BAFTA Fellowship for Kate Adie

A ward-winning broadcast journalist and author Kate Adie OBE, a longstanding member of the Chartered Institute of Journalists (and a Fellow of our Institute since 1990), has been honoured with a Fellowship of the British Academy of Film and Television Arts. The BAFTA Fellowship is the highest accolade bestowed by the Academy on an individual in recognition of outstanding and exceptional contributions to film and television. Fellows previously honoured for their work in television include Melvyn Bragg, Michael Palin, Trevor MacDonald and David Attenborough. Joanna Lumley received the Fellowship at last year’s British Television Awards.

Jane Lush, Chair of BAFTA, said: “Kate Adie is a truly groundbreaking news journalist, being one of a very small number of women working to report the news from hostile environments around the world. Throughout her career, she has brought audiences to the centre of the story by fearlessly reporting from the ground, while clearly and concisely explaining the complex issues to audiences at home. We are delighted to be celebrating her stellar career at this year’s ceremony; she is a true trailblazer and very deserving of the Fellowship.”

Kate Adie told The Journal: “It’s lovely to be awarded the BAFTA Fellowship. I feel very honoured.”

Adie began her broadcasting career as a station assistant at Radio Durham and then moved to BBC Radio Bristol. She made the transition to TV news in London and was on duty in 1980 when the siege of the Iranian Embassy was brought to an end by the SAS. Her live report, which interrupted the World Snooker Championships, was seen and heard by millions in homes across the UK. In 1989, she was appointed Chief News Correspondent for the BBC and held the post for 14 years.

Danger zones

She has reported from danger zones and conflicts around the world, including both Gulf Wars, four years of war in the Balkans, the final NATO intervention in Kosovo and elections in 2000, the Herald of Free Enterprise disaster at Zeebrugge, the massacre at Dunblane, the Selby rail crash, the Bologna railway station bombing and the Tiananmen Square protest in Beijing in 1989. She carried out numerous assignments in Northern Ireland throughout “The Troubles”, as well as reporting on the referendum to ratify the Good Friday Agreement. Kate Adie also covered the Lockerbie bombing and reported from Libya after the London Embassy siege of 1984, reporting from Libya many times thereafter, including the bombing of Tripoli by the US in 1986. She also covered the Rwandan Genocide and the British military intervention in the Sierra Leone Civil War.

The long-serving presenter of Radio 4’s “From Our Own Correspondent”, and a presenter or contributor to many other radio and television programmes, Adie has won numerous awards including the Richard Dimbleby Award at the British Academy Television Awards in 1990 (the same year she was awarded a Fellowship of the CIoJ), three Royal Television Society awards and the Broadcasting Press Guild’s Award for Outstanding Contribution to Broadcasting.

On the move

Exactly 30 years ago, the Institute had to leave its old office in Covent Garden and head out to the suburbs. The site chosen for the new office was in a rather rundown corner of southeast London once known as the Surrey Commercial Docks. These had been a series of nine docks, timber ponds and a canal spreading over 460 acres. Most of this was built by the Commercial Docks Company which constructed a fine block of offices that was opened in 1892. The offices continued to be used after all the London docks were merged into the Port of London Authority in 1908.

The docks had concentrated on the timber trade. After 1950, this began to decline and during the 1980s and subsequently, the docks were progressively abandoned. The area became largely derelict; transport links were poor so, when the office in the old Dock Offices was acquired in 1988, it was cheap. But it had potential and the area was transformed when the Jubilee underground line was extended from Waterloo via the area (now renamed Continued on page 20
**Editor’s Comment**

T
development of mass media has been ever-present and has often been accompanied by the burial of the dead and the fading of the old. The 25th anniversary of the fall of the Berlin Wall is a good reminder of this.

The Government has quite rightly ruled out “Leveson 2” but, as the world Press Freedom Index reveals, freedom of the press here in the United Kingdom is not as secure as we might expect. According to the index, compiled by Reporters Without Borders (RSF), despite being, historically, a cradle of freedom and democracy in the world, Britain is now in 40th place in terms of press freedom, making it one of the worst countries in Western Europe. We have fallen 18 places since the first index was compiled 16 years ago. How has this happened? RSF points to a “hostile environment” for journalists and journalism in the UK, with repeated attempts to clamp down on the press.

This hostility comes both from the Establishment and the far left. The Law Commission, for instance, is currently trying to make it easier to imprison journalists for obtaining leaked information, and the House of Lords has tried to use the Data Protection Bill as a backdoor way to impose state regulation of the press. Meanwhile, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Corbyn, is virulently opposed to the press, and has made no secret of his desire to restrict press freedom. Then, of course, there is the problem of antisemitism in certain sections of his party, and the growing stridency of far-left groups such as Momentum which seems to be injecting a culture of aggression and intolerance into British politics. Intimidation of journalists by delegates at a party conference would have been unheard-of in past decades, but at the last Labour conference the BBC’s Laura Kuenssberg felt so intimidated she had to hire bodyguards!

The insidious campaign to ban the Daily Mail is another sinister feature of this hostile environment. Yes, a number of commercial news vendors have been boycotted for selling the newspaper that goes where other sections of the media fear to tread. Let’s not forget, in this, the 25th anniversary of the appalling murder of black teenager Stephen Lawrence in Eltham, southeast London, that it was the Daily Mail that pursued the racist thugs who brutally murdered young Stephen; the paper’s “MURDERERS” headline and its front-page story naming the boy’s killers “changed the politics of the case” (in the words of former Labour Home Secretary Jack Straw) leading to a rooting-out of the racism and corruption that had undermined the effectiveness of the original Metropolitan Police investigation. The Daily Mail continues to campaign on issues like this, and, despite its right-wing profile and its often rather blimpish editorial tone, has often championed issues of social justice and civil rights. It is currently campaigning against cuts to the Open University. This is the paper that certain politically-motivated organisations wish to stifle.

In addition, there are mounting threats to our freedom, democracy and free speech from outside these shores. We are, for instance, under constant attack from Russia, which is waging a systematic campaign of disinformation and propaganda through “social media”, leading to the widespread sharing – by gullible members of the public – of Russian-created “fake news” and conspiracy theories. Social-media is so out-of-control, and so thoroughly infiltrated and exploited by enemies of democracy, that for those – an increasing number – who obtain their “news” chiefly from the internet, it is hard to navigate through the oceans of extremist propaganda, be it Russian, communist, fascist or Islamist. And then we have self-appointed “guardians of truth” such as the misleadingly titled Working Group on Syrian Propaganda and Media which is, essentially, a body of apologists for Putin and Assad. There are so many lies and conspiracy theories flying around that it is wonder anyone believes anything they read on the internet – but, with the internet taking over from the legitimate news-media, all too many people do.

**STOP PRESS (literally!)**

Despite its rejection by the Government and the House of Commons, the proposal to push forward with state regulation of the press has been given a new lease of life by the un-elected House of Lords who voted in favour of “Leveson 2” by 252 votes to 213, effectively overturning the MPs’ democratic decision and forcing the Commons to debate state regulation all over again. Disguised as an attempt to clamp down on a supposedly intrusive and abusive newspaper industry, in fact “Leveson 2” is nothing more than a Trojan horse for the campaign by the rich and powerful to strangle Britain’s 350-year old tradition of press freedom and investigative journalism. What we now have is an unholy alliance of press-bashing billionaires and far-left Corbynnistas. We cannot let them get away with this! Please write to your Member of Parliament urging them to stand up for democracy and the free press (the essential underpinning of a free society) by opposing this insidious and undemocratic scheme to bring in state regulation of newspapers by the back door.
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UK shows no improvement in press freedom

A continued heavy-handed approach towards the press - often in the name of national security - together with a general climate of hostility towards the media, has resulted in the UK keeping its status as one of the worst-ranked Western European countries in the Reporters Without Borders (RSF) 2018 World Press Freedom Index.

In RSF’s 2018 World Press Freedom Index, the UK failed to improve its ranking of 40th out of 180 countries. This places the UK between Trinidad & Tobago and Burkina Faso, and leaves it as one of the worst-ranked countries in Western Europe in terms of respect for press freedom.

This follows the UK dropping two places in the 2017 World Press Freedom Index, a year that saw an overall decline in democracies around the world. It also represents a staggering decline for the UK of 18 places since the first World Press Freedom Index was published in 2002.

Throughout the year, RSF highlighted a number of worrying moves against press freedom in the UK. An alarming proposal by the Law Commission to replace the Official Secrets Act with an updated Espionage Act could make it easy to jail journalists as “spies” for obtaining leaked information and could see them jailed for up to 14 years.


Online abuse

Both the Conservative and Labour parties restricted journalists’ access to campaign events ahead of the June 2017 general election. BBC political editor Laura Kuenssberg received extensive online abuse and threats, resulting in her being assigned bodyguards to cover the Labour Party conference in September. Offshore law firm Appleby have initiated legal proceedings against the BBC and The Guardian for breach of confidence over the “Paradise Papers” source materials, making them the only two media outlets out of 96 in 67 countries that analysed the Paradise Papers to be taken to court.

Section 40 of the Crime and Courts Act 2013 remained on the books, presenting cause for concern as the law’s punitive cost-shifting provision could hold publishers liable for the costs of all claims made against them, regardless of merit. Although after the end of the year the government announced that it would not implement the longer-term trend of worrying moves to restrict press freedom, and hold the UK government to account.”

Murders

The UK maintained its poor ranking in the midst of an alarming year for press freedom globally, particularly in Europe, a region that has been shaken by the murders of two journalists in the space of five months – Daphne Caruana Galizia in Malta and Jan Kuciak in Slovakia – as well as increased threats to investigative reporters and unprecedented verbal attacks on the media.

See pages 6 - 7 for more on the World Press Freedom Report

Tolerating the intolerant

As free speech and open discussion come under renewed assault in the UK, and as radical Islamist movements and their collaborators exert growing influence univeristy campuses, a new report from the Henry Jackson Society, an independent think-tank, makes worrying reading.

The report, Tolerating the Intolerant, shows how the National Union of Students (NUS) policy, “Students not Suspects”, which seeks to shield radical Islamists from public scrutiny or criticism, is receiving extensive support from certain academics, student committees, trade unions and a range of far-left organisations.

Under the pretence of wanting to abolish the Government’s “Prevent” strategy against radicalisation, “Students Not Suspects” meetings have been held with a variety of extremist speakers from dangerous Islamist groups, such as CAGE, MEND, the Islamic Human Rights Commission (IHRC) and Friends of Al-Aqsa, all of which are defenders of radical Islam.

