

Blame not the mobile phone, 'twas ever thus

Mike Jempson and Wayne Powell look back on decades of questionable behaviour in the national press

Revelations to the Leveson Inquiry into press culture, practice and ethics will have come as no surprise to anyone who has taken an interest in press standards since World War II. There have been periodic outbreaks of concern about press intrusion and sensationalism and demands for statutory controls, none of which have had much impact in terms of curtailing press excesses. Public revulsion over the hacking of a murder victim's phone may have brought things to a head, and while there remain many untold stories about the harm done by intrusive, inaccurate or sensational press coverage, much of what is being said to the inquiry has been said before, and to little avail.

In his memoirs (Brown 1995) Fleet Street investigative reporter Gerry Brown who worked for News International and Mirror Group titles, claimed to have invented what he called 'tabloid-techno' using the latest technology to obtain sound and images. He explained that a scanner costing a few hundred pounds could home in on selected mobile phones, and with a 'Celltracker' - a mobile phone linked to a laptop - it was possible to lock on to signals and even make calls from the numbers under surveillance.

He cited the audio tapes of Princess Diana complaining to her lover James Gilbert about a previous lover James Hewitt, allegedly scanned by a retired bank manager,

and by another Oxfordshire resident, and supplied to *The Sun* in 1990. At the time David Calcutt QC was conducting an investigation into press invasions of privacy (Calcutt 1990), and the ‘Squidgygate’ tapes were not published for another two years (*The Sun*, 23 August 1992). Shortly afterwards an erotic conversation between Prince Charles and his then lover Camilla Parker-Bowles was similarly intercepted. First published by *New Idea* one of Rupert Murdoch’s Australian magazines, his UK titles quickly followed suit, days after the now Sir David Calcutt had proposed statutory controls in a government sponsored review (Calcutt 1993).of the effectiveness of the Press Complaints Commission (PCC).

Although some doubts arose about whether the tapes were direct recordings or if the scanners had picked up deliberately rebroadcast recordings, the Press Complaints Commission (PCC, 27 Jan 1993) was adamant: ‘Bugging of private telephone calls is manifestly an invasion of privacy, no matter who does it. As such, it is contrary to the industry’s code and the commission deplore the publication of the so-called Camillagate tapes. We recognise, however, that unethically and illegally obtained material may still be published abroad and republished in Britain.’

Rejecting the Calcutt proposals, the PCC nonetheless admitted “exceptional circumstances may arise which would justify the publication. For these reasons we think it is essential that there should be legislation defining the boundaries of the law.”

The incident highlighted the apparent contempt with which Murdoch’s newspapers in particular held any attempt by the British establishment to curtail the activities of the press. Brown also hinted at more sinister practices. He claimed that Robert Maxwell bugged his own staff and kept under lock and key the names and pictures of two

senior Tory MPs who made use of the services of a Wigmore Street massage parlour but was happy to publish stories about the visits of showbiz celebrities and Major Tom Ferguson, father of the Duchess of York.

The careers of several prominent members of the Conservative administration had been targeted by the press during the 'Calcutt years' notably Secretary of State for National Heritage David Mellor who had warned that the press were "drinking in last chance saloon". He resigned after several scandalous revelations about him were published. The sexual antics of Environment minister Tim Yeo and former Transport Minister Steven Norris were exposed soon after Calcutt's call for statutory regulation. In 1994 two parliamentary private secretaries Hartley Booth and David Ashby, Transport Minister the Earl of Caithness and Tory whip Michael Brown were forced out of office.

However concerns about the power of the press had given cause for concern long before these latter day press barons held sway. A National Union of Journalists (NUJ) campaign for an investigation into how commercial pressures were driving news values once newspapers had been freed from wartime censorship and shortages of paper and ink, brought into being the first Royal Commission on the Press of 1947.

