reach people when without the

siloeing in that happens in social media. You know, if we go back to say when I was young, that everybody was getting their information from pretty much the same places. in Melbourne there was the the two two maybe three main news organizations, a couple of independent ones and four channels on TV. So everybody was getting the same information. You might still have people arguing about the interpretation of it, but you're all operating on basically the same information. That is just not the case anymore.

I live in a very, very feminist world in the world that I inhabit. Nobody believes in rape myths. But then, as I said, you go having a look at some of the other worlds, online worlds that people inhabit, and realize that actually no everybody here believes this. And it's very, very difficult for somebody like me to get information into those spaces.

Crystal Andrews (19:15)

Yes, it really is the the siloeing of those spaces and

Jane (19:18)

Mm.

Crystal Andrews (19:18)

then amplifying the rhetoric within those silos can be I mean it's a problem that has been talked about for many, many, many years and and no one has figured out the the solution to that

Jane (19:25)

Yes. No.

Crystal Andrews (19:27)

quite yet. and I I dare say that's not going to get better before it gets worse, unfortunately.

Jane (19:33)

No, I think AI is gonna make that worse.

Crystal Andrews (19:36)

yeah. That that much I'm I'm certain of in this discussion. Jane, I do wanna talk about another topic that was the subject of a an article that you wrote for Crikey this week. so you attended a New South Wales government round table about improving the media reporting of gendered violence.

Jane (19:55)

yeah, it was actually organised by Our Watch, which is the National Body for Prevention for what they call violence against women, and the National Commissioner for Domestic Family and Sexual Violence and the New South Wales Office for Women's Safety. So it was the three of them together that convened this round table.

Crystal Andrews (20:13)

Right. A joint effort and and certainly, you know,

Jane (20:15)

Yes.

Crystal Andrews (20:16)

as you were saying, an example of the varied groups of people who are all really

Jane (20:20)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (20:20)

looking to actively move solutions to a lot of these problems. I thought it was really interesting that you you had attended a similar conference or meeting in twenty fourteen and you said that the most recent installment felt like a groundhog day experience for you

Jane (20:36)

Yeah.

Crystal Andrews (20:36)

where it was all sort of the same discussions again.

What was the focus of of this meeting and why were you kind of left feeling this way?

Jane (20:44)

Look, it was very well intentioned. There were a lot of people in the room who were really dedicated and passionate about addressing some of the issues that we've talked about, of of the damage done by unethical and unprofessional and inaccurate reporting on gendered violence.

There was a lot of knowledge in the room, there was a lot of care and experience in the room. But the groundhog day experience for me was I was one of the few, I was not the only one, but one of the few that was in both rooms, this one last week and the one back in 2014. Was that exactly what happened last time? Was that same feeling of of passion and energy and dedication and and it wasn't that anyone there was being cynical or

uninterested. They were there because they really cared about it. But there was also this feeling of, this is all this dedication to the to fixing this problem is new. And and this time, you know, it's it's something that's not happened before. It's we're we're going to make a real change. And I was just sitting there going, but this I've been here before. This was it was such an eerie deja vu Grandhog Day experience. And trying to get people to recognize

Actually, a lot of work has been done. There was so much work done as part of the Our Watch was funded for a project called the National Media Engagement Project. And the funding was not enough. So it's not just that they didn't do a good job with the funding that they had. The National Media Engagement Project did quite an amazing job. They got quite a lot done.

But it was not enough money and it was not enough time to really embed change. So they got all these things done. Margaret Simons wrote a curriculum for teaching in university courses. So you train all the baby journos to report on this properly from the beginning. She completed the curriculum and it needed advocates to go out to universities and say, Hey, we have this, I understand the curriculum. The full curriculum is crowded, but this is really important. Let me work with you to get this in.

to teach your teachers how to teach it, we can organize guest lectures, we can help you with the materials. It was just, here's the curriculum. And we've done a couple of pilots and then the funding ran out and there was no one to do anything more with it. And I think that was the case with a lot of the projects that they did, that there was some really good quality work done. There was a review

Done in 2017, I think, that said that. It did say that the people who were trying who were leading this project ha absolutely had to have a very clear understanding, really experience as journalists, that this is not something that could be led by non-journalists, because journalists like everybody else don't think anybody outside outside their profession understands their profession.

And there I was just thinking about all of that work and all of the knowledge that was pulled together in those years and thinking, well, it's all just been discarded, we're just starting again. without that long-term funding and understanding that this is a huge, complex, difficult project that is going to take years and years and years. And without that,

We're just gonna repeat be repeating the same thing again and God help me, I do not wanna have to turn up to another one of these meetings in another ten years' time and sit here and say, we've done this before. I'm not doing it again.

Crystal Andrews (23:42)

So what so what moves it forward do you think? What actually can can move the dial here?

