

Histoire sociale et idéologie politique 2

Grande-Bretagne



LLCER Anglais LICENCE 3

K. Rivière-De Franco

2021-2022

DOCUMENTS

Part I - Women in Britain

Document 1: Domestic violence viral ad: the real difference between attacks on women and attacks on men

Document 2: Britain thinks it has won the gender equality war

Document 3: UK gender inequality as bad as 10 years ago, EU league table shows

Document 4: Women still have to work twice as hard as less competent men to succeed

Document 5: Women's contribution to household finances 'nearly tripled since 1968'

Document 6: Ads

Document 7: Career women make bad mothers' billboards pulled

Document 8: Harmful Gender Stereotypes in Ads to be Banned

Document 9: Why is British public life dominated by men?

Document 10: Welcome to 'Blair's Babes' but the struggle goes on

Document 11: Labour pink bus

Document 12: Margaret Thatcher: a feminist success story

Document 13: Margaret Thatcher

Document 14: Wake up, Women

Document 15: Theresa May elected but there can be no such thing as a feminist Tory

Document 16: Tories urged to embrace female-friendly shortlists

Document 17: Cherie Blair calls for positive action to ensure equal representation for women

Document 18: New Poll Shows Divided Views on Quotas

Document 19: David Willetts blames feminism over lack of jobs for working men

Document 20: Advertising Campaigns from Fathers 4 Justice

Part II - The British Media

Document 21: Media landscape

Document 22: Brexit: why press bias is a great British tradition

Document 23: The Elephant In The Room: New report on UK media ownership

Document 24: Fake news a democratic crisis for UK, MPs warn

Document 25: Royal Soap Opera

Document 26: Tony Blair and the media

Document 27: MPs Expenses Scandal, 2009

Document 28: Cartoons, The Miners' Strike, 1980s

Document 29: Plan to silence extremists comes 20 years after end of Ulster broadcast ban

Document 30: Nick Griffin on Question Time: No big gaffes, so he will say it's a success

Document 31: The British press: *The Sun*

Document 32: The media column: The lobby system poisons political journalism

Document 33: The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, BBC Parliament

Part III - Women and the media

Document 34: Does the *Daily Mail* really hate women?

Document 35: Media Sexism Investigation: Of course our papers are sexist

Document 1

Domestic violence viral ad: the real difference between attacks on women and attacks on men

A new viral video shines a light on how men are often ignored or even laughed at if their female partner were to physically abuse them in public. But don't be misled, warns Women's Aid chief, Polly Neate

By Polly Neate, Chief executive of Women's Aid, *Telegraph*, 28 May 2014

1 The new advert from Mankind Initiative, a charity that helps male victims of domestic
2 abuse, is shocking – it shows bystanders taking male on female domestic violence seriously
3 but public concern is not returned when the victim is male and the perpetrator is female. The
4 video ends by stating that 40 per cent of domestic violence victims are male.
5 Women’s Aid fully agrees that domestic violence is always unacceptable, no matter who it is
6 happening to. Everyone, regardless of gender or sexuality, deserves dedicated specialist
7 support if they are in an abusive relationship. We work specifically with abused women and
8 children but we work closely with Respect, who run the Men’s Advice Line for male victims,
9 and Broken Rainbow, in which is for those in same-sex relationships. We believe that
10 everybody has the right to live a life free from fear.
11 We know that it has been reported that men, up to one in six, experience some form of
12 violence in the home in their lifetime. Mankind's video ends by showing a statistic that 40 per
13 cent of domestic violence is suffered by men. This figure, while it does come from the Office
14 for National Statistics, can be misleading. It's important to remember that domestic violence,
15 the type of abuse where you are living in utter fear of your partner, isn’t a one-off incident:
16 it’s about ongoing and repeated violence. Women make up 89 per cent of those who
17 experience four or more incidents of domestic violence.
18 It’s also really important to recognise that in the remaining 11 per cent, men are more at risk
19 when they are in same sex relationships. Quite simply, proportionately very few perpetrators
20 of domestic violence where there is ongoing abuse are female. Despite this, female
21 perpetrators are three times more likely to be arrested than men. As men commit 96 per cent
22 of all violent crime, it is difficult to understand why these statistics are so hard to accept.
23 This viral advert works on the basis that people should intervene when they see domestic
24 violence, but most people don’t know what to do and we would always say the only safe thing
25 to do, regardless of the gender of the person making the attack, is to call the police. You could
26 end up at risk and it could make things worse for the victim, so please call 999.
27 It is totally understandable that organisations want to highlight the issue they are campaigning
28 on, to increase their profile and encourage people to support their cause, but campaigns such
29 as these influence important decisions that affect survivors. We have been told by local
30 Women’s Aid federation organisations that they are funded locally on the basis they have to

31 provide services to male victims, and they are rarely used despite putting time and money into
32 promoting this.

33 This is happening at the same time that female victims and their children are being turned
34 away because of a lack of space and funding. There is room for services for both women and
35 male victims, but this support needs to reflect the reality of need. Women are much more
36 likely to be killed by their partner and much more likely to be living in fear. It is worth noting
37 that over the past decade on average two women every week in the UK have been killed by
38 their current or former partner.

39 However, it still surprises me – although perhaps not in light of this advert - that often when I
40 am talking to someone about the lifesaving work that we do at Women’s Aid, the response
41 that I usually get is ‘but what about the men’?

42 + **video Mankind youtube:** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=u3PgH86OyEM>

Document 2

Britain thinks it has won the gender equality war. That's a bad sign

The Guardian, Nesrine Malik, 28/03/2021

1 Progress can often be its own worst enemy. After a month in which the nation's attention was
2 diverted towards the inadequate understanding of the dangers women face from sexual
3 predators, a new survey by King's College London on perceptions of inequality reveals
4 that the UK is exceptional among similar nations in its attitudes towards gender inequality.

5 In short, the British seem to have relegated gender inequality to the consigned-to-the-past
6 category, with only 23% of those surveyed considering it a top concern. In this the British are
7 an anomaly, diverging clearly from other European countries and sitting closer to nations such
8 as China, where respondents posted similarly low levels of concern about female inequality.
9 In fact, among the 28 countries surveyed, Britain and Hungary were the lowest-ranking
10 western countries.

11 A general profile of the UK emerges through the rest of the attitudes it registers about
12 inequality overall. Britain is highly concerned about disparities in income and wealth, and
13 especially when they fall along geographical lines. Britain also posts relatively high anxiety
14 about racial and ethnic inequality – much higher than the European average – which seems to
15 be at odds with the generally hostile environment towards racial justice campaigners since the
16 Black Lives Matter protests last summer.

17 The picture seems to be of a country where there is a robust desire for social justice and a
18 good grasp of its current contours of inequality – except when it comes to gender, which is
19 only a few points above Britain's lowest concern of all: inequalities between generations.

20 The low ranking may be down to a cultural bias that overemphasises technical progress, such
21 as legislation. It is common, when groups secure landmark rights – marriage for gay people,
22 for example – for perceptions of the legitimacy of their remaining grievances to harden. “The
23 struggle for gay rights is over,” wrote James Kirchick in the Atlantic in 2019. “For those born
24 into a form of adversity, sometimes the hardest thing to do is admitting that they've won.” In
25 the same breath he goes on to say that “for many gays and lesbians” coming out comes with
26 risks of banishment, violence and elevated rates of suicide. These things are less significant
27 for him, though, than the fact that “trends are moving in the right direction”.

28 This direction-of-travel analysis is one that women run into often. The landmark fights have
29 been won in the UK, from equal pay to statutory maternity leave. Indeed, some would argue
30 that diversity initiatives have enabled women to overtake men. And Britain does indeed rank
31 highly in the gender equality index. But here is where some progress, or even a lot of
32 progress, breeds complacency.

33 After a year in which a pandemic has thrown more women than men out of the labour market,
34 hit non-university-educated women's jobs harder, pushed women to take on more unpaid
35 care and domestic duties, and in many cases "retraditionalised" work, such low levels of
36 concern suggest a country that is heading into a post-pandemic gender inequality crisis. We
37 may come to realise how our progress is in fact fragile and erected on subterranean
38 inequalities that surface quickly under stress. In sport, for example, women's activities
39 were shut down first under a government designation of "non-elite". Sportswomen then
40 suffered sharp drops in income because, unlike men, they are paid on a match-fee basis and
41 had to pay for their own fitness equipment during lockdown.

42 The unusual laxity on gender inequality may also be a feature of Britain's tendency to view
43 itself in terms of relative status. I am reminded of a moment that precipitated an embarrassing
44 national display of defensiveness. In 2014, the UN special rapporteur on violence against
45 women, Rashida Manjoo, made the (not unreasonable) observation that Britain has an in-
46 your-face "boys' club sexist culture" that led to negative perceptions about women and girls.
47 She added that in the UK there was "a more visible presence of sexist portrayals of women
48 and girls" and a "marketisation" of their bodies.

49 Instead of listening and reflecting, there was indignation that Britain could be called out and
50 insulted on such a global scale. The debate immediately veered into whether Britain was "the
51 most sexist country in the world", something Manjoo never asserted, and the inevitable
52 comparisons with other countries where things were clearly worse began. The former Tory
53 minister Edwina Currie asked: "Why can't she go to a country where women can't drive cars,
54 or have maternity leave?" It seemed that we could only engage with Britain's gender issues
55 insofar as they were relevant to some international pecking order that Britain was, naturally,
56 at the top of.

57 In general, the King's College report observed, British people were "much less likely to pick
58 out inequality between men and women as a serious problem compared with other countries";

59 and countries that ranked higher than the UK in terms of gender equality still recorded higher
60 levels of concern about gender issues. The link between Britain's perception of itself in this
61 regard and reality is seemingly as broken as it is in Saudi Arabia. We are much closer than we
62 would like to think to countries where until recently women couldn't drive. If we continue to
63 congratulate ourselves on how far we have come, we can guarantee not only that progress will
64 stall, but that ultimately it will be reversed.

Document 3

UK gender inequality as bad as 10 years ago, EU league table shows

Britain ranks alongside Slovakia and the Czech Republic in gender equality index as having made no progress in range of fields

Daniel Boffey, *The Guardian*, Wed 11 Oct 2017

1 Britain has made zero progress in tackling inequality between the sexes in the past decade and
2 lags behind Sweden, Denmark, Finland, the Netherlands and France in the EU's latest gender
3 equality league table. The UK joins Slovakia and the Czech Republic among the EU's 28
4 member states in having made no significant advances in reducing levels of inequality when
5 taking into account a range of fields including the workplace, income, education, health or
6 political engagement. Britain's performance declined in the field of educational attainment
7 between 2005 and 2015, according to the Gender Equality Index, although the country
8 remains one the EU's three best performers in that area.

9 The UK results fit into a picture of slow progress towards gender equality
10 across Europe between 2005 and 2015. The overall score for gender equality, when a matrix
11 of data is taken into account, rose by just four points, to 66.2 out of 100, with 100 signifying
12 complete gender equality.

13 The gender gap in employment in the EU is "wide and persistent", the index report says, with
14 the full-time equivalent (FTE) employment rate of 40% for women and 56% for men. Income
15 gaps have narrowed, but on average women still earn 20% less than men, and the average
16 masks huge disparities across the EU. Only every third man in the EU engages daily in
17 cooking and housework, compared with nearly eight in 10 women. Almost every second
18 working woman spends an hour or more caring and educating children or grandchildren,
19 elderly or disabled people during the day, compared with only about a third of working men.
20 The report says: "As the life course of women often involves economic inactivity, part-time
21 work, unpaid work, lower wages and an average of five years' shorter working life than men,
22 they face a significant risk of poverty in old age. In the EU, 18% of women and 12% of men
23 aged 75-plus are at risk of monetary poverty."

24 In education, men still dominate the fields of science and technology
25 (66%). Women represent about three-quarters of tertiary students in education (78%), health
26 and welfare (71%), and humanities and the arts (65%). The report says: "Segregation in
27 educational choices leads to further gender divisions in the labour market and reinforces the
28 undervaluation of work, skills and competencies traditionally attributed to women."

29 It says gender equality in decision-making in political, economic and social areas is
30 "progressing at the fastest rate, but continues to have the lowest score of all domains". The
31 advances are sharpest in the corporate setting, where the proportion of women on the boards
32 of the largest listed companies in the EU has more than doubled, from 10% in 2005 to 22% in
33 2015. However, women account for only 7% of board chairs and presidents and 6% of chief
34 executives in the largest companies.

35 Věra Jourová, the commissioner in Brussels responsible for gender equality, described the
36 results as "embarrassing" and vowed to publish an EU-wide action plan by November. She
37 said: "The numbers we see today tell a sad story. A story of stagnation, slow progress and

38 prevailing gender inequality across Europe. We cannot think of our societies as modern when
39 we let so many people down, every year and every day. “This backwards or stagnating trend I
40 find truly embarrassing. Equality is not about women becoming like men, but tapping the full
41 potential of our society by creating an environment of choice. “Women are discriminated
42 against when it comes to their career paths and access to jobs. Men are discriminated against
43 their private lives and put under huge pressure to focus on their career and making money.”

44 The top-scoring country in the EU is Sweden (82.6), followed by Denmark. Greece holds the
45 lowest score (50). Hungary is the second-worst performer. The most improved country is
46 Italy, up 12.9 points in the past 10 years to reach 14th out of 28.