The industry was slow to agree to its main proposal, the creation of a self-regulatory General Council of the Press (GCP) until statutory controls were imposed in the form of the Defamation Act 1952. Criticism about inaccurate or intrusive stories, mostly featuring Establishment figures and foreign dignitaries, had been largely ignored by the industry until tougher libel laws provided a wake up call. The GCP was set up in

1953. Following a second Royal Commission (1962) it would become the Press Council (PC), but in general the industry displayed a marked reluctance to comply with the recommendations of three separate Royal Commissions (the third came in 1974). This may have been a signal to indicate a desire to remain independent of outside influences, but it was also seen as evidence that proprietors and some editors saw their papers as a law unto themselves. It is an interpretation that has held good to this day.

The Press Council's first Declaration of Principle, in 1966, was that 'no payment should be made for feature articles to persons engaged in crime or other notorious behaviour where the public interests does not warrant it'. As veteran journalist Tom Bairstow recalls (Bairstow, 1984) this followed the discovery that a key prosecution witness in the Moors' Murder trial of Myra Hindley and Ian Brady had received payments from the press for information. Yet a decade later the *Daily Telegraph* was criticised for offering to double its fee for the memoirs of former Liberal MP Peter Bessell if Liberal party leader Jeremy Thorpe was found guilty of conspiracy to murder. Bessel was a prosecution witness at the 1979 trial.

Four years after that the PC found the *Daily Express*, *The Sun*, *The Daily Star*, *The People*, the *Mail on Sunday* and the *Daily Mail* guilty of 'gross misconduct' for making payments to members of the family of Peter Sutcliffe, the 'Yorkshire Ripper'. The PC had compiled a massive dossier of press misbehaviour, accusing newspapers of 'callous harassment' of relatives of his victims to whom offers of 'blood money' had been made. The *Mail's* then editor, recently knighted Sir David English who had refused to attend a hearing before the Press Council, claimed an offer of £90,000 to

Sutcliffe's wife Sonja had just been a ploy to get her to talk. His paper had also tried to buy the story of a prostitute whom Sutcliffe was with at the time of his arrest, and the *Mail on Sunday* had done a deal with the Chief Constable of Yorkshire to publish his 'Ripper File' when he retired.

Sir David's response to the Council's ruling was robust: "This a most unfortunate decision by a body that should be devoting itself to protecting the freedom of the press. Newspapers, for all their faults, are guardians of the public interest," he said dismissing the adjudication as "short-term, short-sighted and smug (proving) yet again that the Press Council does not truly understand the concept of a free press."

Almost thirty years later the journalism ethics charity PressWise (now MediaWise) had to alert the Press Complaints Commission (PCC) Chair that potential witnesses and relatives of victims in the Fred and Rose West murder trial were being similarly harassed and offered money for their stories. Despite Lord Wakeham then warning all newspaper editors of the risks, at the subsequent trial of Rose West no fewer than 19 people admitted to being party to financial deals with national papers.

Around this time the *Daily Mail* and the *Daily Mirror* were criticised, respectively, for paying £300,000 for extracts from a book by gaoled Barings' rogue trader Nick Leeson and for offering cash to convicted fraudster Darius Guppy. By now Sir David English had become Chairman and Editor-in-chief of Associated Newspapers, and Chair of the Press Board of Finance (PressBof) Editors' Code Committee. On the morning he was called to account before the National Heritage Select Committee (27 November 1996), Sir David announced a change to the Editors' Code outlawing such

payments. However, he neglected to mention he had been one of the editors at fault when he dismissed this PC's earlier condemnation of the practice as "some grandiose announcement ... around the time of the Ripper trial".

The 'particularly unwarranted intrusion' into the lives of Sonja Sutcliffe and the mother of his last victim' also flew in the face of another Press Council Declaration of Principle, on privacy. In 1976 it had insisted that 'the publication of information about the private life of individuals without their consent is only acceptable if there is a legitimate public interest over-riding the right of privacy, not merely a prurient or morbid curiosity.' Demonstrably this had had as little impact then as the new PCC would have when it replaced the PC in 1991. It was the industry's response to a fresh threat of statutory regulation following David Calcutt QC's investigation of press breaches of privacy. (Calcutt 1990).

