

**MOTION FOR DERIVATIVE
SETTLEMENT**

**EXHIBIT 3
to Exhibit B to Exhibit 1 to Exhibit A**

*Journalism Media Watchdog Auditing
Guidelines*

Association of Principled Press

Forever Young and Dumb

Personal Statement of APP Founder, Edward “Coach” Weinhaus, Esq.

Dateline: Creve Coeur, Missouri

April 3, 2023

In the Summer of 1992, I earned credentials giving me access to Capitol Hill’s press tables in all their splendor. My first job in journalism came with a point of view. I learned what that meant when my editor received an angry phone call from a friendly source, complaining that I had used the *other sides’* “label” during an interview. Unaware of the battle over words, I nearly lost my job, which paid precisely \$0. “Young and dumb” was my only - and truthful - excuse to save it. After that, I was off to the LSE to finish my degree.

London offered new magazines, newspapers, ideas, languages, cultures and, most importantly, an outsider’s perspective on American ideals. I was once again *young and dumb*. And, able to learn. One place in particular offered the best opportunity - Speaker’s Corner in Hyde Park. Seeing Marxists, Palestinians, or those self-labeled of any stripe standing out in the open forum declaring their positions for all to hear was shocking enough. Watching them debate and engage with their critics mesmerized me. The dichotomy was stark. The university and society from which to gather information and the forum to engage in debate and persuasion. We knew not how the internet would change us.

Interlude - Free Speech and the Classroom

Freedom of speech is a gift from which we all gain. I take it to heart, especially when “teaching,” if that’s what you call what I have done at universities for the last eight years. My classes come with a warning about how we conduct discourse (<https://coachforged.com/mgmt-167-introduction-class-rules-on-discourse/>). It requires students to be encouraged to stand up for what they think, believe, feel, without risk of being canceled. My pedagogy isn’t “education-by-lecture” - it is “exploration-by-provocation.” *Explore*. Don’t be scared of what we might find. Don’t be obstructed by what others may think. Particularly, those in “authority.” My proudest moment may have been when more than 60 of my students petitioned and then marched on the Dean of UCLA Anderson for having been wronged. (See <https://coachforged.com/coach-outside-of-class-dont-poach-coach-protest/>). It wasn’t. Rather, what they wrote about how we conduct learning in our classroom is:

“From the very first lecture, where we were encouraged to disagree with Coach, I knew the course was different. Coach emphasizes in each of his classes that he is there because he loves fostering our desire to learn.”

Straight Journalism

Back to 1992, when I was the same age as my students now, we could imagine an open public forum - in class or in the park. Because then, before the internet as we know it, our media comported itself in a manner allowing public discourse. The local newspaper was an institution for keeping up with sports, listing your old refrigerator, reading obituaries. It reported the *who did what, when, where* and, if we knew, *why*. It boasted opinions - on its opinion pages, an area for judgments, persuasion, and letters to the editor on issues of the day.

In fact, I founded the company now known as Pipeline Media for the purpose of this type of ‘straight journalism.’ We offered no opinions, but rather just straight, authenticatable facts.

My guiding principles weren’t activism in the vein of Woodward and Bernstein. They were the revolutionary nature of free speech and what it means for our society.

My “spirit video” comes from none other than post-apocalyptic, Costner-vehicle (non-water-based) *The Postman*. The petty, tyrannical, militarist dictator brisks at the mere idea that citizens have a means of sharing ‘the facts with each other.’ (<https://youtu.be/8xyl7L7xonM>). Revolutionary indeed.

But, let’s face it, media has changed. The internet - the worlds’ information at our fingertips - promised humans the possibility of endless exploration into ideas. Rather than provoke thought, our media has devolved. Social media screams our biases at us. Labels over facts. Memes over research. The *who did what, when, and where* are supplanted with screeds of knowing the *why*, even when we don’t.

Opinion Supplants The Press

Our friends view disagreements as personal affronts to their “pages.” Family, friends, and foes alike treat a challenge to conclusions with facts as critiques of character, rather than an invitation to learn together. We pat the like-minded on the back in our own echo chamber while decrying those we have demonized. Our society has replaced respectful reciprocal dialogue with required retaliatory diatribes. And then, blocking to drown out the other.

Rather than learning through reporting and entering the forum to engage in discussion, the forum has infiltrated every aspect of our interaction. In terms of 1992, it was as if my studies and learning could only be done at Speaker's Corner. It wouldn't take long, all of us unable to leave, to destroy the beauty and the benefit of the openness. And, it hasn't taken long.