47 Åsa Regnér, the minister for gender equality in Sweden, said the results in general were
48 depressing. She said: “Gender equality doesn’t happen automatically. It happens because of
49 leadership, political decisions, because of the allocation of resource or not. It is because
50 politicians fight in debate or not ... This is all about political leadership. There are
51 governments and leaders who don’t want gender equality.”

52 Joanna Maycock, the secretary general of the European Women’s Lobby, who is from the
53 UK, said “critical action” was needed to deal with the issue, and the European commission’s
54 promise of an action plan was not enough. She said that among the necessary measures, all
55 national governments should offer free childcare, examine their tax practices, review national
56 budgets for gender disparities and apply legal measures to address the “shocking levels of
57 discrimination” against women returning to work after having a baby.

Document 4

Women still have to work twice as hard as less competent men to succeed – just ask Hillary Clinton

Julia Gillard, *The Independent*, 13/11/2019

Julia Gillard is the former prime minister of Australia and chair of the Global Institute for Women's Leadership at King's College London

1 It's long been said that for a woman to get half as much credit as a man, she has to work twice
2 as hard and be twice as smart. As someone who's familiar with being more qualified,
3 competent and dedicated than her male peers, Hillary Clinton knows a great deal about this.
4 The good news is that research to support King's College London's World Questions events
5 series (which I'll kick off with Clinton today), reveals the public now recognise that women
6 often have to be better and brighter than their male counterparts to reach similar heights – and
7 that men tend to have other advantages that are bigger factors in their success.
8 The study, by the Global Institute for Women's Leadership, the Policy Institute and Ipsos
9 Mori, finds that 26 per cent of Britons think intelligence is one of the most important factors
10 in helping women get ahead, compared with 17 per cent who say the same for men. But even
11 then, intelligence will only get you so far: for example, women in England with postgraduate
12 degrees are still paid less than men with only bachelor's degrees.
13 What's more, it seems people in Britain recognise that women are more likely to have to earn
14 what's given to them, putting in more time and effort than men to get similar rewards: 37 per
15 cent say working hard is key for women's success, versus 29 per cent for men. This could be
16 a sign of a growing awareness that for most women the working day doesn't end when you
17 leave the office. In the UK, there's a stark divide in unpaid labour among heterosexual
18 couples, even where both partners work full time. According to one estimate, based on 2015
19 data, full-time working mothers spend double the amount of time on physical childcare that
20 full-time working fathers do in Britain each day.
21 Meanwhile, the public are also aware that social capital – the range and quality of one's social
22 network – is a trump card that men have over women. Some 29 per cent of Britons say having
23 connections is important for men's success – almost double the 15 per cent who say the same
24 for women. The power of the old boys' network is not lost on the public: for women, it's what
25 you know; for men, it's still *who* you know.

26 And as any woman who's been leered at or received unwanted comments on her appearance
27 will recognise, it's also about how you look.

28 One in 10 Britons say good looks are a key factor in helping women get ahead, while just 4
29 per cent say the same for men. The depressing reality is that if women want to be seen as just
30 as competent as men, they not only have to be better, they have to look better too. Previous
31 research has found that women who are judged to be unattractive or unfeminine are evaluated
32 more negatively than similarly unattractive men.

33 You might have hoped we'd reached a point where a person's appearance isn't deemed
34 relevant to their suitability for a job, but recent reports revealed that last year a consulting
35 firm trained young female employees on the need to be "polished" and have a "good haircut,
36 manicured nails [and] well-cut attire that complements your body type" in order to progress in
37 their careers.

38
39 So how can we level the playing field so that women are not judged by higher standards and
40 expected to do more and be better than men? The public think the world of work would be a
41 good place to start. Employers get most of the blame for the persistent gender inequality in
42 society, according to this research. In the British public's view, the top three barriers to
43 women's success are employers not doing enough to close the gender pay gap (27 per cent), a
44 lack of employer support for women in balancing work and care responsibilities (22 per cent)
45 and employers not promoting women to senior positions (21 per cent).

46 The latest academic research agrees that in more advanced economies the workplace is one of
47 the final frontiers for gender equality. According to economist Claudia Goldin, an end to
48 long-hours culture and a growth in flexible working arrangements would have seismic
49 effects on gender relations.

50
51 Beyond employment issues, unfair media portrayals of women are seen as the next biggest
52 cause of inequality between men and women in Britain. In fact, 16 per cent of the British
53 public say this is a key factor – the highest of all 27 countries surveyed, and significantly
54 higher than the global average of 9 per cent. So it's certainly a good thing that the UK
55 is cracking down on pernicious gender stereotypes on TV.

56 Make no mistake, we've made a great deal of progress on equality between women and men.
57 But there's still a long way to go before capable, competent women get the same rewards as
58 their less-than-stellar male counterparts. Just ask Hillary Clinton.

Document 5

Women's contribution to household finances 'nearly tripled since 1968'

The Telegraph, Stephen Adams, 06 Dec 2011

1 The analysis, by the Institute for Fiscal Studies, found that women accounted for just 14 per
2 cent of employment income in low to middle-income homes in 1968. But by 2008 that
3 proportion had risen to 37 per cent. The report has identified a "major shift in the gender
4 composition of employment income" in such homes. "Since 1968, male employment has
5 fallen and female employment has risen," according to its authors, Mike Brewer and Liam
6 Wren-Lewis. While the changing economy has undermined the traditional role of man as
7 breadwinner, so women have benefited financially from the same shift. It found that women
8 were bringing in more cash because more were working, and working longer hours, and not
9 because women were earning more than men.

10 The report was produced by the IFS for the Resolution Foundation, a think-tank which aims
11 to improve the lives of some 11 million people in Britain who are "broadly independent of
12 state support" but "struggling to get by". While women in these households have earned more
13 and more as the decades have passed, the authors noted "income from men's work has barely
14 increased". In the 1980s, a decade dominated by the dismantling of the coal mining industry
15 and parts of manufacturing industry, falls in male employment were "most concentrated".
16 Since 1990, with the rise of a service economy offering more part-time positions, the situation
17 has changed further "with men working fewer hours and women working more". In terms of
18 total household income, the contribution from women's employment rose from 15 to 26 per
19 cent. The contribution from men's employment fell from 68 to 46 per cent. Over the last
20 decade tax credits - Government-funded reductions in the amount some households pay in tax
21 - have also made a big impact on these households' finances. Since 2002 tax credits have
22 added £581 to their average annual income, while female employment added £301. Male
23 employment income fell by £610.

24 Interestingly, the picture in better-off homes is one of continuity, with men tending to retain
25 their position as the main earner. Gavin Kelly, chief executive of the Resolution Foundation,
26 said: "This report shows the massive contribution of working women to the incomes of hard-
27 pressed households, as well as the growing role of tax credits." However, he held a warning
28 for the future: "Given female employment has now flat-lined - and with cuts to tax credits and
29 less support for childcare - it's not obvious how families are going to raise their incomes in
30 the future."

31 Anna Bird, acting chief executive of the Fawcett Society, was also concerned. She said:
32 "Austerity policies are pushing women out of the workforce - women's unemployment is now
33 at a 23 year high, while changes to the tax and welfare system are having a disproportionate
34 impact on women's finances." She added: "The Fawcett Society is calling on the Government
35 to take urgent action now to help stop this roll-back on both the living standards of low to
36 middle income families and on women's equality in the workforce - factors which this report
37 shows are inextricably linked."

Document 6 : Ads

SO THE HARDER A WIFE WORKS, THE CUTER SHE LOOKS!

GOSH, HONEY, YOU SEEM TO THRIVE ON COOKING, CLEANING AND DUSTING—AND I'M ALL TUCKERED OUT BY CLOSING TIME. WHAT'S THE ANSWER?

VITAMINS, DARLING! I ALWAYS GET MY VITAMINS

Kellogg's PEP
VITAMIN-ENRICHED
HOT FLAKES

Vitamins for pep! PEP for vitamins!*

Would you be more careful if it was you that got pregnant?

Anyone married or single can get advice on contraception from the Family Planning Association
Margaret Pyke House, 27-35 Mortimer Street, London W1 N 8BQ. Tel. 01-636 9135.

THE WARD BROTHERS COMPANY

Document 7

Career women make bad mothers' billboards pulled

The Guardian, Ben Dowell, Wed 6 Jan 2010 16



'Career women make bad mothers' ads: 'felt like a kick in the stomach', according to one commenter on the Mumsnet forum. Photograph: Beta

1 The Outdoor Advertising Association has ordered the withdrawal of controversial billboard
2 ad which read "Career women make bad mothers" following an outcry from working mothers.
3 The ads, which were part of an OAA campaign designed to promote the effectiveness of
4 billboard advertising, started appearing on the side of buses and on an estimated 11,000
5 billboard sites this week and were due to run for two weeks in total.

6 However the OAA today ordered them to be immediately replaced with alternative slogans.
7 These will be "Educashun Isn't Working" and "1966. It Won't Happen This Year", a reference
8 to England's chances in this summer's World Cup.

9 One of more than 450 contributors to the Mumsnet forum, notevenamousie, wrote of the
10 Working Women Make Bad Mothers poster: "The one on the side of a building today felt like
11 a kick in the stomach. So I am being a decent role model and crying blood, sweat and tears for
12 my girl is bad. I don't know what else I can do." Another, dittany, added: "Somebody needs a
13 ladder and an aerosol can to sort this out. Or a lot of someones, a lot of ladders and a lot of
14 aerosol cans. I just can't imagine what it must be like to be a woman working in companies
15 that are doing stuff like this." Justine Roberts, co-founder and managing director of Mumsnet,
16 said: "Mumsnetters thought the campaign to be ill-conceived, crass and stupid and the
17 reaction on Mumsnet was a mixture of annoyance, contempt and despair in fairly equal
18 measure."

19 The campaign was devised by veteran creative Garry Lace, from the Beta agency, to show the
20 power of billboard advertising as an alternative to digital advertising. He was unavailable for
21 comment at the time of publication. A spokeswoman for the campaign confirmed that posters
22 bearing the slogan were being pulled. She added that this was due to the "outcry and the
23 publicity over the past couple of days". The strategy head of Beta, Sharon Johnson, said:
24 "There has been a misunderstanding with an important mothers' forum about this campaign
25 which is about sparking a debate. It is not what the campaign thinks. But rather than offend
26 people the decision has been taken to replace the posters saying 'Working women make bad
27 mothers' with other slogans which work just as effectively."

Document 8

Harmful Gender Stereotypes in Ads to be Banned

ASA and CAP News, 14/12/2018

<https://www.asa.org.uk/news/harmful-gender-stereotypes-in-ads-to-be-banned.html>

1 Following a public consultation, CAP has today announced that ads will no longer be able
2 to depict harmful gender stereotypes. The new rule in the Advertising Codes, which will
3 apply to broadcast and non-broadcast media (including online and social media), states:

4 *[Advertisements] must not include gender stereotypes that are likely to cause harm, or serious*
5 *or widespread offence.*

6 The new rule will come into force on 14 June 2019. This change follows a review of gender
7 stereotyping in ads by the ASA. The review found evidence suggesting that harmful
8 stereotypes can restrict the choices, aspirations and opportunities of children, young people
9 and adults and these stereotypes can be reinforced by some advertising, which plays a part in
10 unequal gender outcomes.

11 Following the review, CAP consulted publicly on specific proposals to ban harmful gender
12 stereotypes in ads, underpinned by the evidence collected by the ASA. The proposed
13 restrictions were supported by a majority of respondents.

14 The evidence does not show that the use of gender stereotypes is always problematic and the
15 new rule does not seek to ban gender stereotypes outright, but to identify specific harms that
16 should be prevented.

17 CAP has published guidance to help advertisers stick to the new rule by providing examples
18 of scenarios likely to be problematic in ads. For example:

- 19 • An ad that depicts a man with his feet up and family members creating
20 mess around a home while a woman is solely responsible for cleaning up
21 the mess.
- 22 • An ad that depicts a man or a woman failing to achieve a task specifically
23 because of their gender e.g. a man's inability to change nappies; a woman's
24 inability to park a car.
- 25 • Where an ad features a person with a physique that does not match an ideal
26 stereotypically associated with their gender, the ad should not imply that
27 their physique is a significant reason for them not being successful, for
28 example in their romantic or social lives.
- 29 • An ad that seeks to emphasise the contrast between a boy's stereotypical
30 personality (e.g. daring) with a girl's stereotypical personality (e.g. caring)
31 needs to be handled with care.
- 32 • An ad aimed at new mums which suggests that looking attractive or
33 keeping a home pristine is a priority over other factors such as their
34 emotional wellbeing.
- 35 • An ad that belittles a man for carrying out stereotypically 'female' roles or
36 tasks.

37 The rule and guidance does not intend to prevent ads from featuring:

- 38 • Glamorous, attractive, successful, aspirational or healthy people or
39 lifestyles;

- 40 • One gender only, including in ads for products developed for and aimed at
41 one gender;
- 42 • Gender stereotypes as a means to challenge their negative effects.
- 43 CAP will carry out a 12 month review after the new rule comes into force to make sure it's
44 meeting its objective to prevent harmful gender stereotypes.