During the 1980s the excesses of the press had given rise to three, unsuccessful, Right of Reply Bills, sponsored by Labour MPs Frank Allaun, Ann Clwyd, and Tony Worthington) and a Privacy Bill tabled by Tory MP John Browne. All were unsuccessful but were indicative of growing public concern. Tabloid coverage had also claimed the life of talented young actor David Scarboro (*Grange Hill, East Enders*). He leapt to his death from Beachy Head in 1988 after the *News of the World* published a picture of the psychiatric hospital in which he was receiving treatment. He had been hounded by the tabloids over many months and begun libel actions against several for inaccurate and intrusive stories. After his suicide his parents left the UK in disgust. His brother Simon presented a moving account of his mistreatment by the press in a documentary (BBC 1988).

The mother of the 'Worst brat in Britain' (*The Sun*, July 1989), also quit the UK after failing in her initial efforts to obtain redress for a series of hurtful and inaccurate stories about her son whose behavioural problems had been caused by childhood illness. In 1991 he became the first child in the UK to win a libel action.

The ineffectiveness of the Press Council had been most clearly demonstrated by its response to complaints that *The Sun* had fabricated an interview with the widow of a Falklands' War hero in 1982. The *Daily Mirror* (22 Oct 1982) accused its rival of publishing deliberate lies, and Maria McKay told *The Observer* she had never spoken to *The Sun*. The PC didn't contact her directly and dismissed this evidence as hearsay. (Robertson pp54-57, 1983)

There was further public outrage in 1990 when it became clear that a *Sunday Sport* journalist had sneaked into the hospital where popular sit-com actor Gordon Kaye was recovering from brain surgery after a serious car accident, taken photographs and claimed to have interviewed him. To add insult to injury Kaye failed to win his court action for invasion of privacy.

Evidence of the radical reform the PC went through under the chairmanship of Louis Blom Cooper QC who would later chair the journalism ethics charity MediaWise <www.mediawise.org.uk>, was its final act. It published an excoriating critique of coverage of the Strangeways prison riots of April 2000, when the press had fallen

“into the serious ethical error of presenting speculation and unconfirmed reports as fact”.(Blom-Cooper 1991)

Newspapers had claimed that up to 20 prisoners had been murdered and others tortured or castrated during a stand-off that lasted for weeks. One *Daily Mirror* front page announced ‘Prison Mob ‘Hang Cop’ (3 April 2000). The PC report made clear that “many of the more gruesome events report in the press had not occurred – nobody had been systematically mutilated, there had been no castrations, no bodies had been chopped up and flushed in the sewers. Though there was inter-prisoner violence in the first hours of the riot, torture on the scale suggested by many of the early reports did not take place.”

This was an era when television in particular began to keep a watchful eye on such excesses, with programmes such ‘Hard News’ or ‘Right of Reply’ holding journalists to account. ‘Hard News’ went on air in April 1989 and won it a Royal Television Society award for its rigorous investigations into the truth behind intrusive and sensational headlines in the press.

Its presenter, journalist Raymond Snoddy, would later write a challenging book about press standards and regulation (Snoddy, 1992). Its point was “a very simple one,” he wrote. “It is that all journalists, broadsheet no less than tabloid, have got to make the time to get off the treadmill of deadlines to think a little more about what they do, the

effect it can have on their fellow citizens and the impact their work is having on the reputation of the press.’

