

3. Panel discussion—investigative case studies

COMMENTARY

The transcript of a panel discussion on two Australian investigative journalism case studies, moderated by Helen Vatsikopoulos: 1. *Dirty Money: The Age* and *ABC Four Corners* investigations in 2009 and 2010 into the Federal Reserve Bank and the allegedly corrupt activities of some staff of a subsidiary company, Securrency—Richard Baker, Nick McKenzie and Sue Spencer; 2. *Crime Does Pay*: a *Sydney Morning Herald* investigation into how the law enforcement agency NSW Crime Commission has been sharing the proceeds of crime with organised crime figures, cutting deals that allow them to walk away with millions of dollars—Dylan Welch, Linton Besser.

HELEN VATSIKOPOULOS, RICHARD BAKER, NICK MCKENZIE, SUE SPENCER, DYLAN WELCH AND LINTON BESSER

Case 1: *Dirty Money*

RICHARD BAKER: I first got a whiff of the story in September 2008. An acquaintance who I'd got to know through journalism wandered up and said he knew a guy with a hell of a story. I said What's it about? He replied that the Reserve Bank had these companies, Securrency and Note Printing Australia. I had to admit I'd never heard of them. He said in a nutshell his mate knew a bit about it and they were paying massive bribes to foreign politicians and officials all over the world to secure contracts. So I thought it sounded pretty good. Naturally, I asked if I could meet this guy. So he set up a meeting.

We haven't revealed the identity of this person because they asked to remain confidential, so I might refer to him as the Insider for ease.

The Insider and I met at this little café in Spencer Street in Melbourne. The Insider had recently resigned from Securrency and he explained how the company was 50 percent owned by the Reserve Bank of Australia and its board was controlled and overseen by Reserve Bank appointees.

In the case of Securrency the chairman of the board was an Assistant Governor of the RBA, a guy called Bob Rankin, and before that it was a Deputy Governor.

We started talking about how they did business and the Insider pointed out that business was done in corruption-prone countries around the world, like Nigeria, Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia. He said that the company was headed by these British businessmen, several of them from an establishment banknote firm in England called De La Rue. They’ve been around for 120, 130 years. Basically they used that business model there which was appointing agents or middlemen in different countries who had the contacts and the right bank accounts often in tax havens to be their agents and be there winning contracts. And through them they’d funnel huge multimillion dollars and out of that, out of that he alleged that the bribes were then paid to various officials and politicians to win those deals.

The Insider didn’t come forward with everything in the first meeting. It took a long time and multiple meetings to win his confidence and for him to have trust in us and to go further. I remember going back to the office after the first meeting and going over to Nick and saying, ‘I just met this guy, sounds like a hell of a story’—and to be fair Nick was a little dubious about it because you kinda think about it, the Reserve Bank’s probably the last institution you’d associate with that kind of stuff.

So we quickly realised that it needed both of us to dedicate a lot of time and energy if we were going to get the story. For a starting point we really had to put it on this insider and say ‘Stop beating around the bush, tell us what you can and name some of these agents’, because initially he was reluctant to do so. It was a case of ‘Open up your diary and show us what you’ve got’.

So we set up a process of several months trying to follow the money around the world. Sometimes the agents were actually hidden behind a shelf company or something, so they didn’t have a name, so then we had to do company searches all over the place to try and identify them.

It was an incredibly secretive business. One of the things the Insider said to us was that before he would really cooperate with us he would give us a bit of homework. He said: ‘I want you to find this book called *The Brotherhood of Money*. It will spell it out for you. It’s not about these companies per se, it’s about the industry.’

We had a look for it and there were about one or two copies in Australia at

‘BACK TO THE SOURCE’

the National Library. It was written in 1982 by a bloke called Murray Bloom, an American author. It’s a fascinating book. There aren’t many copies, they’re retailing for about \$ 2500 and \$1000 on eBay, because the industry didn’t like the book, so they bought most of them and pulped it.

