

# FREE <sup>30p</sup> PRESS

JOURNAL OF THE CAMPAIGN FOR  
PRESS AND BROADCASTING FREEDOM  
No. 55 October 1989

## Keep up the campaign for an end to the Hurd ban :

- Monitor the broadcast media for the effects of the ban and protest to broadcasting companies when instances occur.
- Send copies of letters detailing the effects of the ban to the CPBF.
- Write to the Home Secretary urging him to repeal the ban.

## Widen remit inquiry told

The CPBF has called upon the Calcutt inquiry into the press to widen its terms of reference to allow consideration of issues such as right of reply, concentration of ownership and Government secrecy. The inquiry, chaired by David Calcutt QC, was announced by the Home Office Minister Tim Renton during the third reading debate on Tony Worthington's Right of Reply Bill.

Its terms of reference, published two months later, charge it however, with examining only the narrow issues of privacy and libel law. The CPBF, despite having drafted the Bill which gave rise to the inquiry was not formally invited to submit evidence. This plus the narrow terms of reference and the incredibly short timetable – all evidence had to be submitted by 31 August – raises major doubts about the seriousness of the exercise.

The CPBF's evidence is in four parts: Part 1 raises issues about the reason for the enquiry, its remit and conduct. Part 2 outlines the case for a statutory right of reply. Part 3 deals with privacy and ombudsmen. Part 4 outlines a series of recommendations designed to create a climate for responsible and accountable journalism.

On the first of these areas the submission urges, on the breadth of concern which gave rise to the inquiry basis of the consideration of a range of issues beyond the narrow remit set by the Government. In particular CPBF has urged the Committee to consider broadcasting as well as the press and to look at ownership, access, standards and the public right to know.

### Recommendations

The recommendations set out in Part 4 of the submission include:

- Establishment of a legal right of reply including the establishment of a Media Commission
- Limits on ownership and cross-ownership in the media
- Protection for journalists from proprietorial interference
- The spreading of public service obligations to all broadcast media
- Repeal of the 1989 Official Secrets Act, the Contempt of Court Act and the Police and Criminal Evidence Act.

The submission concludes: 'Unless the inquiry is prepared to tackle the issue of the climate in which media work is undertaken and address the detrimental effect of standards resulting virtually from unrestricted private ownership of the media, then in the Campaign's view, it will be avoiding the basic issue.'

## Hurd ban protests

CPBF supporters, along with members of the media unions, took to the streets on 19 October to ensure that the one year anniversary of the Hurd ban on broadcast interviews with named Irish groups did not go unremarked.

Protesters gathered at noon outside the BBC in Portland Place from where they marched to Channel 4 to hand in protest letters. They then proceeded to a rally at the Dominion Theatre where the speakers included Roy Hattersley, NUJ General Secretary Harry Conroy and playwright Harold Pinter.

Hattersley pledged that a Labour Government if elected, would repeal the ban, which he said was 'wrong in principle'.

A lobby of Parliament at 2.30 was followed by the handing in at Downing Street of a petition against the ban organised by CPBF and Information on Ireland. A long list of public figures signed the petition including well known authors, actors, TV presenters, lawyers, academics and 50 MPs.

During the previous two days a number of TV and radio programmes covering Irish issues had drawn attention to the effects of the ban.



## In Support of Salman Rushdie

The International Committee for the Defence of Salman Rushdie and his publishers was founded at a meeting convened in London on 20 February 1989 in response to the death threat against the author and his publishers issued by the late Ayatollah Khomeini on 14 February.

The meeting was attended by organisations representing writers, publishers, booksellers, journalists, trades unionists and human rights groups whose first initiative was the denunciation of the fatwah as 'armed censorship'.

The committee, chaired and co-ordinated by Article 19 – the International Centre on Censorship, then issued a World Statement, signed by 1000 internationally-known writers, calling for the right to freedom of expression as embodied in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

The World Statement called upon world opinion to support the right of all people to express their ideas and beliefs and to discuss them with their critics on the basis of mutual tolerance, free from censorship, intimidation and violence.

### Rushdie File Meeting

Sara Maitland, the feminist theologian, and Lisa Appignanesi of the ICA, put together a book which documents reactions to Salman Rushdie's *Satanic Verses* (The Rushdie File, reviewed in the August edition of *Free Press*). The story of how Collins, the commissioning publisher, became alarmed and withdrew its support from the project – an example of the pervasive fear censorship can engender was detailed at a meeting organised by the CPBF Women's Section in August.

Sara Maitland described the authors work on the book and their search for another publisher (eventually Fourth Estate took it on), and her own worries for her family's safety.