45

46 **FAWCETT COMMENTS ON NEW CODE TO BAN GENDER STEREOTYPING IN**
47 **ADVERTISING**

48 [https://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/News/fawcett-comments-on-new-code-to-ban-gender-](https://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/News/fawcett-comments-on-new-code-to-ban-gender-stereotyping-in-advertising)
49 [stereotyping-in-advertising](https://www.fawcettsociety.org.uk/News/fawcett-comments-on-new-code-to-ban-gender-stereotyping-in-advertising)

50 News & press releases, 14 DECEMBER 2018

51

52 The Advertising Standards Authority has today announced that it will enforce a new code
53 around gender stereotyping in adverts from June 2019. Under the new rules, British
54 companies will no longer be able to create promotions that depict harmful gender stereotypes.

55 Sam Smethers, Fawcett Chief Executive, says:

56 "What the ASA has done is very welcome. It is time for us to wake up to the harm that gender
57 norms and stereotypes can do. Limiting girls' horizons and career choices, objectifying
58 women and causing them to self-harm; legitimising violence and aggression in boys and
59 inhibiting dads' caring roles. Our society and our economy pays a heavy price for the
60 constraints we place on boys and girls from our earliest moments of life. It has to change.

61 "Gender stereotypes hold us all back and help to drive assumptions about who does the
62 caring, cause toxic masculinity and hold women and girls back in terms of the career choices
63 they perceive as being 'for them'. By smashing stereotypes we will begin to address the
64 underlying causes of the inequality which causes the gender pay gap, drives misogyny and
65 violence against women and girls."

66 Th Fawcett Society is feeding into this important issue with their #SmashingStereotypes
67 campaign, and is asking members of the public to signpost gender stereotypical labels or
68 marketing on toys and children's clothing. Get involved by tweeting @fawcettsociety today.

Document 9

Why is British public life dominated by men?

Kira Cochrane, guardian.co.uk, Sunday 4 December 2011

1 In a typical month, 78% of newspaper articles are written by men, 72% of Question Time
2 contributors are men and 84% of reporters and guests on Radio 4's Today show are men.
3 Where are all the women?

4 I don't know when the breaking point came. Was it the 2010 election, in which the most
5 prominent women on the national stage seemed to be the leaders' wives? Was it a drip, drip,
6 drip of Question Time panels featuring one woman alongside four men and a male presenter?
7 Could it have been the low growl of voices waking me each morning on the Today
8 programme, or a growing feeling that I hadn't seen a female byline on the cover of some
9 newspaper sections for weeks? Was it images of the Commons? Images of the Lords? Was it
10 the prime-time television comedy shows with their all-male panels? Or the current affairs
11 shows, also apparently aimed at a mixed audience, that barely featured women?

12 It was all those factors, in truth, and so in mid-June I began a count. I started with bylines (the
13 name of the journalist who has written the article). For four weeks I counted every byline in
14 the Monday-to-Friday editions of seven newspapers, looking at the number of male and
15 female writers. I knew there were only two female editors of national newspapers: Tina
16 Weaver at the Sunday Mirror, and Dawn Neesom at the Daily Star. But I wanted a clearer
17 picture overall. I did the count for the first two weeks, a colleague did the third, and two
18 researchers the fourth. We doggedly counted each byline, in every part of each paper, and
19 while this wasn't a scientific study, each individual week brought forth broadly similar figures
20 (the count was timed to end before the start of the school summer holidays, to avoid any
21 skewing of the statistics). There wasn't a single day, on a single newspaper, when the number
22 of female bylines outstripped or equalled the number of male bylines. The Daily Mail came
23 the closest of any newspaper to parity on Monday 27 June, when its contributors were 53%
24 male and 47% female – reflecting the fact that, whatever the Daily Mail's style and tone, it
25 clearly recognises the commercial importance of its women readers, targets a mass of material
26 at them, and is rewarded as the only daily national, besides the Daily Express, whose female
27 readers currently outnumber male readers. At the end of the month we averaged all the daily
28 percentages and the results were: the Mail, 68% male bylines, 32% female; the Guardian,
29 72% male, 28% female; the Times, 74% male, 26% female; the Daily Telegraph, 78% male,
30 22% female; the Daily Mirror, 79% male, 21% female; the Sun, 80% male, 20% female; and
31 the Independent, 84% male, 16% female [...]

32 During that four-week period, I also logged the gender of reporters and guests on the Today
33 programme. (All the shows I looked at, including Today, were on the BBC, which reflects the
34 agenda-setting nature of the corporation.) It is well-recognised that the main roster of Today
35 programme presenters is male-dominated – John Humphrys, James Naughtie, Evan Davis and
36 Justin Webb, with Sarah Montague the only woman. But I wondered whether this 80/20 split
37 spilled over to its other contributors. Using the breakdown of each morning's programme,
38 published on the BBC website, and discounting the lead presenters, I added up the number of
39 reporters and guests who appeared on each episode – counting each reporter only once if they
40 were, for instance, appearing repeatedly on a single show to relay the business or sports news.
41 On Tuesday 5 July you had to wait from 6.15am until 8.20am to hear the one female

42 contributor who appeared alongside the 27 male contributors on the programme: arts
43 correspondent Rebecca Jones talking about the Hampton Court Palace flower show. Overall,
44 across the month, discounting the main presenters, Today had 83.5% male contributors and
45 16.5% female ones. I spoke to the editor of the Today programme, Ceri Thomas, on Friday 11
46 November – a day when only two female contributors appeared on the programme. The day
47 before there had been just one. I asked if there was a strong enough female presence on the
48 show at the moment. "I think nearly every day there is not," he said. "And within the
49 programme it's a very active discussion. And not just a discussion – it's pursued actively, too.
50 Every producer on the programme is aware we're trying to increase the representation of
51 women on air. People such as the planning editor, who is in a position to do a bit more about
52 it, have it as a specific objective." He adds that the show's listenership is about 50/50 men and
53 women, "and I'm bound to say to you, it almost never comes up as an issue from the audience
54 ... I suppose it might be two letters a year, or something of that nature." He makes this last
55 point, in different words, three times in our 10-minute conversation.

56 If most Today programme listeners aren't bothered by the male dominance of the media, other
57 people certainly are. Earlier this year Chitra Nagarajan, a member of the activist group Black
58 Feminists, started the "diversity audit" hashtag on Twitter, where people can note the
59 comparative male or female presence on any show, or at any event – as well as collating
60 information, according to their interests and concerns, about race, class, sexuality, disability
61 or other factors. Nagarajan says that, from an early age, she became used to entering a room,
62 looking around and seeing "who else was there that wasn't white. And then, since I started
63 going along to events, you look at the panel and notice they're all male – even at events where
64 the issue actually affects women disproportionately." Earlier this year, Nagarajan did an
65 analysis of Question Time, looking at the comparative number of men and women on the
66 show, and also black men and women. Of the 12 shows that started on 27 January, seven
67 featured all white guests. Only three non-white women appeared on the panels in that period –
68 numbers of non-white men were even lower: just two appeared.

69 The analysis I did of every Question Time episode this year, up until 3 November, found that,
70 including David Dimbleby, the show featured 71.5% male contributors and 28.5% female
71 contributors. If you exclude the presenter from that count, it was 66% male contributors, 34%
72 female. There were 13 programmes out of 34 that featured only one female panellist. There
73 were no programmes in that period that featured only one male panellist – all had at least two
74 [...]

75 As Nagarajan says, the absence of women, and particularly black and ethnic-minority women,
76 on current affairs programmes is deeply problematic. "When I was doing my count," she says,
77 "it was the early months of the year, when revolutions were happening in the Middle East and
78 north Africa, but very rarely did you actually see a woman from any of those countries speak.
79 You occasionally saw the men speak, but never the women, which I think ties into the whole
80 idea of black women's vulnerability and invisibility. So black women never speak for
81 themselves – other people speak for them, and over their heads – when it comes to their
82 rights. And the image you see of them is as weak, vulnerable and not being really important
83 agents for change."

84 Seema Malhotra, director of the Fabian Women's Network, has also been speaking out on this
85 issue. She published a letter in the Guardian last month, alongside 61 other influential women,
86 raising concern about the number of all-male panels at policy debates. The letter stated: "We

87 will no longer be attending events where there is an all-male panel without exceptional reason
88 and will be encouraging others to do the same."

89 When you consider the representation of women in mainstream politics, their invisibility at
90 policy debates and on current affairs programmes comes as no surprise. Nan Sloane, director
91 of the Centre for Women and Democracy, points out that the current figures are easy to
92 remember: 22% of MPs are female, 22% of peers and 22% of the cabinet. Interestingly, when
93 the figures for women's representation across the newspapers and the Today programme are
94 averaged, they produce almost exactly the same result – 22.6%.

Document 10

Welcome to 'Blair's Babes' but the struggle goes on

Labour has 101 women in Parliament thanks to feminist drive, but what will they do for their worse-off sisters

Suzanne Moore, Friday 9 May 1997, <https://www.independent.co.uk/voices/welcome-to-blairs-babes-but-the-struggle-goes-on-1260491.html>

1 This is an historic occasion indeed! Margaret Beckett has been called a babe. There she is
2 down at the front of that terrific picture of Tony Blair surrounded by all the New Labour
3 women on the steps of Church House. The Daily Mail chose to headline this image "Blair's
4 Babes". Matthew Parris commented somewhat archly: "So many purple suits! So much
5 hairspray!" It all reminded me of that picture of Hugh Hefner surrounded by his Playboy
6 Bunnies, except of course that these women are not bunnies, they are, say it again, MPs.

7 The sudden visibility of women is so enchanting, one is inclined to forget that only two weeks
8 ago women were virtually invisible in the election campaign. Indeed, now that we are in the
9 mood, we can forgive and forget a lot of things if we really try, just like Tony Blair forgot to
10 tell Harriet Harman that she was in fact ... er, Minister for Women. We can forget that Roy
11 Hattersley called women-only shortlists "a silly idea", that Blair himself described the scheme
12 as "not ideal at all". We can forget the battles that Clare Short had when she was
13 Spokesperson for Women. We can forget the promise of a separate and properly funded
14 Ministry for Women. Now that new era has begun and New Labour flaunts its femininity,
15 perhaps these things may be eminently forgettable. We just don't need to worry our pretty
16 heads about positive discrimination anymore. Look how much better Labour is than the
17 Tories with their unlucky 13 female MPs. Anyway, affirmative action, that offensive
18 Americanised phrase, smacks of political correctness, of old-fashioned feminism, of a bygone
19 era of wimmin, of Big Sister watching every move.

20 It is easy enough to say that things would have got better all by themselves. After all, this is
21 the age of Girl Power, of a culture in which girls are outperforming boys at every level. In
22 some classes and in some situations this is certainly true. The earnings gap between young
23 male and female professionals is closing. Yet at both the top end and bottom end of society,
24 the gender gap is as wide as it ever was. Only 3 per cent of company directors are female, and
25 at the other end of the scale the impoverishment of single parents means thousands of women
26 and children are living in appalling circumstances.

27 The idea of separate women's issues has become almost meaningless, but if anything is a
28 women's issue, it is the minimum wage that looks like being set at a lower level than has
29 previously been discussed. Had the Minister for Women's job not been tacked on to Harriet
30 Harman's already bulging portfolio, it is possible to imagine that some of the Labour Party's
31 commitments to women might be delivered. Of course none of these commitments were in the
32 Labour party pledges, so no actual promises will be broken. None the less, both those within
33 and without the party have expectations about what a Labour government will actually do for
34 us.

35 Despite the photo-opportunities, less than a quarter of the new intake are women. So how
36 many of these were propelled into power through the despised all-women shortlists? Less than
37 a third. If we say that perhaps half of these women might have got through anyway, we are

38 talking perhaps about 15 women who benefited from this quota system. Yet what these
39 shortlists did was raise the profile of women in the party, provoking a debate that meant a
40 sluggish and smug institution became more self-aware. Barbara Follett's powerful argument at
41 the time was that without doing anything, nothing would change. As she reminded us, Labour
42 returned the same number of women to Parliament in 1987 as it did in 1945. Blair, in one
43 sense, was right to say that the shortlists were not ideal, but then the alternative was doing
44 nothing and ending up like the Tory Party.

45 Positive discrimination in favour of women, as we have seen in other countries, often means
46 that its beneficiaries are defensive. It also means a male backlash with men cast as the new
47 victims. Yet it is a means to an end; and at conference last year, Labour backed a motion
48 calling for a target of 50 per cent female MPs in the next 10 years. It was proposed by Clare
49 Short, who described it correctly as the "biggest modernisation of all". Even Tories were
50 forced to comment on the number of bright young women at conference, Boris Johnson
51 registering much Hot Totty on his own personal Tottymeter. And now that the Totty is on
52 display, giggling in the corridors of power and presumably having to queue to get into the
53 Ladies, they remain an unknown quantity. The expression "transitional women" is being
54 bandied about. It applies to the Harmans and the Jowells, the women who were already
55 considered acceptable by the boys. There is nothing transitional about the new mob of
56 women, their number makes them a solid presence. Some of them even wear normal clothes
57 instead of those peculiar power suits.

