A long fight ahead

By Charlie Harris
President

“History repeats itself, first as tragedy, second as farce”. It’s not often that you’ll find Karl Marx quoted in The Journal, but occasionally he told the truth. For history is repeating itself, and the outcome could be a tragic – for journalists, those who value free speech, and for the very democracy on which our country has for centuries prided itself.

Having taken over as President of the Chartered Institute of Journalists a few weeks ago, I find myself involved in a campaign with chilling echoes from my early days as a journalist. When I became a local newspaper reporter 40 years ago, I found myself caught up in a bitter battle to prevent a Labour government controlling the press by enforcing a statutory closed shop on our profession, essentially creating a licensing system.

As a 19-year-old junior on a small paper in north London the part I played was tiny. I resigned from the NUJ and joined the Institute. But there were many like me, we had allies in the corridors of power – and we won. Four decades later, the exact cause of the fight we face may be different, but the issues are startlingly similar, and many of the foes are familiar.

Statutory underpinning

The NUJ, long ago having given up the vain hope of forcing all journalists to join its ranks or face being unable to practise their trade, is now throwing its weight behind moves to introduce an element of ‘statutory underpinning’ to the regulation of journalistic ethics. It is standing shoulder-to-shoulder with the Labour Party and the Liberal Democrats.

All three are in thrall to a small paper in north London the part I played was tiny. I resigned from the NUJ and joined the Institute. But there were many like me, we had allies in the corridors of power – and we won. Four decades later, the exact cause of the fight we face may be different, but the issues are startlingly similar, and many of the foes are familiar.

“What’s the point of joining a union that is on the side of the ultimate bosses - the government?”

Some are joining the CIoJ, attracted by our principled stand against state involvement in the ethics of our profession. Such involvement by the state is totally unnecessary. The alleged malpractices which led to the Leveson inquiry and the arrest of dozens of journalists are criminal offences, not ethical misdemeanours.

The problem is not a failure of the regulatory system but the failure of the police to enforce the law. But supporters of statutorily-backed ethical regulation, many of them the alleged victims of crimes committed by journalists, have hijacked the issue to seek revenge on the whole press for the sins of a few journalists on a handful of national newspapers. They are using a blunderbuss instead of a sniper’s rifle.

What they are proposing will seriously wound totally innocent journalists and sections of the press, such as local newspapers which were cleared by Leveson of any wrongdoing, Hacked Off and its allies in the political parties know this, but they don’t care. The ‘light-touch’ – but massively expensive – statutory underpinning, which at the time of writing seems certain to be imposed on us, would allow much tougher controls to be imposed by a future government with even less respect for free speech and democracy.

MPs must consider the long-term effects on our democracy of beefed-up press regulation. In a free society, a press under state control is a far greater danger than a press out of control. As Sir Winston Churchill said: “A free press is the unsleeping guardian of every other right that free men prize; it is the most dangerous foe of tyranny. Where free institutions are indigenous to the soil and men have the habit of liberty, the press will continue to be the Fourth Estate, the vigilant guardian of the rights of the ordinary citizen.”

Kirsty Hughes, chief executive of Index on Censorship, a long established and highly respected defender of free speech and a free press, said that involvement of politicians in the formation of the proposed Royal Charter undermined the fundamental principle that the press holds politicians to account. “It is a bleak moment for the UK’s international reputation as a country where press freedom is cherished as a fundamental principle and right,” she said. She is right.

See centre pages for more articles on regulation
The British tradition of press freedom began over 300 years ago when William of Orange landed at Brixham in Devon and proclaimed that he had come to overthrow tyranny and bring civil and religious liberty to England. The Glorious Revolution of 1688-9 gave Great Britain a balanced constitution and a free parliament, paving the way for the parliamentary democracy that we know today. Political freedom was followed by press freedom when in 1694 William ended centuries of State censorship by doing away with the system by which all journals and publications had to be licensed by the authorities. Ever since then, democracy and press freedom have gone hand in hand.

So it is ironic that now, in 2013, it is Parliament that poses the greatest direct threat to the freedom of the press – and this apparently in response to demands from the general public (in reality the agitation of pressure-groups) for ‘protection’ from an over mighty press. Determined to hold the entire journalistic profession responsible for the sins of a few phone-hackers, party leaders from both sides of the House of Commons have agreed a new regulatory regime for the British press.

But who would be ‘protected’ by this new regime? The new regulatory system has not been designed to serve the interests of the British nation but that of a tiny but vocal minority. As Simon Jenkins wrote recently, “Press regulation is a victory for the rich, the celebrated and the powerful.” It is these people whose cause has been championed so effectively, and dishonestly, by the so-called Hacked-Off campaign – who feel so threatened by a free press, and who have correctly calculated that enough politicians could be persuaded to side with them in creating an unstoppable momentum for state control. So, here we are, after the lengthy and monstrous show-trial of journalism at the Leveson Inquiry, with a broad cross-party Parliamentary consensus supporting what Nigel Farage has called, correctly, “a charter for the suppression of the press”.

Meanwhile, some journalists have breathed an audible sigh of relief that the terms of the Royal Charter are not as bad as they feared. The National Union of Journalists and the Independent newspaper, among others, have welcomed the new rules as, in effect, the least worst option. It is not surprising. The experience of the Leveson inquiry had softened them up to the idea of a regulated press. They believe that British journalism can survive the imposition of state regulation. Maybe it can – but the real danger is not the Royal Charter itself, or the new regulatory body that is being set up to police it, but where this will all lead.

The Royal Charter, the first peacetime regulation of the press in over three centuries, is just the beginning of a long, long road. Once the principle is established that the state should exercise a degree of control over the press, the extent of that control will grow, inch by inch, year on year, until eventually journalistic freedom has been extinguished in this country altogether.