Snoddy’s first two examples contrasted the resources of a media-savvy government minister MP Peter Bottomley MP with those of a man devastated by the loss of his wife and two children in an accident in Greece. Both had received rough treatment by the press - Bottomley by the *Mail on Sunday* (Minister in Sex Case Row, 21 May 1989), Tom Evans by the *Daily Mirror* (9 Aug 1989) which had distressingly misrepresented an interview he gave to an agency reporter while visiting his one surviving daughter in hospital. Evans eventually won an apology and was sent a cheque for £100 by way of compensation. Bottomley received substantial undisclosed damages in an out-of-court settlement, but no apology. It was a telling example of the inequities in the relationship between the press and its readers, whether well-connected or not.

His book came out as a second Calcutt enquiry got underway questioning whether the two year old PCC was sufficiently effective to preclude the necessity of statutory intervention. Meanwhile Labour MP Clive Soley was making parliamentary history by setting up an all-party committee to hear evidence for and against his proposal for an Independent Press Authority to investigate complaints and defend press freedom. Soley’s Freedom and Responsibility of the Press Bill did not make it onto the statute book but the essential idea is among these that have resurfaced for consideration by Lord Leveson.

During the Soley hearings MPs heard traumatic stories of lives being ripped apart by unthinking, inaccurate or intrusive stories (Jempson, 1993), again highlighting the

unequal battle ordinary people face when trying to set the record straight. Former royal maid Linda Townley and her brother spoke of the stress they had endured when she had been falsely accused (by the now defunct *Today*) of stealing love letters from Princess Anne, and how they had been pursued by the press pack even after she had cleared her name. A young couple told of the upset caused when the *Daily Mirror* misrepresented research findings giving them false hopes that their child might be cured of a debilitating illness. One witness, a journalist from Northern Ireland, had to give his evidence *in camera* because inaccurate reports in a 'quality newspaper' that he was part of an alleged ANC/IRA plot to assassinate Margaret Thatcher had put his life in danger,

Having documented the Hillsborough football stadium tragedy in 1989 when 96 people lost their lives tragedy (Scruton, Jemphrey Coleman, 1995) criminologist Professor Phil Scruton told the Soley hearings about a journalist whose request for a photograph of a child killed at the stadium had been refused by the parents. He then went to the grandmother and told her he had a picture of the child dead but would prefer to use one of the boy alive. Both images were then published as 'before' and 'after' pictures. It was one example of a lengthy catalogue of insensitive, inaccurate and sensational stories. some newspapers carried pictures of the dead and dying crushed against fencing. After *The Sun* claimed that Liverpool fans had urinated on the dying crowds, it saw its readership in Liverpool drop by up to 40% as the public responded to its crass and hurtful coverage.

During the hearings, Quentin Davies MP asked Keith Parker of the Guild of British Newspaper Editors about "the great sensational stories of 1992 the bugging of (government minister) Mellor's telephone conversations, the theft of the lawyer's

letter relating to (the then Lib Dem leader Paddy) Ashdown's private life, and the purloining of photographs and the bugging of telephone conversations allegedly held by members of the Royal Family."

Were the methods used to obtain information for these stories "illegitimate?" he wanted to know. "Yes" replied Parker, although he could not be certain "that newspapers themselves were necessarily engaged in the activities". Pressed on the point that newspapers "had rewarded financially those who were engaged in these illegitimate activities" Parker admitted that this "could indeed be said to be an excess". (Jempson 1993)

It was such 'excesses' that had given rise to the earlier the first Calcutt Report which in turn noted that "Similar concerns were examined by the (Younger) Committee on Privacy ... which reported in July 1972". Sir David Calcutt's review of self-regulation appeared just after the Soley hearings and was withering in its disdain for the Press Complaints Commission. "Nothing that I have learnt about the press has led me to conclude that the press would now be willing to make, or would in fact make, the changes which would be needed," he wrote. "I do not doubt that the commission commands the confidence of the industry, but it cannot, in my view, command the confidence of the public. The pressing social need which has to be addressed is protection against unjustifiable infringements by the press.' He wanted it replaced by a statutory tribunal, operating to a tough code and with power to impose fines, and initiate investigations, not unlike one of the proposals placed before Lord Leveson by the Co-ordinating Committee for Media Reform, a group of academics and media activists.