While recognising that the *Satanic Verses* provoked an unusually extreme reaction, she pointed out that the affair threw into relief the limited use of the blasphemy laws as they currently stand, a theme which was enlarged by Frances de Souza, from Article 19.

Article 19 have recently produced an excellent pamphlet on the blasphemy laws (available from them – tel. 01 403 4822). Frances de Souza clarified the alternatives.

The meeting was chaired by Helen Kuttner, and despite very low-key publicity because of our security worries, there was a good attendance and a lively discussion.

Teresa Stratford

Furthermore it requested all world leaders to continue to repudiate the threats made against Salman Rushdie and his publishers and to take firm action to ensure that these threats are withdrawn.

The World Statement was published free of charge, by 62 newspapers and magazines and later endorsed by a further 11,000 signatures from writers and readers from 67 countries.

The International Committee campaigns actively, worldwide for the repeal of the fatwah, lobbying government leaders, the United Nations Security Council, UNESCO and the Commonwealth Secretariat. It has published a document, *The Crime of Blasphemy – Why It Should Be Abolished*, in response to the British Muslim Action Front's demand for an extension of the UK blasphemy law to cover Islam.

This document provides a cogent argument in favour of the repeal of the law in the interests of equal treatment of all religious beliefs as well as freedom of expression.

The depressing history of the persecutions of writers and thinkers in Britain, who questioned in their day

the tenets of the Christian religion, is also recounted in this short study. It has been circulated to MPs, Peers, Church leaders, Mosques and Islamic Associations and has been widely praised.

In the wake of threats to booksellers and the bombing of bookshops both here and abroad, the Committee has a commitment to document the evidence of incitement to murder the author and to exert pressure on the appropriate authorities to take legal action against threats of this kind.

The Committee continues to closely monitor and to lobby for unimpeded publication, distribution and display of *The Satanic Verses*, and is pledged to remain in existence until the threat against his life is withdrawn and Salman Rushdie is ensured the fundamental human right to freedom of expression.

The International Committee for the Defence of Salman Rushdie is totally independent and relies on public support for its campaign. You can help the campaign by sending a financial contribution to the Committee at P.O. Box 49, London SE1 1LX UK.

Carmel Bedford

## Black Journalists Organise

The newly formed Black Journalist Association held its first discussion recently at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London. Around 50 journalists heard leading black media people speak about journalism in the 1990s.

The BJA was formed by young black journalists and is the successor to the now defunct Black Media Workers Association. The BMWA was formed post-1981 and helped to open media doors to black people. Now there are a significant number of experienced black media people working inside white media who probably need some direction.

So the discussion did not really get to grips with the 1990s and de-regulation. People wanted to talk about where they were now. Although Beverley Anderson hosts Channel Four's *After Dark* programme she still wanted to say that she was on the fringe of 'mainstream' television.

What worried her most was that when broadcasting was being racially offensive black people did not complain. She felt that black people should be encouraged to lobby companies, write well thought out letters, to get what black people deserve.

'What senior broadcasters should know is if they step out of line there will be a sharp reaction from black journalists,' she said. She was also critical of white producers making

programmes about black people. Their ignorance about black experiences means they make incompetent programmes. So now there is a committee of black people advising BBC Education about the programmes about black people that they are making.

While suggestions that BBC's Black and White Media programme, which is about media racism, should be made by black people was greeted by BBC executives as a revolutionary idea.

London Broadcasting Company's Syd Burke was highly cynical about the commitment of radio's decision makers to black people. BBC radio in Reading has chopped its black programme, he said, because an incremental franchise had gone to the town which had black music.

BBC and ILR, he feared would use community radio to axe black programmes. But his own experience of trying to get the London FM franchise was that black bids can get overlooked.

Onye Wambu, a producer for BBC 2's *Ebony*, had an argument with white BBC personnel, who, of course were not there. He felt he had to justify programming for and by black people. He was also fed up with black programmes being labeled as 'ghetto' because black people have been at the forefront of civil rights struggles that have benefitted white people.

Simon Hinds

## The Labour Party and the Media

The following is part of a lecture given by Michael Meacher MP, Shadow Employment Secretary, at the invitation of the Campaign for Press and Broadcasting Freedom, on 21 September at the Mechanics Institute, Manchester.

The simplest way to assess what progress there has been in the Thatcher decade is through a case study. I cannot think of a better example to take than the Labour Party over this period. After all, if the media cannot or will not offer even handed treatment to the official Opposition, what hope is there for minority groups and individuals.