So that was quite instructive. That was September 2008. We published our first story in *The Age* and *The Sydney Morning Herald* on 23 May 2009. We took a long time to get to that stage. We had a few lucky breaks along the way where things joined together, things fell into place. But we also had a lot of legal threats before the first story came out.

Helen Vatsikopoulos: From ...?

Richard Baker: From various agents that we had asked questions to about their associations with Securrency and Note Printing Australia. Securrency is 50 percent owned by the RBA: Securrency makes the plastic material. Note Printing Australia, which prints out money, is a 100 percent owned.

So there were legal threats from those agents, and then when we put the questions to their companies, we got a strong legal letter that I still have a copy of which says, ‘By the tone of Mr McKenzie and Mr Baker’s questions, it clearly indicates they have no knowledge of this industry’. I liked that, that was good.

Nick McKenzie: It took six months to do the story. The Insider didn’t have any prima facie evidence at all. He didn’t have the smoking gun, there was no proof. So we had to corroborate what he told us and it’s a process, it’s good fun, it’s sort of like being a detective.

What we in fact did was to gather as much information as we could from everybody in the print note industry here and abroad. We began to develop contacts in law enforcement agencies in places like Africa and we got the names of the people that Reserve Bank companies were employing overseas to win contracts: the people who we thought were corrupt who were bribing officials.

One of the breakthroughs we got, we were sitting at the office once late at night, and we had finally got onto the name of one of these guys they were using in Africa. I simply Googled it and found out he was charged with corruption in Africa, and convicted. And that’s one of many breakthroughs.

We said: ‘Wow the Reserve Bank of Australia is employing a guy that

is corrupt, convicted in court, to work for us. As journos, we’d just done a Google search and found out, how can they not know that?’

Now of course they knew it. The reason they were going to employ the guy was because he was going to pay bribes. And to this day the question remains: where was the Reserve Bank of Australia’s due diligence? It appears to have been non-existent.

We can’t tap phones, we can’t put listening devices in cars, we can’t use any law enforcement techniques—and yet as journalists just hitting the phones, speaking to dozens of people a week, and using Google, we cracked it. It leaves open the question: how come they didn’t know, how come the Reserve Bank didn’t know what was going on?

Richard Baker: Particularly because they get a list every year—the board of Securrency and Note Printing Australia. They would get a list of the agents and how much money they were getting paid, and often where they were getting paid. So it’s mind-boggling to think that this went on, and the claims of ignorance are pretty incredible really.

So as we lead up to the story we got legal threats from the agent company, and I spoke to the Deputy Chairman of the Reserve Bank, Ric Battellino, on the night before the story and put some allegations, and some questions to him saying, ‘We’re going to write this story tomorrow alleging this company’s corrupt’.

There was nothing on the other end of the phone. There was silence for about 10 seconds. He said, ‘Are you sure about that?’ I said, ‘Yeah, I think so’.

Anyway, he went on: ‘Well, if this is going on, this is outrageous, there are rules and policies, we have very robust policies to prevent this sort of thing. It’s against all the rules.’

I took a few quotes down and put it in the paper. And within hours the next day after it was published the next day the Reserve Bank and the Securrency board referred the matter to the federal police and that began and a two and half year, well an ongoing investigation for them and we continued our investigation from that starting point.

Even though there was a lot of secrecy and difficulty, from time to time there were people out there, anonymous people who would email in stuff, or ring up and give you clues. Only one little thing and it leads to the next thing or it gives you a hint that you can follow the trail.

‘BACK TO THE SOURCE’

It was a classic Watergate, follow-the-money kind of story. And so we’ve really put it out there. We were surprised there wasn’t much of a response from the media. Calling in a police investigation tends to close things down. It gives politicians and the bank a line to hide behind while there’s an ongoing inquiry. It didn’t stop Kevin Rudd getting on the radio every day with the Australian Wheat Board when there was a Royal Commission—but anyway, we didn’t hear anything from anyone on this story after it was first published. But we continued chipping away for six months. Really, it needed a bigger audience.