58 What with a handful of openly gay MPs, someone in a wheel-chair, a few more black faces,
59 Parliament is getting nearer to representing a cross- section of the population. Nearer but not
60 near enough. In the flush of victory it is easy to forget that. Just as it easy to overlook the fact
61 that those 101 female MPs were not delivered by Mr. Blair's hand alone. They were delivered
62 by a combination of cultural change - the electorate has less of a problem in voting for a
63 women than ever before - and political activism: a conscious, stubborn and explicitly feminist
64 drive towards equal representation. The irony, not so gentle, is that at a time when such
65 feminist tactics are referred to as "so Seventies", as completely out of touch and out of date,
66 they have produced such a dramatic change in the House of Commons.

67 For the Tories this is yet another problem that they must deal with if they want to reconstitute
68 themselves as a serious party. At a grassroots level they need to persuade their female
69 supporters to vote for women instead of more ghastly Tory Boys. For the Conservatives to
70 impose any sort of quota system is almost inconceivable, but without one it is difficult to see
71 how any sort of progress will be made.

72 However, while New Labour congratulates itself on its landslide and its new feminised
73 culture, it should also remember its irritating little anthem "Things can only better ..." While
74 we are looking forward, glance backward over New Labour's shoulder and you will see the
75 struggle it has been to produce this profound shift in its own culture. Being a politician means
76 never having to say you are sorry and I don't expect Blair to be any different; but he cannot be
77 allowed to take all the credit here. At long last the party has delivered up some women. The
78 question now is this: what can the Government deliver for all women?

Document 11

Labour pink bus: Party criticised for patronising 'Barbie doll' colour as Harriet Harman attempts to appeal to women voters

Andrew Grice, 11 February 2015,

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/generalelection/election-2015-harriet-harman-urges-more-women-to-vote-labour-in-a-pink-bus-10037169.html>

1 Labour will today appeal to women voters to help it win the general election, telling them
2 their support can stop politics being a “men-only club”. Analysis by the party of the
3 candidates chosen to fight marginal seats shows that women would make up 43 per cent of
4 Labour’s MPs if it wins a majority in May – close to its 50 per cent target. More than half (53
5 per cent) of Labour’s candidates in its target seats will be women, Labour claims, compared
6 with 25 per cent of the Conservatives’ candidates in their target constituencies and 31 per cent
7 of Liberal Democrats in theirs.

8 Men will literally take a back seat in Labour’s “Woman to Woman” campaign when Harriet
9 Harman, the party’s deputy leader, tours more than 70 seats from today in a pink 16-seater
10 mini-bus. The party denied that the “Barbie doll” colour was patronising to women, insisting
11 it was a deeper “burgundy end of pink” used in the party’s “One Nation” campaign.

12 Labour’s first separate “women’s manifesto”, to be launched in April, will promise:

- 13 • 25 hours of free childcare for working parents of three- and four-year-olds (up from the
14 current 15 hours); an additional 50,000 childcare places; guaranteed access to “8am-
15 6pm” schooling through breakfast and after-school clubs to help working parents
- 16 • Support for grandparents who juggle the care of their grandchildren and their working
17 hours
- 18 • Companies with more than 250 workers to publish the “hourly pay gap” between the
19 sexes in their annual report to shame them into ensuring equal pay for women
- 20 • Greater priority to tackling domestic and sexual violence against women, through a
21 commissioner to set minimum standards.

22 Ms Harman said: “Women do not want to be told by men how they feel. They want women to
23 speak up for them. Politics is too important to be left as a male-only activity. Women are
24 entitled to have a government elected by them that understands them and will deliver for
25 them. Conservatives want women’s votes so they can get into government, full stop.” She
26 admitted: “We [women] have not made all the progress we need. Women believe they are
27 equal citizens of the country. Our politics is left behind. It is still male-dominated. We are still
28 pioneers in the male business of politics. We are in the minority, but we are making
29 progress.”

30 Labour’s campaign will target the 9.1 million women who did not vote in the 2010 election,
31 telling them: “Don’t give up on politics.” The party leadership argues that this group “holds
32 the balance of power” in what it describes as a “watershed” election for women. Lucy Powell,
33 vice-chair of Labour’s general election campaign, said: “This is a once-in-a-generation choice
34 about who our country works for.”

35 Caroline Dineage, a Tory MP, said: “The wheels have come off the Labour bus. Getting
36 Harriet Harman to drive around the country in a pink van to try and attract the female vote is

37 as patronising as it gets. This is clearly just another divisive gimmick that the electorate will
38 see through.”

39 Nick Clegg urged businesses to smash the “glass ceiling” for women and called for a million
40 more female workers to be in employment by 2020. The Deputy Prime Minister told the
41 British Chamber of Commerce that at the highest levels too many firms are male-dominated
42 and more work was needed to close the gender pay gap. He said: “We have started to crack
43 the glass ceiling, but we are still a long way from smashing it. In Britain today, too many
44 women find their talents are wasted.” Urging bosses to implement Liberal Democrat plans for
45 shared parental leave and flexible working, Mr Clegg said: “Too many women still face a
46 heart-breaking choice between pursuing their career and caring for their family. And too
47 many businesses let the status quo persist year after year.”

Document 12

Margaret Thatcher: a feminist success story

Like it or not, she advanced the cause of women in politics immensely.

David Boaz, guardian.co.uk, Thursday 6 April 2006

1 The Spectator assesses the queen on her impending 80th birthday. And just a few days earlier,
2 Margaret Thatcher, who entered her ninth decade just a few months before the queen, was in
3 Washington for the funeral of Ronald Reagan's defense secretary, Caspar Weinberger. Which
4 reminded me of what I always thought would have been the feminist picture of the century:
5 Her Majesty the Queen asking the Hon. Margaret Thatcher to form a government. Yet
6 feminists, of course, never liked Thatcher. Even though she was a woman who worked her
7 way up the political ladder to become Prime Minister of Great Britain - no husband's coat-
8 tails for her, like so many women in politics - even though she let little girls across the UK
9 know that they could aspire to high office, she was a conservative and thus her achievement
10 was not to be celebrated.

11 Gloria Steinem once called Republican senator Kay Bailey Hutchison a "female
12 impersonator" and said "Having someone who looks like us, but thinks like them is worse
13 than having no one." That was the typical feminist attitude toward Thatcher. But like it or not,
14 Thatcher advanced the cause of women in politics immensely by becoming the beloved leader
15 of conservatives on both sides of the Atlantic. In the United States, she ranks second only to
16 Ronald Reagan in the conservative pantheon. Conservatives may still not favor forced gender
17 equality or economically loony ideas like "comparable worth," but they know that women can
18 be stronger and smarter than men in public office.

19 A few conservative feminists get it. If feminism is about equal rights and equal opportunity,
20 and the notion that women are as capable as men, then Thatcher's career was a feminist
21 triumph. And I suppose, if you like monarchy and all that, Queen Elizabeth has also proven
22 just as capable as her male predecessors.

Document 13 : Magaret Thatcher



Document 14

Wake up, Women

1952 Feb 17, Margaret Thatcher, Article for *Sunday Graphic*

1 A young Queen, the loveliest ever to reign over us, now occupies the highest position in the
2 land. If as many earnestly pray, the accession of Elizabeth II can help to remove the last
3 shreds of prejudice against women aspiring to the highest places, then a new era for women
4 will indeed be at hand. We owe it to the Queen—and to the memory of a father who set her
5 such a wonderful example throughout his life—to play our part with increasing enterprises in
6 the years ahead.

7 I hope we shall see more and more women combining marriage And a career. Prejudice
8 against this dual role is not confined to men. Far too often. I regret to say it comes from our
9 own sex. But the happy management of home and career can and IS being achieved. The
10 name of Mrs. Norman Karper, wife of a Liverpool surgeon and mother of a three-year-old
11 daughter, may mean little to many of you. But the name of Miss Rose Heilbron , Q.C., whose
12 moving advocacy in recent trials has been so widely praised, is known throughout the land.
13 Unless Britain, in the new age to come, can produce more Rose Heilbrons—not only in the
14 field of law, of course—we shall have betrayed the tremendous work of those who fought for
15 equal rights against such misguided opposition. The term "career woman" has unfortunately
16 come to imply in many minds a "hard" woman devoid of all feminine characteristics. But
17 Rose Heilbron and many more have shown only too well that capability and charm can go
18 together.

19 Why have so few women in recent years risen to the top of the professions? One reason may
20 be that so many have cut short their careers when they marry. In my view this is a great Pity.
21 For it is possible to carry on working. taking a short leave of absence when families arrive,
22 and returning later. In this way gifts and talents that would otherwise be wasted are developed
23 to the benefit of the community. The idea that the family suffers is, I believe, quite mistaken.
24 To carry on with a career stimulates the mind, provides a refreshing contact with the world
25 outside—and so means that a wife can be a much better companion at home. Moreover, when
26 her children themselves marry, she is not left with a gap in her life which so often seems
27 impossible to fill.

28 Women can—And must—play a leading part in the creation of a glorious Elizabethan era.
29 The opportunities are there in abundance—in almost every sphere of British endeavour. We
30 must emulate the example of such women as Barbara Ward , at 37 one of our leading
31 economists and an expert on foreign affairs; Dr. Janet Vaughan , mother of two children and
32 principal of Somerville College; Mary Field who, as president of the 90,000—strong British
33 Federation of Business and Professional Women, is one of our most successful "career
34 women"; and Dame Caroline Haslett , Britain's No. 1 woman engineer and founder more than
35 a quarter of a century ago of the Electrical Association for Women.

36 That there is a place for women at the top of the tree has been proved beyond question by
37 these, and very many others. And if there are those who would say: "It couldn't happen to
38 me," they would do well to remember that Dame Caroline Haslett herself started as a 10s-a-
39 week apprentice in a London boiler works more than 30 years ago.

40 I have heard it said that American women have far more influence over the nation's affairs
41 than do the women of Britain. Yet American women have only six out of 435 members in the
42 House of Representatives. We have 17 out of 625 in the House of Commons. But it is still not
43 good enough. If we are to have better representation in Parliament, the women of England
44 must fight harder for it.

45 Should a woman arise equal to the task, I say let her have an equal chance with the men for
46 the leading Cabinet posts. Why not a woman Chancellor—or Foreign Secretary? Why not?
47 And if they made mistakes, they would not be the first to do so in those jobs!

48 To sum up. *I should like to see* the woman with a career holding down her responsibility with
49 easy assurance during the Elizabethan era. *I should like to see* married women carrying on
50 with their jobs, if so inclined, after their children are born. *I should like to see* Every woman
51 trying to overcome ignorance of day-to-day affairs; and Every woman taking an active part in
52 local life. And, above all, *I should like to see* more and more women at Westminster, and in
53 the highest places, too. It would certainly be a good thing for the women of Britain. And I'm
54 sure it would be a good thing for the men, too!

Document 15

Theresa May



Fawcett Society

Theresa May elected but there can be no such thing as a feminist Tory

<https://www.wsm.ie/c/theresa-may-elected-feminist-tory>

Thu, 2016-07-21 10:34, Workers Solidarity Movement



1 Theresa May has just become the UK's latest Prime Minister and the second ever woman
2 Prime Minister. She's certainly a decent orator paired with a comedian or a speech writer who
3 wrote a statement filled with faux concern about making the "UK a country that works for all
4 and not just the privileged few" – it's as if she thinks we don't know she's a member of the
5 privileged-few-loving Conservative Party, or as she reminded us, Conservative and Unionist
6 Party.

7 For a woman who only a few weeks ago voted to repeal the Human Rights Act she had no
8 problem spitting out some crap about how she's going to protect black men who are treated
9 more harshly by the criminal justice system, not to mention her bringing up other statistics
10 that highlight an intersection of oppression that she has mentioned as if she is appalled by
11 them (despite belonging to a party that perpetrates them). She didn't seem too concerned
12 about the criminal justice system acting too harshly – or any other mechanism for the Tory
13 reign of terror – when she was giving off about Human Rights Legislation getting in the way
14 and limiting the powers of government. What else is in her record as an MP that goes against
15 all the talk she talked today about "a union of citizens, whoever we are, wherever we come
16 from"? Oh yeah, those racist billboard vans that we saw a few years back that drove around
17 the UK telling people that wherever they come from to go home (obviously people that don't

18 belong to the “precious, precious union” for those who are confused by the outrageous
19 contradiction). This does go hand in hand with her in 2013 voting against a law that would
20 have made it illegal for people to discriminate against others on the basis of “caste” (as the
21 legislation put it).

22 Her speech writer was clearly told to ignore her actions and everything she has done up until
23 now and to tap into the latest trend of feminism – she is a woman after all, it should be easier
24 for her to pretend she’s a feminist than it was for Cameron et al. So, as expected, she
25 mentioned the gender pay gap. How very good of you Theresa, you’re only a member of the
26 party that is responsible for mothers skipping meals to feed their kids. You’re a member of the
27 establishment that has seen women queuing in food banks for sanitary towels – not to mention
28 that the use of food banks is at a record high. You’ve made cut after cut against the public
29 sector of which women comprise 65%. Your party has seen that women will be hit twice as
30 hard than any other group by your austerity measures – that’s right, they’re your austerity
31 measures; you are currently fighting a war against women. Of £26 billion you have saved in
32 “Welfare Reform” (read: welfare destruction), £22 billion of it has been from women’s
33 pockets, that is a deliberate gendered attack. You’ve made mothers, the primary carers of
34 children, pay through the nose for the carelessness of your class. You’ve cut tax credits,
35 reduced housing benefit and frozen child benefit and you have wrongly sanctioned thousands
36 of single mothers. Yet you think you can parade about in a “this is what a feminist looks like”
37 t-shirt. You think you’re off the hook because you took 3 seconds of your speech to highlight
38 the gender pay gap; not on our watch. This is not feminism.

