

**Magazine Publishing and Web Site design
not bastardized production and Politically Expedient Content.**

Distribution Proviso

The author and publisher has restricted access to this series of articles to National Union of Journalists (NUJ) and International Federation of Journalists (IFJ) members (also named parties) pending investigation of alleged criminal activity and legal action under: Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992; Solicitors' Code of Conduct 2007; Solicitors Act 1974; Administration of Justice Act 1985; Courts and Legal Services Act 1990; Fraud Act 2006; Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006; Vienna Convention on Consular Relations; and, Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

This proviso in no way restricts NUJ and IFJ members from releasing excerpts (with accreditation) to interested third parties including news media. Separate exposés cover unethical and illegal activities by London Freelance Branch officials in a consort with National Executive Council officers.

Independent investigation by law enforcement agencies involves an alleged pattern or practice of joint and several illegal or criminal activities by: National Union of Journalists (NUJ) executives, lawyers, and staff; National Executive Council (NEC) officers; and, London Freelance Branch (LFB) officials.

The author has little personal knowledge of other branches and chapels which do not form part of intended civil and criminal complaints; therefore, he has no opinion on their activities. Adverse comments, all verified and validated to insure accurate reporting, meet legal requirements.

Principles

The author sent a prepublication advisory to all candidates for Editor, *Journalist Magazine* that personal information about them could appear in an upcoming issue of *Contra Cabal*. He gave them notice following the international codes of ethics agreed among journalists. Several of those codes, tested in international courts, have legal precedent.

The notice informed regional chairmen and the eight candidates for Editor of current circumstances and gave them an opportunity to meet with the author. Some candidates accepted that offer. The notice gave candidates a chance to respond to charges that could affect their ethical or moral character. For public accountability, the author encouraged recipients to respond in open exchange. He informed them that he did not solicit personal opinions and that any response should address matters of fact only.

The author informed candidates that he does not report issues arbitrarily and no person receives immunity from investigation. He also informed them that individuals whom the author may personally respect receive no favors. In fact, he advised them that anything published results from investigation, verification, and validation taking into account violations of law or breach of established rules and ethical practices.

Advisory

A legacy awaits whoever wins the election for Editor, *Journalist* magazine. It includes both civil and criminal charges also a petition for a public inquiry. Arguably, it could make the successful candidate liable as an accessory after the fact if, as Editor, that person does not immediately mitigate the illegal circumstances that Jeremy Dear and Timothy R Gopsill have either caused or neglected to address.

Both Dear and Gopsill have operated an illegal prior restraint using a media blackout for nine years. A Washington Supreme Court unanimous decision by nine judges (30 Mar 06) found no wrongdoing; however, Dear and Gopsill ignored that decision to continue their prior restraint and to launch a smear campaign.

They have willfully used derogatory language to evade a responsibility to investigate complaints exhaustively and without bias. The number and frequency of those acts leaves no alternative but to file for criminal investigation of NUJ officials and officers for hate speech and age discrimination against an elderly NUJ member under Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006. The new editor could inherit those problems and become liable for the crimes of the predecessor the issues do not receive immediate mitigation. [\[Agism\]](#) [\[Derogation\]](#) [\[Advisory\]](#)

Comment

Dominic Ponsford, Editor, *Press Gazette*, known as a biased commentator and proponent of illegal prior restraint, attacked a candidate Mark Watts instead of commenting upon his manifesto. Challenged by Watts the leadership has responded with an irrational hysteria which has revealed several motives for the existing sociopathic autocracy which denies freedom of expression that it alone deems heterodox. [\[Press Gazette\]](#)

Watts tends to ingratiate himself by repeatedly referring to his past connection with Dear. By that, he arouses suspicion about his political leanings. Although he lambasts NUJ Left, he shows a propensity to shine up to Dear. That contradiction does not bode well. Claiming affinity with a sociopath does Watts no good when reasonable members consider what he represents before they cast their votes.

Present circumstances do not allow the best person for the job to win. Instead, some NEC members and NUJ officers have attempted to elect an editor with extreme left ideology into a powerful communication position.

Learning on the job has been the problem in the past especially with the online aspects of communication. NUJ staff have for two decades shown an abysmal ignorance of new media and its technology. With high salaries and low performance, administrators have repeatedly misled members. Their expenditures contrast the average income of journalists which have consistently ranked in a low category.

Dominic Ponsford, Editor, *Press Gazette* claimed:

One of the candidates [Watts] in the election for editor of NUJ magazine *The Journalist* has accused a "political faction" called NUJ Left of trying to hijack the union. Each of the candidates

in the election to edit *The Journalist* are allowed an email out to union members. Watts has used his to launch a lengthy diatribe against NUJ Left and against the candidate it has endorsed as *Journalist* editor, Richard Simcox. . . .

[\[Mark Watts: Secrets that NUJ Leadership is Hiding - Election Statement\]](#)

NUJ Left says on its website that its aims include: "Identifying and targeting key elected posts and NEC seats, democratically agreeing slates for elections, and campaigning for NUJ Left candidates, to advance our influence and further develop equality representation on policy-making bodies and through other structures of the union."

That statement ranks as political without consideration for the nature of the editor's job which needs an apolitical candidate conversant with publishing, printing, and editing a trade union journal also designing and maintaining a web site.