Activists from “Students Not Suspects” condemn any individual expressing criticism of Islamic extremism. They accuse critics and fellow students of being motivated by racism and Islamophobia. The HJS report shows that the influence of “Students Not Suspects” has been built on the back of effective publicity campaigns involving panel discussions, workshops, protests and social media.

“Students Not Suspects” is effectively a vehicle for extremist interests, says the HJS report, and “it advances extremist tropes, extremist speakers and extremist narratives – all the while attacking anybody, NUS officials or otherwise, who distances themselves from its position.”

The author of the report, Richard Black, explains: “While the NUS’s ‘Students Not Suspects’ campaign has not succeeded in its overall aim of ‘scrapping’ Prevent, it has encouraged numerous student unions to pass motions boycotting the policy. It has spread misinformation and undermined trust between students, staff and local authorities.

“Far from moderating its message, ‘Students Not Suspects’ has also developed ever closer links to extremist organisations such as CAGE and MEND. This divisive campaign continues to alienate moderate students and further undermines the credibility and legitimacy of the NUS amongst government, policy makers and wider civil society.”

Recruitment

The Institute is offering a referral fee to any member who can help recruit new members. Every Full Member you sign up will earn you £50. The new member will need to be sponsored by you and will have to satisfy our accreditation procedures. Contact our Chief Executive for more details - memberservices@cioj.co.uk.
All change at Trinity Mirror

Newspaper group Trinity Mirror is changing its name to Reach. Shareholders have also approved the group’s takeover of Express newspapers (from Northern Shell) by an overwhelming 99 per cent.

Not all the news from Trinity Mirror is positive; its current annual report shows that its female staff were paid 18 per cent less than their male counterparts in 2017, that its female staff were paid 18 per cent less than their male counterparts in 2017, and that its female staff were paid 18 per cent less than their male counterparts in 2017. This follows the long-running set of court cases dealing with behaviour in the group’s newsrooms more than a decade ago and takes the total provision for hacking claims made by the group to more than £60m.

The forecast for “structural cost savings” is still estimated to be a further £15m this year and that is not looking good for staff as the two groups – Trinity Mirror and Express Newspapers – converge. Just days after the report was published, Daily Express editor Hugh Whittow announced his retirement and Daily Star editor Dawn Neesom said she was leaving to pursue a freelance writing and broadcasting career.

The name change, to Reach, may inspire forward thinking as two large media groups come together and kick past poor behaviour over phone-hacking into the long grass, but new horizons are rarely without clouds.

The Competitions & Markets Authority is now looking at the “plurality issues” and there have been assurances that the newspapers across the merged group would retain their editorial independence. The takeover deal includes the Daily Express, Daily Star, Sunday Express and Daily Star Sunday, plus celebrity magazine titles OK!, New! and Star.

Trinity Mirror’s annual report is available online at: http://www.trinitymirror.com/latest/news/annual-report

Liz Justice

Fake news, NUJ-style

It has been brought to our attention that the National Union of Journalists (NUJ) is claiming on its website that its members’ magazine, The Journalist, is unique, stating that “since Press Gazette moved to online publication only, The Journalist is the only specialist publication dedicated to the media available in print.” This is obviously a false claim, as our own Institute’s magazine, The Journal, in continuous publication since 1912, is still a printed journal, in addition to being available in an online edition downloadable from our website, and there are no plans to cease publishing The Journal in this way. We therefore call on the NUJ to remove the false statement from their website.

CloJ welcomes decision to scrap Leveson 2 and Section 40

The Chartered Institute of Journalists has welcomed the Government stated intention to scrap Leveson Inquiry Part 2 and Section 40 of the Crime and Courts Act, which threatened to punish news publishers refusing to sign up to a state-approved regulator.

New CloJ Vice President, Professor Tim Crook, says that Ministers should now scrap the Press Recognition Panel, adding “it is time for the regulator IMPRESS, largely funded by the controversial Max Mosley, to leave the media landscape.”

Says Prof Crook: “Journalists and news publishers need clarity and leadership. We need a single independent regulator for journalism ethics and we hope IPSO will take on reforms to attract participation from all national newspaper publishers including The Guardian, Financial Times, London Standard and the online Independent.”

The Institute believes IPSO should involve representatives from professional journalist associations such as the CloJ and NUJ. “The Government has quite rightly responded to the democratic voice of public consultation”, the CloJ said in a statement.

The Government received 174,730 direct responses to its consultation into whether the Leveson Inquiry should be re-opened, along with petitions bearing 200,428 signatories. Some 66% of direct respondents thought that Part 2 of the inquiry should be terminated, compared to 12% who thought it should continue.

An overwhelming 79% favoured full repeal of Section 40, with many expressing concerns that it would have a “chilling effect” on the freedom of the press, while just 7% said the measure should be implemented.

New arbitration scheme

The Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO) is creating a compulsory arbitration scheme as an alternative to court action for people with “genuine claims” against newspapers. It already has a voluntary scheme but there have been no cases brought under this system since it was introduced two years.

The scheme is scheduled to go live on July 31. Those members who do not sign up to it will remain on the voluntary arbitration scheme, although not all IPSO members are signed up to offer arbitration at all.

IPSO chief executive Matt Tee said: “Lord Justice Leveson stressed the importance of having a low-cost means of people that had been wronged by a newspaper getting compensation, without the expense of court and legal fees. Our new scheme does exactly that and the papers are not able to choose which cases they take.”

Culture Secretary Matt Hancock called the IPSO scheme “an important step forward for a press that’s both free and fair.” He urged newspapers to sign up to it.

Journalists’ Charity shuts home

The Journalists’ Charity (formerly the Newspaper Press Fund) has been forced by financial circumstances to close its nursing home for journalists and their dependants, Pickering House in Dorking, Surrey.

The home, which opened in 2007, has been making substantial losses. The home’s 14 residents have been given three months’ notice to leave, and the charity is working with Social Services to find them all alternative accommodation.

Jill Palmer, who chairs the charity’s board of trustees, said: “It has been a very difficult decision to close Pickering House but a combination of falling demand and increasing costs meant the home had become an unsustainable drain on the charity’s finances.

Our primary duty is to ensure that we have the financial capability to support as wide a range of eligible people in the short, medium and long term. We will of course ensure that current residents at Pickering House are relocated to comparable and suitable accommodation.”
Contesting the world’s most invasive surveillance regime

By Tim Crook

At the heart of the 2016 Investigatory Powers Act is the Government’s belief that we do not own our communications data. The information about who we contact, on which day and at what time, where and in what way belongs to private internet service providers and telecommunications companies. That is why the legal access is a relationship between government and data processors; not the users.

There is nothing in the Act to explicitly declare that the content of a communication is our personal property, but perhaps that is implied. The trick played on journalists and everyone else is that the police, intelligence agencies and any of the 48 state investigatory bodies given access powers in the 2016 legislation have the data map to that content should it be preserved on computer hard discs or any form of digital storage server. It is the roadmap to finding the more detailed evidence if required.

Liberty, the civil rights group, and Edward Snowden, the American whistleblower, say that the Investigatory Powers Act is the most invasive surveillance regime of any democracy in the world. The fear for all of us is that it introduces staggering state spying powers that give the Government access to up to a year of everybody’s web histories, email, text and phone records.

Ministers tell us this makes us safer and freer from all the dangers of terrorism and other awful crimes. They say the Dystopian “Big Brother” vista of doom conjured by privacy campaigners is an unnecessary and inaccurate exaggeration.

The IPA, they tell us, was intended to introduce transparency to state surveillance following Snowden’s revelations of unlawful mass monitoring of the public’s communications.

But Liberty’s legal experts say the Act simply legalises the practices that Snowden exposed, and introduces hugely intrusive new powers which undermine our privacy, free press, free speech, protest rights, protections for journalists’ sources and whistleblowers, and legal and patient confidentiality.

When it was passed in Parliament at the end of 2016 there was an atmosphere of shambolic opposition and a political climate reeling from the implications of the EU referendum. The Government was criticised for not providing any credible evidence that the extreme indiscriminate powers included in the legislation complied with European Union and European Human Rights law or were fully necessary to prevent or detect crime.

**Petition**

A public petition has called for its repeal, with more than 200,000 signatures, but this has not as yet been debated by Parliament. In January 2018, the English Court of Appeal ruled that near-identical powers in the Government’s previous surveillance law – the Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act – were unlawful because they let public bodies access the nation’s internet activity and phone records with no suspicion of serious crime and no independent sign-off. This ruling had applied an earlier judgment in the same case from the European Court of Justice (ECJ).

The Government has conceded that Part 4 of the new Act needs reform, in the light of these cases, but further intervention by the courts is not needed. IPA not only gives state agency access to communications data on demand; it also allows the State to hack computers, phones and tablets on an industrial scale, and collect the content of our digital communications and records about those communications created by our computers, phones and other devices.

**Espionage**

This means that any public official trying to leak anything to a journalist will be furthering a criminal purpose because the maximum sentence is life imprisonment for misconduct in public office and will be 14 years for leaking information under a proposed Espionage Bill.

At the judicial review hearing held over three days at the end of February, the Government’s barrister, James Eadie QC, contended that the vast majority of communications data retained will never be accessed by the state because most people are not affected by police or other relevant investigations. This is certainly not the case with professional journalists.

Under the old Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA), hundreds of journalists had their data secretly accessed with a sign-off from a senior police officer in the same force. The lack of scrutiny in such oversight chimes ironically with a profession castigated during the Leveson Inquiry for “marking its own homework.”

When RIPA was debated in Parliament, politicians assured the media industry that its powers would never be used against journalists in leak inquiries. The Government lawyer told the High Court in February that accessing a person’s entire communications data history would require the most serious justification and “in reality the law does not permit vast, intrusive collection by the state of communications data.”

In January 2018, the English Court of Appeal ruled that near-identical powers in the Government’s previous surveillance law – the Data Retention and Investigatory Powers Act – were unlawful because they let public bodies access the nation’s internet activity and phone records with no suspicion of serious crime and no independent sign-off.
Hatred of journalism threatens democracies

The 2018 World Press Freedom Index, compiled by Reporters Without Borders (RSF), reflects growing animosity towards journalists. Hostility towards the media, openly encouraged by political leaders, and the efforts of authoritarian regimes to export their vision of journalism pose a threat to democracies.

The climate of hatred is steadily more visible in the Index, which evaluates the level of press freedom in 180 countries each year. Hostility towards the media from political leaders is no longer limited to authoritarian countries such as Turkey (down two at 157th) and Egypt (161st), where “media-phobia” is now so pronounced that journalists are routinely accused of terrorism and all those who don’t offer loyalty are arbitrarily imprisoned.