In the 21st century it is only in totalitarian regimes, Islamic theocracies and Third World banana republics that the State controls the press. We are a long way from that, but – make no mistake – with this Royal Charter and the creation of a press regulator we are taking our first steps in that direction.

Andy Smith

“Press freedom is the one that guarantees all the rest. Without it, the corrupt, the criminal and the compromised can get clean away with wrongdoing — and thus uninvigilated, the institutions of a free society would turn rotten and disintegrate. Yet this crucial freedom is about to be thrown away.”

– Melanie Phillips, Daily Mail

CIOJ Council

Seven members put their names forward to serve on the Council for the term. The rules allow for six members to be elected but also have the option for two more to be co-opted. With that in mind the President took the view that there was no need for expense of a ballot. Accordingly, then, the following have been elected to serve on the Council of the Chartered Institute of Journalists for a two-year term, 2013-15:

Andy Smith
Mark Croucher
Janice ShillumBhend
Vivienne Du-Bourdieu
Keith Lockwood
Karen Birch
Ken Brookes

The Ex Officio members of Council in 2013-15 will be:
Charlie Harris, President
Paul Leighton, Vice-President
Norman Bartlett, Immediate Past President
Amanda Brodie, Chairman, Professional Practices Board
New MOD rules on journalist safety in war zones

The Ministry of Defence has given official recognition to the issue of journalist safety in war zones. This follows an initiative led by the International News Safety Institute (INSI) and supported by major news organisations concerned over the mounting death toll of news media staff on the modern battlefield.

For the first time, the MOD Green Book, which sets out working arrangements with the media, contains a chapter on journalist safety. Critically, the Ministry has recognised the right of correspondents to move freely in the battle space in present and future wars. “The MOD recognises that correspondents are free to look for information in the area of operations and to communicate it back to the public,” states the book, written for the guidance of military personnel and the news media.

“The MOD recognises and understands the concerns of correspondents working in operational areas and other hostile environments regarding their own safety and protection.”

It also pledges that “UK forces on operations will never deliberately target either individual correspondents or civil media facilities.”

INSI, of which the Chartered Institute of Journalists is a co-founder, began talks two years ago with the MOD and submitted a list of suggestions aimed at improving news media safety in war.

Previous editions of the MOD’s Green Book hitherto have made no specific provision for the safety of journalists.

Recognition

“We did not get everything we wanted,” said INSI Director Rodney Pinder, “but basic recognition of the issue of journalist safety in war and of the freedom of movement of journalists in the battle space was key for us. I believe this is the first time a major military power has inscribed in its bible of media-military operations important procedures to help make war coverage safer for journalists.”

“The MOD is to be congratulated – especially on its pledge that journalists will never be targeted by the British armed forces. We would like to see other militaries follow this lead.”

Death toll

In the conventional opening phase of the Iraq war, between March and October 2003, the news media suffered proportionately the second biggest death toll, after the Iraqi army, according to statistics compiled at the time by the private Australia-based Global Risk Awareness & Safety Programs.

Twenty dead amounted to one per cent of the news media numbers then in the area, compared with 1.4 per cent for the Iraqi military, 0.4 per cent for Allied ground forces and 0.03 per cent for Iraqi civilians.

Most of the media dead were ‘unilaterals’ working independently outside the coalition’s official procedures for ‘embedded’ journalists.

The INSI-MOD talks began with the question of why the military should do more for journalists than embed them. While embedded news teams are protected by the troops around them, it was clear the exposure of non-embeds and freelancers had to be brought to the military’s attention and openly addressed for this and future conflicts.

The MOD accepted that there will be independent journalists in the battle space seeking to balance the reporting of the embedded journalists and then moved to meet some of the concerns of INSI and the NSG, which comprises the BBC, ITN, Sky News, Reuters, APTN and the US networks CNN, NBC, ABC and CBS. The Guardian newspaper, a member of INSI’s Advisory Board, also joined the initiative.

The Green Book safety chapter also contains caveats for independent war correspondents.

It says the recognition that reporters are free to report in the battle area does not imply any specific obligation by UK forces to protect individuals or installations beyond their obligations to civilians as set out in the Geneva Conventions.

It stresses that reporters who gain access to operational areas on their own initiative do so at their own risk.

And although UK forces will not target journalists, media representatives need to recognise that war creates extremely hazardous environments and mistakes “resulting from misidentification, weapon systems failure or mal-location” may result.

Basic training

The MOD urges that journalists should be thoroughly trained in preparation for war coverage. “Too often, correspondents’ lives are placed in danger through their own lack of understanding or knowledge,” the book says.

Hundreds of correspondents from around the world turned up to cover the Iraq war without the most basic training on what to expect or how best to survive.

“Far too often, journalists are the only untrained professionals on the battlefield, lacking essential survival skills and proper safety equipment,” Rodney Pinder said.

“War reporting will never be safe but we can – and must – make it safer.”

The date:
The time:
The Venue:
The Cost:

Brand you...What does your online profile say about you

This training day will be a unique opportunity for members to attend a professional development seminar run by Skribe London, a new, young training collective aiming to help journalists broaden their field of operations and use new technology to re-brand their portfolio for a multi-platform, digital publishing world.

Contact head office for more details: 020 7252 1187, memberservices@cioj.co.uk
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Greek journalists targeted by anarchist groups

The Greek police are looking for the anarchist group responsible for detonating makeshift bombs at the homes of five journalists in Athens – the latest in a series of actions taken against reporters in Greece.

An anarchist group calling itself Lovers of Lawlessness claimed responsibility for the latest attacks. It said the journalists had been targeted for supporting the Greek government’s austerity programme.