39 There can be no such thing as a “feminist Tory” – it’s an oxymoron, one term contradicts the
40 other. Feminism isn’t just about ending the pay gap; it’s about class war. It’s about
41 dismantling capitalism, racism, homophobia, disablism, and of course sexism. These systems
42 of oppression do not exist on their own, however, each one reinforces the other, and in
43 examining them and seeing where and how they connect we can see how to tear them down.
44 No Theresa May, and no other Tory is ever going to dismantle the very system that they
45 benefit from. A Tory can’t eradicate sexism, because sexism cannot be eradicated without
46 destroying the environment it lives in.

47 This doesn’t mean we elect someone as Prime Minister who has feminist principals; the
48 master’s tools will never dismantle the master’s house. Women’s participation in the very
49 system that has furthered our own oppression will not be the source of our liberation. We need
50 to build a feminist society from the bottom up, and that doesn’t start in parliament, because
51 feminism is completely at odds with the state. The state: the exploitative, oppressive,
52 patriarchal and male dominated state, whose very foundations are our servitude, will never be
53 used for our emancipation.

54 So, Prime Minister, you can take your tokenism and shove it. Don’t you dare call yourself a
55 feminist while you wage a war on women and the entire 99%. As we’re as we’re concerned
56 this is Thatcher round 2 and neither of you are what a feminist looks like.

Document 16

Tories urged to embrace female-friendly shortlists

Oliver King, Wed 23 Nov 2005, *The Guardian*

1 A shadow cabinet minister today urged her party to drop its opposition to positive
2 discrimination and back a new campaign to get more Conservative women MPs elected. The
3 shadow culture secretary, Theresa May, called on the two Tory leadership hopefuls, David
4 Davis and David Cameron, to sign up to the Women2Win campaign declaration, which urges
5 the party to change the way it selects parliamentary candidates. "It is a little-known fact that
6 there are more men in the shadow cabinet called David than there are women," she said.
7 "Women2Win are making this challenge to the leadership candidates: over the course of the
8 remaining leadership election campaign, make clear your commitment to reform the
9 Conservative party into a party that represents, reflects and understands Britain today."

10 The Women2Win campaign declaration called for "any positive and radical reforms of the
11 selection procedures" for Conservative parliamentary candidates, short of compulsory all-
12 women shortlists, to increase the number of female Tory MPs. Among the campaign's
13 proposals is an "A-list", divided equally between men and women, of possible candidates to
14 fight the best 100 seats. The A-list scheme would work either by fielding 60 men and 60
15 women immediately for the top 100 seats or by fielding 50 men and 50 women and then
16 adding 20 more candidates to the list when it came to selections by the last few Tory
17 associations. The system would result in a minimum of 40 Tory women candidates in the top
18 seats, according to the campaign. The proposals fall short of the recent call by the
19 Conservative Women's Organisation for the introduction of all-women shortlists as the only
20 effective and rapid way to increase the representation of women in the parliamentary party.

21 Both David Cameron and David Davis rejected the idea of imposing all-women shortlists on
22 Conservative associations in their recent appearance on BBC Radio 4's Woman's Hour. Mr
23 Cameron told the BBC: "I believe in positive action, not positive discrimination. There are
24 three things the party needs to address: the issue of women candidates; particular policies
25 which affect women, such as pay and childcare; and the way we conduct politics. Women are
26 particularly put off by the Punch and Judy show." Mr Davis agreed, saying: "I do not believe
27 in positive discrimination, so I would invest the full authority of my leadership in persuasion,
28 not in imposition. We have to pass the decency test, which is particularly important to
29 women."

30 With both leadership candidates yet to respond to the new proposals, six shadow cabinet
31 members have already signed up to the Women2win declaration. They are Ms May, Caroline
32 Spelman, David Willetts, Oliver Letwin, Michael Ancram and Andrew Lansley. Tory MPs
33 including Peter Viggers, Maria Miller, Bernard Jenkin and Peter Lilley supported the
34 campaign launch.

35 The event heard from Katherine Rake, chairman of the Fawcett Society, which works for
36 increased women's representation in parliament. She said the overall picture was "pretty dire"
37 in the Conservative party in terms of women's representation. She said: "The party looks
38 outdated to an electorate that expects women to have equal opportunities in the workplace and
39 in public life." Figures released by the campaign show that in 1932 there were 13
40 Conservative women MPs. At the last election, 73 years later, the total was still just 17.
41 Women make up just 9% of the Conservative parliamentary party, an increase of just 1% on
42 the 2001 general election total. According to the campaign, at the current rate it will take the
43 Conservative party 400 years to achieve equal representation of women within its ranks.

44 Dr Rake told the conference: "The system is not currently operating on merit. There is
45 discrimination right the way through the system, whether knowing or unknowing. What we
46 are suggesting is positive action that allows women a fair chance but within a competitive
47 framework."

48 Mr Viggers, a former minister, joked to the conference that there were "lots" of candidates
49 selected who were in their 30s with pretty wives. He said: "If we simply speak with the voice
50 of 35-plus people with pretty wives, two children and a spaniel, we will not look as if we
51 understand what the country needs." Shireen Ritchie, mother of the film director Guy Ritchie,
52 and a Tory activist in Chelsea, said the party needed to improve its representation of women
53 in parliament if it was to avoid being rejected "time and time again" by the electorate. She
54 said: "Not only will we lose elections but we will lose the skills and the talent of a vast
55 number of people. The time really has come to accept that gradual change has failed to deliver
56 what is required. We must embrace radical action to ensure that women are selected for
57 winnable Conservative seats."

58 Melanie McLean, Tory parliamentary candidate for Islington South at the 2005 general
59 election, who has worked for many years in banking, said the Conservative party needed to
60 follow the example of big business, including investment banks, which had been proactive in
61 spotting women for senior positions. She said she had been selected for the second seat she
62 applied for but she knew of other women who had tried for 10 or 20 seats without success.
63 Many women did not apply at all, she said. "It seems to me that this is a terrible waste of
64 talent that could otherwise be brought into the party and work for the benefit of the party."

65 Bernard Jenkin, whose wife, Ann, is one of the campaign's leaders, said there was "absolutely
66 no doubt at all" that improving the quality and quantity of Tory women in parliament would
67 change the "whole chemistry" of the party in parliament. Mr Jenkin, one of the six signatories
68 of a letter to the Telegraph calling for greater representation of women, said the campaign had
69 produced a "crackle of sexual tension" in the party and parliament.

70 The Women2Win campaign is also proposing support for women candidates through training,
71 funding and mentoring programmes. The group has highlighted figures showing that in 1997
72 Labour led the Conservatives among women by 12 points, and the Tory party has yet to win
73 the female vote back.

Document 17

Cherie Blair calls for positive action to ensure equal representation for women

Patrick Wintour, guardian.co.uk, Monday 5 December 2011

1 Cherie Blair made her call for positive action to ensure equal representation for women during
2 a speech at Chatham House. Positive action should be taken to ensure equal representation of
3 women in the UK Parliament and in boardrooms, Cherie Blair has said. Speaking at Chatham
4 House under her professional name Cherie Booth, she said evidence showed that 30% female
5 representation is the minimum necessary to create a critical mass of women - a target
6 recognised by the United Nations. Booth compared what she called the slow progress of
7 women's rights in the UK to the "tremendous strides" taken by emerging democracies such as
8 Tunisia and Egypt, saying Tunisia had in fact leapfrogged the UK. The old democracies
9 needed to listen and learn from what is happening in emerging democracies, she said. She
10 pointed out that currently only 22% of UK MPs were women, up from 10% in 1992. At this
11 rate of progress it might take another 200 years to reach equal representation, she said. By the
12 same token, gender parity in local government was still over a century away. She said "there
13 was a compelling evidence that the involvement of women in all levels of decision-making
14 leads to better decisions". "Our experience shows, and survey after survey reveals institutions
15 are run better, communities are healthier when women are involved in solving the challenges
16 of our society. "Equal representation does not just lead to good democracy, it is democracy,"
17 she said.

18 She added that too often change might seem frightening, but once achieved will be seen as
19 inevitable. Women's equality is the great moral imperative of our society, she said. She spoke
20 of an act in France in 1982 that mandated at least 25% of each gender on the electoral ballots
21 of municipal elections, which was declared unconstitutional and contrary to equality
22 legislation. "This of course is the argument," she said. "This, and the concern that I
23 understand, which is that such measures ensure tokenism, breed resentment and undermine
24 women's progress.

25 "I grant that quotas are imperfect, but I am convinced that the continuation of existing
26 inequality is even worse." In 28 countries that have reached 30% women's representation, at
27 least 23 of them have used some form of quota, Booth said. "And 30% is of course the critical
28 mass of women in parliament which was endorsed as a target by the UN conference on
29 women in Beijing back in 1995." It was a failure in our politics that the UK remained outside
30 this target 16 years later. "Our democracy is changing, with a reduction in the number of MPs.
31 If we can change the number of parliamentarians, why do we balk at taking positive action to
32 ensure we actually do finally get to that 30% target, and then reach full equality?"

33 Booth said mature democracies such as the UK seemed to have settled for an "incremental
34 equality". She compared this to emerging democracies in Africa, Central America and more
35 recently in the Arab world, where "women and men alike are demanding a democracy that
36 doesn't just promote full equality in rhetoric but achieves it in reality". She said their
37 creativity and urgency "should be a lesson to us all". Drawing on Tunisia as an example,
38 Booth said the fact that men and women had to feature equally as candidates to be elected to
39 the new assembly means women now make up 24% of the assembly that will draw up
40 Tunisia's new constitution. She said: "In one free and fair election they have leapfrogged what
41 it's taken us decades in the UK and the US to achieve."

Document 18

New Poll Shows Divided Views on Quotas

2 Sep, 2010,

<http://www.cfwd.org.uk/news/32/61/New-Poll-Shows-Divided-Views-on-Quotas>

1 95% of respondents said that the recent increase in women MPs of 2.5% is unacceptable, with
2 45% supporting compulsory quotas for the House of Commons and 62% advocating them for a
3 new elected House of Lords.
4 Over the summer the Centre for Women & Democracy has been running an online poll on
5 whether or not the Coalition Government's proposed constitutional changes might make a
6 difference to the representation of women in the UK parliament, and the interim findings have
7 now been published. A massive 95% of people who took part in the poll thought that the 2.5%
8 increase in women MPs at the last election was 'not significant'. with 45% saying that the
9 Coalition should include compulsory quotas in its constitutional change programme. A
10 sizeable 62% thought that an elected House of Lords should have a quota of 50% women,
11 whilst only 12% thought that there should be no quota at all.

12 Opinion on how helpful the proposed change to the Alternative Voting (AV) system of
13 elections would be was mixed, with 38% thinking that it might help if the political parties
14 took responsibility for making sure that it did, and 35% thinking that it would make no
15 difference at all. 85% of Liberal Democrat respondents said that AV would make a difference
16 if the parties took action to make sure that it did, whilst 75% of Conservatives thought that it
17 would make no difference at all. Labour respondents were divided – 37% thought that AV
18 might help with another 37% thinking that it would not. 67% said that they thought that the
19 proposed reduction in constituencies would not help to get more women into parliament.

20 21% of Labour respondents disagreed with the use of quotas in any circumstances, 50% of
21 Liberal Democrat and 67% of Conservative.

22 Commenting on the findings, CFWD's Director, Nan Sloane, said: "This poll show that,
23 although on the whole women find the negligible increase in women MPs this year
24 unacceptable, they are not in agreement about what to do about it, and there needs to be a
25 much wider debate about what the options might be. "We are disappointed that the
26 Government's proposed constitutional changes include nothing at all about the diversity of
27 representation in general or the representation of women in particular – this is a missed
28 opportunity which means that the UK will continue to lag behind many comparable
29 countries."

Document 19

David Willetts blames feminism over lack of jobs for working men

Hélène Mulholland, guardian.co.uk, Friday 1 April 2011

1 The universities minister David Willetts has been criticised after making comments that
2 appear to blame educated working women for the lack of jobs available to aspiring working
3 class men.

4 Willetts said feminism was probably the "single biggest factor" for the lack of social mobility
5 in Britain, because women who would otherwise have been housewives had taken university
6 places and well-paid jobs that could have gone to ambitious working-class men. The
7 Conservative minister made his comments before the launch of the government's social
8 mobility strategy next week. Looking at reasons for social mobility, he said: "The feminist
9 revolution in its first round effects was probably the key factor. Feminism trumped
10 egalitarianism. It is not that I am against feminism, it's just that is probably the single biggest
11 factor."

12 He expounded the downsides of the "admirable transformation of opportunities for women"
13 by suggesting opening up education since the 1960s had magnified social divides, courtesy of
14 "assortative mating" whereby well-educated women marry well-educated men.

15 "It is delicate territory, because it is not a bad thing that women had these opportunities," he
16 said. "But it widened the gap in household incomes, because you suddenly had two-earner
17 couples, both of whom were well-educated, compared with often workless households where
18 nobody was educated."