There have been worrying examples of overseas governments pressurising or conspiring with sections of the media to discriminate against opposition parties, and not only in dictatorships. In both France and more recently Greece the stranglehold the ruling parties have over state television has been abused disgracefully.

Here the process has been more subtle but perhaps more dangerous because of that, since it has resulted in a disturbing trend in the media towards self-censorship, which is far harder to pin down and root out.

Before I go on to give examples of what I mean by this perhaps I should answer the question 'does it matter?' This is not as fatuous a question as it may seem. If the media in Britain, and the press in particular, is overwhelmingly right-wing and pro-establishment and getting more so, does it change people's political outlook.

This has been the meat of countless fringe meetings at Labour conferences over the last decade. My answer is no. Because if it did I would not expect to see Labour maintaining a ten point lead in the opinion polls since the beginning of the summer.

Where I fear this bias is having an effect is on policy making within the Labour Party. Politicians are the most assiduous devourers of newsprint. Unlike the general public they are active readers looking for ideas to pinch, instant solutions to insoluble problems and clues to the prospects for them and their parties.

Can the policy makers in the Labour Party read wall-to-wall criticism of established Labour policies and traditions without being affected?

I don't believe they can. Wave after wave of adverse comment, from the vitriolic to the 'quiet word in your ear' variety, from the *Sun* to the *Guardian*,

erodes the resolve and the confidence of the most principled and the most stubborn socialist. Most of all it weakens both the judgement of politicians and the link between them and the electorate.

I am not a supporter of the opposite view – that if the press dislike something it must be a fine piece of socialism. But I do think we are in danger of becoming too reactive and too nervous in putting forward policy. There is too much temptation to bend in the wind, to give a little ground in the hope of appeasing the critics.

But however much ground you give enough is never quite enough. There is an equally dangerous temptation to keep quiet about areas the media are likely to label unpopular.

At the last election this reached farcical proportions with the whole Labour Front Bench keeping quiet about defence and the economy. We didn't get away with it. The only surprise is that we thought we could.

### Policies

The Policy Review has in many respects helped to prevent this happening again. Two years of detailed and constructive argument have given us a set of policies across the whole span of government.

And having had to convince ourselves and our advisors that these are sound as well as radical policies, we are much more confident about selling these ideas to the public and the media.

Nevertheless, there are still important areas of policy, important to us as socialists as well as to our audience, on which we are reluctant to speak. The unspoken but unmistakable advice coming from some sections of the party is, when giving interviews try to speak for one minute without mentioning trade unions or public ownership.

I think it is short-sighted to believe political parties can win elections on the issues they choose to talk about while waffling through or skirting round those they think are less cuddly. The Tories last minute scare campaign at the 1987 election – Britain is great again, don't let Labour ruin it – built on just these fears. It's not what they say it's what they don't say. Two years on the voting public is showing no more inclination to buy a pig in a poke.

If we do not address issues which are of genuine rather than mischievous interest to the media, policy will be made for us in Wapping and White City. And the longer we remain silent on the key issues the more difficult it becomes for us to speak.

We will lose part of our identity by default and will become on some issues

indistinguishable from the muddle of irrelevant initials that currently clutters up the centre of British politics.

But to return to the argument. Why do I think this criticism by the media is unfounded prejudice rather than commonsense good advice.

I came across one of the best pieces of evidence for this only this week. In a Radio 4 interview last weekend, Michael Checkland, Director General of the BBC, admitted with suprising candour moving the BBC to the right in the last two years. He justified this by saying that 'there was a point in the BBC when we kind of missed what was going on, the fact that the country had moved over the last decade towards the right'.

This he said was the cause of 'difficulties' the BBC was encountering when he took charge. I think Mr Checkland may be confusing cause and effect here – even leaving aside the naive assumption that an organisation like the BBC has no influence of its own, but is a passive mirror of the national mood.

I don't remember huge popular demonstrations outside Broadcasting House calling for more martial music and less Paul Robeson to be played on Radio 2. I do remember concerted harrying from the Tory wolf pack, with Norman Tebbit at its head.

In fact, every recent public survey has shown that the British Public has been left politically unmoved by ten years Thatcher Governments. Only this week a poll for the *Guardian* has confirmed the growing popularity of trade unions, and opposition to privatisation. It is a pity that the leader writers of that and other newspapers don't read what their fellow journalists write.

Moreover I didn't notice the BBC or any other part of the media moving back to the left with the revival of the Labour Party's fortunes.

Almost without exception throughout the 1980s the media has championed the cause of the centre parties, and only in the last few months when the truth became irrefutable has the liberal as well as the right wing press reluctantly conceded that we are the only alternative government.