Helen Vatsikopoulos: *It needed television.*

Richard Baker: Yeah. And that leads us to *Four Corners*.

Helen Vatsikopoulos: *Sue Spencer* [executive producer of *Four Corners*]—*tell me why you decided to take this story on, given that the Insider did not want to be identified, wanted to remain anonymous? But in television we always say, ‘Well, show us the pictures!’ When it went to air an actor played the Insider, and he wasn’t pixelated or in the shadows or anything. How did you come to the decision to do all of that?*

Sue Spencer: I think I was a bit like Richard and Nick; very surprised at the lack of follow-up to the story. I kept thinking, ‘This is an absolutely fabulous story’. I can’t remember the chain of events. I started talking to Nick and I said that I think this could make great television but clearly the role of the whistleblower was going to be important.

I think what got us over the line was that the whistle blower didn’t want to be identified, but he was prepared to do an audio interview with Nick. And once we had that audio interview and we could actually use an actor to speak the whistleblower’s words, that was very important from a television point of view. We could use him to tell the story about how the bribery was occurring within Securrency.

I think another thing was that even the whistleblower was getting frustrated. Even though the federal police had been approached the investigation was going very slowly, also the Reserve Bank was slowly pulling down the shutters, making no comments. This is once again where working with *The Age* and using television were important in terms of making sure this story’s still there.

What I might do is show the beginning of the story and show the whistleblower who was portrayed by the actor. [Clip shown from *Dirty Money*: www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2010/s2905618.htm]

Sue Spencer: So that gives you a little bit of an idea. I guess what the real advantage was for Nick and Richard in terms of getting this story to a wider audience was the fact that you can pool resources. Now we had an opportunity to put Nick and a producer on a plane and he could travel to Malaysia and to the United States and the United Kingdom and actually follow that money trail. And in television terms that actually sets up a wonderful narrative and film opportunities, so essentially we had all that we needed to tell this story. From a *Four Corners* perspective, it's wonderful to have a fully researched story delivered to you and once again this is the advantage we know in terms of this sort of conference, in terms of doing very powerful investigative journalism. If we can pool our resources and work more collaboratively, we can have really good stories which hopefully can have significant impact.

Even after the programme went to air on national television and went all around Australia we actually thought it might have had a bit more of an impact than what it did.

The Reserve Bank, even the Treasurer, wouldn't comment. I guess at that stage too the AFP [Australian Federal Police] was investigating. They couldn't talk that much anyway but we actually thought there may have been a political response after the program went to air. I think it's a legacy of the mad 30 minute news cycle we have that—straight away going from one story to another—and something may have an impact for a little while and something else might happen and the media straight away turns their attention away and moves on to the next story.

I think ultimately it was the extraordinary research and journalism of Richard and Nick which did actually deliver quite an amazing impact so maybe you might want to talk about what the impact was, Nick.

Helen Vatsikopoulos: *How many heads have rolled and are they still rolling?*

Nick McKenzie: During this year the Australian Federal Police made a series of arrests, so basically the bloke at the start of the programme, the British

‘BACK TO THE SOURCE’

guy, they knocked on his door and arrested and charged him with bribery along with seven or eight other very senior executives, former executives now.

I mean it was quite an amazing day. Two and half years we slogged at this, it’s been great fun but it’s been frustrating as well. And you begin to lose faith will the cops ever follow through, is there enough evidence, are we wrong? Always at the back of your mind there’s a bit of self doubt, and to actually be there in court when these seven 50 to 60-year-old men were led in, in handcuffs in the dock and had bribery charges read out and then they were released out of the court. And it was a really powerful moment and it was a sense that, hang on, sometimes in our job we can actually have an impact which is the reason why we’re all here as journalists to try and effect some sort of change.

