

Facts that Jeremy Dear and NUJ Lawyers do not want NUJ Members to know.

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.

Repeated insolent and evasive acts by NUJ officers, officials, and lawyers¹ to members with legitimate complaints have established an illegal pattern or practice of derogation: communication that belittles and deviates or partially takes away the effectiveness of laws or rules. The number and frequency of those acts reveals an organized campaign or pattern or practice which leaves no alternative but to file a request for investigation under Employment Equality (Age) Regulations 2006.

Wrongful use of language evades a responsibility to investigate both current and previous circumstances exhaustively and without bias. A pattern or practice defines as, and manifests in, two or more organized acts or instances which indicate ensuant activity. To establish a pattern, laws generally require at least two acts within a ten year period which indicate ensuant activity and a distinctive pattern.

Stereotyping and prejudice against individuals or groups based upon their age legally defines as agism. The term describes discrimination against seniors patterned after, and equal to, sexism and racism. It evolves from a combination of prejudicial attitudes toward older people and the protocols that govern institutional practices and policies. Agism ranks as the most pervasive form of prejudice currently experienced within the UK.

Case Studies

The officials or officers named in the case studies have not addressed any of the issues. Instead, they have resorted to *ad hominem* in a massive cover-up of alleged criminal activity.

Deranged Threats - Reginald [Tim] Gopsill, Editor, Journalist Magazine

Statement

Gopsill admitted to deliberately enforcing a seven-year media blackout on the imprisonment and torture issues discussed in this series of articles by writing: "I have always avoided reporting them". He then replied to an inquiry concerning articles published in the *Journalist*, particularly articles about Gareth Thomas MP, by writing (17 Oct 08): "I am pleased to receive this . . . not having received any deranged threats from you".

After a protest, he lied (20 Oct 08): "I told you - I have nothing - your name has never appeared in the *Journalist* and neither has that of Gareth Thomas. I am certain I have no material related to you or your activities because I have always avoided reporting them".

Comment

In fact, a search of British Library files revealed an article about Thomas which announced a £262,000/3 years government grant to NUJ. Any investigative mind must question whether Gopsill denied the existence of the article about government funding with ulterior motives. Other articles allege *quid pro quo* among NUJ officers and Gareth Thomas MP, (Harrow West) Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State, Department for International Development: the author's member of parliament.

Arguably, Dear, Gopsill, Mincoff, and Thomas have conspired in a cover-up of dereliction by UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO); record destruction dealing with unlawful imprisonment of the author in US; and, involvement of a bogus HM Consul General; all issues that warrant a public inquiry.

Journalist quotes: Jeremy Dear, General Secretary, as saying that the full cost of employing the editor amounts to £65,000 (actual salary £45,000) and that he last stood for election in 1998. Gopsill's behavior will soon become subject to investigation for orchestrating an unlawful prior restraint by using media blackouts on a member and, as its servicing officer, placing gag orders on NUJ Ethics Council members. Those prior restraints formed an integral part of a conspiracy to defraud a member and to cover up criminal activity related to his imprisonment and Internet denial-of-service attacks on his web sites.

Frivolous and Vexatious - Jeremy Dear, General Secretary, National Union of Journalists

Statement

Dear received (13 Jan 09) a comprehensive request for information about a moronic role-play session to promote the education program funded by the government grant. It noted the lack of academic and adult education qualifications of several lecturers granted teaching commissions. It stated that several of them had refused to furnish copies of their resumes and that no advertisements had offered teaching positions to all members as required by equal opportunity laws.

He replied (03 Feb 09): "I have responded to your complaint about the role play session at London Freelance Branch. I do not believe your email is in accordance with the facts, is erroneous on points of law and the complaint is frivolous, vexatious and entirely unreasonable".

Comment

Legal language without substantiation which comprises an unlawful general denial evidently plagiarized from The Solicitors Little Book of Dirty Tricks by Mincoff then parroted by Dear.

Plain Mad - Jim Humphries, Secretary, London Central Branch, NUJ

Statement

Humphries wrote: . . . quite frankly, I haven't a clue what you're on about. Reading what I can only describe as an incoherent, abusive diatribe, I must conclude that you are just plain mad! I leave it up to you to convince me that you are sane with a legitimate complaint. . . . Perhaps you could couch it in terms of a news story which is immediately accessible to an ordinary reader. Basically, what the hell is all this about?

Comment

Despite encouraging letters from NUJ/IFJ members, Humphries has chosen to send a defamatory message in a similar vein to those received from other officials and officers as part of a campaign of derogation. I write for educated readers and feel sorry that they cannot understand the issues; however, I am considering a cartoon version to assist semiliterate members. They will see from the graphics that Dear should be impeached or jailed for his pathological lying and machination. If that does not help them to understand the issues, then they should consult any eight-year-old for an interpretation.

Contemptuous and Obnoxious

Philip Sutcliffe, London Freelance Branch, National Executive Council

Statement

Philip Sutcliffe received (23 Apr 08) a copy of a "legal opinion" submitted by Roy M Mincoff, NUJ Legal Officer. It classified as no more than an internal memorandum and had no standing in law. Purportedly written in response to a request for legal advice by John Toner (1 Apr 08), it contained a general denial not acceptable by any court (and by extension any committee). If submitted as a legal opinion (or even as a memorandum from a solicitor at a NUJ committee meeting), then the content would definitely construe as prejudicial to the member.

The member rejected the document, a copy of an unsigned "internal memorandum" (11 Apr 08) that bore no NUJ heading and an illegible signature p.p. (per procuracionem or by proxy) by Andrew Dixon, an NUJ employee. Mincoff then denied a request for a properly signed and headed copy which created a legal dilemma.