Commercial pressures have also been used by government to create a climate in which self-censorship is an attractive option. The broadcasting White Paper has done this in a very wide-ranging way.

More thuggishly, the direct government intervention over *Death on the Rock* has meant that despite total vindication of that courageous programme, that *This Week* will not be attempting anything like it in the foreseeable future.

As usual it was the questions that didn't get asked at the Edinburgh TV Festival which might have proved the most revealing

Nobody asked Rupert Murdoch who wrote his McTaggart Lecture, which he read so carefully (missing a full paragraph at one point), nor challenged his equation of 'freedom' in the market place with 'press and broadcasting freedom'.

No one asked whether his bullish support for deregulation had as much to do with opening up new markets for a stagnant US economy as with feathering his own nest. Nor did anyone take him up on his thinly veiled threat that any nation that tried to restrict his version of the 'free flow of information' would fall behind 'technically, intellectually, and economically'.

Murdoch poured scorn on the incestuous elitism of the broadcasting establishment and promised a new age in which every point of view will get an airing, if the punters are prepared to pay for them.

His seductive populism may have irked the audience of 1,500, but most of the TV executives paddling in the shallow waters of chit chat that pass for rigorous debate at Edinburgh, were more anxious to defend their corner and get a piece of the action than face Murdoch's extraordinary arrogance.

Yet Murdoch began to fall apart under questioning. John Birt was far too polite to ask him why his papers had so vindictively pursued the BBC, or Thames TV. Only Jaci Stephens of the *Standard* and MP Norman Buchan pulled him up about his contribution to gutter journalism, but no voices were raised about his union bashing attitude.

## Ireland - the censored subject

Conor Cruse O'Brien and Democratic Unionist Peter Robinson defended and demanded more political censorship in the Edinburgh TV festival debate about the Hurd broadcasting ban, which took place in a church. Robinson wanted to know whether a convicted rapist should get airtime if he won an election.

'The broadcaster's job would be to find out what peculiar local circumstances led to his election,' snorted Derry NUJ member Eamon McCann.

Along with a somewhat subdued Roger Bolton, 'an honorary Irishman for the day' according to session chair freelancer Barry Cowan, 'Battler' McCann was the platforms spokesman for the oppressed - the nationalist minority and broadcasters in the province.

They sat on the altar beneath a huge wooden cross and demonstrated that rational arguments seldom find favour when bigots are about.

It was contributions from the floor which really livened things up.

# Festival humbug

**MIKE JEMPSON and GRANVILLE WILLIAMS**  
report on Rupert Murdoch's McTaggart lecture and other aspects of the Festival.

The session was called to an abrupt halt when cries of 'shame' erupted as Murdoch denied knowledge of the Hurd broadcasting ban, and his papers' support for it. The passage in his speech about government interference with the media had, significantly, also failed to mention it.

On the Saturday morning, in a session which smacked of torture victims taking their tea with the Grand Inquisitor, George Russell, Chair designate of the Independent TV Commission (ITC) and Lord Rees Mogg, headmaster of the Broadcasting Standards Council chatted amiably about their role as 'New Regulators'.

All would not be doom and gloom, they assured the worried assembly. Rees Mogg said he wanted no statutory powers, just the right to air his views on moral issues and point new broadcasters towards good taste and decency.

Within days Douglas Hurd had conferred upon him the very powers

he said he didn't need, which is cold comfort for those who were relieved by George Russell's soothing words.

TV companies, he said should not drop their standards in an effort to save enough money to win back their franchise at Thatcher's planned auction. He was trying to ensure that the 'quality hurdle' would be a Beecher's Brook that only existing ITV companies could manage.

(M J)

Neil Ascherson, the distinguished *Observer* columnist, pointed out, quite rightly that broadcasters snigger at Murdoch's text at their peril, even if it is riddled with inaccuracies.

Some of Murdoch's comments on the existing BBC and ITV duopoly could have well been made by the CPBF over the past decade. But he starts from a radically different perspective, and supports his argument with some breath-taking and impertinent statements.

A technological vision is conjured up of television sets being able to provide 'a global cornucopia of programming and nearly infinite libraries of data, education and entertainment.' But only market forces will make this possible.

'We begin this decade with television in the hands of two powerful groups...we start the next decade with the possibility of enormous diversity, with monopoly control blown apart by market forces.'

'We see ourselves (News International) as destroyers of monopoly power, whether it be in print or broadcasting, and as creators of choice...cross media ownership is a force for diversity.'

Rupert Murdoch provided the justification for sweeping away public service broadcasting. He condemned TV drama which is 'up-market costume soap operas...drama run by the costume department.'