As if to demonstrate disdain for their critics no journalists turned up at the public meeting Clive Soley organised in the Grand Committee Room at Westminster to which he had invited the national press along with some 70 people who wanted to explain how they had been hurt and how things might be improved. Annoyed by what they saw as the arrogance or lack of comprehension among editors and journalists, the 'victims of media abuse' who did turn up, spoke of the sense of isolation and powerlessness they overcame when the inaccurate or intrusive stories were published. They recorded their displeasure at the non-appearance of the press by resolving to set up an organisation that would provide advice and support for complainants and challenge the media.

Since then PressWise (which changed its name to MediaWise in 1995) has handled thousands of enquiries from individuals and groups about mistreatment by the press.

They have included black and minority ethnic groups, gypsies and travellers, mental health service users, gays lesbians and transgender groups, single parents, surrogate mothers, young people, people with disabilities, asylum-seekers and refugees, victims of crime and families of prisoners. In short some of the most vulnerable groups in society have found that the popular press are more often their adversary rather than their friend.

The tabloids turned Essene Rabbi Desiree Ntolo into a figure of fun, then derision. A former teacher from Cameroon she had built an oratory from mud in her back garden, only to be told by Redbridge Council that it required planning consent. Persuaded that

publicity would help her cause she spoke to *The Sun* (Nice Hut With All Mud Cons'), *The Daily Star* (Des Res is a Mud Hut in Dagenham) and the *Daily Mail* (Out in Dagenham). All these stories appeared on the same day (25 June 1992) but it was to be the start of a media assault on her dignity that lasted for months. One reporter she found climbing over her wall offered her money if he could pretend to have stayed in the building over night, but when she told a *Daily Star* reporter he should pay for wasting her time his paper ran with 'Mud Hut Mum Begs For Cash'.

All of the stories misrepresented her, and none of the nationals recorded that that she later won her court battle with the council - but only after the oratory had been demolished. One of the most damaging examples of bad journalism came in an appalling piece by columnist Barbara Amiel (*The Sunday Times* 26 Mar 1993). Relying entirely on inaccurate information culled from cuttings she vilified Ms Ntolo, whom she didn't realise was a fellow Jew. Using highly pejorative language, she attacked 'the madness of immigration without integration' under the headline 'Here's Mud in Your Multicultural Eye' and suggested that the mother of six should leave England. The family received racist hate mail and death threats and her 12 year old son was attacked at school. She did not know about the PCC and never received redress for her ill-treatment, survived to write her own story (Ntolo & Cohen 1994) and to help found PressWise.

Her story was one of many that highlighted the practice of cheque-book journalism. Trading in stories has long been lucrative and journalist Christopher Browne claimed (Browne p.55 1996) that in 1994 *The Sun* alone was paying its agency and freelance journalists £8,million for stories and tips. Then an ex-directory phone number was

worth £100, and informants included police officers, chauffeurs, taxi drivers, airport staff, bar staff and hairdressers. And if sufficient leads had not come in as deadlines approached at the *Sunday Sport* and *Daily Sport*, he claimed 'the news editor sometime instructs six or seven reporters to go into a private room for the afternoon and concoct stories zany and outrageous enough to titillate their readers'.

The tabloids and so-called human interest magazines have been openly offering inducements for years. The lure of easy cash has persuaded many to sell tittle-tattle as well as hard factual information.

Editors have often claimed that it is greed which fuels the trade. There was distressing evidence of this at the trial of two juveniles accused of the murder of 10 year old Damilola Taylor in 2002. The key prosecution witness, a 14 year old girl, demanded the £50,000 offered by a national newspaper to give evidence of what she had seen.