19 Yvette Cooper, the shadow equalities minister, who has warned that the government's cuts
20 will hit women hardest, called on Willetts to withdraw his comments. "The idea that working
21 women are responsible for persistent child poverty or youth unemployment in disadvantaged
22 areas is just shocking. David Willetts should quickly withdraw this rubbish and face up to the
23 real problems his policies are causing for young people and women who want to get on."

24 Sarah Veale, the TUC's head of equality and employment rights, said: "It's disappointing to
25 hear this Neanderthal take on our current unemployment crisis coming from a minister
26 serving in the current government. If ministers want clues as to what has held 'working men'
27 back, they should look to their predecessors in the 1980s, hardly a golden age for equal rights,
28 who oversaw the sharp decline of manufacturing and other key industries."

29 However, journalist Cristina Odone, blogging on the Telegraph site, said Willetts was right to
30 suggest feminists were responsible for the plight of working class men. "But not because they
31 have stolen their jobs. Feminists – or at least the kind that have gained the upper hand in this
32 varied movement – have undermined working class men with their philosophy that all males
33 are expendable ... This man-hatred has not only been taught, it has been rewarded: successive
34 Labour governments have satisfied the feminists in their ranks by conceiving a benefits
35 system that rewards single mothers who don't let the father of their children live under the
36 same roof."

Matthew is one of over three-million children in the United Kingdom growing up with little or no access to their fathers.

Because of sexism, prejudice and bigotry, Matthew will grow up without the love and care of his father. He will create his family on the street in a gang. He will riot.

Organisations like the Labour Party, the Fawcett Society and the NSPCC have become dominated by a militant form of feminism which will condemn Matthew to a lifetime of discrimination.

Hate Male.

Like his father he will be segregated from his children. He will be reduced to the status of cashpoint, not father. He will be condemned as a 'runaway' and a 'deadbeat'.

We oppose extremism in all its forms. We support equality of treatment for all our children when they become older, regardless of their gender. Support a message of love, not hate.

www.fathers-4-justice.org

We Are Fathers4Justice.

Advertising Campaigns from Fathers 4 Justice ® The Official Campaign Organisation
www.fathers-4-justice.org, September 2011

Document 21

MEDIA LANDSCAPE

<https://medialandscapes.org/country/united-kingdom>

Julie Firmstone, Associate Professor of Media and Communication, 2017

1 The UK media landscape is characterised by a strongly partisan mass circulation commercial
2 national press and a system of public service broadcasting led by the BBC. A sharp distinction
3 exists between the quality and tabloid national press and between the regimes that govern the
4 print and broadcast media.

5 Although the press remains strong, readership and circulation of the printed national press has
6 been steadily falling due to readers moving to digitally available news. Many legacy media
7 organisations have embraced the Internet to make their content available online via dedicated
8 sites or apps for mobile devices. The online readerships of some newspapers now greatly
9 surpass printed circulation, yet newspapers are still struggling to find ways to make online
10 readership profitable. A great deal of influence is attributed to the national press in the public
11 sphere, particularly at election time. The suggestions of this influence is evidenced by the
12 notorious British tabloid headline, ‘It’s the Sun wot won it’ the day after the unexpected
13 election of a Conservative government which the paper had supported in 1992. Research
14 provides convincing evidence that the press agenda exerts a strong influence on the
15 broadcasting agenda.

16 A strong commercial press funded by advertising developed in the UK. The commercial basis
17 allows the press to operate independently of government and party control. The UK case is an
18 exception within Hallin and Mancini’s Liberal model because the professional journalistic
19 ethos to divide fact-based news from opinion does not result in political neutrality as seen in
20 the other countries in the Liberal model – the USA, Ireland and Canada. As Hallin and
21 Mancini note, the concept of ‘press parallelism’ was developed in Britain and relates to the
22 tendency of the British press to reflect divisions in political parties closely and to adopt
23 distinct political orientations even though newspapers do not have official links with political
24 parties. These political orientations are more clearly manifest in news reporting, particularly
25 in tabloids, than in other countries. The strict division between fact-based objective reporting
26 and opinion that characterises US papers is far more blurred in British papers, even in
27 broadsheets which deploy a more subtle, interpretative style than the tabloids. The relatively
28 strong press parallelism of the British press is also indicated by the high degree to which
29 readers buy newspapers according to their political preferences.

30 Partisanship is largely fixed and based on traditional positions. However, the partisanship of
31 some papers has been more fluid than others, with the Sun famously switching allegiances to
32 Blair’s Labour party then back again to support Cameron’s Conservatives, and changes of
33 ownership often lead to changes in party endorsement. Given the degree of political
34 parallelism, many have observed with concern the disproportionate right-wing weighting in
35 the political orientation of the UK press. Hallin and Mancini’s 2004 observation that this
36 partisan imbalance may be shifting towards support for Labour and/or more pragmatic
37 orientations has come full circle with a clear dominance of right-wing supporting papers in
38 2018. Only two papers and their sister Sunday publications (*The Guardian/The*
39 *Observer* and *The Daily Mirror/Sunday Mirror*) supported the opposition Labour party in the
40 2017 election. A diversity of opinions in the British press relies on the degree of plurality of

41 ownership and the degree to which newspapers owners choose to influence the partisanship of
42 their papers. The strong connection between ownership and partisanship has led to concerns
43 about plurality due to the high degree of concentration of newspaper ownership in the UK
44 market.

45 The UK's newspaper readership continues to be stratified by class and a left/right political
46 divide. Readerships of quality/broadsheet newspapers are predominantly ABC1, with far
47 fewer C2DE readers. Readerships of mid-market papers are more evenly split with relatively
48 equal proportions of readers from each socio-economic background. Tabloids are read
49 predominantly by C2DEs yet their high circulation means that despite low proportions of
50 ABC1 readers they reach a relatively large section of this population. Mid market tabloids
51 have taken more market share since Hallin and Mancini's observations when tabloids
52 accounted for 54 percent of the market and mid-market tabloids held 27 percent. Based on
53 ABC figures for 2018, tabloids now account for 48 percent, mid market tabloids 33 percent,
54 and broadsheets 19 percent.

55 In comparison, public service broadcasting operates a system characterised by a strong
56 tradition of political neutrality. Statutory regulation requires all news produced by
57 broadcasters, television and radio, to remain impartial and to provide balanced coverage.
58 These obligations are overseen by the regulatory body Ofcom. Ofcom also monitors and
59 enforces special impartiality requirements and other legislation that must be applied at the
60 time of elections and referendums. In addition, the BBC has its own set of editorial codes and
61 guidelines to ensure neutrality and diversity in their reporting. Despite the existence of these
62 policies and legislation some degree of controversy exists regarding BBC coverage which is
63 variously accused of being biased towards both sides of the political spectrum. Commercial
64 broadcasting has traditionally played an important role alongside a strong public service
65 broadcasting system. A drive towards opening up the UK market to the global industry led to
66 increasing deregulation and a subsequent increase in non-UK ownership of broadcasters.

67 Although the press and broadcasting is predominantly organised at a national level, the
68 importance of regional and local media should not be overlooked. In particular, media
69 organised at the level of the devolved nations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland play an
70 important role for the public in these areas.

71 Professional journalism is well developed in the UK with journalists considering that they
72 enjoy significant autonomy and operating according to the values of providing a public
73 service. However, two significant shifts in education and ethics have occurred since Hallin
74 and Mancini's overview of the profession. First, the shift towards more journalists possessing
75 university degrees has continued apace and is now the norm rather than the exception.
76 Second, the 'phone hacking scandal' and the subsequent government inquiry led by Leveson
77 in 2012 necessitated a major re-evaluation of journalistic ethics and practices (see 3.2).
78 Leveson's recommendations also led to an as yet incomplete major shake up of the system for
79 self regulation of the press.

80 Methods for accessing news in the UK continue to evolve towards the digital. 2017 marked
81 the first year when the proportion of people using online platforms (74 percent) to access
82 news overtook those using television (69 percent) and print (41 percent) according to the
83 Reuters Digital report.

Document 22

BREXIT: WHY PRESS BIAS IS A GREAT BRITISH TRADITION

CHARLIE BECKETT, NEWSWEEK, OPINION, 6/14/16

Charlie Beckett is Director of the Polis Think Tank at the London School of Economics (LSE)
<https://www.newsweek.com/brexit-press-bias-british-tradition-470385>

1 To people not used to British newspapers they can sometimes feel a bit like that drunken,
2 loud-mouthed guy in the bar who is anxious to tell you what he thinks and what you should
3 think, too. But readers seem to like it. Whether they do what they are told is another matter.
4 The fact that the UK's biggest-selling tabloid *The Sun* has come out in favour of voting to
5 leave the European Union at the referendum on June 23 is no surprise. It has been virulently
6 Euroskeptic ever since Rupert Murdoch bought it nearly half a century ago. In that time it has
7 backed the winners—including Labour's Tony Blair—in every U.K. General Election. If you
8 prefer a more pro-EU voice then feel free to read the more left-wing *The Guardian* or the
9 tabloid *Mirror*. Most U.K. newspapers, including *The Sun*, not only feel it is allowed to
10 express an opinion on the big issues of the day, it is passionately, aggressively partisan. Press
11 bias in the U.K. goes much further than in most other countries, it's a great British tradition.
12 That bias is not just about leader or opinion columns, it extends into the way that news stories
13 are selected and shaped.

14
15 Two different titles will treat the same story in different ways. So while the *Daily Mail* will
16 see rising immigration as a threat to British identity, the *Financial Times* might well stress
17 how it has helped the economy providing skilled workers and people prepared to do jobs in
18 social care or services that Brits avoid. This is partly a product of proprietors buying
19 newspapers to exert influence. This goes back to Lords Beaverbrook and Northcliffe in the
20 early 20th century. These press barons were often motivated by single issue causes rather than
21 backing a political party. The virulently anti-German, Lord Northcliffe used the *Daily Mail* to
22 lobby for more battleships in the run up to the First World War and ended up as the wartime
23 government's official minister for propaganda. He would have loved the way the *Daily*
24 *Mail* has been bashing Brussels. More recently Richard Desmond has turned the already right-
25 wing *Express* into a mouthpiece for the populist U.K. Independence Party (UKIP). It is also a
26 good way to make your product stand out in the highly competitive U.K. national news
27 market. Readers happily identify as liberal "Guardianistas" or followers of the *Telegraph*,
28 "the house journal of the Conservative party." It does not stop those papers from attacking
29 their own side, but readers know where they stand ideologically. *The Independent*, the one
30 paper that sought a non-partisan, high-minded approach, has just stopped printing.

31
32 In other countries newspapers do have political affiliations. Some will be outspoken. Look at
33 the way that the *New York Daily News* has backed Clinton and derided Trump and Sanders,
34 for example. But it seems that some U.K. newspapers are more prepared to permeate their
35 editorial with a slant and try deliberately to shift public opinion on specific causes.
36 In Britain the broadcasters are regulated to be "balanced," so overall there is diversity in the
37 marketplace of ideas. But partly because they can be so outspoken, it often seems during a
38 heated political campaign, such as the E.U. referendum, that it is the newspapers that shape
39 the agenda.

40

Document 23

The Elephant In The Room: New report on UK media ownership

April 24, 2014, Media Reform Coalition

<http://www.mediareform.org.uk/media-ownership/the-elephant-in-the-room>

1 The Media Reform Coalition has today published its newest report ‘The Elephant In The
2 Room: a survey of media ownership and plurality in the United Kingdom.’ The report
3 considers the changing landscape of media ownership across national, regional and local
4 press, as well as radio, TV and internet news sources. Although the state of the UK’s media
5 has been under close examination since the start of the Leveson Inquiry in 2011, media
6 ownership has somehow managed to escape from scrutiny. It is the elephant in the room:
7 obvious to all but never discussed.

8 ‘The Elephant In The Room’ charts some worrying trends that signal the increasing
9 concentration of UK media into fewer and fewer hands. We view media plurality as crucial
10 for a healthy democracy, and vital for ensuring the public has access to a wide range of news
11 and views from independent providers.

12 The statistics gathered about the spread of local media are worrisome – 1/4 of all Local
13 Government Areas (LGAs) aren’t served by a local newspaper, while 35% are covered by
14 only a single local news outlet. Since March 2011, a total of 141 local papers have shut down,
15 and now in 224 LGAs (55% of total) the same 4 companies have majority ownership of the
16 local market.

17 The ownership of national newspapers remains concentrated in just a few large companies:
18 70% of the UK national market is controlled by just three companies (News UK, Daily Mail
19 and General Trust, and Trinity Mirror), with Rupert Murdoch’s News UK fully holding a
20 third of the entire market share.

21 55% of national radio listenership is held by the BBC’s channels, however news content for
22 almost all commercial radio stations is provided by Sky News, giving them 43% of the
23 national audience share for radio.

24 The collapse of the BSkyB deal in 2011, following the revelations of the phone hacking
25 scandal, was a small victory for plurality in the UK. However, when viewed in context of the
26 huge cross-media operation of News Corporation, the figures give no reason for celebration or
27 complacency. News Corp. still holds 39% in BSkyB, effectively counting as joint-leadership
28 between the two companies. Along with its print and radio news outlets, News Corp. controls
29 20% of the market share across all UK media outlets, almost twice that of the public service
30 news services provided by the BBC.