Another target was TV journalism. 'I cannot imagine a British Watergate, or a British Irangate, being pursued by the BBC or ITV with the vigour that the US networks did,' he said.

Well of course, it was the *Washington Post*, not the networks which uncovered Watergate. In this country the role of the *Sunday Times*, and other Murdoch titles, was to savage and discredit the IBA and Thames TV for *Death on the Rock*.

TV journalism does not get an easy ride from this government, but some of Murdoch's papers supported Douglas Hurd's Sinn Fein broadcasting ban, and helped create a climate in which government intervention, covert and overt, is encouraged. It's difficult to believe that an unfettered broadcasting system in which Murdoch was a major player would be a bulwark of freedom.

Rupert Murdoch wants 'a level playing ground' for SKY and his other media initiatives. For success he needs to destabilise and demoralise organisations and individuals who care for public service broadcasting.

Since Edinburgh we've seen a co-ordinated promotional campaign by News International to clean up its image. Murdoch is playing for high stakes, with losses at SKY running at £2 million a week, and increasing public concern about cross media ownership and declining press standards.

The CPBF has to ensure that the flawed and dangerous arguments aired by Murdoch in Edinburgh are repudiated. Otherwise what's at stake is a major erosion of choice, access and the possibility of democratic control of the media.

(GW)

## Whose choice?

Media Unions ACTT and BETA in association with *Broadcast* magazine, offered delegates to the Edinburgh TV festival the chance to consider alternatives to government plans for the future of broadcasting, at a well attended fringe meeting on Saturday evening. It was part of the continuing Public Service Broadcasting Campaign, set up after the publication of the White Paper.

Alan Sapper, ACTT General Secretary described government plans as 'deeply dishonest and undemocratic'. 'Workers in the industry find nothing liberating about the so-called free market in broadcasting,' he said.

The means of distribution should be in public rather than in private hands, he went on, proposing a unified broadcasting license fee and massive investment in a national fibre optic grid to supply every building in Britain with access to inter-active communication systems.

Marta Wohrle, editor of *Broadcast* unfurled a charter for broadcasters which she said could act as a contract between journalists and the public. It spelled out broadcasters' responsibilities to investigate and inform, and their independence from commercial interests. Labour media spokesperson Mark Fisher said that an incoming Labour administration, having learned the dangers of government interference would need to introduce legislation that would protect the rights of journalists and the public to information.

## Whose freedom?

In answer to questions from the *Financial Times* and media correspondents, he said that he hoped a Labour government would renegotiate the terms of auctioned ITV franchises in return for guarantees about greater access and diversity in programming.

Speaking for the NUJ Roy McHardy complemented the media unions for providing a 'signer' at the meeting - the only festival session at which the needs of the deaf had been met.

A similar tribute came from Christopher Jones, Chair of the Deaf Broadcasting Council, who said that a glance at any evening's schedule on any channel would quickly reveal how poorly the hard of hearing are served by TV.

Calling for greater use of signers and Teletext/Oracle subtitles he warned '20% of those present have or will have hearing difficulties. Then you will want to know what has happened to your access to TV?'

Unfortunately guest speaker Sir Alan Peacock, Director of the David Hume Institute, did not show up. In a letter of apology, the man commissioned by the government to investigate future funding of the BBC, said that he did not like the idea of being put in an oppositional role and did not want to debate with people who thought they had the answers when no one could know what the future of broadcasting should be.

## Network of Workshops

The recent Policy Document from Channel 4's Independent Department, and September's Regional Conference of the British Film Institute, both signal a change of attitude towards the grant-aided sector by two of its main funders. This change hinges on the 'Workshop Declaration', and is being contested by the Network of Workshops, one of the sector's strongest voices and one of the Declaration's staunchest defenders.

The Declaration, signed by ACCT, C4, the BFI, and regional Arts Associations, is a unique cultural agreement. It ensures basic wages for a minimum of four workers, supports cooperative decision making, encourages a relationship with the community (referred to as 'integrated practice' with screenings, training, access and distribution complementing production), and demands non-profit distribution.

Although the Declaration contributes to the remit required by the legislation for minority and innovative programming on C4, both the Channel and the

BFI see short-comings and are proposing changes. They want the minimum number of workers reduced, more editorial control and copyright, and less commitment to project funding with a preference for on-off commissions. They also claim that the programmes produced are not innovative enough.

While welcoming any reappraisal of their working practices and product, and adopting a flexible attitude to change, NOW (made up of 20 groups from Wales, England, Scotland and the north of Ireland) does question some of the assertions above.