But it is the newspapers that offer the lure, produce questionable contracts to obtain exclusive access and leave notes offering blank cheques for people's stories, Those despised for 'kissing and selling' are often turn out to have been victims themselves. MediaWise has heard time after time from young women who have effectively been blackmailed into giving 'their side of the story' or risk sensational exposure with no means redress after a third party had tipped off the press about their encounters with married or just famous people.

MediaWise dealt with the case of a young woman who hoped to pay off her student debts by selling information about her encounter with a convicted rapist. Isolated with

a friend in a London hotel by a tabloid her photo was taken before a lengthy 'debrief' ensued. When she objected to posing on a bed in her underwear, the newspaper reneged on the agreed payment on the grounds that the story did not meet the terms of the entirely self-serving contract it had drafted.

In another case a hard-up young couple who were offered money to strip for a visiting sheikh in his London hotel room found themselves at the centre of an elaborate trap set by the *News of the World's* Mahzer Mahmood. The paper was trying to expose a solicitor whom it believed was running a sexual services scheme from his workplace. The couple were repaid with drinks and handed drugs for the sheikh before being taken to his room in the Savoy. But the paper named the wrong law firm and had to publish a fulsome apology the following week and pay damages.

Meanwhile the young couple were ostracised by their family at a time when the woman's mother was dying in hospital. Although they had committed no crime they received no apology and did even receive the promised fee.

The PCC has always seemed strangely reluctant to investigate the methods used to obtain stories, perhaps relying too heavily upon assurances from editors that their staff would never misbehave in such wise. Often MediaWise has had calls from people besieged in their homes by 'media scrums'. They are always advised to try and keep their cool, since displays of fear - driving away at speed- or anger - threatening or actually striking out at photographers or reporters provide the new angle to the pack are waiting to seize upon.

One teacher, who had in earlier days worked for an escort agency, described how a reporter had marched around her house calling out “Come on out, we know you’re in there. We know you were a whore.” This was, of course, denied by the newspaper.

A single parent who had left the police force after winning compensation three years earlier for what the *Daily Mail* had described as ‘a sustained campaign of harassment (by police colleagues) which undermined not only her professional confidence but also her health’, was horrified to discover that two people had been peering into her house and asking questions of her neighbours. She had moved home for her own protection. The following week the *Daily Mail* identified its location and described her home as ‘tastefully decorated with old-style farm furniture and expensive ornaments’.

Although the *Mail* had earlier opined ‘She had every justification for taking her case to an industrial tribunal ... which she had deservedly won,’ like other papers it had always quoted a sum concocted by journalists after the hearing. Constrained by the terms of her settlement from revealing details of the award the woman felt helpless to challenge the frequent repetition of this exaggerated figure, which was now being used by the *Mail* along with some of the sexist jibes she had endured, as part of its campaign against ‘the compensation culture’. The PCC wanted evidence that the incident had affected her health, and the *Mail* claimed ‘The public interest is plain’ in justification of its repeated references to her.

Other complainants had also been asked to reveal medical or even police records to the PCC with no guarantee that they would not be seen by the newspapers which had

made inaccurate or intrusive claims. Some even suggested that the PCC was being used as a backdoor means of confirming what was only suspected, or of legitimising information which had been illicitly obtained.

Another woman called MediaWise from her bedroom where she had taken refuge after being told by a neighbour that two men were skulking around her isolated house, and peering through her downstairs windows. She had earlier refused to talk to a reporter and photographer from the *Daily Mail*. MediaWise called the news desk to insist that the men be called off, Despite denials of their presence they withdrew shortly afterwards. This woman, who had been trying to expose sharp practices by a mortgage company, and had become terrified when she realised that someone was accessing her telephone records illicitly. This was before mobile phones had become ubiquitous. She had been hounded by a man claiming to be a journalist but whom she suspected of being a private investigator. Years later the revelations of the Information Commissioner (Thomas 2006) confirmed what so many MediaWise clients had always suspected, that newspapers routinely hired investigators to collect data which staff could not readily access.