In terms of impact: it was the first time in Australian history, foreign bribery laws were actually used. The laws were passed in 1999, the Federal Police basically had a ‘too hard’ approach. And I think in Australian business it’s still a big problem. Companies overseas, they bribe. Big companies bribe. The recent case with BHP (well not too recent) in Cambodia paying what they call ‘tea money’, where they gave local politicians something like a couple of hundred thousand dollars. Clearly it stinks. But it’s seen as an acceptable way of doing business, it’s a bit of a ‘when in Rome.’ So to have charges, to have the business community and the wider community realise that if you do this, and if you’re caught you’ll go to jail, that has a tremendous impact. Us following through on the story, we kept banging away, we’ve done over 200 stories—it kept it in the police’s face, it kept it in the government’s face and ultimately it became a top priority for the Federal Police. They did a marvelous job although it’s still not over.

So the broader impact, apart from the individuals being charged is the accountability that’s now around corporate Australia. I think this is the case with any major company, that they’re now saying to their staff, if you’re over in Indonesia or in China, remember the Securrency/Note Printing Australia case. If you bribe, and you get caught, you’re getting locked up. And that cultural change, it’s really hard to measure but we think it’s been fairly profound, but certainly the police have said so and every blog and company memo now refers to Securrency. It has been that sort of a change.

The impact around the world: there’s been tremendous media coverage. Just today *The Guardian* broke a fresh story. There’s been another charge. But

from Africa, Europe, *The New York Times*, the *Wall Street Journal*, they’ve all picked up and followed various things in the story. One of the disappointing things today is the lack of follow-up in Australia.

Now we have a real problem in Australia. It’s highly competitive, very small industry. If Fairfax breaks a story, or News Limited breaks a story sometimes there’s a tendency not to follow the other stories, not the ABC. When I worked at the ABC I found if I broke a good story it would be picked up by both Fairfax and News Ltd. But now I’m at Fairfax, News Ltd tends not to follow our stories and vice versa. We’re both guilty of it. But it means that the stories don’t get the coverage all around Australia. And the coverage is so important to get the political change, to get the politician to pay attention and to take notice.

So there’s been massive worldwide coverage, it’s real thrill to see your story picked up in the *Guardian* or whatever, but in Australia it’s been very disappointing. On the day of the charges *The Australian* had a reporter in court, I’d never seen her before and I said, ‘How long have you been at the Oz?’ Three days. They’d sent an intern to cover the case and they put her on page five, and they buried that story. No doubt about it. Very disappointing, and the question must be asked: Why?

So in terms of having an impact, we felt we had to be fairly strategic, hence the partnership with *Four Corners*. It was about getting as many people, as many eyes on the story as possible. And what TV does, it brings stuff to life.

One of the things as journalists, I think Quentin Dempster, a well-known ABC journalist makes the point: for a really good story to turn into a scandal it’s got to be picked up everywhere and talked about. It’s got to have several elements. First element is having the journalism there, the story to be broken. And then you need political follow-up, a politician to make a point out of this. The perfect example was the Australian Wheat Board scandal and Kevin Rudd. Kevin Rudd made his name on the Wheat Board.

But Mr Rudd and Labor showed gross hypocrisy a couple of years later when this thing blows up and they don’t say a single word.

By denying it air time they denied its existence and the scandal doesn’t follow. The lack of impact of the story was there’s been very little political bite. The other thing you need, especially nowadays, you’ve got the story, you’ve got the politician but to make it really sell it seems that you need celebrity, sport and sex. A classic example is a terrific story *Four Corners* did about a rugby

‘BACK TO THE SOURCE’

league sexual assault when you had a celebrity and a sportsman and sex. That story went ballistic but it had all these elements and became a political issue.

That thing was talked about. Another example is the animal story, the abattoir story. There was great vision, it was hugely politicised and as soon as it’s talked about in parliament that story gets a life of its own.