The news media are the “main managers of the oppressing state designs, manipulating society accordingly,” the group said in a statement posted to the Internet.

Reporters Without Borders condemned the bombings, in which explosives tied to gas canisters caused minor damage.

Scapegoats

“These attacks are the most visible expression of an increasingly dangerous climate for all journalists, who are being turned into the scapegoats of a crisis they are just analyzing,” Reporters Without Borders said.

Activism by far-left groups appears to be on the rise after a series of attacks and threats against journalists last year by the neo-Nazi group Golden Dawn.

Anarchists have also attacked the offices of media organisations. “Yesterday they raided radio stations; today we have explosions at journalists’ homes,” said Simos Kedikoglou, the coalition government’s spokesman.

“There is an open effort to terrorize the media, a vital part of our democracy.”

Azerbaijani journalist arrested at peaceful protest in Baku

Concerns are growing about the safety of journalists and the freedom of the press in Azerbaijan. The recent arrest and detention of radio reporter Khadija Ismayilova has highlighted the failure of the Azerbaijani government to respect the constitutionally guaranteed right to free speech.

Ismayilova, who was last year awarded the Courage in Journalism Award, was seized by armed police in Azerbaijan’s capital Baku during a peaceful demonstration against police abuse. Ismayilova hosts a talk show at Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty in Baku.

She was held for seven hours and charged with violation of Article 298.2 of the Law on Freedom of Assembly – participation in a non-sanctioned gathering.

“My lawyer was denied access to me both in the police station and the court,” Ismayilova told the International Women’s Media Foundation.

She was eventually but was fined 400 AZN (approx. $500). “These fines are a new thing”, Ismayilova explained. “A couple of months ago they changed the law introducing punishment for participation in non-sanctioned rallies. The government doesn’t authorize any protest rally in this country, so all rallies are non-sanctioned.”

This is not the first time Ismayilova has been the subject of attempts to silence her. She has been the victim of regular slander campaigns in pro-government media while investigating corruption and power abuse among her country’s elite.

Smear campaign

The Azerbaijani president has personally tried to have her fired. In May 2012, Ismayilova became the target of a massive smear campaign threatening to defame her and put her life at risk unless she stopped reporting. This included an anonymous letter with photos from surveillance cameras planted in Ismayilova’s apartment, depicting her in an intimate situation with her boyfriend. It was made clear that she should stop her reporting or risk having the photos made public.

During the many attempts to discredit her, Khadija Ismayilova has refused to stop working and has publicly denounced her accusers.

Her investigations into government corruption are dangerous, she acknowledges. But “it doesn’t seem a good enough reason to stop doing it,” she said.

“Silence is what these regimes want. Power and the lack of checks and balances ensure access of corrupt officials to vast resources. Silence helps them to continue depriving their people of opportunities. Silence is supported by police truncheons and assassins’ bullets inside the country and geopolitical interests internationally.”

Continued from page 1

Watchdog

Phenyo Butale of the South African Freedom of Expression Institute said: “African governments have shown they are uncomfortable with free press acting as a watchdog, holding them to account. A move to statutory regulation in the UK would really be a gift for them.”

The New York Times warned the move would “chill free speech” in the UK. “The kind of press regulations proposed by British politicians would do more harm than good because an unfettered press is essential to democracy,” it said.

Even the Labour-supporting New Statesman weighed in to condemn what was happening, saying it was “regulation designed to suit politicians”.

Its rival on the right, The Spectator, has, along with the Economist and Private Eye, publicly declared it will refuse to join the new regime, its editor Fraser Nelson arguing: “Yes, there have been horrific abuses by the press. But this was already illegal: this is why so many journalists have been arrested and why so many will go to jail. No new laws are required. No political oversight is required.”

The (slightly) good news is that the proposed regime may not survive long after its difficult birth.

Glimmers of hope?

Firstly, the regulatory system it will create is horrendously complicated and bureaucratic, and very difficult to understand, so it may collapse under its own weight.

Secondly, at the time of writing it is looking as if many national newspapers will join The Spectator, New Statesman, the Economist and Private Eye in refusing to be part of the scheme – and there is talk of rival regimes being established.

And thirdly, the scheme will apply only to England and Wales, with the possibility of Scotland and Northern Ireland setting up their own. Whether these would be better or worse in themselves, that would leave journalists in the UK facing three separate regulatory regimes, a prospect that will please no-one – except lawyers who must already think their birthdays and Christmas have come at once.

There is a long fight ahead, and Institute members can be assured that we will be in the spearhead, defending their rights and those of all journalists, and defending democracy in the UK, and free speech for all its citizens.

Back in the early 70s, prospects often looked very bleak and our cause in vain, and we sometimes feared the Institute would be killed off. But we won that battle and we can win this one.
Thin red line versus red ink
Ministry of Defence appoints new Media & Communications Director
By Norman Bartlett

As everyone knows by now, Britain’s armed forces have been in the front line of the Government’s efforts to reduce expenditure. The popular view is that the country has a navy without ships, an air force without aircraft and an army without tanks but a bigger Defence ministry than ever.

In a hugely sensitive area like Defence, the challenges for those in press relations are quite formidable. Step forward Cloj member Stephen Jolly who has just been appointed to one very hot seat, that of Director of Media & Communications (DMC) at the Ministry of Defence.

It is a 2-star post – equivalent to major-general – but he has the experience to handle it. He was Director of External Affairs and Communications with the University of Cambridge for eight years. Before that he held a number of posts with major corporations involved with change - more of that below. His academic record is to be envied, for following a First in English from Christ’s College he went on to take his Masters in linguistics science at Sussex University. He is a Fellow of Clare College and of the Judge Business School.

