



## Conference: Promoting dialogue between the European Court of Human Rights and the media freedom community

Freedom of expression and the role and case law of the  
European Court of Human Rights:  
developments and challenges

Friday 24 March 2017,

●  
Palais de l'Europe building (Room 1)  
Concept Note

This one-day conference supported by the Council of Europe aims to bring together judges and lawyers of the European Court of Human Rights and media lawyers, academics, policymakers, journalists and civil society representatives active in the field of media law and freedom of expression. The conference will provide a platform to thoroughly analyse and discuss the European Court of Human Rights' case law on Article 10 and related articles of the European Convention on Human Rights in cases concerning freedom of expression of media and journalists.

The event is organized by ECPMF in cooperation with ARTICLE 19, Access Info, the European Federation of Journalists, Ghent University Human Rights Centre, Index on Censorship, the Institute of European Media Law, the International Federation of Journalists, the International Press Institute, the Media Legal Defence Initiative, the Mass Media Defence Centre and PEN International.

The conference will focus on developments in the areas of defamation, privacy and the processing of personal data, investigative journalism in relation to newsgathering, access to official documents and the importance of the protection of sources and whistle-blowers, as well as the right to protest and the role of the media during protests. There will be panel discussions featuring current and former judges of the European Court of Human Rights as well as lawyers, journalists, activists and academic researchers. It will take place in Strasbourg, on 24 March 2017, with support from the Information Society Department of the Council of Europe.

1

supported by:

 [www.ecpmf.eu](http://www.ecpmf.eu)  @ecpmf



## Objective

The conference will provide a venue to analyse and discuss the Court's recent case law related to freedom of expression, media and journalism and it will provide a broad platform to engage in dialogue. By bringing together all stakeholders and stimulating both high quality analysis and discussion, the organisers hope to contribute to a better understanding of actual developments in freedom of expression jurisprudence and to promote informed awareness about how the right to freedom of expression is challenged in a globalised information society.

This conference will build on the conclusions of the “Seminar on the European Protection of Freedom of Expression: Reflections on Some Recent Restrictive Trends”, held on 10<sup>th</sup> of October 2008 at the Court and organised by the Université Robert Schuman, Ghent University and the Open Society Justice Initiative. That seminar focused on a series of judgments in which the Court had found no violation of Article 10 as the “interferences” or sanctions challenged by the applicants, were, according to the Court, legitimately, pertinently and sufficiently based on the “duties and responsibilities” and therefore held to be necessary in a democratic society<sup>1</sup>. Since then, the Court's privacy and defamation jurisprudence has been significantly elaborated and the Court has begun to develop jurisprudence on themes such as the right of access to public documents, whistleblowing, newsgathering and freedom of expression online.

Over the last ten years, the Court has delivered significant new jurisprudence with regard to the right to freedom of expression and information. Specialised observers and commentators of the jurisprudence have noted that the scope of protection of this right ranges from a broad one in some cases to a more restrictive one in others<sup>2</sup>. The Court often refers to the concept of “*responsible journalism*”, including the expectation that a journalist in his or her actions of newsgathering should not breach the law, even in cases where a journalist has acted in order to inform the public on important matters in society. In addition, in some recent decisions and judgments the margin of appreciation of the States parties has been expanded, reducing the level of protection for journalists and the media. These developments impact the expectations of the public at large, national judges, media lawyers, researchers and media professionals, the academic institutions regarding the role of the Court as the ultimate watchdog over the right to freedom of expression and information for media and journalists in Europe.

---

<sup>1</sup> Dirk Voorhoof, ‘Seminar on the European Protection of Freedom of Expression: Reflections on Some Recent Restrictive Trends Strasbourg: Some Conclusions and Outlook’ [2008], Organised by: Université Robert Schuman in Strasbourg, Ghent University and Open Society Justice Initiative.

<sup>2</sup> Such as in *Lindon, Otchakovsky-Laurens & July v. France*, *Stoll v. Switzerland*, *Palomo Sánchez v. Spain*, *Animal Defenders International v. United Kingdom*, *Mouvement Raelien Suisse v. Switzerland*; *Delfi AS v. Estonia*; *Pentikäinen v. Finland* and *Bédat v. Switzerland*.

The abovementioned themes of the seminar will be discussed and analysed having in mind these considerations.