Their other sources are the news agencies and freelances who provide an ever more essential information gathering service as the number of staff journalists has reduced over the years. Their earning capacity depend upon adding value to stories which may arise from court cases or local news outlets, and to provide local background for national stories. This is one of the significant structural issues, along with 'citizen journalism', blogging and Twitter which will continue to have an impact upon newsgathering techniques and media standards.

Two European Commission funded projects are currently investigating what all this might mean in terms of both policy and practice (<www.mediaact.eu> and <<http://www.mediadem.eliamep.gr/>>). The new PCC Chair Lord Hunt already believes he has got the measure of the task in his reform proposals to persuade bloggers to register and adopt a standards 'kitemark'. However it remains one of the greatest challenges both to regulators and to the Leveson Inquiry.

Hackgate and the forensic investigation of stories and information gathering techniques that the inquiry has brought on, may have opened up UK journalism to unfamiliar scrutiny but that will do little to resolve the problem of unethical behaviour when the pressure for stories that will sell is more likely to increase than decrease if newspapers and magazines are to survive. All of the cases quoted here occurred long before the *News of the World* royal editor Clive Goodman was jailed for using phone intercepts. Opportunities to gain private information about people have since increased exponentially as access to the internet has spread and social networks have encouraged the sharing of intimacies.

Three months after the Scottish *Sunday Express* published its disgraceful 'Anniversary Shame of Dunblane Survivors' (8 March 2009), the PCC announced that the paper had made a "serious error of judgement", since the young people whose Facebook pages had been trawled for evidence of their life styles "were not public figures in any meaningful sense, and ... had done nothing to warrant media scrutiny". By then the paper had already removed the offending article from its website and

published an apology, in response to an online petition which attracted 11,186 signatures.

It may well be that in future those subjected to unwarranted harassment by the media will begin to more effectively use the internet to set the record straight, or get their own back, as an alternative to approaching the regulator. When Bob and Sue Firth exacted revenge on News of the World reporter Neville Thurlbeck by posting on the internet a video of him in the nude and evidently not ‘making his excuses and leaving’ while visiting their naturist bed and breakfast in 1998. His employers were quick to shut down the site and visited the couple to find out how best to resolve matters. The Scientologists tried a similar technique by filming John Sweeney while he put together a Panorama programme about them. Ahead of the BBC broadcast in May 2007 they posted on YouTube a sequence of him losing his cool. It is unlikely that many others will emulate this approach to keeping journalism in order, but such examples and the evidence assembled by Leveson serve as a warning that the ‘good old bad old days’ are over.

The journalism of the future will not be in the hands of a select band of hacks who consider themselves the gatekeepers of public taste and morals, free to operate as they please. It will be subject to constant scrutiny and open to a far wider range of participants – and best of all it should be fertile ground for high quality investigative reporting which recognises people rights, considers consequences, and expects public servants and power elites to operate as ethically as the media professionals will now be expected to behave.

Mike Jempson was a co-founder of PressWise (now MediaWise <www.mediawise.org.uk) and is now its Honorary Director. He has some 40 years experience as a journalist in newspapers, radio, TV, public relations and in parliament. He has devised and delivered training programmes in more than 45 countries, working with UN agencies, the International Federation of Journalists, Media Diversity Institute, IREX, the OSCE and the British Council. He has been Visiting Professor in Media Ethics at the University of Lincoln (UK) since 2006, and a Senior Lecturer in Journalism at the University of the West of England since 2007. He is Vice Chair of the NUJ Ethics Committee, the longest serving member of the Campaign for Press & Broadcasting Freedom, and is leading the UK end of an international research project on media accountability systems <www.mediaact.eu>.