His exposure to the military began about 15 years ago as an instructor at the UK’s Defence Intelligence & Security School, Chicksands. At about the same time he was Visiting Fellow in Psychological Warfare at the International Centre for Security Analysis, King’s College in London. ‘Psyops’ is the military elision for this activity and Jolly’s psyops record has been of interest to those who follow his appointment.

It is a matter that Jolly wanted to downplay when I met him at Brooks’s Club in St James. His experience, he emphasised, was with large organisations. He is particularly proud of the transformation that was achieved with HSBC.

“The bank was unknown in the UK. Everyone knew about the Midland – it was one of the world’s largest banks. Yet in a few years the public awareness of HSBC was transformed.” He also mentions Nomura that had been simply a large Japanese stockbroker and was now an international investment banking brand.

“I was recruited [to the MoD] because of my work for these sorts of large organisations where change was a key requirement.” He will be working with Chris Mace, Director of Transformation. This is a relatively new post, created as a consequence of the Coalition government’s Strategic Defence & Security Review 2010. I mention the Army is still a large organisation with 80,000 people. There are not that many other British organisations with that many staff. He agrees. Add in the smaller numbers in the RAF and Navy as well as almost 70,000 in the Ministry itself.

Stephen Jolly will have a staff of 150 plus another 450 distributed around the branches of the armed forces. “I have met four of them”, he confesses. I suggested this number of staff is sufficient to man a regiment.

“Ah, but the 450 do cover the 32 defence agencies.” When I raise my eyebrows at the number of defence agencies he explains that some were very small, like the Submarine Museum at Portsmouth.

“A very nice museum indeed,” he notes, “although a bit run down.”

But how will he set about his new job?

Difficult line to tread

“I have three priorities. Firstly there is the internal challenge of low morale. Repeated cuts have had their effect and people’s morale must be rebuilt. Then, how are we to deal with social media? Defence is an organisation built on a command and control.” He explains that while it is not possible or even desirable to limit what personnel put on social media in an open society, there is still the matter of security. It is a very difficult line to tread and will require some thought to resolve things. He sees no easy answers.

“Then, thirdly, there are the relationships with the media.” I illustrate the challenge there by reminding him of the headline in the Daily Telegraph: “Desert Rats to lose their tanks”. He smiles but maintains that many surveys have shown that the armed forces enjoy an astonishingly favourable image in the eyes of the public.

I probe a little on the psywar issue. He explains how he was interested early on in the power of argument (rhetoric) and describes the spectrum of communication: from the overt message of the advertising hoarding at one end to more subtle messages and black propaganda at the other.

Stephen Jolly, an interesting man for an interesting appointment.

Midnight comes of age

Midnight Communications, one of the South East’s leading PR agencies, this year celebrates its 18th birthday – a fantastic achievement when the average life span of a PR company is between five and seven years.

When the company was first launched back in 1995, it became the first agency to specialise in the internet. It was funded by a £2k overdraft and a belief that the internet would grow and flourish.

Over the years Midnight has employed and trained around two hundred people and been the parent of ten or more spin-off agencies. Two of its alumnae hold positions as MDs of top ten London PR firms and for eight years in a row a member of the team has been either a finalist or winner of the Young Communicator of the Year award.

Commenting on the company’s 18 years in business, Midnight’s founder and managing director Caroline Brown said: “We have survived the recession (I hope!) and last year won twelve awards for our work – including silver for outstanding PR consultancy in the south east. We continue to deliver quality results on behalf of a broad national client base which includes PR and social media, events and awards management.”
Press freedom versus

Institute in talks with DCMS on press regulation

The Institute made its views known on press regulation and the draft Royal Charter in a private meeting at the Department of Culture, Media and Sport.

Amanda Brodie, chairman of the Professional Practices Board, had set up the meeting and attended on February 20, along with General Secretary Dominic Cooper.

“The draft Charter had only been published the week before, so it was very topical and we spent an hour with two members of the Leveson team, outlining the Institute’s stand on the Charter and the Leveson report,” said Amanda.

“We had spent some considerable time going through the draft Charter and we were able to point out some areas of concern for our members. Dominic was able to tell them a bit about the Institute and I put across our response to Leveson and took them through the Royal Charter issues. They seemed genuinely interested in what we had to say, asking our opinion on various aspects of the Charter and on press regulation in general."

Submission

She added: “We left them with a copy of these points, a copy of our submission to Leveson and a copy of the Centenary edition of the Journal – I am not sure which will have impressed them most!”

New press regime ‘will inhibit free speech’

The new regulatory regime will inhibit freedom of speech and the freedom to publish, the Newspaper Society has warned. The ‘red line of principle’ that a free press should not be subject to parliamentary statute had now been crossed, it said.

The society, which represents more than 1,100 local newspapers, said that the new regulator’s powers would be greater than those of the courts - and more extensive than any press regulator in the Western World. And the regime will place a crippling financial burden on the UK’s local and regional press.

Leveson cleared the local press of the crimes alleged against some national newspapers, but, as Adrian Jeakings, President of the Newspaper Society, has said, the deal thrashed out by Hacked Off and its allies in the main parties completely ignored Leveson’s recommendations on the local press.

“The proposals extract an unacceptably high price for regional and local newspapers, including huge financial penalties for publishers who chose to be outside the system and an arbitration service which would open the floodgates to compensation claims,” Jeakings said.

Compensation claims

The system would be underpinned by statutory penalty clauses, using the threat of exemplary damages and costs in libel and other cases - which could run to hundreds of thousands of pounds - to penalise publishers who do not sign up to the regulator. And the free arbitration service for civil legal claims would “inevitably lead to many more legal claims against publishers and more legal costs”

“Small errors that are currently settled easily and without cost to either side could become compensation claims,” Mr Jeakings said. “Lord Justice Leveson found that the UK’s local media had nothing to do with the phone hacking scandal which prompted the Inquiry. Indeed, he praised regional and local newspapers for their important social and democratic role and recommended that the regulatory model proposed should not provide an added burden to our sector.