31 The report demonstrates that concentration in ownership across the UK’s news and
32 information markets has reached endemic levels. The existing Public Interest Test (which sees
33 regulators and government taking occasional looks at media plurality) has failed to prevent
34 the continued concentration of UK media into fewer and fewer hands. Along with wider
35 structural remedies to protect local and regional media the report recommends that ownership
36 limits should be enshrined in statute, to ensure that the public is always served by a pluralistic
37 and independent media.

Document 24

Fake news a democratic crisis for UK, MPs warn

<https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-44967650>, 28 July 2018

1 The UK faces a "democratic crisis" with voters being targeted with "pernicious views" and
2 data being manipulated, a parliamentary committee is set to warn. The Digital, Culture, Media
3 and Sport (DCMS) Committee has been investigating disinformation and fake news following
4 the Cambridge Analytica data scandal. In its first report, MPs will suggest social media
5 companies should face tougher regulation or a new tax. It also proposes measures to combat
6 election interference.

7 The MPs' report comes after months of investigating the impact of technology giants and how
8 people are affected by the rise in fake news on social media. It also probed whether Russia
9 had a role in influencing voters in the EU referendum. The committee's report was due to be
10 officially published on Sunday. But a copy was leaked on Friday by Dominic Cummings, the
11 director of the official Brexit campaign group Vote Leave, who published it on his own blog.
12 Mr Cummings was asked and officially summoned to take part in the inquiry - to respond to
13 allegations made against the Vote Leave campaign - but he refused. Mr Cummings called the
14 report "fake news".

15 According to the leaked report, MPs say "our democracy is at risk and now is the time to act".
16 The committee highlights the "relentless targeting of hyper-partisan views, which play to the
17 fears and prejudices of people, in order to influence their voting plans".

18 The report is expected to be very critical of Facebook, which has been under increased
19 scrutiny following the Cambridge Analytica data scandal. "Facebook has hampered our
20 efforts to get information about their company throughout this inquiry. It is as if it thinks that
21 the problem will go away if it does not share information about the problem, and reacts only
22 when it is pressed," it will say. "It provided witnesses who have been unwilling or unable to
23 give full answers to the committee's questions." It will repeat its call for Facebook chief Mark
24 Zuckerberg to give evidence.

25 The committee's report will also say it had received "disturbing evidence" - some of which it
26 had not published - of hacking, disinformation and voter suppression in elections since 2010.
27 "We urge the government to ensure that the National Crime Agency thoroughly investigates
28 these allegations."

29 Companies such as Facebook and YouTube have repeatedly said they are just a "platform",
30 rather than a "publisher". They have argued that they are not responsible for the content
31 people post on their services. The committee's report is expected to say social media
32 companies "cannot hide behind" this claim. A "new category of tech company" which is
33 something in between a platform or publisher should be created, the committee will suggest.
34 This should establish "clear legal liability for the tech companies to act against harmful and
35 illegal content on their platforms".

36 The committee will say that electoral law needs to be "updated to reflect changes in
37 campaigning techniques". It will suggest:

- 38 ▪ creating a public register for political advertising so that anybody can see what messages
39 are being distributed
- 40 ▪ online political advertisements should have a digital imprint stating who was responsible, as
41 is required with printed leaflets and advertisements

42 ▪ social media sites should be held responsible for interference in elections by malicious
43 actors

44 ▪ electoral fraud fines should be increased from a maximum of £20,000 to a percentage of an
45 organisations' annual turnover [...]

46 Tighter regulation of social media sites would mean more work for organisations such as the
47 Electoral Commission and Information Commissioner's Office (ICO). The committee will
48 suggest a tax on tech companies. Some of the money should fund the extra responsibilities of
49 the regulators. The rest of the money should be spent on digital education in schools and a
50 public awareness campaign, to help people identify disinformation and fake news. "Digital
51 literacy should be the fourth pillar of education, alongside reading, writing and maths," the
52 report will say [...]

53 Tom Baldwin, who has written a book on the relationship between politics and media, told
54 BBC Radio 4's Today programme the report's recommendations did not go far enough. "The
55 social media ads that were seen used by Donald Trump and the Leave campaign are the most
56 lethal political weapons ever invented," Mr Baldwin said. Will Moy, the head of fact checking
57 charity Full Fact, told the BBC that the same conversation about fake news is going on around
58 the world - and the reaction of some governments had been "quite scary". He said MPs should
59 acknowledge that it is important to also "stand proudly on being an open society and valuing
60 free speech". Rules for political advertising have become out of date because they do not
61 work for online, and the transparency of where adverts come from should be available
62 immediately, he added. Meanwhile, Jamie Bartlett, the head of think tank Demos, said the
63 report is about the "long-term integrity of elections" so people "trust they are getting accurate
64 information". He said he fears the Brexit debate could distract the focus of the issue. "So
65 those who are pro-Brexit will dismiss a lot of it, those who are anti-Brexit will say 'this is why
66 we should have another referendum, and then we miss what is essentially far more important:
67 The long-term health of democracy.'" The committee's final report is expected before the end
68 of the year.

Document 25

Royal Soap Opera

Malcolm Muggeridge, *The New Statesman and Nation*, 22nd October 1955

1 There probably are quite a lot of people –more than might be supposed – who, like myself,
2 feel that another newspaper photograph of a member of the royal family will be more than
3 they can bear. Even Princess Anne, a doubtless estimable child, becomes abhorrent by
4 constant repetition. Already she has that curious characteristic gesture of limply holding up
5 her hand to acknowledge applause. The Queen Mother, the Duke of Edinburgh, Nanny
6 Lightbody, Group Captain Townsend – the whole show is utterly out of hand, and there is
7 much graver danger than might superficially appear that a strong reaction against it might be
8 produced. This attitude of adulatory curiosity towards the royal family is, of course,
9 something quite new. *Punch* in the nineteenth century made full use, for instance, of the rich
10 vein of satirical material provided by the Royal Dukes, and in our own time Max Beerbohm
11 found the reigning monarch a natural subject, along with all the eminent, for caricature. All
12 this was very healthy. It presupposed a respect for the institution of monarchy, and a sense
13 that incumbents were, like us all, mortal men and women. Let us beware lest, in adulating the
14 incumbents, in insulating them from the normal hazards of public life, we jeopardise the
15 institution. It is, of course, true that the present royal family are much more respectable than
16 most of their Hanoverian ancestors, and therefore lend themselves less to satire. But to put
17 them above laughter, above criticism, above the workaday world, is, ultimately, to
18 dehumanise them and risk the monarchy dying of acute anaemia.

19 It may be argued that it is the general public who require this adulation of the royal family,
20 and that the newspapers, magazines and the B.B.C., in catering for it, are merely meeting the
21 public's requirement in this, as they do in any other field. Undoubtedly it is true that a picture
22 in colour of the Queen or Princess Margaret is a circulation-builder. Equally undoubtedly it is
23 true that the unspeakable Crawfie, and all the other dredgers up of unconsidered trifles in the
24 lives of members of the royal family, down to and including Godfrey Winn, provide popular
25 features. It may even be true (though there is no way of proving this) that those portentous,
26 unctuous B.B.C. announcements, with “the Queen and the Duke of Edinburgh” rolled off the
27 tongue like a toastmaster at a particularly awesome Guildhall banquet that even these are
28 liked by listeners. Personally, I came to feel, during the recent royal tour, that it was better to
29 sacrifice the news than endure them. The fact remains that tedious adulation of the royal
30 family is bad for them, for the public, and ultimately for the monarchical institution itself. Is
31 there anything that can be done to check it? One step would be for the royal family to provide
32 themselves with an efficient public relations set-up in place of the rather ludicrous courtiers
33 who now function as such. This would enable information and photographs to be channelled
34 out in a controlled, instead of haphazard, manner. It would also, if astutely conducted, check
35 some of the worst abuses in the way of invasion of privacy and sheer impertinence. An
36 experienced public relations operator knows how to distribute and withhold favours in such a
37 manner as to maintain some measure of control over those with whom he deals. Also, he
38 knows how to advise those on whose behalf he acts [...]

39 Members of the royal family are in an entirely different situation. Their role is to symbolise
40 the unity of a nation; to provide an element of continuity in a necessarily changing society.
41 This is history, not the Archers, and their affairs ought to be treated as such.

42 If there were a republican party, as in Joseph Chamberlain's time, it might get quite a few
43 recruits. A lot of the old arguments which pointed to the great advantages of a monarchical
44 over an elective presidential system no longer apply. The simple fact is that the United States'
45 Presidency today is a far more dignified institution than the British monarchy. It is accepted
46 that the President must be “put over” by all the vast and diverse apparatus of mass

47 communications. If the result lacks elegance, at least the impression created is of efficiency
48 and forethought [...]
49 The royal family and their advisers have really got to make up their minds – do they want to
50 be part of the mystique of the century of the common man or to be an institutional monarchy;
51 to ride, as it were, in a glass coach or on bicycles; to provide the tabloids with a running serial
52 or to live simply and unaffectedly among their subjects like the Dutch and Scandinavian royal
53 families. What they cannot do is to have it both ways.

Document 26

Tony Blair and the media

<http://www.st-annes.ox.ac.uk/about/news/item/article/tony-blair-and-the-media>

Tim Gardam, 12 June 2007

1 Had Tony Blair wanted confirmation of his argument that the relationship between British
2 media and public life is dangerously dysfunctional, he only had to observe the way his speech
3 to The Reuters Institute was received by the journalists who listened to him.

4 Blair had obviously both longed to speak out about the media, as if only free to do so as his
5 last day in office approaches, and yet he remained strangely hesitant. His thesis was that the
6 fast changing context of the media, the speed and fragmentation of modern technology, had
7 driven journalists to the need for impact over and above accuracy. The effect has been
8 seriously adverse to the way public life is conducted. A culture of cynicism now dominated
9 the public conversation, - “the fear of missing out means today’s media, more than ever
10 before, hunts in a pack. In these modes, it is like a feral beast, just tearing people and
11 reputations to bits”.

12 When he finished, the questions from the listening journalists were as if they had not bothered
13 to listen. Each journalist pursued a particular hobby horse, their agenda not his, focusing on
14 the Iraq dodgy dossier, the Gilligan affair, or seeking the sound bite on “Blair’s legacy” for
15 the next news bulletin. On Tuesday evening, Channel 4 News covered the story, but ran less
16 than 5 seconds of Blair’s speech, preferring a slick montage of Blair surrounded by file
17 footage of wolves- “the feral beasts” - Jon Snow’s vague summary of what Blair had said
18 drowned out by their howling. The discussion between David Blunkett and the right wing
19 polemicist Peter Osborne took up predictable positions, the worst sort of stale, tit for tat
20 posturing that counts as television debate.

21 What was interesting about Blair’s speech was its perplexity; the one British politician who
22 would share Ronald Reagan’s title of “the great communicator” trying to understand how the
23 terms of communication had so changed during his decade in power. He now sounds
24 strangely antiquated. He talked, as he has always done, of “The People”, the use of the
25 definite article revealing his belief in Britain as a collective public consciousness which the
26 deft political leader can charm and lead by inspiration. He condemned the confusion of news
27 and commentary. “Commentary is a perfectly respectable part of journalism” he said “But it is
28 supposed to be separate.” Who makes that supposition one might ask; the politician like the
29 schoolboy prefect appealing to the rules that the playground no longer notices. One had a
30 sense of an old master wrestling with a syntax he no longer understood.

31 For the paradox of Blair’s speech, and its failing despite much perceptiveness, was that he
32 was embroiled in the battles of the old media which in itself is being changed out of
33 recognition by the new. The old elite conversation between the magic circle of journalists and
34 politicians, whose narrow idiom and insider gossip has so disenfranchised public interest in
35 politics for so long, is being swept aside by the anarchic freedom of expression of the internet
36 which rejects such intermediation.

37 Blair was perceptive in that he recognised in the savage competitiveness of modern
38 journalism the fragility of a medium under intense pressure as its business model is turned
39 upside down. Yet, in talking of the internet, he betrayed how little he understands its

40 implications. “It used to be thought – and I include myself in this – that help was on the
41 horizon. New forms of communication would provide outlets to bypass the increasingly shrill
42 tenor of the traditional media. In fact, the new forms can be even more pernicious”.

43 Here Blair reveals the reason why he is so troubled by the evolution of media during his
44 political hegemony. He sees the internet in the vertical terms of the old politics, where the
45 politician could use a medium to “get the message across”. Blair is a politician of one way
46 communication – fixing the press barons, massaging the 24 hour news agenda, relying on his
47 unparalleled informal eloquence, he thought, at the start of his premiership, he had it sorted.
48 However, the internet has destroyed these old certainties. Its communication trajectory is not
49 vertical but horizontal – networks of conversation threading their way through a loosely
50 configured argument where anyone can join in and have their say.

51 This is a different paradigm, where effectiveness in politics depends not on the power of the
52 message and charisma of its deliverer but on how one manages the conversation that flows
53 from it. Government has been quite effective in getting its policies online; it has however not
54 begun to work out how to be seen to listen and respond, as the fiasco of the online debate on
55 road pricing revealed. In the internet world, legitimacy depends on online accountability and
56 sustaining the public conversation on the public’s terms is inherently extremely difficult for
57 government. “The People” no longer exist as such, there are lots of them. Blair seemed utterly
58 unaware of these challenges. He is a politician left over from the era of 24 Hour Rolling
59 News, not of the Online Age.