More and more democratically-elected leaders no longer see the media as part of democracy’s essential underpinning, but as an adversary to which they openly display their aversion. The United States, the country of the First Amendment, has fallen again in the Index under Donald Trump, this time two places to 45th. A media-bashing enthusiast, President Trump has referred to reporters as “enemies of the people”, a term once used by Joseph Stalin.

The line separating verbal violence from physical violence is dissolving. In the Philippines (down six at 133rd), President Rodrigo Duterte not only constantly insults political leaders but has also warned them that they are “not exempted from assassination”. In India (down two at 138th), hate speech targeting journalists is shared and amplified on social networks, often by troll accounts, and “idiotic hyenas”. A Slovak reporter, Ján Kuciak, was shot dead in his home in February 2018, just four months after another European journalist, Daphne Caruana Galizia, was killed by a targeted car-bombing in Malta (down 18 at 65th).

Threat to democracy
“The unleashing of hatred towards journalists is one of the worst threats to democracies,” RSF secretary-general Christophe Deloire says. “Political leaders who fuel loathing for reporters bear heavy responsibility because they undermine the concept of public debate based on facts instead of propaganda. To dispute the legitimacy of journalism today is to play with extremely dangerous political fire.”

In this year’s Index, Norway is first for the second year running, followed – as it was last year – by Sweden (2nd). Although traditionally respectful of press freedom, the Nordic countries have also been affected by the overall decline. Undermined by a case threatening the confidentiality of a journalist’s sources, Finland (down one at 4th) has fallen for the second year running, surrendering its third place to the Netherlands. At the other end of the Index, North Korea (180th) is still last.

The Index also reflects the growing influence of “strongmen” and rival models. After stifling independent voices at home, Vladimir Putin’s Russia (148th) is extending its propaganda network by means of media outlets such as RT and Sputnik.

Vladimir Putin’s Russia (148th) is extending its propaganda network by means of media outlets such as RT and Sputnik

Africa came next, with a score that is slightly better than in 2017 but also contained a wide range of internal variation. Frequent internet cuts, especially in Cameroon (129th) and Democratic Republic of Congo (154th), combined with frequent attacks and arrests are the region’s latest forms of censorship. Mauritania (72nd) suffered the region’s biggest fall (17 places) after adopting a law under which blasphemy and apostasy are punishable by death even if the accused repents. But a more promising era for
The press freedom map, which is distributed in print and digital versions, offers a visual overview of the situation in each country in the Index. The colour categories are assigned as follows: good (white), fairly good (yellow), problematic (yellow), bad (red) and very bad (black).

journalists may result from the departure of three of Africa’s most predatory presidents, in Zimbabwe (up two as 126th), Angola (up four at 121st) and Gambia, whose 21-place jump to 122nd was Africa’s biggest.

In the Asia-Pacific region, still ranked fourth in the Index, South Korea jumped 20 places to 43rd, the Index’s second biggest rise, after Moon Jae-In’s election as president turned the page on a bad decade for press freedom. North Asia’s democracies are struggling to defend their models against an all-powerful China that shamelessly exports its methods for silencing all criticism. Cambodia (142nd) seems dangerously inclined to take the same path as China after closing dozens of independent media outlets and plunging ten places, one of the biggest falls in the region.

The former Soviet countries and Turkey continue to lead the worldwide decline in press freedom. Almost two-thirds of the region’s countries are ranked somewhere near or below the 150th position in the Index and most are continuing to fall. They include Kyrgyzstan (98th), which registered one of the Index’s biggest falls (nine places) after a year with a great deal of harassment of the media includingastronomic fines for “insulting the head of state”. In light of such a wretched performance, it is no surprise that the region’s overall indicator is close to reaching that of Middle East/North Africa.

According to the indicators used to measure the year-by-year changes, it is the Middle East/North Africa region that has registered the biggest decline in Media freedom. The continuing wars in Syria (117th) and Yemen (down one at 167th) and the terrorism charges still being used in Egypt (161st); Saudi Arabia (down one at 169th) and Bahrain (down two at 166th) continue to make this the most difficult and dangerous region for journalists to operate.

The World Press Freedom report – what is it?

Published every year since 2002 by Reporters Without Borders (RSF), the World Press Freedom Index is an important advocacy tool based on the principle of emulation between states. Because it is well known, its influence over governments is growing. Many heads of state and government fear its annual publication. The Index is a point of reference that is quoted by media throughout the world and is used by diplomats and international entities such as the United Nations and the World Bank.

The Index ranks 180 countries according to the level of freedom available to journalists. It is a snapshot of the media freedom situation based on an evaluation of pluralism, independence of the media, quality of legislative framework and safety of journalists in each country. It does not rank public policies even if governments obviously have a major impact on their country’s ranking.

Nor is it an indicator of the quality of journalism in each country.

Along with the Index, RSF calculates a global indicator and regional indicators that evaluate the overall performance of countries (in the world and in each region) as regards media freedom. It is an absolute measure that complements the Index’s comparative rankings. The global indicator is the average of the regional indicators, each of which is obtained by averaging the scores of all the countries in the region, weighted according to their population as given by the World Bank.

Qualitative analysis

The degree of freedom available to journalists in 180 countries is determined by pooling the responses of experts to a questionnaire devised by RSF. This qualitative analysis is combined with quantitative data on abuses and acts of violence against journalists during the period evaluated. The criteria used in the questionnaire are pluralism, media independence, media environment and self-censorship, legislative framework, transparency, and the quality of the infrastructure that supports the production of news and information.

To compile the Index, RSF has developed an online questionnaire focusing on the subjects specified above. This year’s questionnaire was slightly less detailed that in the past but, thanks to statistical analysis, the data gathered continued to permit comparison with previous years.

Translated into 20 languages including English, Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Indonesian and Korean, the questionnaire is sent to journalists, media lawyers, researchers and other media specialists selected by RSF in the 180 countries covered by the Index. Each country is assigned a score based on the answers provided by these experts and on the figures for acts of violence and abuses against journalists during the previous year.

A team of in-house specialists, each assigned to a different geographical region, keeps a detailed tally of abuses and violence against journalists and media outlets. These researchers also rely on a network of correspondents in 130 countries. The Abuses indicator for each country is calculated on the basis of the data about the intensity of abuses and violence against media actors during the period evaluated. This quantitative indicator is then used to weight the qualitative analysis of the situation in the country based on the replies to the questionnaires.
How to avoid hating journalists when disaster strikes

By Prof Tim Crook

Somebody I know who became a college principal described recently how much he hated the press after having to manage the fallout from the deaths of his students in a road traffic accident. Reporters were described as “vultures” who were “shouting down the phone to get details before the families were ready” and “publishing pictures of the students having somehow got their names, and turning up at the gates”.

He asked for my advice. I responded with sympathy and said that he and the grieving families of his students should not be confronted with any insensitive and harassing behaviour. I offered all the advice I could provide, including the 24-hour Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO) harassment helpline number.

I explained that, under Clause 3 of the Editors’ Code, journalists should identify themselves and the publication or agency they work for; that everyone has the right to tell journalists clearly that they do not wish to speak to them or be photographed and that they are asking them to stop. I said that under the Code of Practice, journalists must not continue their activities once asked to stop; that If anyone at home does not wish to answer their door they can pin a short note to it to say that they do not wish to speak to journalists and do not want to be disturbed.

IPSO also advises if anyone is being telephoned repeatedly and does not wish to speak to journalists they should change personal callers should leave a message and they do not wish to speak to the media. I pointed out that the Prevention of Harassment Act 1997 makes it a civil wrong and criminal offence for any journalist to work for; that everyone has the right to speak to journalists they should change their phone number and communicate with people in very distressing circumstances.

Distressing circumstances

My friend’s Facebook page filled up with angry anti-journalist comments; some of them asking how the journalists would feel if it was their daughter or son who had been killed. The reality, of course, is that generally journalists do know how it feels to experience tragedy at home and at work. Very early on in their careers they often have to learn how to deal with the stress of approaching bereaved families and communicate with people in very distressing circumstances.

It is also not uncommon for journalists to be victims of the very incidents they report on. This is certainly the case with terrorism. Journalists regularly see and experience aspects of carnage, horror and death that most people would never encounter once in a lifetime. In the London Bridge and Borough attack, a BBC journalist going home from work was a fraction of an inch from being killed when a van rammed down people before her very eyes. Later on, a Sunday Express journalist nearly paid with his life when he placed himself in front of terrorists indiscriminately plunging their lethal blades into anyone they came across.

When the worst things happen in the world, it is the duty of journalists to report and communicate, but to do so they have to have the trust and respect of the human society they are a part of. Recent events suggest this is not happening. The Kerslake Report into the Manchester Etihad Arena terrorist bombing complained: “Most participants who commented on their experience of the media in the attack aftermath were negative. People talked about feeling ‘hounded’ and ‘bombarded’.”

Some described being put under pressure to participate in TV programmes. At the Etihad there were concerns with people feeling accosted by media crews. Specific mention was made of photos being taken through the glass windows of a family being given news of bereavement. There were descriptions of people having to run to cars with coats over their heads to escape. Similarly, someone described having to be taken into hospital to see their injured child via a staff entrance because of the behaviour of some media representatives at the main entrance.

Official notification

Several people told of the physical presence of crews outside their homes. One mentioned the forceful attempt by a reporter to gain access through their front door by ramming a foot in the doorway. It was reported that the child of one family was given condolences on the doorstep before official notification of the death of her mother. Another family told how their child was stopped by journalists whilst making their way to school.

At the hospitals, families attending to look for missing loved ones and visiting the injured described having to force their way through scrums of reporters who “wouldn’t take no for an answer”. One mother, who was herself seriously injured as was her daughter, spoke of the press ringing her on her mobile whilst she was recovering in hospital. A member of staff on her ward spoke of a note offering £2,000 for information being included in a tin of biscuits given to the staff.

The report described how a young woman was visited by a reporter at their home and given condolences on the death of her brother whilst her parents were at the Etihad Stadium. This took place on the morning following the attack. The family were not told that their son was likely to be among the fatalities until later that day.

The report alleged at least two examples of impersonation. One respondent talked on the phone to someone saying they were a Bereavement Nurse; whilst another described talking to someone who they felt sounded to be more like a journalist but who purported to be from the police.

Some families mentioned the repeated use of their loved one’s photo causing renewed upset each time. International media used an image taken inside the foyer in which the deceased could be identified. Families were angered by personal Facebook and other social media accounts being accessed and information and photos used without permission. Inaccurate details about their loved ones, such as a wrongly spelled name, caused considerable upset.