Helen Vatsikopoulos: *So just very quickly, we’re talking about collaboration here. There was no sense of rivalry in the sense you both have websites and online and did you have an exec saying well you can’t share everything?*

Sue Spencer This is where it does get very tricky. You see, *The Age* wants to protect their journalists and it was an *Age* story, and Nick and Richard worked for the *Age*, although Nick was seconded to *Four Corners* for when we were making this program. What I actually [am] always encouraging is that we cross promote. We cross-linked from our website to *The Age* website and we still find huge resistance particularly from the ABC to doing that. And straight away the ABC sees us as if we’re sending all the potential visitors to the ABC site going to the Fairfax site and I think this is a very limited view. In a way it actually works both ways.

I think we just need to break down those barriers and not see it as separate silos, always in competition. And once again, as Robert Rosenthal was saying earlier this morning, the most important thing is that if you’ve got a good story you want to make sure it gets out. You want it to have an impact and deliver some sort of results. As journalists then you’re doing what you’re supposed to do.

We have it even within the ABC. The same sort of competition exists between *Four Corners* and 7.30 and *Lateline* and particularly with this story, the ABC has a number of financial reporters who you would expect should be following up a major scandal about the Reserve Bank and it just doesn’t happen. I just don’t get that. In the end it’s about the story, it’s not about us.

Case 2: Crime Does Pay

Helen Vatsikopoulos: *We’ll move on to our second case study: Linton Besser and Dylan Welch work for The Sydney Morning Herald and they investigated the NSW Crime Commission in their series of investigations ‘Crime Does Pay’. Linton can you begin by encapsulating for us what exactly did you uncover and how did you come to the story?*

Linton Besser: Well, we came to the story from two quite different places. Dylan has a long experience as a police reporter and I hadn’t done a police story for about five years so we had quite different mind sets. Ultimately the idea was to have a look at the NSW Crime Commission, which was a very secretive and very powerful organisation. In NSW it’s the top criminal investigation agency in the state and maybe one of the best in the country but there is not much known about it, and it had never been exposed to any great kind of scrutiny.

Ultimately what we discovered was the Crime Commission has two tasks. Its primary task was to investigate organised crime and beat the kingpins of Sydney’s underworld at their game. And its secondary task was to confiscate proceeds of crime that emerge as a result of these investigations.

What Dylan and I uncovered was in fact what the Crime Commission had done was almost flip its priorities around. It had confiscated an enormous amount of money from criminals, but many of them had escaped investigative scrutiny by the Crime Commission because they had paid their dues.

What emerged was a picture of an organisation that had become addicted to the slap on the back from the politician of the day for bringing money into Treasury. There was a tangible measure of their success: they brought in \$250 million since they started doing this, but the arrest rate had been spiralling downwards.

We came to the story from different ways. I became interested because our legal affairs reporter at the time, Joel Gibson, had filed this fantastic story in 2009, a High Court case in which the commissioner had its key power to confiscate proceeds of crime ruled unconstitutional and there was an emergency sitting of parliament and an emergency sitting of cabinet and they’d rushed through an amendment to circumvent this ruling.

And I thought, ‘Gee they’ve been confiscating proceeds of crime for 20 years or more, what has happened to these proceeds of crime? I’d never heard of it.’

Dylan Welch: I guess on the other side of the story that got everyone’s attention directed to the Crime Commission was Mark Stanton. He was an assistant director there, probably their most senior investigator. The guy that was responsible for much of their good work for much of the last 15 years. And then, of course he was arrested and charged with conspiracy to import a massive amount of pseudoephedrine which is a drug precursor.

‘BACK TO THE SOURCE’

So that perhaps also suggested that not all was right at this very secretive body. So it got us thinking about how could this occur. When someone like that gets busted they immediately paint them as the rotten apple. Everything’s fine, that guy was a crook but we’re not. And sometimes it’s true sometimes it’s not. But we were very interested in seeing if the stink went any higher or further. Because as a police reporter I spent a lot of time talking to both cops and crooks, because remember they’re civilians at the Crime Commission, not cops.