Jane (23:46)

I think if those three organizations that put together that round table actually understand that they need that long-term significant funding and and commitment of 10 years or more and can get that from federal government, then then there might be a chance. If they can look back at the lessons of the past and say, well, what was actually done as part of that project that started back in 2014? What worked and what didn't, and do a really thorough, unflinching analysis of

Where did we go wrong? Where did other people go wrong? And how do we not make those mistakes again? How can we take what was done last time and not reinvent the wheel, but just build on it?

I think that that yes, we could make a real difference because we're not talking about advocacy or turning journalists into activists, because although some journalists, I don't certainly don't think that journalists shouldn't be activists, and I do think it's part of the problem with this is that resistance that journalists have to being called activists is particularly strong when we're talking about men's violence against women. Nobody ever, ever has called Nick Mackenzie

An activist against the building industry or an advocate against corruption. He is a much respected investigative journalist. But any journalist who makes it their business to report on violence against women, and I would give you Nina Fennel, who ha is a multi-Walkley award-winning investigative journalist in this area. The Guardian, on an article about reporting that she'd done that had actually won a Walkley, called her a critic. They would never ever

Crystal Andrews (25:17)

Well

Jane (25:17)

say that about a man.

Who was reporting on another topic. It's because she's a woman and because she's reporting on sexual violence. She's a critic, she's an advocate, she's an activist.

Crystal Andrews (25:27)

Mm.

Jane (25:28)

So that is part of the resistance that journalists have, I think, to this: is I don't want to be an activist because you run the risk of being dismissed as that if you become an expert in this area. there are

350 journalists, I think, in the Canberra Press Gallery. There are about three hundred and something sports journalists in Australia. In not one single organization in the entire country is any journalist specifically given the beat of reporting on gendered violence.

in all of those things, if you stitch them all together, you have journalists saying, I don't want to be labelled an activist, journalists who do want to report on this running the risk of being labelled as activists and therefore not being properly professional.

People outside journalism not necessarily understanding those dynamics. They may understand the sexist side of it, they may understand the complications of it, but they don't work in newsrooms, they don't have that newsroom experience and understand what it's like for journalists living with that, living with daily contact with editors who will say things like, as I've had editors say to me, We've already done domestic violence this week. I had another editor say to me, Our audience is professional women.

I don't think they really have that kind of experience. We don't need to do so much reporting on domestic violence. And I was just like, Right, yep. Don't even know where to start here.

So all of that was a bit messy, but but what I'm trying to paint here is a very complex, confusing picture of a whole lot of barriers and a whole lot of places that need to be overcome, that can only be overcome in a sustained, structured education project that reaches that starts at the highest levels of media organization and then moves all the way down from there. And that's expensive and time consuming.

Crystal Andrews (27:06)

Like so many of the problems that we discuss on Cut Through,

Jane (27:09)

Yes.

Crystal Andrews (27:09)

Unfortunately, you know, the solutions are there, but the funding and the sort of will to implement them may be a little a little lacking. Jane,

Jane (27:17)

Yes.

Crystal Andrews (27:18)

I really appreciate you walking me through all of this. Before we wrap up, we like to end our episodes with this snoopin' with Coshon segment where I ask guests to share a tip, something juicy or interesting that our audience should be across. Do you have a tip?

Jane (27:34)

I do actually, and it came up when I was doing the research on the Ralph Carr trial and some of the other research that I've been doing on headlines about rape trials. You might remember last week and also a few months ago when the Tom Silvani trial was on, there was a bit of carrying on from media organizations like the Age and the Herald Sun about suppression orders, and this is getting in the way of the principles of open justice, and with the public have a right to know, and we should be reporting on sexual violence like this. And I was reading this thinking, hang on, in my studies, I've just found, I think the day that the article came out in the A.

I was looking at reporting on a rape trial that was happening that week that got no coverage at all. Absolutely none. That as far as I can tell, I'm not even sure if the age still has caught reporters. I'm struggling to find any record at all of them reporting on rape trials. The Herald Sun reports on the ones that are celebrity-based or sensationalist, but if you're an Aboriginal woman, if your rape happened in the context of family violence, there's no reporting.

So don't take seriously their principled stance on open justice and the removal of suppression orders. They want the removal of suppression orders so they can report on football-based trials.

Crystal Andrews (28:42)

Yes, that is something that I'll definitely have the Crikey team look at the sort of roster of court reporters existing at some of those titles. But yeah, the suppression order issue was such a big topic within media circles, and I think important for people to understand the broader context around all of that.

Jane (29:01)

I wonder how much of a topic it would have been if Tom Silvani and Ralph Carr hadn't been directly related to AFL football.

Crystal Andrews (29:08)

yeah, look, I'll maybe I'll share my thoughts on that one offline, Jane. How about that? How about that? Jane, once again, thank you so much for your time today and sharing your expertise. I really appreciate it.

Jane (29:23)

Happy to be here. Thanks very much, Crystal.