The Kerslake report did say that a number of families spoke in praise of sympathetic reporting by the Manchester Evening News and other papers local to the bereaved. Those involved in the Disaster Victim Identification process said the media had respected the dignity of the deceased and the privacy of the families when making visits to see their loved ones.

The Manchester Evening News raised more than £1 million for the victims.

One difficulty is that the Kerslake Review has taken all the media complaints as being accurate accounts of media conduct. These allegations have not been investigated. They have only been reported. IPSO Chief Executive Matt Tee quite rightly said: “The press has a narrow path to tread between reporting accurately and sympathetically on tragedies on the public’s behalf and respecting the feelings of those most directly affected.”

The volume and intensity of anger does suggest that clearly not everyone is tip-toeing effectively on this narrow path and this includes broadcasters as much as the press. A key recommendation of the report is that IPSO should engage a review of the Editors’ Code in the light of the complaints of bad media conduct and consider
Continued from 8

“developing a new code specifically to cover such events.” The report also advised wider education and planning on the role of the media by police family liaison officers, statutory responders, first response agencies and local authorities.

Round-table discussion
The Kerslake inquiry held a round-table discussion with the media in Manchester and recognized how the role of social media considerably accelerated the pace at which information on individual families became more widely available. It learned that the BBC had established a system so that a single BBC journalist was assigned to each any one family affected by the bombing so the BBC was not making multiple contacts.

It strikes me that much more work needs to be done. IPSO should not be alone in this process. Ofcom, professional unions, and the main broadcasters such as ITV, Sky, the BBC, and the Foreign Press Association in Britain should be involved as well. Those news publishers refusing to be regulated by IPSO, the Guardian, Independent online, London Standard, and Financial Times should be participating rather than hiding or pontificating.

It is also apparent that members of the public and those people likely to have direct contact with journalists in the midst of human tragedy and disaster have little idea of the rights and needs of professional journalists when covering large scale human tragedies. Reporters do have to ask questions and obtain accurate information. It is a stressful situation for all concerned.

IPSO has produced an excellent 13-page briefing, “Press Report on a Death: Information for the Public”. It would be surprising if many people in the emergency services and indeed many media relations and press officers for public and private bodies throughout the country have any idea of its existence.

The first duty of any journalist when reporting human tragedy is to behave decently and respectfully toward those they have contact with. The learning and understanding of this duty is an ongoing and never-ending journey. But the need for liaison and education about the media’s role in these events can be a matter for negotiated understanding rather than scapegoating and condemnation.

Election purdah is not an excuse to shut down democracy

The Chartered Institute of Journalists has condemned a decision by the Greater London Authority to shut out the media and general public from London Assembly and Mayor of London meetings on knife crime.

The CIoJ says the GLA has wrongly applied an over-strict interpretation of electoral purdah restrictions during local elections in London Boroughs.

Institute Vice-President, Professor Tim Crook, says: “The House of Commons would not dream of sitting in private because there’s a by-election in Barnsley, or elections for the Scottish Parliament, Welsh or Northern Ireland assemblies.”

The CIoJ has issued a complaint to the Electoral Commission that the GLA did not allow journalists or the public to attend the London Assembly meeting on knife crime in the capital on April 11.

The same exclusion happened in relation to the Mayor’s Summit at City Hall on April 10, which was discussing the same issue and which was attended by Mayor of London Sadiq Khan as well as a number of high-profile politicians and the Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police.

The number of people who have been fatally stabbed in London during 2018 has now reached at least 35.

Professor Crook says: “Election purdah is not an excuse to bring down the shutters on democracy. We believe that the apparent view of the GLA’s monitoring officer of electoral law is wrong, and the Local Government Association briefing on Purdah Guidance is being interpreted inappropriately.”

FOI request
The CIoJ has also made a Freedom of Information Act request for all emails, documentation and minutes of meetings relating to the media exclusion decision.

In response to the Institute’s complaint, Karim Aziz of the Electoral Commission replied:

“The Commission had no role in the setting or adherence to the rules on purdah.”

He added: “I can confirm that the Greater London Authority did not consult with the Electoral Commission before they took their decision. The Commission does not have any information as how the decision was arrived at by the Greater London Authority.”

ALCS to sponsor CWA Gold Dagger for Non-Fiction

The Authors’ Licensing and Collecting Society (ALCS) is to sponsor the Crime Writers’ Association Gold Dagger for Non-Fiction in 2018.

This year sees the 40th anniversary of the award; previous winners having included Antonia Fraser, Jonathan Goodman and Ruth Dudley Edwards.

Martin Edwards, Chair of the CWA, said: “We are delighted by ALCS’ support for the Dagger. Although the CWA is associated in the public mind with crime fiction, non-fiction has always been a key part of our remit. Our members include some of the leading writers of non-fiction, and they focus on a much wider range of subjects than just ‘true crime’. That breadth of range of their work is increasingly recognised worldwide, and this new sponsorship can only help.”

The Gold Dagger is an award for any non-fiction work on a crime-related theme by an author of any nationality on condition that the book was first published in the UK in English during the judging period. This award encompasses, though is not limited to, non-fiction works relating to true crime, historical crime, crime-related biography, crime-fiction literature, and critical studies.

Mysterious death of Russian journalist

Although local police in the Urals Region decided there was “nothing suspicious” about the death of journalist Maksim Borodin, others remain to be convinced. The investigative reporter, who recently wrote an expose of the Russian government’s use of mercenaries in Syria and elsewhere – Putin’s “shadow army” – fell to his death in a five-story plunge from the balcony of his apartment in the city of Yekaterinburg.

Despite the official disinterest in the matter, press freedom organizations including the CIoJ have called for an independent investigation.

Borodin is among 58 Russian journalists who have been killed since 1992, according to the Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ). The article “The Journalist Who Exposed Russia’s Mercenary Force Dies in Fall from Balcony” (http://www.themedialine.org/mideast-daily-news/journalist-mercenary-force-dies-in-fall-from-balcony/) appeared first on The Media Line (http://www.themedialine.org).
President’s message

I enjoyed talking to CIoJ members at the Presidential handover party in March. It was a happy occasion, and everyone enjoyed the evening. My thanks to all those members who took the time out of their busy schedules to come along.

In my speech, I mentioned that the Institute’s Council had, earlier that day, agreed to surrender our lease to British Land who have a development plan for Canada Water that will take more than 20 years to complete. As an HQ, Number 2 Dock Offices has served us well over the last 30 years, and we’ll be sad to leave, but it’s an offer that we really could not refuse.

This is not only because Dock Offices will be in the middle of a building site for the foreseeable future but also because BL’s offer was well above market value.

Seamless

Members do not need to worry; our contact details will remain unchanged for the time being, and all services will be maintained with no break in service. We have, over the past few years, engaged with modern working practices and emerging technologies. This means that we will be able to deliver services to members from interim offices in a seamless fashion.

So, one of my first priorities as your new President will be to help ensure we find a new head office in an up-and-coming area that will be easily accessible to all and potentially another great investment for the future. Until then we will continue much as before, using the same contact details but working day-to-day in a more “virtual” world, as so many journalists do now. It’s an exciting opportunity to move on to the next chapter in the CIoJ’s long history — I will, of course, keep you all posted.

In the meantime, if any member has any concerns whatsoever, please contact memberservices@cioj.co.uk.

Janice Shillum Bhend

The Presidental Handover of the Chartered Institute of Journalists, was held on March 9 at No.2, Dock Offices, headquarters of our Institute since the 1980s. Janice Shillum Bhend was invested with her badge of office as President for 2018-2020, and Prof Tim Crook was invested as her Vice-President. Andy Smith, a Editor of this Journal for the past 16 years, was awarded a Life Fellowship of the Institute. In her inaugural speech, the new President outlined her plans for the next two years, highlighting the immediate actions and the priorities for her Presidential term of office.

Janice Shillum Bhend is an experienced journalist, publisher, editor and media professional with a strong background in feature, celebrity and women’s interest writing for numerous best-selling, national magazines. She has made many TV and radio appearances over her long career and contributed to several books. Passionate about promoting quality journalism, she has seven year’s experience teaching the next generation of journalists at degree and post-graduate level. She also published her own national women’s title YES! for five years — a runner up in the PPA Small Publisher of the Year awards.
The following are excerpts from the President’s speech at the Handover:

**For immediate action**

Our Canada Water HQ has served us well for 30 years and now the decision has been made to accept British Land’s offer for the lease, we must find a new head office in a situation that will be easily accessible for all and as good an investment for the future as No. 2 Dock Offices has proved to be.

The merger of our charities, voted for at the AGM last October, will enable us to be more flexible when assessing members’ needs and save on costs as we will need fewer trustees and committee members. We have already begun on what will be a great deal of work to ensure we meet all legal requirements and the rules of the Charity Commission.

**Priorities**

Recruitment has to be a top priority and one which we urgently need to address. We have been discussing how to tackle the decline in our membership for some years but it is now time to take action. We are building relationships with journalism colleges and universities especially Harlow College and Goldsmiths, University of London and already offer lower membership rates to students but perhaps we could do more.

I would ask all our members nationwide to help us by making contact with their own local journalism teaching centres to spread the message that the CIoJ is a viable and non-political alternative to the NUJ. We should also forge stronger links with other organisations, especially those popular journalists’ media forums on the internet, I’m hoping they may prove to be the perfect place to find new members in the future.

Training at low cost should be on offer to all our members whatever stage of their careers they have reached and must include Continuing Professional Development and Early Career programmes. We are currently considering an initiative that would require us to undertake an industry-wide consultation before it could be implemented and could take up to a year to set up.

In the meantime, I hope we will be able to carry on offering training sessions as we have done before. These have been met with varying degrees of success in the past because the take-up from members is not always sufficient to cover costs. We think webinars could be the way forward to save attendees the expense of travel and of losing a day’s work. Offering alternative topics like marketing, feature writing or PR skills would help members to earn more. Tell us what you need and how you would like it to happen.

**What we must do next**

We journalists, especially freelances, have had the rug pulled from under our feet in recent years and must diversify to survive in what is now a very different media landscape. The Independent went online, then the Guardian went tabloid, now that grand old standard NME will be available only in digital form. What’s next? Women’s weekly magazines are looking decidedly shaky, they are being written by journalists from writing hubs, nothing but glorified typing pools while editors are being expected to oversee four titles at a time. How can publishers expect circulations to increase when the quality of content is being driven ever downwards?