Both cops and crooks had a lot to say about the Crime Commission. A lot of it was very good. And to this day I will defend a lot of the work they do particularly investigating significant murders. The murder of the Lin family, if you remember that one, as well as the murder of Michael McGuirk. Both of those I would suggest probably wouldn’t have been solved or at least solved to the extent that they’ve charged people, were it not for the good work of the Crime Commission where they can burrow down and spend a long time investigating things where others can’t. And they can scare a lot of people with their powers of compulsion. They can tell somebody, you come in and I’m going to ask you a question and if you lie to me or if you refuse to answer you’re going straight to jail. That tends to have a very powerful impact. The cops, of course, don’t have that power.

Helen Vatsikopoulos: *Just tell us about some of your sources. How did you come across some of that information? You write about a man called Joe who had a trophy pen. Tell us that fascinating story.*

Dylan Welch: Yeah well, that was one of the stories I’d heard over a long time. One of them was a crook I knew who had the Crime Commission turn their gaze upon him. They’d frozen his assets, his house and they declared he had earned a certain amount of money, I think at the beginning it was about half a million in criminal wealth. There was a long negotiation. He fought it, he challenged it. It went to the Supreme Court.

The end result was on the final day when they went to the Supreme Court, when they were meant to settle it, the Crime Commissioner said look, we’ll go outside and he had a quick chat to them and he said: ‘Well, look, ultimately we’ll just settle on about whatever you have in your bank account’, which at the time was about \$60,000. The crook, Joe as we call him, said: ‘I don’t have that much in the bank anymore, I’ve got about \$30,000.’

The Crime Commissioner said, OK, fine. One of the Crime Commission guys there, he had this Crime Commission pen, a big silver thing with Crime Commission written on the side of it. Joe said: ‘OK, but I want the pen’. And they gave him the pen.

So the Crime Commission took \$30,000 off Joe. The rest, in effect, is washed. It’s now been declared legitimate earnings, they can’t touch that money again. He has that pen sitting on a stand in his bedroom.

Linton Besser: But if I can just add, when they start that process with Joe and with all of these very significant organised crime figures, they start with the position that 100 percent of their wealth is ill-gotten gains, and then they eventually cut a deal where they both walk away and no litigation goes to court. And so the effect of that, as Dylan said, the money that they walk away with—and this is irrespective of any criminal charges or any investigations as a civil matter—any money that these figures walk away with is deemed clean.

What we were hearing, from criminals and the legal fraternity in particular, was that there was now a view, in Sydney at least, that you must pay your due to the Crime Commission.

If you think about that for a moment: how is that dramatically different to what was happening at the Wood Royal Commission where street level cops were licensing crime if you like, were running protection rackets?

It wasn’t technically corrupt what they were doing, they were acting within the law although there are questions about that. But they were essentially licensing people to go out and continue doing what they were doing. And what has happened since is that the Police Integrity Commission has opened public hearings and the Police Integrity Commission says that these negotiations, over millions of dollars of criminal proceeds, are not legal.

The Crime Commission was writing up consent orders to process these settlements and simply giving them to a clerk of the Supreme Court to be stamped when actually the law required that they be inspected by a judge so there are big question marks over that.

The other major element to the investigation that we published was that the legal fraternity was getting a big cut as well. The Crime Commission and lawyers associated with the criminals that they were targeting were taking substantial amounts of money for what was really 45 minute negotiations to

‘BACK TO THE SOURCE’

come away with that \$30,000 and the silver pen. And more of that is going to emerge next week at these hearings.

Helen Vatsikopoulos: *Were you able to substantiate a lot of what your sources were telling you through a paper trail...*

Linton Besser: One great success we had early on was that we launched the only successful Freedom of Information application in the history of the NSW Crime Commission. It might have been the only application.

Dylan Welch: We didn’t actually realise they were FOI-able.

