

Berlin, July 4, 2017

Emily Shutt
U.S. Attorney's Office
1100 Commerce Street, 3rd floor
Dallas, TX 75242
United States of America

Case 3:12-CR-413-01

Dear Mrs. or Ms. Shutt,

We have taken part of your subpoena to The Intercept, re *United States v. Barrett Lancaster Brown*, where you request information on any wages Mr. Brown has made as a journalist working for said outlet.

As you are no doubt aware, Mr. Brown was arrested in a case – the leaks from Stratfor – that would have been thrown out as utterly unconstitutional in countries with strong freedom of the press and proper whistleblower protection, and where the prosecution would likely face charges themselves. We would therefore ponder, whether personnel in law enforcement agencies in the Lone Star State are aware that any official of any branch of government will go straight to prison in such Western countries for merely asking a colleague over coffee if they knew who might have leaked documents (a comprehensive ban on any and all tracing of sources to the press).

In tradition with procedures of such countries with strong freedom of press, and in response to the subpoena given, we would therefore cordially like to refer you to the legal response given in the freedom-of-press case of *Arkell v. Pressdram* (1971).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Rick Falkvinge". The signature is stylized and fluid, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Rick Falkvinge

European Pirate Academy
Berlin

Explanation for people who aren't nerds on freedom of press and legal stuffs:

Arkell vs. Pressdram was a case in the UK against the very resourceful outlet *Private Eye*, which picked up any improper behavior from the grapevine and undressed officials of their mask-of-honor like it was second nature.

One of these people, a certain *J. Arkell*, tried suing the publisher of *Private Eye*, a company called Pressdram, for libel. The first piece of correspondence went thus:

29th April 1971

Dear Sir,

We act for Mr Arkell who is Retail Credit Manager of Granada TV Rental Ltd. His attention has been drawn to an article appearing in the issue of *Private Eye* dated 9th April 1971 on page 4. The statements made about Mr Arkell are entirely untrue and clearly highly defamatory. We are therefore instructed to require from you immediately your proposals for dealing with the matter.

Mr Arkell's first concern is that there should be a full retraction at the earliest possible date in *Private Eye* and he will also want his costs paid. His attitude to damages will be governed by the nature of your reply.

Yours,

Goodman Derrick & Co.

And here's their legal response, referred to as "the response given in *Arkell v. Pressdram*":

Dear Sirs,

We acknowledge your letter of 29th April referring to Mr. J. Arkell.

We note that Mr Arkell's attitude to damages will be governed by the nature of our reply and would therefore be grateful if you would inform us what his attitude to damages would be, were he to learn that the nature of our reply is as follows: fuck off.

Yours,

Private Eye