We must also raise the profile of the CIoJ. The Professional Practices Board is always active in sending out press releases on relevant topics: We’ve campaigned on many important subjects in the last year and sent out a release recently, welcoming the Government’s decision not to implement Leveson 2. Tim Crook, Chair of the PPB and our new Vice President is heading Open Justice and Save Our Newspapers campaigns and we have protested long and hard against local council ‘Pravdas’ like Waltham Forest News and the Hackney Gazette that continue to defy the law on frequency of publication and have had a bad effect on local papers causing closures and loss of journalism jobs.

I recently had an idea for badges with slogans like “Support journalists – Make News Great Again”, “Save our Newspapers” or even “Adopt a journalist — save the world”; they could be a simple and inexpensive way to raise awareness of real journalists and journalism which have both lost credibility in the wake of Leveson, phone hacking and Fake news. Our reputation has plummeted, we could even be an endangered species about to be replaced by algorithms and robots. But we do have one big advantage over them — and that is creativity. Journalists have a way of making things fresh and relevant to their target audience that I doubt Alexis or Siri will ever perfect. Our Royal charter demands that we champion ethics and standards and it is these that could help the public to trust us again — they are our trump cards that will also help us win out over the Internet.

**Foundation stone of democracy**

Journalists do a vital job, press freedom must be protected at all costs, it is the foundation stone of our democracy. If a local newspaper reporter had been on the ground, instead of living miles away due to ‘centralisation’ and cut backs, he would have heard and reported the concerns of residents about the safety of the Grenfell flats and that terrible tragedy might have been avoided.

What The Guardian called recently an ‘existential threat due to a combination of social, technical and economic factors’ means we are facing a ‘perfect storm’, a fourth industrial revolution where journalists need support like never before — when times are hard we should help each other and work together to make them better. The CIoJ offers employment advice and protection; an official press card and an international one for overseas assignments; a regular magazine in print and online to help to keep members in touch with industry developments and where they can also make their own views known.

Our charities help and support members and their families through hardship, redundancy, illness, old age and worse. Far from being rooted in a Dickensian past, our unique Orphan Fund currently has three beneficiaries.

Plus, there’s the right to use the letters MCJ after your name to demonstrate your professional status. And all for less than £4 a week, not much more than the price of a coffee. You, our members, already know this but what we need to do now is ensure all journalists know about our Institute; too many do not.

I attended a London Press Club debate on Women and Journalism recently — women in the Media have been making news themselves, mistreated because of their sex, discriminated against because of their status as mothers or paid less simply because they are women. Listening to that debate it was evident that things haven’t changed all that much since I started in women’s magazines in the 60s. There are many things wrong with journalism today that affect both women and men but as 8th March was International Women’s Day and February saw the centenary of the Representation of the People Act in which women of property aged 30 and over, finally got the vote, I feel justified in appealing for more women members to come forward to serve on our Council, the PPB and committees. We have two on Council, one on the PPB but we do need a better balance. Note to self: must try harder to sub edit the CIoJ rule book to read s/he wherever the President is referred to as ‘he’ (which is actually of course, the whole way through).

I may have just become only the fifth woman President of the CIoJ in 134 years (the others were Meg Peacock, Lois Hainsworth, Sangita Shah and Liz Justice) but I sincerely hope there will be many more in future. Let us work together with our male colleagues to ensure that the Chartered Institute of Journalists is still a force to be reckoned with in the years to come.
Liberty and democracy under assault

Democracy is in retreat around the globe, according to Freedom in the World 2018, the latest edition of the annual report on political rights and civil liberties, published by Freedom House.

The report finds that 2017 was the 12th consecutive year of decline in global freedom, with 71 countries suffering net declines in political rights and civil liberties, and only 35 registering gains. Once-promising states such as Turkey, Venezuela, Poland, and Tunisia were among those experiencing declines in democratic standards. The recent democratic opening in Burma/Myanmar was permanently damaged by a shocking campaign of ethnic cleansing against the Rohingya minority.

“Democracy is facing its most serious crisis in decades,” said Michael J. Abramowitz, President of Freedom House. “Democracy’s basic tenets—including guarantees of free and fair elections, the rights of minorities, freedom of the press, and the rule of law—are under siege around the world.”

Freedom in the World 2018 reports on how China and Russia have taken advantage of the retreat of leading democracies, increasing repression at home and exporting their malign influence to other countries. To maintain power, these autocratic regimes are acting beyond their borders to squelch open debate, pursue dissidents, and compromise rules-based institutions.

A major development of 2017 was the retreat of the United States of America as a champion and an exemplar of democracy. While Freedom House has tracked a slow decline in political rights and civil liberties in the USA for the past seven years, the decline accelerated in 2017, owing to growing evidence of Russian interference in the 2016 elections, violations of basic ethical standards by the new administration, and a reduction in government transparency.

Although American institutions like the press and the judiciary have remained resilient, attacks upon them could ultimately leave them weakened, the report concludes, with serious implications for the health of US democracy and America’s place in the world. Meanwhile, the abdication of the traditional US role as the leading champion of democracy is of deep concern and potential consequence in the ongoing struggle against modern authoritarians and their pernicious ideas.

“The core institutions of American democracy are being battered by an administration that has treated the country’s traditional checks and balances with disdain,” Abramowitz said.

Authoritarian challenge

“The Trump administration has made a sharp break from the political consensus of the last 70 years by casting aside democracy as the animating force behind American foreign policy,” Abramowitz added. “The hastening withdrawal of the United States from its historical commitment to supporting democracy overseas makes the challenge posed by authoritarian regimes all the more powerful and threatening.”

In another significant development, Turkey moved from “Partly Free” to “Not Free” as President Recep Tayyip Erdogan broadened and intensified the crackdown on his perceived opponents that began after a failed 2016 coup attempt, with dire consequences for Turkish citizens.

Over the period since the 12-year slide began in 2006, 113 countries have seen a net decline, and only 62 have experienced a net improvement.

KEY GLOBAL FINDINGS

- Of the 195 countries assessed, 88 (45 percent) were rated “Free”, 58 (30 percent) “Partly Free”, and 49 (25 percent) “Not Free”.

- The United States saw declines in its political rights due to:
  - Growing evidence of Russian interference in the 2016 election campaign and a lack of action by the Trump administration either to condemn or to prevent a reoccurrence of such meddling
  - Violations of basic ethical standards by the new administration, including the President’s failure to divest himself of his business empire, his hiring of family members as senior advisers, and his appointment of cabinet members and other senior officials despite apparent conflicts of interest
  - A reduction in government transparency, including an unusual pattern of false statements by the administration, the President’s failure to disclose basic information such as his personal tax data, policy and other decisions made without meaningful input from relevant agencies and officials, and the removal of information on issues of public interest from government websites for political or ideological reasons

- Sharp democratic declines in Tunisia in 2017 threatened the only Free country in the Arab world and the sole success story from the 2011 Arab Spring.

- The forced resignation under military pressure of elected president Robert Mugabe pushed Zimbabwe over the threshold from Partly Free to Not Free.

- Myanmar’s campaign of ethnic cleansing in 2017 demonstrated the flawed nature of the country’s limited democratic opening, which had been welcomed by the international community since 2010.

Worst of the Worst:

- Of the 49 countries designated as Not Free, the following 12 have the worst aggregate scores for political rights and civil liberties, earning less than 10 points on a 100-point scale (beginning with the least free): Syria, South Sudan, Eritrea, North Korea, Turkmenistan, Equatorial Guinea, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Uzbekistan, Sudan, Central African Republic, and Libya.

Freedom House is an independent watchdog organization that supports democratic change, monitors the status of freedom around the world, and advocates for democracy and human rights.

2018 applications invited for Grace Wyndham Goldie Trust Fund

Applications are invited for grants from the Grace Wyndham Goldie (BBC) Trust Fund, which exists to help those engaged in broadcasting or an associated activity, now or in the past, as well as their children and dependents.

The Trustees, in their discretion, will consider giving assistance towards educational costs in small ways, such as travelling expenses, school outfits, books and additions to educational awards.

Other grants can be made in respect of a specific short term unexpected need which is beyond the means of the beneficiary and not covered by aid from other sources.

The resource of the fund is limited. So that help can be given where it is most needed, the applicants must be prepared to give, in confidence, full information about the circumstances supporting their applications.

See CIoJ website for more details.
Rowing Warrior

By Ian Harvey

“WHERE’S the crazy Irishman?” shouted a determined and forthright woman, in the distinctive drawl of Upper Peninsula, Michigan, as she stood beside a tall broad-shouldered, swarthy-faced man on the Munising marina jetty. The man was her partner, a Cherokee Indian, and she was hailing the deck of the tugboat Seneca moored alongside. The ancient, battered but proud, WW2 tugboat moved restlessly, tethered by its hawsers on the stormy waters of Lake Superior, just opposite Grand Island on the huge lake’s southern shore.

The Seneca had run for cover from the pent-up July storm now throwing up white water around Grand Island and the great lake beyond. The Ojibwa or Chippewa Native American people, who for hundreds of years have lived all the way round the island, call it Gichigami, meaning Big Water.

I was the “Crazy Irishman”, a name adopted by the newspapers of various mid-western States including a radio and TV station who were covering my charity rowing challenge. My plan had been to row from the western end of Superior, the largest freshwater lake in the world, to the eastern end, some 400 miles as it turned out. The intention was to row in a low-slung single scull rowing boat, resting and eating on board the backup boat, Seneca, aiming to complete the journey within a two week period by keeping parallel with the southern shore. Everyone thought I was mad including the crew of the Seneca, my back-up team of friends from Northern Ireland, and a BBC NI film crew.

Lunacy

It had never before been attempted by rowers and within that period it seemed impossible given the unpredictable nature of the lake, even in July when the water temperature had risen from below freezing to just a handful of degrees centigrade in deeper water [still hypothermia level]! I had just turned 58 which only added to the sense of lunacy surrounding the entire endurance escapade.

“He’s here, resting on deck, come aboard!” shouted my comrades as they laughed at the familiarity of the name I had been justifiably dubbed.

At that point I had covered well over three quarters of the total mileage with one of the worst stretches still to tackle and time running out. Apart from a few days spent sheltering from the worst storms I had been averaging 36 miles a day, rowing at night when the weather was calm enough (a bit like rowing with one’s eyes closed).

“I want to give you this book Ian, about Grand Island, about my family and my fourth great grandfather, Ogichida, Chief Gashkiewishin-gijigong, a legendary Chippewa warrior and clan chief of his people,” said Kris (Kristine) LeVeque, stepping on deck with a smile and a warm embrace. “Please read what I have written inside the flyleaf – it’s about you and what you have inspired me to say about your voyage for the benefit of children’s charities.