## Key issues

The key themes to be discussed will be:

**Theme #1:** Defamation, privacy and the processing of personal data

**Theme #2:** Investigative journalism, access to information, protection of sources and whistle-blowers

**Theme #3:** The right to protest and the role of the media during protests.

## Expected outcomes:

- Providing a platform for judges and media lawyers, non-governmental organisations, researchers and media professionals to discuss recent trends of the interpretation of the Convention in cases involving freedom of expression, media and journalists;
- Thorough analysis of ECtHR developments with examples of concrete cases based on the analysis of media lawyers, academics and journalists;
- The organisers aim to have several of the contributions published on authoritative blogs or in academic journals;
- Reflections from judges and lawyers on the challenges in interpreting and applying Article 10 of the Convention and other articles related to the work of media and journalists;
- Follow up on the conclusions of the the 2008 conference conclusions (see annex)

## Organising committee:

Flutura Kusari, Peter Noorlander, Dirk Voorhoof, Urska Umek

For more information, contact [kusari@ecpmf.eu](mailto:kusari@ecpmf.eu)

## Annex

### Seminar on the European Protection of Freedom of Expression: Reflections on Some Recent Restrictive Trends

Strasbourg, 10 October 2008

A Seminar at the European Court of Human Rights

Université Robert Schuman, Strasbourg

Ghent University

Open Society Justice Initiative

#### Some conclusions and outlook

By Dirk VOORHOOF

After a long day of interesting, challenging and lively presentations and debate, it is time to formulate some final observations before closing today's conference. A bit more than a year ago Constance Grewe, Mario Oetheimer and I decided to organise a conference that should focus on certain peculiar developments in Strasbourg's freedom of expression case law as there were some signals – perhaps weak signals at that time – suggesting that the European Court of Human Rights was taking a divergent approach in some cases on press freedom, and in particular on the “duties and responsibilities” of the media and journalists.

That was in early autumn 2007. It was – just like today – a sunny day in Strasbourg. Symbolically, however, some dark clouds have appeared ever since. In the weeks and months that followed, the initial indications regarding a shift in the Court's case law became overwhelmingly obvious signals.

Let us recall some of the cases we discussed today:

- Lindon, Otchakovsky-Laurens and July v. France (Grand Chamber), 22 October 2007
- Stoll v. Switzerland (Grand Chamber), 10 December 2007
- Rumyana Ivanova v. Bulgaria, 14 February 2008
- Alithia Publishing Company Ltd. & Constantinides v. Cyprus, 22 May 2008
- Backes v. Luxembourg, 8 July 2008
- Soulas a.o. v. France, 10 July 2008
- Flux (n°6) v. Moldova, 29 July 2008
- Cuc Pasco v. Romania, 16 September 2008
- and most recently Leroy v. France, 2 October 2008,

The last judgment dealing with a 9/11-cartoon whose message, according to its author, was criticizing US imperialism, while the French courts and the European Court of Human Rights concluded that the essence of the message of the cartoon was condoning and glorifying terrorism.

In each of the above mentioned cases the Court found no violations of Article 10 as the “interferences”, convictions and sanctions challenged by the applicants, were, according to the Court, legitimately, pertinently and sufficiently based on the “duties and responsibilities” which are inherent in the exercise of the freedom of expression (paragraph 2 of Article 10).

The outcome and rationale of the judgments in which the Court has recently found no violation of freedom of expression have raised serious concerns regarding the level of protection of press freedom in Europe compared to the ‘traditional’ high standards of Strasbourg case law in this matter. Some of these judgments were not only critically analyzed by academics and NGOs advocating freedom of expression, but also from within the Court, where during the last year some of the dissenting judges, on several occasions, pulled the alarm bell regarding the ‘new’ approach adopted by the Court in applying the test of necessity in a democracy. The discussion is especially focusing on the notion of whether democracy is best served with more or less freedom of expression and on the notion of ‘responsible’ investigative or critical journalistic reporting. The dissenting opinions in *Stoll v. Switzerland* referred to a “dangerous and unjustified departure from the Court’s well established case-law concerning the nature and vital importance of freedom of expression in democratic societies”. In the case of *Lindon a.o. v. France*, the dissenters criticized the findings and the assessment of the Grand Chamber and described the majority’s approach in this case as “a significant departure from the Court’s case-law in matters of criticism of politicians”. In the case of *Flux nr. 6 v. Moldova*, the dissenters expressed concern that “that this judgment of the Court has thrown the protection of freedom of expression as far back as it possibly could”, making it “a sad day for freedom of expression”. It became obvious that also within the Court some of the above mentioned judgments have initiated a robust debate on the relation between press freedom, democracy and duties and responsibilities of media and journalists.

The reports, presentations and interventions of today have analysed, argued and demonstrated that there is a “restrictive trend” in the Court’s recent case law, confirming the concerns expressed in the title of the event. Depending on a more optimistic or pessimistic attitude, the perception can only gradually differ. Some have qualified the changing approach of the Court, initiated by the Grand Chamber, as a “quantum shift” (Gavin Millar) or as “une inflexion”, a turn in the Court’s case law

(Patrick Wachsmann). The perception can be that this shift has happened already or that such a restrictive trend is actually underway, but the material analysed and debated today has demonstrated that at least some, if not most of the above mentioned judgments, provide legitimate reasons for serious concern regarding the future of freedom of expression in Europe. Some of the Court's judgments reflect a willingness to treat public figures' personal rights, in particular to "dignity" and honour and reputation, as at least equal in importance to the right to the free speech right. In some judgments the protection of personal interests may be obscuring the wider importance of public interest speech. In other judgments priority has been given to the protection of secret or confidential information and to the interest of the state or a country's foreign policy interest, neglecting the public watchdog function of the media. Another worrying trend is that Article 8 (right to privacy) is more often invoked for additional justification of interferences in freedom of expression, also in cases of protection of the reputation of politicians and public figures in relation to their political or public life.