[Leveson] called on the Government to look urgently at what action it might take to help safeguard regional and local newspapers’ ongoing viability as a valued and important part of the British press. Yet the deal announced by the three main political parties completely ignores the Leveson recommendations on the local press."

Local newspapers remain fiercely opposed to any form of statutory involvement or underpinning in the regulation of the press.

“A free press cannot be free if it is dependent on and accountable to a regulatory body recognised by the state,” Mr Jeakings said.

In the House of Commons debate on March 19, Deputy Prime Minster Nick Clegg said: “Let us not forget that the hacking scandal was caused by some of our biggest newspapers, but it was still a minority of newspapers, and certainly not the local and regional press, which must not pay the price for a problem they did not create.”

Difficult circumstances

The chairman of the Culture, Media and Sport select committee, John Whittingdale, said: “We should recognise the vital importance of local newspapers, and ensure that whatever system we introduce does not add to the burden on them at a time when they are experiencing very difficult economic circumstances.”

The Leveson Report said that “local, high-quality and trusted newspapers are good for our communities, our identity and our democracy and play an important social role” and that their “contribution to local life is truly without parallel.”

CloJ President Charlie Harris, a former local newspaper editor, said: “National papers, with their massive budgets and armies of lawyers, could stand up to state bullying.

“Our local press would not be in such a strong position. Its role of holding local authorities, police, NHS, and other public bodies to account would be under serious threat and the public’s right to know would suffer. Hacked Off and its supporters, including those in all the main political parties, know this but don’t care.”
state control

Let’s not give up on press freedom so easily

By Dia Chakravarty
Email: dia@tfa.net
Twitter: @DiaChakravarty

The Hacked Off campaign would have us believe that the only way to prevent a repeat of the atrocities inflicted on the Dowlers and the McCanns is the introduction of statutory regulation of the press. Let’s explore this assertion.

The deplorable acts committed by some journalists that have shocked the nation, leading to the Leveson Inquiry, were all illegal acts which could and should have been dealt with through existing criminal and privacy laws. If existing laws are being broken, shouldn’t the focus be on ensuring that individuals responsible are brought to justice within the current legal framework? If that can’t be ensured then what would be the point of introducing of new statutory regulations, other than limiting press freedom for the sake of it? The state must not be allowed to use the actions of a minority to justify the introduction of government control of the press through the back door.

An independent press is a crucial element of a functioning democracy, playing a key role in holding the government to account. Thomas Jefferson said in 1786, “Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost.” Any form of regulation, underpinned by statute or otherwise derived from the state, would run the risk of seriously undermining that independence and therefore the ability of the press to carry out this function freely and effectively. Any form of such regulation, however limited, would open up the possibility of further state regulation in the future, leaving the press vulnerable to greater loss of freedom and therefore threatening a fundamental principle of our democracy.

Code of conduct

It has been argued that the statutory underpinning of the press regulator proposed by Lord Leveson does not directly restrict freedom of press, it merely provides an incentive to follow a certain code of conduct. But it seems quite clear to me that this act of statutory underpinning carries a promise and a threat that if the regulatory body does not meet the required standards (in the opinion of, for example, Ofcom) then more legislation could follow. This future threat acts as hindrance on press freedom now. Picture this: a few years ahead, another press scandal breaks, the tide of public opinion shifts, a quango, rather like Ofcom, finds that the regulatory body has failed to hold the press accountable. Is it difficult to imagine further encroachment of legislation against press freedom? What would stop a future government taking further steps down the path of censorship? The EU has already waded into the debate. In January, an EU panel praised the Leveson Report and proposed the establishment of national media councils to enforce press standards. It stated, rather chillingly, that these state regulators “should follow a set of European-wide standards and be monitored by the Commission to ensure that they comply with European values.”

Financial protection

The Freedom Association recently held a panel debate examining the Letwin Plan, the Conservatives’ proposal in response to the Leveson Report, where Harry Cole, the political blogger, expressed concerns that there was only “a cigarette paper’s difference” between the kind of press regulation proposed by the Leveson Report and by the Letwin Plan. The latter expounds the use of a Royal Charter rather than statutory regulation to put in place a ‘Recognition Body’, the apparently optional membership of which would provide members of the press with significant financial protection in case of litigation. Mr Cole felt that refraining from signing up to the Recognition Body is not a real option as membership could be seen as a seal of credibility (for all mainstream press, at least), with those choosing not to sign up being deemed as somehow less credible. He noted that credibility in this sense was itself problematic, as it would derive ultimately from the government-linked Royal Charter.

It is worth remembering that it is the audacity of the British press which provides our democracy with some much needed scrutiny, holding the government and Parliament to account. With statutory regulation or the Royal Charter in place, would the Telegraph have felt just as free to investigate and break the expenses scandal? Chris Huhne may well still have been representing Eastleigh in the House of Commons. I was sad to see the Hacked Off campaign painting the entire press industry with the same brush. In response to the Letwin Plan, Prof Brian Cathcart said that Conservative ministers negotiating the Leveson recommendations with the industry was “akin to giving a convicted man a veto on his sentence.” The Hacked Off campaign are of course entitled to raise objection with the Conservatives’ handling of this issue, but their unfortunate choice of words in condemning the entire industry for the sins of a few betrays a broader hostility towards the press which is worrying.