“I have lived through you on your journey as our ancestors did when on one famous occasion in the early 1800s the island warriors canoed all the way to the western end of the lake as part of a huge Chippewa war party. Caught up in a disastrous battle they fought courageously against the Sioux, our traditional enemy at that time, in defence of their honour, families and land,” she added.

Sole survivor

The island chief’s teenage son was the only Grand Island survivor of that one-sided battle, escaping and taking months to canoe home to tell of the courage of every one of the islanders who died with honour. Gashkiewishin-gijigong was made chief in his father’s place and given the honoured Chippewa title of “Ogichida”, meaning warrior. His heroic feat became local legend and in 1855, his extraordinary story was woven into literary history as additional inspiration for Henry Wadsworth Longfellow’s world-famous poem, “The Songs of Hiawatha”.

I completed the epic voyage a few days later having almost come to grief in huge waves at Au Sable Point, ridden out another storm in Grand Marais and rowed through the night as I watched shoreward celebratory fireworks set off in honour of the final leg of my challenge! I had reached the last possible day and after a gruelling 400 miles, a massive storm chased me across the finishing line. It had been achieved in eight days and two and a half nights of exhausting but exhilarating effort, which turned out to be a world-first for the sport of rowing.

It was the fact that I had done it to raise funds for BBC Children in Need and my East African charity Fields of Life, that the descendants of the island Chief, in 2006, a year after my row, invited me to join a native powwow in their small coastal city and in time become an adopted member of their family as blood brother to Kris! They added that they wished to honour me with the title Ogichida because I had braved all that the “Lady Lake” had thrown at me, for the sake of families and children who couldn’t help themselves.

In September 2011, I travelled to Indiantown, Munising where the time-honoured ceremony took place in a Wabeno [communal Wigwam], during which I uttered the Ojibwa words, “Ogichida ndizhnikaaz, Northern Ireland ndoonjibaa, makwa doodem Gichiminisa” [“I am called Warrior, I come from Northern Ireland and I am a member of the Bear Clan of Grand Island”]. Welcoming me into the family the clan leader and elder Ogima Kwae presented me with a blanket to wrap myself in. Granted the right to wear four colours on my native regalia, teal blue, aqua blue, royal blue and white [the colours of the Lake], I had become blood brother to a direct descendant of a legendary Chippewa Chief and adopted member of the Bear Clan, Grand Island Band, Tribe of Sault Ste. Marie, Chippewa Indians - the stuff of Wild West childhood dreams.
Review points way to sustainable future for S4C

An independent review of the Welsh language broadcaster S4C has been published. The UK Government has accepted all of the review’s recommendations.

The review, led by Euryn Ogwen Williams, presents a package of reforms which have the potential to deliver real change to make S4C a better organisation that more effectively serves Welsh-speaking audiences. The review’s recommendations will also be instrumental in strengthening the independence of the broadcaster and increasing the transparency of its operations.

As part of its commitment to ensuring a strong future for Welsh language broadcasting, the Government has also announced it will be maintaining funding for S4C at its current level of £6.762 million for 2018/19 and 2019/20. This will give S4C the funding certainty it needs for the next two years to deliver the much-needed reforms set out in the review until the new arrangements take effect.

Secretary of State for Wales, Alun Cairns, said: “S4C undeniably makes an enormous contribution towards the creative industries in Wales, and crucially, to promoting the Welsh language and our culture around the world.

“The UK Government recognises the importance the people of Wales place upon S4C. Broadcasting across the UK is a reserved function, that is why this Government will continue to provide funding certainty to the channel as it navigates the recommendations set out in the review over the coming two years.

“I am confident that the future is bright for S4C. We want to see the channel continue to evolve to meet the needs of the digital age, and develop some of the UK’s most innovative, authoritative and entertaining programming now and in the years to come.”

Unique cultural value

The Minister for the Creative Industries, Margot James added: “S4C has a unique cultural and social value as the world’s only Welsh language broadcaster. We want to see it continue to thrive, but, as with all broadcasters, it needs to adapt to the changing media landscape. This review sets out a clear and sensible path for its future, and we are providing the funding certainty that S4C needs to deliver this.”

The review’s recommendations are as follows:

- The government should update S4C’s public service remit to include digital and online services and remove the current geographical broadcasting restrictions. This will allow S4C to broaden its reach and offer its content on a range of new platforms in the UK and beyond.
- S4C should establish an in-house digital hub to develop and improve S4C’s digital footprint and form the basis of a Welsh language digital cluster.
- The broadcaster should establish a language partnership with the Welsh Government and others to help deliver the government’s commitment to reach a million Welsh language speakers by 2050.
- S4C’s public funding should be provided entirely through the licence fee from 2023 onwards, with all future funding decisions made as part of the BBC licence fee funding settlement.
- The Government should consider amending current approval requirements to give S4C greater freedom to invest and generate commercial revenue.
- The S4C Authority should be replaced with a new unitary board comprising executive and non-executive directors.
- The Government should consider whether S4C’s current financial audit arrangements are suitable, including whether it would be appropriate to appoint the Comptroller and Auditor General as S4C’s external auditor.

Euryn Ogwen Williams, who chaired the independent review, said: “I was delighted to be asked to lead on this independent review, on a subject very close to my heart. Being the only Welsh language broadcaster, S4C’s role is one of great importance to Welsh speaking audiences in and outside of Wales and I wanted to make sure it can continue to thrive in this new and fast developing media landscape.

“I hope that my report and recommendations will guarantee S4C’s status as an independent broadcaster that can play a major role in the Welsh language partnership, having secured the stability to do so for the years to come.”

Implementation plan

The Government has accepted all the recommendations made by the review and has asked S4C to provide a detailed implementation plan by July 2018 on how it will deliver the necessary reforms.

Williams has over 50 years’ broadcasting experience in Wales, and was appointed to chair the S4C review based on his understanding of the Welsh language broadcasting sector as well as his knowledge of Welsh language, culture and society.
Reinventing digital editions

By Mary-Katharine Phillips

In recent years, we’ve seen that newspapers are re-discovering the power of editions as their core and unique value proposition. After years of investing in the “news flow”, they have learned that their most loyal and profitable audiences are actually hooked by carefully curated and packaged publications.

That’s why at Twipe we launched the research project “Reinventing Digital Editions”. This fits very well with our DNA as technology innovators for edition-based publishing. We analyzed successful digital-only editions, defined as digital publications with a clear beginning and end, published on a more than monthly basis, and with no print counterpart containing the exact same content.

To begin, we took up the challenge of listing all the digital-only editions that existed, but we quickly found that the market was not as mature as we had expected. Other than a few standout examples in Europe, there are not many digital-only editions available today. From this we wondered what had driven the creation of these editions and what commonalities they had that led to their success.

Analysis of the editions served as the first ever benchmarking for digital-only editions, and found common factors in terms of format and navigational structure, publishing frequency and time, length and amount of non-news content, and features. In addition to the analysis, interviews with leaders behind these editions revealed the key motivations in developing these new innovative, digital-only editions.

In total eight leading digital-only editions were studied:

- Handelsblatt 10 from Handelsblatt (Germany)
- DN+ from Diario de Navarra (Spain)
- La Matinale from Le Monde (France)
- Welt Edition from Die Welt (Germany)
- L’édition du Soir from Ouest-France (France)
- Espresso from The Economist (UK)
- The Independent Daily Edition from The Independent (UK)
- 12 from Tamedia (Switzerland)

Some of these digital-only editions replace the entire print publication, like The Independent, which became digital-only due to business needs. Other editions target new, complementary audiences, like L’édition du Soir (Ouest-France). Ouest-France noticed a trend in their readers of wanting something more light-hearted to read in the evening, so they created L’édition du Soir which has an emphasis on games and interactive stories. Other editions, such as Welt Edition, come from a pure desire to innovate—when they first started development, they didn’t even know what the iPad would be called, they just knew they wanted to be the first on the German market with a newspaper tablet app. The rest of the editions emerged from a need to serve time-crunched readers who feel overwhelmed by the constant onslaught of news. The Economist’s Espresso is one such edition, positioning itself as a “shot of daily news” for people on the go.

From the benchmarking and common factors of the editions themselves plus interviews with the innovation leaders, six key best practices for digital-only editions emerged.

For your own free copy of the full report with the 6 key success factors for digital-only editions, please contact mary-katharine.phillips@twipemobile.com.
Failing Open Justice at Britain’s biggest court centre

By Prof Tim Crook

There used to be many more journalists at the RCJ working for the Press Association, other agencies and national newspapers. In 1980 I remember well over 20 journalists working there and using the press room on the ground floor. On February 28, The Press Association’s news diary announced in the early morning that in the High Court there was “nothing listed”. What I presume they meant by this is that they did not detect any demand from the wider media for any alerting to cases that may be of interest.

There was no doubt there were journalists attending hearings and reporting what was going on, but it was disturbing that there was a clear disconnection between the significance of some of that day’s court hearings and the lack of publication in local, regional and national news media.

Britain’s biggest court complex contains 3.5 miles of corridors, over 1,000 rooms and across a multi-building complex hosts 120 courts and around 200 senior judges. Yet hardly anything substantial emerged in terms of media news coverage which in my opinion deserved to published.

In Court 19, before Mr Justice Ousely at 10.30 a.m., there was a judicial review of the Government’s refusal to allow a 16 year old Afghan refugee to seek sanctuary in the UK. It is a case that could give hope to thousands of other child asylum seekers across Europe.

The boy was listed as “ZS”, and was living in the Calais refugee camp when the French authorities cleared it in October 2016. He applied unsuccessfully to be brought to the UK under Section 67 of the Immigration Act, known as the Dubs amendment.

It is the first time a lone child asylum seeker has issued a challenge of this kind against the Home Secretary. Scouring the press, I could only trace a report arising from this day’s proceedings in the Guardian, provided by Diane Taylor.

I did my best to follow Press Association filing on this day and could not find any reports from this case being distributed. The hearing lasted three days, with Judgement being reserved.

Photo opp

There was a picture opportunity outside the Royal Courts of Justice where a group of activists promoted the cause of unaccompanied child refugees seeking asylum in the UK. This case arises out of a documentary film project “Calais Children: A Case to Answer” by Professor Sue Clayton who is a colleague of mine at Goldsmiths, University of London.