Linton Besser: There are exempt agencies like ASIO, but the Crime Commission is not exempt, it’s just that certain functions are exempt from the Act. So when we put in the application there was only a junior lawyer there to say, ‘Get nicked, we don’t have to comply with the Act.’

And of course she was completely wrong and I had them over the barrel from that point in time because they’d misread the Act, or they probably hadn’t read the Act.

So I was able to get ten years of financial records from inside the Crime Commission. It had, I don’t know, 10 or 12 columns across and it detailed all of these secret settlements, and the Ferraris and the casino chips and the racehorses and the paintings that had been seized: allegedly the proceeds of crime.

Dylan Welch: And the other thing, we have to be a bit careful about it when we talk about it but we also ended up referring in our stories to a police integrity operation called Rodium. It was essentially established after Standon and it made certain findings and it referred to their lack of corruption control, their internal corruption mechanisms. It raised a whole bunch of problems. Now we can’t talk about anything to do with how we obtained the material because that’s subject to ongoing legal activity. It was certainly the most amazing legal document I’d seen in my career.

Both Linton, me and Fairfax generally received these subpoenas demanding access, first to a physical thing, our phones, and also to anything held by anybody within Fairfax, with a relationship to either of these organisations, with a relationship to the Crime Commission or the Police Integrity Commission or anything to do with them.

Linton Besser: It was broader than that. It asked for all telephone records of all journalists in the *Sydney Morning Herald* newsroom.

Dylan Welch: This is what we've been finding. When you get stuck between two warring super-judicial bodies, it's not pleasant. But the other thing is that these guys are so used to operating with impunity... they're used to getting their own way. They have legislation that allows them to act in a way that is contrary to the usual application of the law. They just don't like not getting their way, they're just used to bullying people.

References

- Dirty money* (2010, May 24). ABC *Four Corners*. Available at: www.abc.net.au/4corners/content/2010/s2905618.htm
- Baker, R., and McKenzie, N. (2011, July 2). The money men, *The Age*. Available at: www.theage.com.au/national/the-money-men-20110701-1gv2b.html
- Bloom, M. (1983). *The brotherhood of money: The secret world of bank note printers*. Port Clinton, Ohio: BNR Press.
- The untouchables: crime fighters let gangsters take the money and run (2011, February 12). Crime does pay, a *Sydney Morning Herald* investigation. Available at: www.smh.com.au/nsw/the-untouchables-crime-fighters-let-gangsters-take-the-money-and-run-20110211-1aqjn.html

Richard Baker, investigative journalist at The Age: *He has been a reporter at The Age since 1999 and has worked in its investigative unit since 2005. In recent years, he and colleague Nick McKenzie have worked together to break several big stories. Foremost is the RBA banknote bribery scandal, which has led to Australia's first-ever foreign bribery prosecution against two Reserve Bank subsidiaries and, at this point, eight former executives. His reports sparked police probes and arrests in UK, Vietnam, Malaysia, Nepal, Nigeria and Indonesia. The Baker and McKenzie partnership also last year exposed the inner workings of Australia's doomed soccer World Cup bid in a series that was picked up around the world. These and other stories have led to Baker and McKenzie winning several journalism awards in recent years, including the Walkley Award for Investigative Journalism (2011).*

Nick McKenzie, investigative journalist at The Age: *He began his career as a cadet journalist at the Australian Broadcasting Corporation. He joined*

‘BACK TO THE SOURCE’

the ABC investigative unit in 2003, where he broke major national stories on terrorist financing and abuse in immigration detention centres. In 2004, he won his first Walkley award, Australia’s leading journalism award, and a Melbourne Press Club investigative reporting award for his expose on Victoria police corruption and the murder of a state corruption witness. One of the stories led to an independent inquiry by Tony Fitzgerald QC, later tabled in state Parliament. While at the ABC, McKenzie worked on investigative stories for the 7.30 Report and Four Corners, before joining The Age’s investigative unit in 2006. In 2008, he won a Gold Quill and an investigative Quill for his work exposing the misconduct of one of Australia’s leading surgeons.