The press doesn’t always get it right. As in other industries, some of its members at times behave unacceptably. Some even commit crimes. But an independent press is a vital element of our democracy which performs the very important role of holding up our government and other powerful groups to scrutiny.

It is something we have cultivated over centuries. Let’s not give it up so easily citing the deplorable actions of a minority group within the industry, before fully exploring alternative ways of addressing its shortcomings.
Crossing the floor – from reporter to councillor

By Simon Mountford

Statistics were flying thick and fast: 1.5 million eggs a day, 52 employees, second largest agricultural operation in Scotland etc. All reporters know the sort of verbal factfile they can expect on company visits. Only this wasn’t a press facility trip; I was taking part in my first site visit as a newly-elected councillor and member of Scottish Borders Council’s Planning Committee.

It so happened that the visit was being filmed by the BBC for its new series of The Planners. This was duly viewed by, among others, the esteemed Editor of The Journal, who promptly invited me to write about my experiences. Hence this article.

It is nearly 45 years since, as the sole reporter on a Sydney suburban free weekly, I had to attend monthly meetings of the local council. My abiding memory of these was the impression that Northern Ireland’s orange/green politics had been transplanted into the IWMF, go to: www.iwmf.org.

IWMF names new CEO

The board of the International Women’s Media Foundation (IWMF) has appointed Elisa Lees Muñoz as the Foundation’s Executive Director.

Lees Muñoz brings over 20 years of experience in human rights and media development leading organizations that promote the rule of law, press freedom and the protection of journalists around the world.

“I am honored by the Board’s faith in my ability to lead the IWMF,” said Lees Muñoz, “In the coming year, we aim to expand our programmes for women entrepreneurs in digital news media and to continue to support courageous women journalists working under extraordinary difficult conditions around the globe.”

For more information about the IWMF, go to: www.iwmf.org.

New music editor for Quarterly Review

The Quarterly Review, the journal founded in 1809 by George Canning and Robert Southey, and relaunched in 2007 by the novelist and journalist Derek Turner, has just appointed Stuart Millson as its Music Editor.

Stuart, a longtermember of the Chartered Institute of Journalists and a former City of London police officer and Robert Southey, and relaunched in 2007 by the novelist and journalist Derek Turner, has just appointed Stuart Millson as its Music Editor.

Stuart, a longtimemember of the Chartered Institute of Journalists and a former member of the CIoJ Council, has already written extensively for the magazine on the subject of classical composers and artists. Recently, the Board of the Quarterly Review announced that the journal would move from a printed to a purely on-line publication, and Stuart’s first articles as Music Editor have now appeared: pieces on the Romanian George Enescu, the Welsh 20th-century composer, Arwel Hughes, and a celebration of the Benjamin Britten centenary. Other features are planned on the English Music Festival, the symphonies of Anton Bruckner, and on the 17th-century composers Thomas Tomkins and William Lawes.

Military music, our brass-band tradition, amateur music-making, regional orchestras, famous conductors, new-generation performers and contemporary composers will also be covered. Stuart says that he would be very pleased to hear from any fellow CIoJ members who might have an interest in music, or who might be interested in sharing their views on recent concerts or recordings.

A major article by Stuart on the music written for the Queen’s coronation is due to appear in the summer edition of This England magazine.

Did you know?

Your annual subscription to the Chartered Institute of Journalists is tax-deductible? This applies to any Institute member who is a UK taxpayer, whether you are a staff journalist or a freelance.

Also, you may pay your subscription online or by internet banking. Check our website for more details.
Turning back the clock

Men of principle!

Just as we are today with the Leveson aftermath, the journalism profession was in the throes of controversy in what was called the Marconi Scandal, which had the editor of The Journal re-stating the ethical position of bona fide journalists.

The Scandal broke when the ‘distributist publication’ New Witness (founded by Hilaire Belloc and edited by Cecil Chesterton, brother of G K) alleged that high-ranking members of the Liberal government had engaged insider trading of shares in a Marconi company subsidiary.

George Springfield, editor of The Journal, was keen to defend the good name of journalism.

“There has been much discussion in connection with the later proceedings of the Marconi Committee as to what might be called the ethics of journalism and editorship.

“All good journalists have long recognised two principles: first, that it is a point of honour not to publish serious statements or definite charges based on mere rumour, unless they have satisfied themselves by investigation that such rumours are well founded; secondly, having once given publicity to information supplied in confidence, they must at any personal risk refuse to disclose the name of their informant without the latter’s consent.

“A journalist would, however, in my opinion be freed from this obligation if he found that the information was given to him in bad faith with the deliberate intention of misleading or of causing attack on an innocent person.”

Words as true today as they were 100 years ago!

Writers’ cramp

The Departmental Committee on Compensation for Industrial Diseases in a report respecting writers’ cramp, points out that it may prove complete and permanent, and when, as is often the case, the sufferer is young, the indefinite continuance of compensation might involve a serious burden on the compensator. The report continues :-

We doubt whether this would be justified. The writers’ cramp disables only for writing, not for other occupation, so that, in some cases, rest may lead to recovery, we feel that where inability to write continues after a long period of rest, the sufferer should seek other employment.

They, therefore, recommend that the words “writers’ cramp” should be added to the first column of the schedule, and that compensation for a single disablement should be payable in respect of not more than 12 months’ incapacity in all.

All this was, of course, in the days when a typewriter was considered to be ‘new technology’ and the tools of the trade of a journalist were just a pen and some paper. These days writers’ cramp is dignified by the term ‘repetitive strain injury’ – RSI – and is considered to be an industrial injury.