She said she was trying to do for the children of the present refugee crisis what people struggled to achieve for the children of the Kindertransport of 1938-9, explaining: “The triumph for me was to get a film accepted as evidence. In a way the biggest achievement of my life has been to get the lawyers to take this on. We have been comrades in arms on this for 18 months. We’ve all worked insane hours and suffered a lot of setbacks. It matters a lot to us.”

There were at least two other significant cases going on that day which did not produce any media coverage. The Government was giving its argument in Liberty’s challenge to the Snoopers’ Charter in Court 1. And in Court 5 there was the Court Martial Appeal of an RAF pilot who, having caused his plane to nosedive over 4,000 feet while using a digital camera, had his dismissal from the service reversed.

This was the case of Flt Lt Andrew Townshend who in February last year was accused of costing the Ministry of Defence millions of pounds when he accidentally deactivated the autopilot of the military passenger jet. The Voyager aircraft, which had 198 passengers and crew on board, plummeted 4,400ft over the Black Sea.

His original case was covered by nearly every national newspaper. His successful appeal was not.

Something clearly needs to be done. The Institute has made some recommendations for a multi-agency approach and sent a report to the senior judiciary, Lord Chancellor and Minister for Justice and Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport. The report can be downloaded from the Cloj’s website.

Suggestions include judges being trained to provide one-page summaries of their rulings for the media and public; online sound recordings of case rulings; court reporter apprenticeships at the Royal Courts of Justice; better access for journalists to courtrooms and case papers; and the setting up of judge and media ‘bench committees’ throughout the country to develop a partnership of understanding and ongoing promotion of the Open Justice principle.

Culture of secrecy

The journalism industry needs to be better resourced in terms of court reporters, and the judiciary needs to make it easier to find out what is going on and to report newsworthy proceedings. The growing culture of secrecy and anonymity is a significant problem. If the parties to a hearing are not known why should any news publication find any human interest in the court hearings?

This is undoubtedly the case that was going on in Court 13, where two anonymous businessmen were pursuing the first “right to be forgotten” claims to be tried in England against Google.

Earlier, on February 15, journalists had to persuade the Appeal Court judge, Lord Justice Holroyde, that he did not have the power to prevent the identification of two convicted sex offenders appealing against their sentence. And on February 23, after a two year freedom of speech battle, the Times was able to identify a billionaire former judo partner of Russian President Vladimir Putin who had been involved in a legal dispute with his former wife over money.

But the struggle to win this right had meandered from High Court, Appeal Court to Supreme Court. The worry here is that journalists and news publishers cannot afford to be in every court that makes orders rendering justice secret.

Justice not seen and justice not heard will become justice blind and silent.
OBITUARY

Henry Douglas (1925-2018)

The longest-standing member of our Institute, and one of the best-loved former Presidents, has died, peacefully, after a “very good lunch”, at the age of 93.

Henry Russell Douglas was born in Bishopbriggs, near Glasgow, in 1925. According to his daughter Jane, he was a particularly patriotic Scot who had an extensive collection of kilts, in which he was proud to appear “at the drop of a hat”. Henry joined the navy in 1943 and, rather surprisingly, given that he was immensely tall, served in submarines. Only a year ago, he found himself stuck in a lift and was asked whether he was claustrophobic: “Oh no. I was in submarines during the war” was his swift reply.

After his service in the Royal Navy, Henry went up to Oxford University where he read History. While there, apparently, he wrote a great deal of poetry, played a lot of chess – sometimes playing for the University – and met his future wife, Elizabeth. In her eulogy, Jane referred to how the family often heard of the chess tournament in which Henry “beat the man who beat the man who beat the world champion”!

Henry met the young Elizabeth at a seminar on the French Revolution. The class consisted of Elizabeth, and three men. She described the experience to her children as “One was married, one was mad and one was Daddy!” Married in 1951, the couple settled down to married life in Liverpool where Henry worked on the staff of the Liverpool Daily Post as leader-writer and assistant editor. His passion for books also manifested itself in his other role as the Post’s Literary Editor.

Legendary

Henry Douglas became a member of the Institute of Journalists in 1957, which suggests he may well have been the longest-standing member of the Institute – unless, of course, any Journal readers know otherwise!

Encouraged by the now-legendary Larry Lamb, Henry moved to Fleet Street in 1969 as part of the launch team for the new Sun newspaper. Writing in his book Sunrise, Larry wrote of Henry that “he is a big man in every sense of the word, with a big heart, a big appetite, a big family and a magnificently well-stocked mind.”

In common with many Institute members, Henry was a stickler for proper use of language and grammar. (I fear that, even now, he will have a good look at this piece from above and find my scribblings a little wanting!)

As an employee of News International, Henry, although had not had any former legal training, went on to become Legal Manager of the News of the World and, after retiring, served as a much-respected consultant on media legal issues.

However, he found he had to defer to his granddaughter Helen when he was asked to check over the teenage publication, Sugar, for libel. Unfortunately, without her help he couldn’t understand what the magazine was on about! I suspect many fathers and grandfathers would have sympathised!

Henry continued to be an active and committed supporter of the Institute in his retirement, attending many functions, and serving as one of the organisation’s senior “Three Wise Men”, who, traditionally, were called on to resolve seemingly intractable disputes between officers and, sometimes, argumentative members. Although Henry’s legs and knees were not in great shape in 2008, he and Elizabeth attended that year’s CIoJ conference in Malta. The walk up through the old capital was a bit of a trial, I remember uncomfortably, because arthritis had already taken a hold on my left knee so I was happy to slow down and wander through the historic streets with them both.

Requiem Mass

Henry’s grandfather and great-grandfather were ministers of Scotland’s United Free Church, but, at the age of 18, in 1943, he became a Roman Catholic. It is clear that Henry’s faith was vitally important to him, and most surely, he would have appreciated the traditional Requiem Mass held to celebrate his life at the church of St Edward the Confessor, Sutton Park, near Guildford.

As daughter Jane told me, his Faith sustained him greatly on the death of Elizabeth after their 61 years of marriage. It must have proved a huge comfort too on the early deaths of two of his children; Catherine and Alexander.

After the service in Guildford, his coffin began a journey north so that Henry could be buried with Elizabeth in Yorkshire. The Institute was represented at his funeral by Chief Executive Dominic Cooper and Past-Presidents Roger Bush and Paul Leighton.

On the Sunday before Henry died he was out with his family for lunch at his favourite local hostelry, The Olive Tree, where he enjoyed a ‘jolly good lunch’, two large glasses of Merlot, and was driven home by his family for an afternoon snooze. May he Rest in Peace.

Paul Francis Leighton
(with grateful thanks to Jane Douglas for her help and kindness)
The Electoral Reform Society (ERS) is calling for an urgent review of political campaign regulation in the UK in light of the Cambridge Analytica scandal.

The ERS has written to leaders of Britain’s main political parties calling for cross-party talks on how the UK’s campaign regulations can be updated to “finally come to terms with the digital age in the wake of these revelations.”

Democracy campaigners are also urging the Electoral Commission and the Information Commissioner to set out what powers and resources they need to monitor the online campaigning landscape, which the ERS describe as a “wild west”.

The main legislation regulating political parties’ campaigning activity and finance dates back to 2000 – before Facebook (public in 2006) or Twitter (2006) even existed, and long before they had any role in political campaigns.

The campaigners note that the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act (PPERA) – the main Act of Parliament covering election law – was written in a time of ‘mini-discs and the millennium bug, with today’s online minefield far from sight’.

Harvesting data

Social media giants and the politicians have both been “asleep at the wheel” while companies harvest citizens’ personal information for political and financial ends. Regulators may need to be given more powers and resources, and citizens more rights to see what is being done with their data in real time.

Willie Sullivan, Senior Director of the Electoral Reform Society, said: “Online campaigning is the 21st century’s wild west – and the Cambridge Analytica saga is a very stark reminder that we have to assess how to govern the new terrain. That’s why we have written to party leaders today, and are urging regulators to set out what powers and resources they need in this fraught landscape.

“The rules on campaigning simply haven’t caught up with the digital age. Parties and campaigns are able to collect huge quantities of personal information with little oversight. Our main act covering election law was written in a time of mini-discs and the millennium bug, with today’s online minefield far from sight. Clearly it is time for an urgent review of this legislation to bring it up to date.”

He added: “Information can change how people think and behave and is often the basis on which people vote: if you can control information and know in detail how it affects people’s behaviour, you can influence our democracy. So, we must make sure the regulators can do their jobs properly, to monitor what is going on, and that citizens can see what campaigners are doing with their data.

“Data harvesting and campaign targeting is not new – but the difference now is that it can be done much more extensively and stealthily than in the past. We know what newspapers print, and we can all see the billboards parties put up. It is harder to know who is being targeted online, how they are being targeted, and who is behind it.

Call to reform election rules

Gordon Thomas (1933-2017)

A longstanding member of our Institute, and sometime contributor to this Journal, Gordon Thomas was an investigative journalist and prolific author who specialised in espionage and the secret intelligence services. He was the author of no fewer than 53 books, including Inside British Intelligence: A Hundred Years of MI5 and MI6, Gideon’s Spies: Mossad’s Secret Warriors, Secrets and Lies: A History of CIA Mind Control, and The Assassination of Robert Maxwell.

He also co-wrote, with Max Morgan-Witts, the bestselling Voyage of the Damned, concerning the fate of the MS St Louis ocean liner carrying Jewish refugees from Germany to Cuba in 1939, which became a Hollywood film starring Max von Sydow and Faye Dunaway in 1976.

Gordon Thomas was born in Wales, in a cemetery keeper’s cottage. He had his first story published at nine years old in a Boy’s Own Paper competition. His father served in the Royal Air Force and had a series of overseas postings which meant young Gordon went to various schools in Egypt, South Africa, and Bedfordshire. His cousin was none other than Dylan Thomas, whose great-uncle was a cemetry keeper.

His brother was a BBC writer and producer. His last book on secret services was Shadow Warriors: Daring Missions of World War II by Women of the OSS and SOE (written with Greg Lewis). Spies and spooks were not Gordon Thomas’s sole subject matter and his literary and journalistic output covered a diverse range of topics.

His books The Jesus Conspiracy: The Trial and Inevitable Crucifixion of Jesus Christ, Pontiff: Inside the Vatican and The Day the Bubble Burst: A Social History of the Wall Street Crash of 1929 showed that, as a good investigative reporter, Gordon could readily immerse himself in any given subject. Farewell, Gordon – it was a privilege to know you. Enjoy your next great adventure – and please write about it, if the opportunity arises!

