



Settle or fight?
Far Eastern Economic Review and Singapore
Epilogue

Dow Jones lawyer Stuart Karle, in his capacity as counsel for the *Far Eastern Economic Review* (FEER), decided to challenge the Lees in court. After the Ministry of Information, Communications and the Arts stepped in, and when the Lees filed suit on August 22, reconciliation no longer seemed an option—leaving only capitulation or confrontation. Dow Jones believed that FEER had libeled neither Prime Minister Lee Hsien Loong nor his father, Lee Kuan Yew.¹

FEER took the steps it deemed appropriate. The magazine decided to keep on its website the July 2006 editorial which had prompted the lawsuit. In addition, it posted all the correspondence between Karle and the Lees' attorney. Finally, it contested the ruling from the Ministry of Information which retroactively changed the status of FEER and four other publications. Because FEER was not incorporated in Singapore but in Hong Kong, Karle refused to post S\$200,000 and name a local counsel.

In response, on September 28, 2006, the Ministry banned the *Review* from Singapore outright. Though it had only 1,000 subscribers in Singapore, the *Review* issued a statement lamenting the infringement on "the fundamental rights of our Singaporean subscribers [which] further restricts the already narrow scope of free expression in Singapore."² Singaporean authorities in turn reminded the Western press of its privileged guest status in the country.

In October, Karle and Dow Jones petitioned to have the libel case heard in Hong Kong since the *Review* was based there and had no staff in Singapore. Hong Kong also seemed to promise a more fair legal process; Singapore had never won a libel suit outside its own borders,

¹ Chee Soon Juan, the subject of the offending article, publicly urged Karle to fight on. "I hope FEER will seriously fight this matter and not bow to the Lees," he said. John Burton and Justine Lau, "Economic Publication Urged to Fight Libel Suit." *Financial Times*, September 15, 2006.

² "Singapore Bans Far Eastern Economic Review Magazine," *International Herald Tribune*, September 28, 2006.

This Epilogue was written by Julia Ioffe for the Knight Case Studies Initiative, Graduate School of Journalism, Columbia University. Funding was provided by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation. (0308)

Copyright © 2008 The Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York. No part of this publication may be reproduced, revised, translated, stored in a retrieval system, used in a spreadsheet, or transmitted in any form or by any means (electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise) without the written permission of the Case Studies Initiative.

and never lost one domestically. However, the petition failed and the trial got underway later that month in Singapore. The government later refused FEER's request to retain a Queen's Counsel from Britain, a possible compromise since Singapore's legal system had its roots in British Common Law.³ Singapore insisted instead that FEER retain a local attorney.

The case was still unresolved in spring 2008. In August 2007, Rupert Murdoch's News Corporation purchased Dow Jones. Some wondered whether the change in ownership would affect FEER's legal fight in Singapore. Murdoch's purchase did not immediately change the status of FEER's case. However, FEER dropped the history of the dispute with Singapore from its website, and the Dow Jones legal team that had contested the Singapore case was largely replaced.⁴

³ Agence France Presse, "Singapore Rejects Banned Magazine's Bid for British Lawyer," July 9, 2007.

⁴ Eric Ellis, "Will Rupert Murdoch Knuckle Under to Singapore?" *Asia Sentinel*, January 11, 2008.