The member suggested to Sutcliffe that Jeremy Dear, NUJ General Secretary should quash the memorandum as inadmissible and prejudicial because it did not represent the facts and had been prepared contrary to normal rules and procedures for lawyers. He informed Sutcliffe that it would have no standing in law and could only construe as an attempt to evade due process.

Sutcliffe responded: "I think your tone and your approach will lose your argument before you start because it's so hostile, contemptuous, officious, rude and all-round pointlessly obnoxious. So it would set up a situation where you might well enjoy being "right" while losing the argument. . . . I don't believe you are capable of drafting the letter that needs drafting in order to argue your case persuasively in the direction of enabling the union to decide that it can act usefully for you/support you".

Mincoff duplicitously acted as both adversary and advocate at an appeal challenging his professional conduct. The prerogative for providing evidence for the grievance rested with the grievant not with the subject of it; however, Mincoff used the inadmissible "legal opinion" that he had prepared as evidence before an appellate NUJ committee (18 June 08).

Mincoff excluded the member from attending the hearing and acted as his own judge and jury then found himself not guilty. From the minutes, it appears that committee members did not discuss the member's motions. Mincoff then withheld the minutes so that time expired for an appeal to National Executive Council (NEC). Sutcliffe evidently participated in the hearing in direct conflict of interest as both advocate for the member and an interested party. He had previously claimed that he would recuse himself.

Comment

NUJ has conspired to defraud a member by taking dues then not providing services; instead, it has colluded with government to the detriment of a member which warrants a public inquiry into both dereliction by FCO and its US embassy also into government collusion with, and conflict of interest among, NUJ officers.

Sutcliffe's supportive attitude changed to harassment concurrent with his "election" (01 Apr 06) to NUJ National Executive Council as London Freelance Branch representative. The unopposed reelection of Jeremy Dear as general secretary for an additional five-year term (01 Apr 07) allowed them both to act coercively. Those appointments following a government "strategic grant agreement" for £262,000/3 years circa (01 Jan 05).

Gareth Thomas MP negotiated the grant with NUJ to the detriment of his constituent (the NUJ member) to investigate HM Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) regarding his unlawful jailing and torture. This created a conflict of interest when NUJ had a responsibility for ongoing adversarial representation on the same issue.

Subsequent meetings requested by the member with Dear and Thomas ended in dumb insolence by them. Investigation of FCO has not proceeded which leaves the member in danger of incarceration every time he visits US. The subjects of his writing in Seattle know that the member has no protection from his own government or by NUJ. They continue to take retaliatory advantage by threatening jail, death, and using Internet denial-of-service attacks to destroy media despite a unanimous Washington Supreme Court ruling (30 Mar 06) that exonerated the member of any wrongdoing.

Meanwhile, Jeremy Dear and Roy Mincoff, his legal officer, have unlawfully obstructed any attempt to obtain due process relative to both the effects of the jailing and FCO complicity in it also concerning other illegal acts that have arisen from seven years of delaying tactics by Dear.

NUJ in-house solicitor, who has denied a member his right to legal representation, allegedly with ulterior motives, now faces a Solicitors' Regulation Authority investigation. Dear and NUJ officers apparently prefer association with an MP and his political party which provides them with financial benefits to giving service to their member. They would prefer to let him languish in jail as Dear and Claire S Kirby (Mincoff's predecessor) did previously by using an organized media blackout to cover up their actions while they exorbitantly publicize similar member cases for political expediency. This strengthens the charges of discrimination against them.

On conflict of interest by taking government money, Dear took the opportunity of the launch of the government grant (00 Jun 05) to stress that "the NUJ is not for sale" after John Pilger, *New Statesman* (an NUJ member) used *Journalist* letters page and *New Statesman* to accuse the union of accepting tainted money.

According to *Journalist*, August 2005, p.12, Pilger alleged that NUJ had taken money from British Embassy in Kiev to set up a union: The Independent Media Trade Union of Ukraine (IMTUU). As a result, eight NUJ members denied receiving any money in a letter to *New Statesman*. However, UK Embassy in Kiev admitted to funding a union training programme for IMTUU members which employed NUJ members.

Journalist did not state whether the members who "helped" in Ukraine: possessed adult education teaching credentials; spoke the language; or, held positions as NUJ staff members, officers, or officials. In light of current circumstances, Pilger appears to have made a valid point despite NUJ attempts to justify accepting government money by proxy to the detriment of NUJ members except Dear's sycophants.

Disgusted . . . Insulting Language

James Doherty, President and Chair, National Executive Council (NEC)

Statement

James Doherty, NUJ President evidently read Sutcliffe's inflammatory correspondence and attributed the derogation to the member. He wrote: (24 Aug 08): "I've just read some of your previous correspondence and the inflammatory and abusive language you have used. I am quite frankly disgusted that anyone would use such insulting language in any shape or form. I will not enter into any further correspondence with you and would urge the same of my colleagues".

Comment

Doherty used Sutcliffe's derogation to evade convening an emergency NEC meeting to hear an appeal. Doherty evidently attributed Sutcliffe's abusive language to the member, transferred the blame to him, and remained unwilling to acknowledge his mistake or reverse the denial of process that he arbitrarily implemented.

Nmesis.

If any NUJ member needs a copy of original correspondence to verify and validate the claims made here, then send a request by email, with particularity.

1. Solicitors' Code of Conduct, Rule 6, pp 92-102, generally. Equality and Diversity. 6.01 Duty not to Discriminate. (1) You must not in your professional dealings with employees, partners, members, directors, barristers, other lawyers, clients or third parties discriminate, without lawful cause, against any person, nor victimise or harass them on grounds of . . . (e) age.

© Copyright 2009 by Paul Trummel

All Rights Reserved: 16 Jun 09/12:08

Edition: #880-31-01/09-0621-0942

Feedback: Webspinner@ContraCabal.org