In the Court's recent case law the finding of non-compliance with ethics of journalism has become an important, or even a crucial, if not decisive, argument in evaluating the necessity of an interference in freedom of expression and press freedom as guaranteed by Article 10 of the European Convention on Human Rights. In some judgments the Court shows less reluctance than it did before in determining itself how a journalist should have reported the news. The Court refers in this regard to "ethics of journalism", the "standard of proper journalistic care", the "duties of responsible journalism", "best journalistic practice", "the customary rules of investigative journalism" and the "requirements of journalistic diligence", integrating professional standards and ethics of journalism into the legal framework of Article 10 of the Convention.

Hesitations and doubts have been created around the Court's 'new' approach in Article 10 cases, at the very moment that the Court's 'classical' case law has been increasingly influencing national courts and national authorities, creating added value for freedom of expression in a democracy. An impact that became obvious both within the 47 states parties to the European Convention and outside its strict regional jurisdiction. It has been illustrated how the case law of the Strasbourg Court in the past has been an inspiring source for upholding freedom of expression in other parts of the world or how it has influenced e.g. some of the judgments of the Inter-American Court of Human Rights promoting freedom of expression in application of Article 13 of the American Convention on Human Rights, as illustrated in the report by Eduardo Bertoni.

Today's conference, opened by the Vice-President of the European Court of Human Rights and taking place in the building of the European Court in the presence of many of the Court's judges, has certainly helped us to have a better overview and to cast a

sharper light on the recent developments in the Court's case law applying Article 10 of the Convention.

Several questions will need further elaboration, more study, a more thorough analysis and further reflection and debate.

Questions e.g. as:

- How to explain the changing approach in the Court's case law? Why is this happening? What factors are influencing this development? What is or has been the specific role of the Grand Chamber in this regard?
- What is or will be the impact of these recent developments? What is the impact on media lawyers dealing with freedom of expression cases or advising their clients? What will be the impact on national judges and courts at the domestic level? And what will be the impact on the continental media and journalism, will there be a 'chilling effect' for the media, for journalists in Europe? To what extent? Will investigative journalism, in particular, come under greater threat?
- What is the impact on Press Councils confronted with the convergence between journalistic ethics as professional standards and failure to observe such standards as important or decisive legal factors legitimating an interference with media freedom? Should, in this perspective, the Councils of Journalistic Ethics in Europe anticipate in the future an increased possibility that their decisions might influence the fact finding and legal reasoning of judicial authorities in both civil and criminal cases against journalists? Should the self- and co-regulatory bodies of journalistic ethics be more aware of a virtual 'second life' of their opinions and decisions? What are the possibilities, what are the options?
- Is there still a way back? How can the Court find its way back on the track of its generally very well-respected approach in cases regarding freedom of expression? How to stimulate this?

The organisers of today's conference do hope that the meeting and the exchange of opinions and information will have a process of follow up, that there will be a creative spin-off. We do hope that the signals given today will have an effect, an impact on future developments.

We need to keep the debate open, maintain a spotlight on where Strasbourg case law is going and continue addressing together the very important issue that brought us together today: NGOs, journalists, professional organisations in the media sector, Press Councils, media lawyers, academics and judges, all within their own role, possibilities and accountability towards society. We need to develop what we have started today in

order to find out what can be done against tendencies decreasing protection of freedom of expression, media freedom and (investigative) journalism and stimulating responsible journalism and transparency about the ‘res publica’ in a democratic society.

Instead of taking part today in the “funeral” of the Handyside or Sunday Times doctrines regarding the importance of freedom of expression in a democratic society based on broadmindedness, pluralism and tolerance - and on a concept of society in which shocking, offending and disturbing opinions and information have their place - we hope that today’s conference has helped create a revival of this approach and will contribute to bringing to an end the restrictive trend in Article 10 case law. We hope that this conference has helped motivate all its participants to contribute, take initiatives or positive action in this regard. Let’s also keep in mind and be aware of the more than hundred judgments of the European Court of Human Rights firmly supporting freedom of expression in application of Article 10 of the Convention and having created a standard that should be respected in the future.

The organisers would like to thank all those who have contributed to today’s event: those who hosted the meeting, sponsored the conference, and co-organised or supported it, and especially all those who have been actively participating in this meeting. Special thanks also for the interpreters who did a fantastic job during this very long day. I wish all of you a safe and joyful journey back to your home countries today or tomorrow or have a fine and sunny weekend in Strasbourg.