An anonymous scribe (who would not normally occupy space here) gets nearer to the mark:

The *Journalist* has survived unscathed? I think not. Whenever I read about a newspaper I know about, the facts are wrong, and the *Journalist* never holds the leadership to account. It's no wonder people are leaving the NUJ in droves, me included, because all we ever see the leaders doing is telling each other what a good job they're doing. Newsflash: Jobs still keep going, and all Jeremy Dear can do is suggest office sit ins. That's how poor the NUJ is - the union leader can only suggest members break the law. Perhaps if *Journalist* had questioned the NUJ leadership, or even actually got its facts right, there would be open debate in the organisation.

Nick Serpell (a normally inconsistent NEC member employed by BBC) wrote a probably true political comment when he alluded to the apathy of NUJ members:

The reason that small, completely unrepresentative groups such as NUJ Left have any sway in the NUJ is because the vast majority of members don't bother to get involved. That's why we have had to put up with nonsense over the last few years such as a move to set up a political fund, boycott Israel and, at a recent NEC, suggest the NUJ should back the recently deposed President of Honduras.

It is the left which is behind the unions affiliation to organisations such as the Stop the War Coalition. Nothing to do with journalism but union time and money is wasted by these people and their political hobby horses.

What is most concerning is the note on the NUJ Left website which says one of their aims is to "ensure senior lay and elected left officials are accountable to NUJ Left". So, if you vote for an NUJ Left supported candidate be assured their first responsibility will not be to you. It will be to a small, unrepresentative and unelected clique. You have been warned.

However, all this political gamesmanship misses the point that NUJ needs an apolitical editor to manage and publish the *Journalist* who will not censor free speech and impose illegal prior restraints as the present editor, Timothy R Gopsill, has done for many years. The job calls for efficient and unbiased publishing not political expediency

The author has never endorsed, and does not intend to start endorsing, candidates. He has more interest in what candidates can do and what they say about genre and magazine production not content. Tim Arnold made a valid observation when he commented on "the appalling quality of material on the [NUJ] website".

As publisher of four of the largest non-profit web sites on the Internet (established 1992 and personally written, designed, programmed, administered, and published); designer of systems

(FotoSpectrum 1977) with word processing, typesetting, and accounting applications utilizing prototype hardware under OEM contracts with Monotype UK and Wang Systems US (a paradigm for desktop publishing); former CEO of a group of communication companies; president of one of the largest printers in US; editor for Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE); and professor of graphic and visual communication; the author can understand Arnold's publishing concerns.

Production of the *Journalist* during the past two decades has been an abysmal failure exacerbated by the switch to online production by Luddites. Apart from the sample edition, the online *Journalist* ranks as totally unusable for any type of research by virtue of its programming. The paranoid access restrictions transgress all publishing ethics. To say that it is a "restricted member only" publication defines as an oxymoron when anyone can access copies at The British Library.

The author spent several years introducing DIN (A4) standards into UK publishing and printing during the early 1960s while consultant to The Modular Society (RIBA). That project not only addressed magazine size but upgraded paper production and printing press sizes to incorporate international criteria into UK publishing. Half a century later, NUJ has arbitrarily bastardized the size of *Journalist* magazine so that it does not fit any standard filing system or computer application which must have considerably increased the production costs.

Apart from the "training and education" site, technical incompetence and ignorance in production have resulted in an impractical web site deliberately slanted for political expedience. The current editor ignores topics that make the administration uncomfortable. Perhaps more disturbing, misrepresentation or withholding of official NUJ minutes to slant their use and denial of access to some web sites, if not illegal, certainly calls for an ethical review.

NUJ does not need a political hack as editor. It needs someone fully versed in printing, publishing and on online production not a journalist who cannot hold a job elsewhere. The campaign for election of a new editor does not state those precepts.

Arnold makes a valid point about party membership. The author has never belonged to a political party. He believes that party affiliation creates a conflict of interest for investigative reporters and editors. In 1960s, when unions were closed shops with compulsory political levies, he opted-out of those programs. Since, he has not paid a political levy and has no intention to affiliate with any particular party.

Candidate Tim Arnold wrote:

As someone who is not aligned with a particular NUJ group, I understand the frustration of fighting against an established political machine. Such organisations clearly place solo candidates such as myself, at a disadvantage.

I have also experienced difficulty in getting answers from Headland House on very fair questions that I have posed; worse, even when I have received assurances from the deputy general secretary, then these guarantees have been ignored by union staff. I think this election has, at the very least, shown fault lines appearing in the NUJ's administration.

. . . we need a high turnout in this election, to make sure the next Editor of the *Journalist* has a mandate for change. And change is certainly necessary, not least on the appalling quality of

material on the website. I don't see how we can claim to act for professional, skilled journalists, if the standard of pod-casts currently is demonstrably poor.

Arnold claims himself the only candidate with the skills to deliver on these pledges to:

Give every sector its own regular magazine in PDF format;

Introduce daily podcasts to improve the website;

Maintain an award-winning print edition of the *Journalist*. [[Arnold Manifesto](#)]

Former NUJ General Secretary John Foster released a statement from his Dorset home saying:

I am backing Tim Arnold because he is the best candidate for the job. I urge all NUJ members to vote for him. He has the right mix of skills from his local newspaper and subsequent broadcasting background to make an immediate improvement to the union's communications from day one – especially its on-line presence, without having to hire expensive consultants.

© Copyright 2009 by Paul Trummel

All Rights Reserved: 29 Oct 09/05:45

Edition: #880-28-03/09-1107-0727

Feedback: Webspinner@ContraCabal.org