Firstly they fail to grasp the need for continuity of funding, and an infrastructure of resources and personnel which this encourages, if programmes which are 'innovative, experimental and challenging' (Channel Four Policy Paper) are to be made consistently. Experience, creativity and boldness of film-makers are hardly encouraged by one-off competitive tendering.

They argue that innovation

Continued on Page 6



# Giving black people a voice

A Home Office Broadcasting Research Unit report recently supported widespread complaints that black people have about broadcasting. It does not, the report said, cater for them. De-regulation will make things worse and one means of dealing with that is for black people to have greater control over broadcasting resources.

The current situation is one where broadcasting organisations have a 'white liberal', social democratic consensus. They espouse the equal treatment of individuals regardless of race, a colour blind approach, and support integration but do not really mean it.

They will be critical/hostile to NF-type racism but their real target is radical black, political currents like nationalism and socialism. White liberals will make concessions in the face of demands from black people but their real aim is the maintenance of white supremacy - white control of power and wealth so as to impose their will on black people. Such white supremacy also means supporting 'white superiority' in most fields of human endeavour.

The media provides the ideological justification for white liberal versions of white supremacy. It does this primarily by not challenging racist ideology and practice in its programming. It means making programmes by white people, for white people and about white people even when looking at general issues. It also means making programmes that perpetuate racist mythology.

An edition of the Money Programme on BBC 2 earlier this year exemplified white supremacy. It was about the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank and their Structural Adjustment Plan in Africa. It offered perspectives on SAP in Ghana from people who were involved in it so supported white initiated capitalism on a continent that has preferred socialism.

Days later, the *Guardian* featured SAP critics who were absent from the Money Programme who said the IMF were making things worse and massaged economic figures to make things look good. But what made it a white supremacist programme was that it failed to address the issue of white institutions determining the affairs of a black nation.

There is a conflict of interest in the field of mass communication between black and white people. The principles of freedom of expression and political impartiality is systematically contradicted by broadcasting institutions particularly when they deal with black experience.

But the broadcasting system, with its public service principles still has the potential for fulfilling its ideals. De-regulation is meant to make sure that it does not. CPBF have pointed out that technology or economics alone cannot explain the move to de-regulate. In fact, the New Right are seeking to shift the political consensus to the right by delivering broadcasters into the

hands of white capitalists.

Programmes putting forward radical perspectives, or black experience will have to compete in a game that is set up for them to lose. The right-wing politics of Fleet Street will be the norm and equal opportunities will not be cost effective.

The only way to protect black people from commercial broadcasters is through laws guaranteeing right of reply, sanctions against distortion of truth, equal opportunities, and written guarantees from those broadcasters getting franchises not to perpetuate racist myths.

Another means of protecting black people is to put broadcasting resources in their hands. Some of the £20m a year black people pay in license fees should go to a black department, at the BBC, that is accountable to the black community. Its role would be twofold. It would make programmes and recruit and train people to do it and would also monitor the output of the rest of the BBC.

It would, of course, be governed by the normal principles of programme-making but there also should be drawn up a philosophy for programmes that directly addresses racial inequality and the reasons for it.

A black agenda on broadcasting would, then, not only seek to reject de-regulation and defend public service broadcasting but also change and democratise it.

Simon Hinds

Continued from Page 5  
in form and content is already a hallmark of many workshop products, e.g. awards for T-Dan Smith, *Passion of Remembrance*, *Testament*, *Out of Order*, and *Our Words Jump to Life*. The list could go on.

Secondly, the importance of autonomy is crucial to the relationship with any community. Editorial control is frequently shared with the people who are taking part, which encourages trust and a more responsible programme of work.

Thirdly, a reduction in the minimum number of workers could lead to a more hierarchical structure. As it takes more than two to make a programme, it is assumed that others would be brought in. Their status may not be as equals.

NOW also argues that one of the weaknesses of C4's Independent Department is their extremely limited scheduling profile of workshop products. This reflects badly on the workshop sector and may have led to some of the difficulties the Department seems to be facing within the Channel, e.g. they

have lost their *People to People* slot.

After discussions with ACTT, and a limited level of public debate, e.g. NOW's August conference, it appears that some headway is being made, C4 and the BFI have responded to workshop arguments, have organised meetings, given public guarantees of commitment to the workshops, and in the case of C4 are prepared to sit on a working group with NOW to highlight the workshops both within C4 and outside of it.

Meanwhile workshops have taken the initiative in searching out other funders and exhibitors. Presently individual TV companies are being approached with a package, and have so far expressed no objection to the principles of the Declaration.

Cahal McLaughlin

The next issue of *Free Press* will include reports on CPBF fringe meetings at this years party political and TUC conferences.