Labels. Shouting down. Lack of sourced information. Guilt-by-association. These are the ills of the modern media as filtered through to us. Social media has created a shortcut to audiences at the expense of creating a space for the straight reporting of traditional journalism. Provoking the *exploration* of ideas has been lost through the noise.

Worst of all, we are missing the entire point of the media. A free press is a right we reserved for ourselves, away from our government's grasp, as a people. The fourth estate is our protection against those in authority. Skipping the chance to responsibly speak truth to power, we hurl insults at each other pretending to do so, bastardizing our own freedoms.

I don't blame Facebook or TikTok. They don't produce anything of substance and doing so isn't in their DNA. And if they tried, it wouldn't be with principles that make journalists worthy of the title.

They are not the press. We are, or at least we can be. But without principles, why bother. We can choose to be forever *young and dumb*, trying only to uncover the *who did what, when, where*, and, if we know, *why*.

Welcome to the Association of Principled Press ("APP").

A NOTE REGARDING OUR FIRST MEMBER

Our first member is (BlockShopper LLC, then Journatic LLC, then Locality Labs, LLC, now) Pipeline Media LLC. It did not arrive here by choice, originally. Ironically, it was founded with precisely these ideals. I know. Because I founded it (with Brian Timpone) based in Missouri. That was before I asked he be thrown in prison on May 27, 2022 for what my law firm contended was perjury.

According to media reports, my old company, run by Mr. Timpone, has lost its way. Although I no longer control it, I had a choice in front of me with an opposing litigant *on the ropes*. As any great, young and dumb faculty member would, I put the idea before my students at UCLA (fact check - data set is too small from which to validate what other faculty would do). Destroy my old company through litigation or fix it by holding it the standards upon which it was originally built.

(<https://www.dropbox.com/s/isy65l82saf24a2/20230227%20Week%208%20MGMT%20167%20LLL%20Settlement.mp4?dl=0>). The students, *young and dumb*, like me, spoke.

Thus, a court is enforcing by order an agreement that Pipeline Media - Brian Timpone's Pipeline Media (of which I own something like 0.337% or thereabouts) - will submit to an audit by this new organization, the APP, based on the principles below.

PERSONNEL RESPONSIBLE FOR INITIAL AUDIT

For what it's worth, and with the advice and counsel of my great students, I will not be the one conducting the audit. I have slotted early Pipeline Media (BlockShopper) employee Christopher Bedell of Polsinelli to perform the work, or a suitable replacement if he is unable to do so.

INUREMENT OF PUBLIC BENEFIT

In no event will I be paid for my work for our initial auditing client. Ensuring the content produced by my creation, Pipeline Media, for the betterment of public discourse is benefit enough for me. That's just the start for APP. Once we have audited Pipeline Media, we will provide a useful standard to help the public understand that a member of the APP is a 'journalist' or 'reporter' and not a 'blogger', 'influencer,' or 'thought leader'.

Our principles, when accepted as yoke, are a public-benefit yardstick that, when done right, will allow press organizations to measure their own reporting. In an ideal world, a media company can join and even use our third-party standard as a transparency certification to comply with the requirements of a public benefit corporation. But that's looking ahead.

In the near-term, merely offering the ability to have a set of standards, an audit, and even a third-party *ombudsman* would make any member superior to the lack of accountability endemic to today's discourse.

CONCLUSION

Speaker's Corner allowed me the adrenaline of real-time participation in lively discourse. I want that for all of us, should we choose it. I never learn so much as when I accept that I am young and dumb. Let us remain that way forever, always be learning, and rely on principled press to provide us an opportunity to explore the world.

Join us.

===
Principles of a Free Press
Version 1.0
April 3, 2023

These are the principles worthy of a press strong and responsible enough to hold those in power accountable.