Sue Spencer, executive producer, ABC Four Corners: *She has 20 years experience as a researcher and then producer/director at the ABC. She began work as a researcher on Four Corners in 1985 and went on to produce and win awards for programmes on the blue asbestos mine at Wittenoom in WA and the businessman, Alan Bond. In 1993, she produced and directed (with Philip Chubb) the award winning series, ‘Labor in Power’. In 2001 she produced and directed (with Paul Kelly and Deb Masters), the series, ‘100 Years – the Australian Story’. At this time she was awarded an ABC-Chevening-Reuters fellowship to Oxford University for mid-career journalists. Between 2002 and 2007, Spencer spent time in Cambodia and Vietnam, working for the United Nations agencies, UNDP and UNICEF. In October 2007, Sue returned to the ABC as executive producer of Four Corners. In 2008, Sue also was the executive producer of the 4-part documentary series, The Howard Years.*

Linton Besser, investigative journalist, Sydney Morning Herald: *He is an investigative reporter at the Sydney Morning Herald. His work has exposed corruption in the public service and the police, prompting public inquiries and the removal of state officials. In 2010, Besser won a Walkley Award for his investigation, The Wrong Stuff, that identified million of dollars being routinely wasted by the Department of Defence. Besser spent months downloading more than 700,000 contracts in order to be able to scratch beneath the surface of what was essentially a gross misuse of taxpayer money. Walkley judges commented that the combination of his incisive analysis, combined with the multi-platform publication of the raw documents on which his stories were based, produced a valuable public service.*

Dylan Welch, investigative journalist, Sydney Morning Herald: *He is Fairfax Media's National Security Correspondent and works out of the National Press Gallery in Canberra. Prior to that he was a police reporter for several years and before that was one of the first ever online reporters at the Sydney Morning Herald. Welch has written extensively about organised crime, particularly in reference to Australia's outlaw motorcycle clubs, international drug syndicates and Sydney's Middle Eastern crime syndicates.*

Facilitator Helen Vatsikopoulos *is a lecturer in journalism at the University of Technology Sydney. Before joining UTS she was a television journalist and presenter with ABC-TV, where she worked as a reporter on Foreign Correspondent, reporter/producer on Lateline, and presenter of Asia-Pacific Focus. Prior to joining the ABC, she worked at SBS Television, where she presented Dateline.*

The advertisement features a dark background with a faint, abstract image of a cityscape or industrial scene. The text is in white, with 'AUT UNIVERSITY' in a large, bold, sans-serif font at the top left. To the right of 'AUT' is the word 'COMMUNICATIONS' in a similar font. Below this, 'POSTGRADUATE JOURNALISM' is written in a smaller, all-caps font. The main body of text describes three programs: Bachelor of Communication Studies (Hons), Master of Communications Studies (MCS), and Doctorate in Communication Studies (PhD). At the bottom left, contact information is provided: 'Email: commstudies@aut.ac.nz | Web: www.commstudies.aut.ac.nz'. At the bottom right, the 'AUT UNIVERSITY' logo is repeated in a smaller size.

AUT UNIVERSITY COMMUNICATIONS

POSTGRADUATE JOURNALISM

Bachelor of Communication Studies (Hons) offers students either an applied or an academic pathway in communication studies. Papers and strands include Asia-Pacific journalism, digital media, investigative journalism, public relations and screen writing.

Master of Communications Studies (MCS) is a postgraduate research degree offering practical options.

Doctorate in Communication Studies (PhD) is a thesis-based research degree granted on the basis of original and substantive contribution to knowledge. The Faculty of Design and Creative Industries encourages and supports innovative interdisciplinary research. The School of Communication Studies has supervising staff whose research interests cover a range of areas encompassing media, politics and ownership, journalism, human communication, new media and development, discourse analysis and popular culture.

Email: commstudies@aut.ac.nz | Web: www.commstudies.aut.ac.nz

AUT UNIVERSITY