# In brief

## Northern Newsreel

Northern Newsreel is a regular half hour video for the trade union and labour movement and is used by trade unions at national, regional and local level, education departments, trades councils, unemployed centres, libraries and resource centres.

In its latest bulletin (No. 13) Northern Newsreel focuses on ten years of Tory anti-union laws in *Ten Glorious Years* featuring archive film and interviews from the past decade. The item highlights the government's unprecedented legal attacks on the trade union movement.

'It is perfectly plain from 10 years worth of anti-union legislation, that the policy and the aim of this government is to dismantle trade unions as effective organisations in defence of the interests of working people,' Geoff Shears, union lawyer.

The government's new Employment Training Scheme claims to be 'Training the workers without jobs to do the jobs without workers' - *Carving a Brighter Future*, the third item in Bulletin 13 examines the reality behind the advertising gloss and asks who really controls training in Britain today?

Our final feature *The Fruits of Fear* is an extract from a powerful campaign video by Non-Aligned Productions for the Anti-Apartheid Movement, which exposes how

## Taking action

### Volunteer Reserve Forces

The Volunteer Reserve Forces (which include the TA and the Volunteer Marines) have recently mounted a new recruitment campaign. One of the print ads used features a dirty man in camouflage being nagged by an angry woman, the copy asking for wives' indulgence of bad behaviour following TA weekends. This advertisement is so sexist, even Steve Wright of Radio One has publicly condemned it. Yet it has appeared in *Today*, the *Guardian* and the *Independent*.

Please write to the Volunteer Reserve Forces' Director at TAVR Assn., Duke of York's HQ, Chelsea, London SW3, with a copy to the Advertising Standards Authority and the relevant newspaper editor.

### Cherchez la Femme

Another round-up of opinions appeared in the *Guardian* on 19.9.89, this one about the first edition of the *Sunday Correspondent*. Twelve opinions were sought: twelve white men, well-known from the media world. This despite the comment made by one of them, Hugh Stephenson, that he was disappointed by the lack of women writers on the *Correspondent*. The *Guardian* has repeatedly excluded women and black people from its opinion surveys; please look out for them, and if you find it happening again, write and ask for the imbalance to be righted. The *Guardian* is at 119 Farringdon Road, London EC1.

South African export trade is used to fund apartheid. Featuring South African trade unionists, activists and TV personalities the item poses the question of what, if any, is the responsibility of the individual British Consumer, especially in view of the fact that in 1988 Britain imported £808 million pounds worth of goods from South Africa.

Finally Northern Newsreel features its regular look at success stories in the trade union movement in *News from the Frontline*, highlighting negotiations and disputes which have been successful.

Northern Newsreel is available by subscription with a reduced rate for trade union branches and voluntary organisations. For further details contact: Northern Newsreel, 36 Bottle Bank, Gateshead, NE8 2AR. Tel (091) 4773 604.

## Tape Magazine

Womens Tape Over is a quarterly digest of feminist print press produced on tape for, and by blind and partially sighted women. It is listened to by blind and partially sighted women from around England, Wales, Scotland, some European countries and the US.

The organisation is unfunded and is currently seeking support from both funded and unfunded women's groups.

There are two C90 cassettes per quarter prepared by the London Collective. The service is operated on a listen and return basis because the group do not have enough money to let women keep the cassettes.

The subscription rates are as follows: £25 - funded groups, £10 - unfunded groups. Cheques or postal orders should be made payable to 'Womens Tapeover' and sent to Róisín Battel, 66 Oakfield Road, London N4 4LB.

## Drawing Conclusions

Paul Morton is best known for the political postcard designs he has created for campaigns such as CND, Anti-Apartheid, Nicaragua Solidarity Campaign, the Campaign for Press and Broadcasting Freedom and various Trade Unions. In *Drawing Conclusions* he presents over 80 images that catalogue concerns that have grown over the past ten years of Thatcherism: the sinking of the Belgrano, Nuclear Disarmament, South Africa, Palestine, the Miner's Strike and Clause 28.

*Drawing Conclusions* is published and distributed by Leeds Postcards who also celebrate ten years of campaign publishing this year. Many of the images are classic Leeds Postcards.

## A timely challenge

Open our pages to the ideas, the people and the arguments looking beyond Thatcherism.



### More than a week in politics

To: 7 Days. FREEPOST, 16 St. John Street, London EC1 1BL.