Andy Smith
LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Dear Editor,

The Autumn 2017 issue of The Journal, which, as a member of the Institute, I always read with great interest, included an article about merging the Institute’s charities that particularly caught my eye. It seems plain that work has to be done to update the rules and trust deeds; and by the time you receive this letter doubtless the AGM will have voted on Resolution 20 proposed by Norman Bartlett. Whichever way any vote will have gone, I have one or two points to make on the subject. I hope they might encourage the Institute’s officers, Council members and the Professional Practices Board to think about the possibility of re-establishing one of the funds that were, as the article pointed out, “closed many years ago”. It could perhaps be re-introduced in an appropriately-adapted modern form. The fund I have in mind is the Oliver Madox Hueffer Fund.

Oliver Madox Hueffer was a journalist and brother of the best-selling 20th century writer and influential literary journalist, Ford Madox Ford. They were the sons of a German 19th century immigrant to Britain, Francis Hueffer. The brothers were born and educated in England and Anglicised their names after Germans had become unpopular during the 1914-18 Great War. They each introduced into their new names at least one of the names of their British grandfather, Ford Madox Brown, a Victorian painter closely associated with the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood.

Oliver’s brother (who fought in the British Army against the Germans and was wounded in the Great War) eliminated completely the German-sounding part of his original name from his new name, to become the Ford Madox Ford remembered in today’s major encyclopaedias. Oliver himself, however, seems to have been fairly brave (some would perhaps say foolhardy), in retaining in his new name his original German-sounding surname at a time when even the British royal family was changing its name from the Germanic “Battenberg” to the English “Windsor”.

Maverick

Oliver was obviously something of a maverick, which is not a bad quality in any independently-minded journalist. More important, though, from the Institute’s viewpoint, is that somewhere along the line he appears to have wanted to encourage young journalists. Hence the establishment, through the Institute, of the Oliver Madox Hueffer Fund.

I believe that I was the last beneficiary of that Fund in 1946. I was a 17-years-old “apprentice junior reporter” on the now-defunct Brighton morning newspaper, the Sussex Daily News, and its evening companion, the still-extant Argus. I won a national essay competition sponsored by the Fund for junior members of the Institute and was awarded the princely first prize of five guineas, nearly three times the £2 that I was being paid weekly while learning some of the crafts of journalism. I was invited to attend the annual general meeting of the Institute in London (with travel expenses paid by the Institute, from West Sussex to London and back). The then President, W.L. Andrews, Editor of the Yorkshire Post, handed the precious money to the callow youth before him, said a few kind words and wished me luck in my career. I certainly had it!

That President was knighted in 1954 as Sir Linton Andrews, was a President of the Guild of British Newspaper Editors and a founder member of the old Press Council. He died in 1972 when I was the BBC’s Africa Correspondent, covering stories of political and often sanguinary upheaval ranging from Amin’s oppressive antics in Uganda to Ian Smith’s declaration of Rhodesian independence (experiencing jail in, and deportation from, both countries); and from wars and military coups in Nigeria to the overthrow of Emperor Haile Selassie in Ethiopia and revolution there. I was on the air and on the screen almost daily for nine years while in Africa and I’ve often wondered if Sir Linton (if he ever watched TV or listened to Radio) perhaps recalled the occasion 16 years earlier when he had wished me luck. If he did, I hope he was satisfied with the standard of my reporting!

Fall-out

A useful fall-out for me from the Fund’s essay award was publicity which helped me in my early struggles to become an established journalist. Memories of that spur me to write this letter because the Fund’s activity was the sort of thing that, in my view, the Institute should still pursue. The essay competition itself was normally triennial, although it was suspended during 1939-45, the competition previous to the one which I entered having been held in 1939. I think (but I am not sure) that the competition I won was actually the last. I may be wrong about that. If any reader has more knowledge on the matter I should be grateful for information.

The competition had been open to junior members of the Institute (then aged 21 or below), and it entailed writing an essay of 1,000 words on “My Favourite Newspaper – and Why”. I chose the old News Chronicle (the title of which I think is now owned by the Daily Mail); and the second prize of three guineas went to P.C. Byrne, aged 18, who chose the Daily Mail. News paragraphs about our successes appeared in October 1946 in local newspapers in the areas where he and I worked and in the trade press, including World’s Press News and Newspaper World. These attracted the attention of the then editor of the News Chronicle, Robin Cruickshank, who had been a distinguished Washington Correspondent during WW2. When he returned to London to become editor, he wrote a rollicking history of the newspapers called “Roaring Century”.

He invited me to London (again, travel expenses paid!) and when I met him he asked me to write him an annual note telling him what I was doing. Overwhelmed by the fact that this busy man, aged sixty or more and not in the best of health, was finding the time to encourage a mere cub reporter in the provinces, I complied. I wonder how many editors today might do anything similar?

Eventually, after obtaining the recognised journalistic General Certificate of Training and being formally accepted by the news industry as a qualified reporter, I was invited by Cruickshank to London from Bristol, where I was then on the staff of the Bristol Evening Post. I spent my entire annual holiday of three weeks working as a holiday relief reporter on the News Chronicle. It was a period of absolute bliss. I was 22; I was given lively assignments every day; and while in London I stayed with my mother, living in Kentish Town, and gave her whatever I could afford in return for my accommodation and breakfast.

I felt that I was really knocking on the doors of the old Fleet Street. I was also given valuable advice by another journalist, Norman Cursley. He was deputising as editor in Cruickshank’s absence because of ill-health – and he did me a good turn. While encouraging me as a reporter (most of my pieces were printed), he discouraged me in any long-term hopes about working for the newspaper, hinting at its financial problems and indicating that I would be sensible to look elsewhere for work. Sure enough, the News Chronicle died not long afterwards and so my first Fleet Street job came a year later when, at the age of 23, I joined the staff of the Press Association.

Assignments

That led, after three years with P.A., to nine years with The Daily Telegraph, nearly a quarter of a century with the BBC, and a full and satisfying career and existence as a foreign correspondent. I worked in over 100 countries, filing and broadcasting from places where I was based for some years at a time, such as Brezhnev’s Soviet Union, the USA during the Nixon years, and an Africa moving from colonial rule to independence.
and all-too-frequent chaos. I was given splendid assignments such as the Dalai Lama’s flight from Tibet, an investigation into slavery that persuaded the late King Feisal of Saudi Arabia to outlaw the practice of it in his country and for which I was made a member of the Anti-Slavery Society, and many other memorable journalistic “dream jobs”. I was, for example, the first BBC correspondent ever to visit the isolated Republic of Outer Mongolia and to broadcast from there, many years before that country established itself as a tourist attraction.

My final five years at the Corporation I spent in a dual role as BBC “Diplomatic and Court Correspondent,” the Court bit of the title meaning Buckingham Palace, not a Law Court. It’s a BBC post that’s been abolished to be replaced by one called “Royal Correspondent” – how I would have hated being so described, being anything other than royal! – that is now separated from the “Diplomatic Correspondent” part of my old job. It was in fact quite an effective money-saving exercise by the Corporation because the correspondent holding the job covered news about royalty as well as foreign news involving the Foreign & Commonwealth Office. It meant that the BBC paid only one journalist to do two jobs!

Returning to the Oliver Madox Hueffer Fund, I should be happy to help in the restoration of the Fund. If Institute members’ responses to this letter are positive I could offer not only some cash to assist in the re-establishment of the Fund but also a few ideas on conditions for entering the essay competition and potential themes – even titles – for subjects to be addressed.

John Osman

POSTSCRIPT: I had been a junior member of the Institute when, on completing my apprenticeship, I was lured away from my employers by the old Worthing Herald (now merged with the Worthing Gazette) offering me more money. Having accepted the job, I found to my shock that an NUJ “closed shop” existed there, although it had never been mentioned until I turned up in the newsroom to begin work. I was forced to accept the switch by a fairly militant “father of the chapel” and an editor who himself was regarded, in Conservative Worthing, as being a bit of a Lefty, if only because he nearly always sported a red tie! With a recently-widowed mother and two younger sisters to help support, I was in no position to argue so I became a reluctant NUJ member. But the pro-Soviet attitude displayed by that organisation later, during the 1956 Hungarian uprising against the Soviets, in due course spurred me to quit and to move back to the Institute.

Then, upon joining the BBC in 1965 I found that most of the Corporation’s journalists were NUJ members, although there was no closed shop as such. So, a few of us formed a kind of informal Institute cell within the BBC, including characters well-known to older Institute members, such as the late Chris Underwood and the late Dominic Harrod. At 88, I can only hope that one day the NUJ might escape from the clutches of the Trades Union Congress and the extreme Left, to become as free and constructive as our Institute. I am not, however, very optimistic!

Head Office move

Canada Water after an earlier dock) and onto Stratford, site of the Olympic Games. Most of the docks were filled in and thousands of homes built.

Come 2015 and the area had become a strange mixture of modern high-rise around distinctive stretches of preserved water, a shopping centre, a striking library, a modern station, Victorian offices and substandard 1950s buildings. Access was transformed when the Overground network was linked to Canada Water. In 2016 a massive £2 billion redevelopment was proposed led by British Land. Many of the proposals can be seen at goo.gl/Tx9w4R

The British Land Company plc is one of the largest property development and investment companies in the UK. It controls 2.2 million sq. metres of property, the largest being Meadowhall, Sheffield.

Negotiations

It was in September 2017 that British Land came calling on the Institute at Number 2, Dock Offices. The first tap was for the Institute’s parking space. A surprisingly high amount was offered for this bit of tarmac. Our street-wise Chief Executive, Dominic Cooper, was naturally suspicious of the sum offered. However, during subsequent negotiations – of which the CIoJ’s Council was kept fully informed – it was revealed that a bigger prize might be on offer for the whole office suite.

Naturally, the Institute sought independent valuations, and after contacting a local commercial property agent it was confirmed that the offer was in excess of the property value at the time.

After receiving that information, the offer was increased following further negotiations.

After considering the price and the options, Council felt the sum of half-a-million pounds finally offered was a fair sum for the leasehold property. This was agreed with British Land. The offer was conditional upon the Institute vacating the premises by March 31, 2018.

The moving process started with storage accommodation hired and a subcommittee formed to investigate suitable premises for the new headquarters of the Institute. In the meantime, temporary rented accommodation will be used. Postal, telephone and email contacts will remain unchanged. The full range of Institute services will continue, unaffected by the removal from Dock Offices.

As the changing dynamic of the media and communication industry threatens so many journalists, the Institute stands as a pillar of continuity. Its good financial situation (see 2017 accounts) will be further strengthened by the release of the equity in the property. When it moves to a new address, it will only be the fourth permanent location in the Institute’s 135-year history.

Norman Bartlett