When alighting from his bicycle at The Elms, Ackworth Road, Pontefract, the residence of Mr. A W Archer, with the intention of fulfilling a tennis engagement there, Mr. Oswald Holmes, journalist and member of this year’s Reception Committee for the York Conference, somehow got his feet mixed up and came a nasty cropper in the road. He was assisted in a fainting condition to the summer-house, where restsoratives were administered, and Dr. Blomfield was telephoned for. He found the left thumb had been dislocated at the wrist, while other injuries included a nasty bruise on the right instep and extensive abrasions on the left thigh. A “tug-of-war” between Mr Archer – who in other respects was kindness itself – and Dr. Blomfield, resulted in the thumb being pulled back in its place, and after it had been set in splints, the patient was conveyed home in Dr. Blomfield’s car and put to bed. The wrist will have to remain bandaged for fully a month, but otherwise, except for stiffness from the bruises, Mr Holmes is recovering nicely.

Help promote the Institute

Members are being asked to help promote the Institute through social media.

Over the last four years, the Institute has had great success in getting itself and its values known, and recruiting members, through Facebook and Twitter.

But more could be achieved if every member who used these did his or her bit. Listed on the right are a few ways you can help.

Members are urged to:

* Register as followers of the Facebook page by “liking” it.
* Re-post items that promote the Institute, its views and activities on their own timelines.
* Follow either or both of the Twitter feeds.
* Re-tweet messages that promote the Institute, its views and activities on their own feeds.

Two Scottish journalists, members of the House of Commons Press Gallery – Mr. A F Geddie, of the Scotsman, and Mr. W B Calder, of the Aberdeen Free Press – were passengers on board the Glasgow steamer Scotsdyke which took fire at sea this month. Both journalists, as well as the captain and all the crew, were rescued by the Dreadnought battleship Iron Duke.
European Publishers Council issues statement on the Google deal in France

Members of the European Publishers Council have criticised the deal between Google and French publishers which aims to settle the dispute over copyright, remuneration and article snippets.

Underlining the need for a ‘copyright-aware’ internet, EPC’s Executive Director Angela Mills Wade said: “The type of deal arranged between Google and a group of French publishers does not address the continuing problem of unauthorised reuse and monetisation of content, and so does not provide the online press with the financial certainty or mechanisms for legal redress which it needs to build sustainable business models and ensure its continued investment in high-quality content.”

Whilst French publishers have agreed to work with Google by accepting a deal whereby Google creates a 60 million euro innovation fund to help them leverage Google’s tools and ad programmes, in other member states publishers are seeking longer term solutions founded in law.

The EPC stressed the importance firstly of respect for intellectual property rights and secondly, a speedy result from DG Competition to restore competition to search and search advertising.

Google is under investigation for manipulating its search services to direct users to its own services, reducing the visibility of competing websites, and deploying other unfair practices which harm competition. The outcome of the EU’s anti-trust cases is expected shortly.

My Life in Music

By Owain Arwel Hughes
University of Wales Press, 188pp, ISBN 9780-7083-2530-8

Orchestral conductor Owain Arwel Hughes has been at the forefront of British musical life for many years, and is known for his long association with the Royal Philharmonic and BBC Welsh National orchestras. The son of the composer Arwel Hughes, Owain has been a particular champion of the music of Wales, and has recorded several of his father’s compositions, including the oratorio St David, and a collection of rare orchestral works – the latter on the Swedish BIS label. But the maestro has also gained an international reputation, performing with the major orchestras of Scandinavia, and with the Cape Philharmonic in South Africa, where a ground breaking recording of Alfred Schnittke’s Nagasaki Mass was made.

My Life in Music, published in his 70th birthday year, is a lively account of Owain’s career, from the days of being a student of conducting (picking up whatever work was available in provincial halls and studios) to a fully-fledged reputation for orchestral mastery. In his early days, OAH (as he is often known in the profession!) came under the influence of the great Sir Adrian Boult, one of the finest-ever interpreters of British music; and the author draws an amusing contrast between the “tall upper-class Englishman” (Boult) and the short Welshman who was trying to gain some sort of foothold in music!

Fortunately, calm prevailed, and the CD was made - part of a magnificent cycle of Russian music.

My Life in Music also shows the precarious side of the music profession and some of the unpleasantness that can prevail, such as the consternation (from one senior BBC figure) directed against Owain’s founding of the Welsh Proms series in 1986. Fortunately, audiences and ensembles knew a good thing when they saw it, and the fledgling proms at St. David’s Hall in Cardiff went on to become a major event in British musical life, attracting several of the leading BBC orchestras, and musicians from abroad.

The Communication and PR Awards are intended to showcase and give recognition to in-house public relations departments and to PR consultancies working in architecture, construction and design, together with residential and commercial property.

These are the first Communication and PR awards dedicated to the built environment, and have been established in response to increasing recognition by builders and clients of the important role that public relations plays in the industry.

For details and an online entry form, go to: ibp.org.uk/Awards

New awards scheme for building industry

International Building Press (IBP) has launched a new award scheme for communicators in the construction and property industries.

The Communication and PR Awards are intended to showcase and give recognition to in-house public relations departments and to PR consultancies working in architecture, construction and design, together with residential and commercial property.

These are the first Communication and PR awards dedicated to the built environment, and have been established in response to increasing recognition by builders and clients of the important role that public relations plays in the industry.

For details and an online entry form, go to: ibp.org.uk/Awards
Joanna Lumley backs St Bride’s Church appeal

Joanna Lumley has launched a campaign to save the steeple of the journalists’ church, St Brides, Fleet Street.

St Brides is Miss Lumley’s favourite British building, and so to help the church’s ‘Inspire’ appeal for the preservation of the church spire, she has launched an ingenious new campaign.

She is asking all married couples celebrating their wedding anniversary to donate towards the repair and restoration of the steeple that is the model for all tiered wedding cakes.