- 1) Opinions are labeled as such, or poison the purpose of the press. Nothing is true or false just because an authority says it is true or false.
- 2) There's no such thing as "narrative." Journalism is limited to who did what, when, where and, if we know, why. Journalists don't assert facts— they aren't active participants in the debate/discussion. A journalist's responsibility is to facilitate substantive discussion/debate.
- 3) The right to free speech is a *gift* that journalists, members of the 'press,' are obligated to uphold and support, without exception.
- 4) The mission of journalists isn't to inform, or for their audience to absorb their stories. It is to spur and maximize discussion and participation, to publish and provoke an *exchange of ideas*.
- 5) Journalists should not endeavor to make authoritative *edicts* that think for their readers, but rather to help them think for themselves. Journalism should encourage the practice of dialectic; done properly, it gives readers the means for their own private judgment.
- 6) Without a robust journalistic community, government authority and power are unchecked. Journalists who echo or purposefully support government authority are propagandizing, not reporting.
- 7) Reliance on euphemisms equate to non-cited assertions of fact.
- 8) Journalists do not know the hearts of others absent citations to authority.
- 9) People have differing opinions. Some are perceived by others to be odious. This is of no matter to a journalist.

10) *Ad hominem* attacks and name-calling are always efforts to avoid arguing the point (or an inability to do so) and serve as an affront to civil discourse. Reporting on them absent this context is a betrayal of our blessings and an abdication of our duty.

Make no mistake, these principles are judgments of what the press' job is. Our association holds members to them via public audit of policies.

===

Auditable Policies

Version 1.0

March 31, 2023

The Association of Principled Press requires its members submit themselves to an audit against these policies for all media not labeled as Opinion or Advertisement (or the like).

Corrections

Must make corrections to factual errors and publish them as prominently as the error itself.

Assertions of fact

Assertions of fact must be cited.

Euphemisms and Non-Substantive Labels

If euphemisms are published, they must be in quotes.

Examples:

Proposed Legislation / government program names are politically-created tools to engender support and therefore lack substance. Once passed, they ought to be either kept in quotes or noted as being 'called' or 'named' their given name.

Legislative and. policy goals cannot be used synonymously with policies. An example of this would be an "Affordable Housing" or a "Tough-on-Crime" Advocate. Neither euphemism serves the purpose of describing a policy, such as, potentially, supporting rigid criminal sentencing rules, or government subsidies for low-income rental housing.

Terms which contradict the common meanings of words like "Settled science." Science is a method of discovery, thus settled science lacks substance without quotes.

Non-substantive labels of a person must not be used unless self-described which should be noted. In a journalist's summary description of a person or group, we describe what the person actually *does*, not what others say they *are*.

Examples of *Non-Substantive Labels*

- “*Liberal*” or “*conservative*” | OK: membership in a political party.
- “*Pro abortion*” or “*pro-life*” | OK: supports (or opposes) legislation expanding access to a woman's ability to have an abortion.
- “*Woke*” / “*Extremist*”
- Labels describing a “*-phobia*” absent a public disclosure of a medical condition or a self-description of a fear lack factual substance.

Creating Motives

Journalists cannot report with credibility motives of those absent admission or finding by an authoritative (and cited) source. Our culture has allowed knowing someone else's heart to creep its way into the media to our detriment. The most prominent example is “hate speech.” Absent an admission of hatred or a finding of “hate speech” by a court as it relates to an enacted law disallowing “hate speech,” a term expressing motivation for an action cannot be used. Primarily, journalists don't know who hates whom to know if hate motivates certain speech. We report on the speech. Likewise, journalists do not know if people who accept government benefits, use tax loopholes and the like are opportunistic, cheats, lazy or what have you. We report on the actions, not the heart of the actor, which we do not know.

Appeals to authority

A journalist reports what was said and by whom, and their credentials. A journalist doesn't assert that something is actually true or false because it was said by an authority.

Name-calling

Journalists aren't obligated to report *ad hominem* attacks and name calling, When *ad hominem* attacks and name calling are reported, they may only be done so in the context of the attacker/name-caller's willful avoidance of substance.

Responses to substantive criticism

When a journalist reports the substantive criticism of a person or group, as a matter of honor and integrity, they must also report the substantive response to that criticism, in the same or similar format/prominence.

Publishing False Information

It has to be said in 2023– a journalist who lies isn't one. Journalists must only publish facts they can independently verify as true. If a source lies, that source must be identified.

===

THIRD PARTY OMBUDSMAN SERVICE

After conducting a member audit, the Association of Principled Press can offer its Third Party Ombudsman Service. Stay tuned.

For Inquiries about Association Membership Pricing, Public Benefit Corporations, or our Third Party Ombudsman Service, please contact:

Edward “Coach” Weinhaus, Esq.
Executive Director
Association of Principled Press
“We put the P in the AP”
11500 Olive Blvd. Suite 133
Creve Coeur, MO 63141
(314) 580-9580
principledpress.org (coming soon)