- **Wayne Powell MA** is history graduate from the university of the West of England has been handling administrative and research duties MediaWise for almost a decade. He is a Research Assistant on the 11 nation EU-funded Media Accountability and Transparency Project <www.mediaact.eu> on which UWE is leading for the UK.

Books & Reports

- Bairstow, Tom (1984) *Fourth Rate Estate*, London, Comedia
- Blom-Cooper, Louis (1991) *Press at the prison gates: report of the inquiry by the Press Council into press coverage of the Strangeways Prison riot and related matters* London, The Press Council 1991
- Brown, Gerry (1995) *Exposed! Sensational true story of Fleet Street reporter* London Virgin Books
- Browne, Christopher (1996) *The Prying Game: The sex, sleaze and scandals of Fleet Street and the media mafia* London, Robson Books
- Calcutt QC, David (1990) *Report of the Committee on Privacy and Related Matters*, Home Office, London HMSO Cm 1102, ISBN 0 10 111022 7
- Calcutt QC, Sir David (1993) *Review of Press Self-Regulation* London HMSO Cm 2135
- Chippindale, Peter & Horrie, Chris (1992), *Stick it up your Punter; the rise and fall of the Sun* London, Mandarin
- Cookson, Richard & Jempson, Mike (2004) *Satisfaction Guaranteed? Press complaints systems under scrutiny* Bristol, MediaWise
- Cookson, Richard & Jempson, Mike (2005) *The RAM Report: Campaigning for fair and accurate coverage of refugees and asylum seekers* Bristol, MediaWise:
- Hooper, David *Public Scandal, Odium and Contempt* Coronet 1986
- Jempson, Mike (1993) *Freedom and Responsibility of the Press: Report of special parliamentary hearings* Bristol, Crantock
- Ntolo, Desiree & Cohen, Phil (1994) *The Sacred and the Profane* London, UEL/NEU ISBN 1 874210 35 7

- Robertson, Geoffrey (1983) *People Against the Press: An Enquiry into the Press Council* London, Quartet
- Scraton, Phil, Jemphrey, Ann, Coleman Sheila (1995) *No Last Rights: The denial of justice and the promotion of myth in the aftermath of the Hillsborough disaster* Liverpool City Council
- Snoddy, Raymond (1993) *The Good, the Bad and the Unacceptable: The hard news about the British Press* London, Faber & Faber
- Thomas, Richard (2006) *What price privacy? and 'What price privacy now?'* London, HMSO
- Younger, Sir Kenneth (1992) *Report of the Committee on Privacy*, HMSO, Cmd 5012

Chapter

- Jempson, Mike *And the consequence was...* Berry, David (2000) *Ethics and Media Culture: Practices and representations* Oxford, Focal Press, pp.278-296

Website references

- My Brother, David can be seen at
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QBnCNlWS88Q&feature=player_embedded

Accessed 13 Dec 2011-12-14

- Among the many website offering to buy or sell stories, accessed on 15 Dec 2011:

www.featureworld.co.uk/sellyourstory.html

www.cashforstories.com

www.cash4yourstory.co.uk/

www.famousfeatures.co.uk/sell_story

www.featureworld.co.uk/sellyourstory.html

www.firstfeatures.co.uk/

www.frontpageagency.co.uk/SellStories

www.mirror.co.uk/sell-your-story/

www.moneyforyourstory.com

www.nationalstoriyseller.co.uk/

www.photo-features.co.uk

www.sell-my-story.co.uk

www.sellyourstorynow.co.uk/

www.sellusyourstory.com/

www.takeabreak.co.uk/send-us-your-story

www.talktothepress.co.uk

www.thesun.co.uk/.../sell_your_story/

www.takeabreak.co.uk/send-us-your-story

- Henke, David (accessed 15 Dec 2011)

<http://www.exarone.com/articles/4198/hunt-plans-to-replace-pcc-with-new-press-regulator>

- John Sweeney loses it (accessed 16 Dec 2011)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hxqR5NPhtLI>