Please send a free copy of 7 Days with subscription details to:

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Postcode \_\_\_\_\_

Communist Party Weekly 40p

**7 DAYS**

OUTLOOK

MAGAZINE

## A Breath of Fresh Air

IN NEWSAGENTS  
SEPTEMBER 15TH

Independent film funding problems  
Victoria Wood interview  
The trade press  
PR - just an illusion!  
Police vs acid house  
Joan Ruddock interview  
Philippines peasants under attack  
TV evangelism

**CAMPAIGN FOR PRESS & BROADCASTING FREEDOM**  
 incorporating the Campaign Against Racism in the Media & the Television Users Group

Office Tel: 01 437 2795 (24 hours)

**NATIONAL COMMITTEE 1989/90**

**CHAIR - TONY LENNON**  
**DEPUTIES - KATHY DARBY & TERESA STRATFORD**  
**TREASURER - JOHN BECK**  
**PLUS - ALF PARISH, BEN STAINES**  
**JON LATHAM, GAIL CHESTER, STEVE GRAY, JULIAN PETLEY, YOSHI BAL, JOHN MITCHELL, CAROL BEMANT, ANDY FREEDMAN, TESSA PALFREYMAN, SUE JOHNSTON, MIKE JEMPSON, WENDY MOORE, LIONEL MORRISON, SIMON COLLINGS, PAT INGRAM, OWEN GUERIN, EVELYN REID, JAKE ECCLESTONE, ANN POINTON, BRUCE HANLIN, GILES OAKLEY, BILL FREEMAN, SUE HARRIS**

**IRELAND - THE RIGHT TO KNOW FESTIVAL**

13 October to 2 November, at South London Art Gallery, 65 Peckham Rd, and other venues, Art Exhibitions, Film and Video Screenings, Public Meeting on Censorship, and Workshops. Check *City Limits* for details, or phone Southwark Arts (01) 703-3499.

**NORTH WEST MEETING**

'News and Blues - the police and the media', Cornerhouse, Manchester, 8.00 pm, 16 November. Speakers include: Gerry Northam, author of *Shooting in the Dark* and editor of BBC File on Four, David Murphy author of *The Silent Watchdog*

**YOUR DAILY DOSE: Your daily dose: RACISM AND THE SUN**

By Chris Searle

*The Sun's racism examined, analysed and exposed. Detailed indictment of the way concentration of ownership debases media standards*  
 Published by CPBF, £5.00



and the forthcoming *The Stalker Affair and the Press*, and Brian Hilliard, editor of *Police Review*. The meeting will be chaired by Gabrielle Cox, ex-chair Manchester Police Authority.

Admission £1.50 & £1.00 concessions. Further details from North West CPBF, 244 Corn Exchange Building, Hanging Ditch, Manchester M4 3BQ

**10TH ANIVERSARY POSTCARD**



Available from North West CPBF or the national office in London. Price 30p or 4 for £1.00.

**YORKS AND HUMBERSIDE NEWS**

The new media guide for Yorks and Humberside is now published. *Reaching the Media*, with cartoons by Paul Morton, is available from: Yorks and Humberside CPBF, 24 Tower Avenue, Upton, near Pontefract, West Yorks WF9 1EE. Price £1.80 (inc. p&p)

A joint event with Leeds International Film Festival has been organised for 25 October, 7.30 pm at The Art Company, near Leeds Station. Guest speakers at the event entitled - 'A Risky Business: TV and investigative journalism' - include James Cutler, YTV's *First Tuesday* and Steve Dorril of *Lobster*. Admission £1.00.

Edited for the National Committee by SIMON COLLINGS. Copy for *Free Press* 56 should arrive at the office by 15 November 1989.

**JOIN CPBF HERE**

PLEASE TICK APPROPRIATE BOX

- a) Individual Membership £10 p.a.
- b) Unwaged £2 p.a.
- c) Household (2 copies of FREE PRESS) £15 p.a.
- d) Supporting membership £20 p.a.   
 (includes FREE CPBF publications)
- e) Institutional membership £20 p.a.   
 (includes 10 copies of FREE PRESS, plus FREE CPBF publications)

**Affiliation by organisation**

- f) Less than 500 members £15 p.a.
- g) 500 to 1,000 members £20 p.a.
- h) 1,000 to 10,000 members £40 p.a.
- i) 10,000 to 50,000 members £95 p.a.
- j) 50,000 to 100,000 members £185 p.a.
- k) Over 100,000 members £375 p.a.

I/We want to join the Campaign for Press and Broadcasting Freedom and enclose a cheque/PO for £

Name/s: .....

FILL IN Organisation (if applicable): .....

& SEND OFF Secretary (if different from above): .....

TO CPBF, Address: .....

9, Poland Street ..... Postcode: ..... Tel: .....

London W1V 3DG Where did you obtain your copy of FREE PRESS? .....