In launching the campaign, Miss Lumley commented: “How thrilling to think that every tiered wedding cake in the world over was inspired by the steeple of St Bride’s church, Wren’s fragile masterpiece which stands like a spiral shell in the heart of London. How perfect it would be if every marriage remembered this link by offering a small donation to save the spire in its time of great need.”

St Brides was designed by Sir Christopher Wren and is one of the very finest examples of his work. It has stood for more than 300 years, and survived the London Blitz.

However, it is in serious need of restoration. In all, the parish needs to raise £2.5 million for this vital programme of restoration.

For more information on St Brides and the Inspire Appeal, go to: www.stbridges.com/inspire

Patricia Latham

Obituary

Tribute was paid to CIoJ stalwart Patricia Latham at her funeral yesterday (January 8).

Pat died, after a long illness, on December 20. She was 91.

The Institute was represented at the service in Telford, Shropshire, by Vice-President Charlie Harris and General Secretary Dominic Cooper.

A fashion journalist and PR officer, Pat was described in the eulogy, given on behalf of her family by Colin Bailey, as well respected, a “very impressive and capable professional lady” whose vitality, energy and irrepressible sense of humour had helped her “make her way in a man’s world”.

She was vibrant and “bubbling with energy”, a livewire, always stylish - an excellent ambassador for her employers, who had included the world-famous West End store Liberty’s.

Constance Patricia Latham was born in Handsworth, Birmingham in 1921, and had a younger brother, John.

She trained as a secretary and during the War worked at the HQ of the British Red Cross in Berkshire, afterwards moving into hospital administration in the county. She moved back to the Midlands to work at Walsall General Hospital before being appointed secretary to the editor of the Birmingham Post and Mail, who eventually offered her the job of women’s editor.

She is pictured during her time in that job.

In 1947 she married Harry Turner, who was known as Tim.

She became a freelance, commuting between her home in the Midlands and London, where she contributed to, among others, the BBC and the Times. She also worked for leading fashion houses in Paris, Milan and Zurich.

She was appointed PR officer for Liberty’s, and was sent by the store to Australia as their ambassador. Her arrival was considered such a major event that The Age in Melbourne carried a major feature profiling her, describing her as “petite and blonde”.

She was a long-standing and active member of the CIoJ, serving at chairman of its London region as well as long periods on its council. She was particularly enthusiastic in her support for the Institute’s charities, especially the Oakhill and TP O’Connor Funds.

She was also an active member of the London Press Club.

In 1979 her husband, Tim, was diagnosed with a terminal illness and Pat put her career on hold to nurse him.

After Tim’s death she resumed work, notably winning an exclusive interview with some of the 96 people who had systematically been taken hostage in Lebanon between 1982 and 1992. The freed British hostages had said they would not speak to journalists, but Pat’s personality and gentle persistence won them round.

Pat became engaged to a widowed retired Royal Navy commander, but he died the day before their wedding. Pat was present when he was buried at sea.

Away from work, Pat was active in local affairs and campaigned for a bypass to take heavy lorries away from the narrow road on which her home, Forge Cottage, stood. One occasion, a workman had to leap onto the roof of the cottage seconds before a lorry hit the ladder on which he had been standing. Pat “moved Heaven and Earth”, and the bypass was built.

She also kept koi carp, every one of which she named.

Pat developed dementia about 10 years ago and died in a hospice, bringing an end to what Mr Bailey described as a “vibrant and energetic life”.

Tindle bucks the recession

Tindle Group, which owns local newspapers throughout the country, has turned in a group operating profit of £1.78m before tax – despite a 5% fall in revenue to £36m.

Group founder and Chairman Sir Ray Tindle, a longstanding member of the Chartered Institute of Journalists, turned the 147-year-old South London Press around last year after launching eight new paid for hyper local newspapers now showing a 64.5% rise in circulation.

And more good news is on the way as there are plans for more Tindle Group titles.
Paul Leighton has been elected Vice-President of the Chartered Institute of Journalists for 2013-15.

Paul, Chairman of the Institute’s Broadcasting Division, won by a small margin in a closely-fought contest against Amanda Brodie, Chairman of the Professional Practices Board.

He will serve alongside the CIoJ’s new President Charlie Harris and will then take over from Charlie as President in 2015.

Both Paul and Charlie have previously held the top job in the Institute but, as Charlie says, “that was hundreds of years ago, in a previous life”. In fact Paul was President (and Charlie was his Vice-President) in 1988 and Charlie went on to become President in 1991. At that time the Presidency was a one-year term.

**Handover**

The Presidential Handover was held on 20 February at the Press Association in London. Former Cabinet office civil servant turned independent candidate for Mayor of London Siobhan Benita (pictured above left) was guest speaker.

Siobhan stood in the last London mayoral election and polled 83,914 first-preference votes, finishing fourth, just 7,860 votes behind the Liberal Democrat candidate. Her impressive performance in the election was praised by former Cabinet Secretary Sir Gus O’Donnell who pointed out that Siobhan had gained many tens of thousands of votes despite having no party machine to support her campaign, very little funding or media coverage, and no election broadcast.

---

PHOTOS:

All photographs courtesy of Camilla Greenwell - camillagreenwellphotography.com.

Clockwise from top right: New President, Charlie Harris; Bruce Dalton (left) with Mark Croucher (right); Orphan Fund Chairman Mike Moriarty (left) with General Secretary Dominic Cooper (right); Norman Bartlett (left), Charlie Harris (second left), Sangita Shah (second right) and Stefan Paetow; Siobhan Benita (left) with our own James Bond; Steph Brown (left), Marcus Goringe (centre) and Charlie Harris (right); Charlie Harris congratulates Paul Leighton; Siobhan Benita.