

Of course in symposia, there is speech and expression, unlimited freedom of the press and unlimited national security. But in real life, what is said is different from what it is said in symposia. You have to find a compromise. The relationship between a journalist and source is an extremely complex one. It is one of almost continuous negotiation in the quest to find a compromise. This compromise has to be found in the real world, which makes it quite different from what the parties concerned might say. And, in fact, manipulation is not always unilateral. Both sides use each other.

In conclusion, I would simply like to say that the ethical debate must be ongoing both in editorial offices and also between participants in the information process, beginning with the sources and including the protagonists involved, the media and also the public. We must accept that the answers to the various questions asked in a public interest symposium, such as cause-and-effect relationships and freedom of the press as opposed to censorship, will vary depending on the individual, the medium and the country concerned. In my view, that is what is meant by democracy.

The following comment by an editorialist of a London newspaper *The Sun* might shock some people. He wrote in the *UK Gazette*: "Truth is sacred, but a newspaper which reveals only part of the truth is a million times preferable to one which reveals all the truth and harms its country." This comment would no doubt meet with the approval of General Sidle, but would displease a large number of journalists and particularly American journalists, but it is right that both sides in the debate should have different viewpoints. A number of people were upset by the interviews with Saddam Hussein. But as Michèle Cotta of the French television channel TF1 noted: "If Hitler had been interviewed, there might not have been a war and millions of people killed in 1940."

There must be an ongoing attempt to balance the values involved, since such values are constantly changing as the world changes. Yesterday, General Sidle asked why so many journalists now wished to cover the Gulf War. The answer is simply that since the Second World War, journalists and the media have changed, society has changed, as has the general also, although he probably would not admit to it. There is no definitive answer to any of these questions, and although that's a pity for those people who like certainty, it's really very good that that's the way things are.