60 Blair has often let slip a petulant exasperation at those who challenge his arguments; it reveals
61 his impatience at those he meets who refuse to be suborned by his eloquence and come inside
62 his big tent. When so challenged, he betrays his natural instincts to control. Hence the most
63 interesting part of his speech was an elliptical but clear hint of his belief in of the need for the
64 new converged world of old and new media to conform to some new form of regulation.
65 Government could not lead this debate, he said.



Document 28

Cartoons, The Miners' Strike, 1980s



Keith Waite, *Daily Mirror*, 08 Mar 1984



Trog [Wally Fawkes], *Observer*, 08 Apr 1984



Peter Maddocks, *Sunday Express*, 13 May 1984



Leslie Gibbard, *The Guardian*, 22 Oct 1984



Michael Cummings, *Daily Express*, 23 Jan 1985



Stanley Franklin, *The Sun*, 23 Jan 1985

Document 29

Plan to silence extremists comes 20 years after end of Ulster broadcast ban

Owen Bowcott, legal affairs correspondent, *The Guardian*, Tue 30 Sep 2014

1 In front of a derelict house on Falls Road, west Belfast, a large placard appeared in the early
2 1990s depicting an IRA gunman in a balaclava and paramilitary jacket. The barrel of his
3 AK47 bore the word “uncensored”. That defiance of the government’s broadcast ban, which
4 operated between 1988 and 1994, symbolised what many critics of the regulations felt: that
5 the prohibition ultimately provided an additional grievance for republican groups pursuing
6 terror campaigns.

7 Margaret Thatcher’s Conservative administration was not the first in the history of the
8 Troubles to prevent the voices of republican leaders, advocating support for the IRA, from
9 being heard on radio and television. The Irish government led the way with far more
10 draconian restrictions in the early 1970s. A series of high-profile, television programmes in
11 the mid-80s, including the BBC’s Real Lives documentary in 1985 which featured an
12 interview with Sinn Féin’s Martin McGuinness, and a surge in IRA violence, notably the
13 Ballygawley coach bombing in 1988 when six soldiers were killed by a roadside bomb,
14 triggered calls for a broadcasting ban. The prime minister explained that it would deprive
15 “terrorists of the oxygen of publicity”. Sinn Féin was the main target of the restrictions but
16 they also covered 10 republican and loyalists paramilitary groups including the Irish National
17 Liberation Army (INLA), the Ulster Volunteer force (UVF) and the Ulster Defence
18 Association (UDA). Unlike the Irish ban, the UK version did not operate during elections and
19 permitted the words of those subject to its controls to be spoken by actors.

20 The ban tested the initiative of broadcast journalists who resented being subject to controls
21 that did not effect their print colleagues. Actors became so skilled in lip-synching sound clips
22 for news bulletins that viewers barely noticed the dubbing. Equity members earned up to £120
23 a session. One of the actors who regularly impersonated Gerry Adams on the airwaves, it
24 emerged, was also providing the voice-over for anti-terrorist television advertisements put out
25 by the Northern Ireland Office. The ban became the target of increasing ridicule.

26 The BBC’s then head of news and current affairs, Tony Hall, now the corporation’s director
27 general, pointed out that it allowed Sinn Féin to avoid being interviewed – exploiting the ban
28 as an excuse. Attempts to challenge the ban at the European court of human rights failed. In
29 early 1994, the Irish government minister Dick Spring dismissed the ban as “a crude form of
30 censorship” and shortly afterwards the Irish republic chose to let its broadcast restrictions
31 lapse. As the peace process gathered pace, the anomaly of Gerry Adams being interviewed by
32 the world’s media and his words broadcast in every country apart from the UK – where they
33 had to be re-voiced – became increasingly difficult to sustain. The Westminster ban was lifted
34 in September 1994, weeks after the IRA declared its first ceasefire.

35 An analysis by Glasgow Media Group in the early 90s suggested that the ban did lead to Sinn
36 Féin being interviewed less frequently, because of the technical difficulty of subtitling or
37 recording voiceovers, but had no noticeable impact on the level of violence.

38 That was in the days when there was a clear division between print and broadcast journalism.
39 Enforcing a broadcast ban in the modern-day, global media jungle – where information moves
40 rapidly through internet links across blogs, video-clips, Twitter, YouTube and established

41 news organisations – will be a far harder task. A more liberal regime of free speech, now
42 buttressed by the Human Rights Act and article 10 of the European convention on human
43 rights which guarantees freedom of expression, is also likely to make courts more sympathetic
44 to challenges.

Document 30

Nick Griffin on Question Time: No big gaffes, so he will say it's a success

<https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2009/oct/23/nick-griffin-bnp-question-time>
Aditya Chakraborty, Fri 23 Oct 2009

1 A thousand shouting protesters in front, a smuggled entrance through the back, and loud boos
2 during his introduction: for any other politician, this would be a terrible, nerve-jangling start
3 to an appearance on Question Time. For Nick Griffin, though, last night's foray into
4 Television Centre was a golden opportunity.

5 A political pariah had a shot at the mainstream and – while the British National party leader
6 was attacked by other panellists, jeered from the floor, and often looked just plain shifty – he
7 came through it without making a big gaffe. Griffin's success last night can be defined as
8 follows: neither cabinet ministers nor protesters stopped him from getting on air and there
9 were no punch-ups nor any telltale flashes of temper. For the BNP, those are sufficient
10 grounds to chalk up last night as a victory.

11 Harriet Harman recently remarked that Question Time could make or break a politician's
12 career. For Griffin though, it was hard to spot the downside. If David Dimbleby ran the
13 programme as usual, a Holocaust-denier could act the populist pundit on MPs' expenses and
14 postal strikes. If the programme became all about him, Griffin could play martyr – another
15 victim of discrimination at the hands of the "ultra-leftist" BBC and the rest of the arugula-
16 eating classes.

17 In the end, Dimbleby went down the second route and assumed the rather uncomfortable role
18 of part-chair, part-inquisitor. The first three-quarters of the programme were all about the
19 BNP leader, and he came well-prepared. Griffin has always been the most upwardly-mobile
20 of racists, and in pre-match interviews had talked of his hopes of attracting "high-quality,
21 serious political people" over to the far right. Last night was hardly a walkover, but it did
22 allow him to ditch the Johnny Racist act.

23 Sporting a poppy and a charcoal-grey suit, he looked like a jobbing backbencher who'd lucked
24 his way on to BBC1. It was a reminder that Griffin is an elected MEP – but also visual
25 reassertion of his claim to be an ordinary guy representing the averagely-excluded rather than
26 a bogeyman. The effect was accentuated by the seating. Nestled between Dimbleby and the
27 African-American playwright Bonnie Greer on the right-wing of the table, with the
28 Westminster politicians arranged opposite, Griffin banged on about how he represented the
29 unrepresented. The act may not have convinced the Twitterati – bursting with tens of
30 thousands of epithets such as "Adolf Brent" – but then, that probably isn't the BNP's target
31 constituency.

32 Time after time, Griffin batted off aggressive question with flat denials. Had he said Hitler
33 had gone "a bit too far?" Never. Other outrageous quotes were simply "outrageous lies".
34 Denying previous statements as taken out of context is a standard Griffin trick, but the
35 Question Time format – quickfire and noisy – was never going to allow for anything
36 approaching forensic interrogation of even obviously-loopy policies. Neither does it allow for

37 a guest who ditches debating manners – by resolutely ducking questions and greeting
38 discussion of Nazi atrocities with a perfectly punchable half-smile.

39 The other flaw was the panel. Jack Straw and Chris Huhne were the two big-hitting but grey
40 male front-benchers while Tory baroness Sayeeda Warsi was occasionally winningly demotic.
41 Greer was impressively polite while also displaying a mastery of the show's body-language,
42 by holding herself throughout in a half-turn away from the racist. But what was missing was a
43 working-class voice to blow Griffin a raspberry and tell this former public schoolboy and
44 Cambridge graduate that he didn't represent the constituency he claimed.

45 Perhaps the biggest blow landed when Dimbleby held up a picture of the BNP with the Ku
46 Klux Klan leader David Duke. Griffin said Duke was a "non-violent" figure, to angry laughter
47 from the audience.

48 It was the audience that came out best from the evening. There was never any chance that
49 members were going to clap or even nod along to Griffin's declamations – who would want
50 their neighbours and colleagues to see them doing that? –but some of the individual questions
51 hit the mark. There was the young Jewish boy who talked movingly about the Holocaust. The
52 young Asian man who offered to start a whip-round to send the BNP leader to the South Pole
53 came up with one of the best questions of the evening. He lived in this country, and he loved
54 it: "Where do you want me to go?"

55 And of course, Griffin had no answer.

The British press: *The Sun*



Document 32

The media column: The lobby system poisons political journalism,

David Aaronovitch, Tuesday 7 May 2002, *The Independent*

1 The most exclusive and strangest club in Britain has long been the gathering together – in a
2 tower in Westminster – of the parliamentary lobby correspondents of Britain. Last week, that
3 club, though not quite disbanded, was damaged by the Government's decision to end the
4 morning briefings that its members – and its members alone – could have with the Prime
5 Minister's spokesperson every weekday of the parliamentary year.

6 In 1990, I became the BBC's Head of News at Westminster, and nominally took charge of the
7 political correspondents who worked for the radio and television bulletins. There were more
8 than a dozen of them, and the politics of their competing careers made Mo Mowlam's
9 complaints of backbiting within government look mild and oversensitive. They all wanted to
10 be on television not radio (which, in some cases, was asking a lot of the viewers), and they all
11 wanted to be on the evening news and not *BBC Breakfast*.

12 What, however, held them together in the face of the outside world and gave them status in
13 the eyes of their producers or among the orcish ranks of regional or policy reporters (from
14 whom they had originally risen) was their membership of the lobby. This entitled them to go
15 where others might not, to the twice daily briefings and (hence the name) into the member's
16 lobby, where they could accost or be accosted by MPs. It was and is their badge of arrival.

17 Up in the tower, where the political journalists live and work in conditions largely unchanged
18 since Edward the Confessor's day (except there is no money to put straw down on the floors),
19 the select vote for a chair of the lobby and attend lobby functions. In my time, the
20 administrator of the lobby was a fierce woman, right out of Dickens's Circumlocution Office,
21 who was renowned for her bureaucratic caprice. This was in the very late Thatcher and early
22 Major period, and the entire arrangement struck me then (and strikes me still) as being
23 corrupt. Defenders of the lobby (mostly political editors who have been around too long)
24 argue that the lobby system, with its band of élite journos sticking spikes into Alastair
25 Campbell, exhibits a "bloody-minded persistence" and a "refusal to be fobbed off". And
26 sometimes – very occasionally – this is true. But more usually, they display a "rush to story",
27 in which they create between them an orthodoxy about a story – which then becomes
28 impossible to dislodge. This stifling of stories was one factor that led *The Independent* and
29 one or two other newspapers in the late Eighties to boycott the lobby. Another factor was the
30 famous "lobby terms" in which reportage had to be couched. Under lobby terms, you could
31 quote the words, but you could not reveal the source. This is different from "off the record",
32 when, effectively, there has been no conversation at all. So we had "sources close to...".

33 "Lobby terms" are nothing more than a conspiracy against the citizen, who cannot tell who is
34 speaking and therefore how to evaluate a story – other than to accept it at the journalist's own
35 evaluation. So the hack gets his or her story, the editor fills the page, the anonymous
36 politician gets the point over (often in exaggerated form) at no cost to him or herself. And
37 only the reader has no idea of what to make of it. This cowardly anonymity, effectively
38 banned by American newspapers, has poisoned our political journalism. For example, I still
39 do not know who is supposed to have briefed against Mo Mowlam and why, and I simply
40 cannot judge whether she is a woman wronged, or a woman deluded. But even worse, it has
41 leeches into all of our other journalism, too. If, for example, Ulrika Jonsson or her agent want
42 to say something about Sven Goran Eriksson, and want their exact words to be used, then they
43 should have the courage to be named, or they should stay silent. So, by all means let's kill the
44 lobby, but let's also kill their bloody terms.

Document 33

The Coronation of Queen Elizabeth II, BBC Parliament

Neil Midgley reflects on the original BBC coverage of the Queen's Coronation, the first example of 'event TV', in all its grainy glory.

Neil Midgley, 02 Jun 2013, <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/tvandradio/10086367/The-Coronation-of-Queen-Elizabeth-II-BBC-Parliament.html>

1 These days, the nation can barely get from one weekend to the next without some broadcast or
2 other being presented as an “event” on television. From the Olympic opening ceremony to the
3 Britain’s Got Talent final, via every general election and major international soccer match,
4 TV presents all the nation’s hoopla, seamlessly and in high definition, straight to our living
5 rooms. In 1953, that wasn’t the case. The Coronation of Her Majesty the Queen was,
6 famously, the first event for which Brits gathered – a dozen or more at a time – around their
7 newly-purchased TV sets. Courtesy of the BBC Parliament channel – which has made a habit
8 recently of replaying history-as-it-happened, in the form of general election coverage from the
9 past – this masterpiece was rebroadcast today in all its grainy glory.

10
11 Certainly, as a piece of television, it was defined by its age. Westminster Abbey’s gothic
12 arches, presented in black-and-white and partially by candlelight, looked more like The
13 Addams Family than the national venue that we have now come to know and venerate. Each
14 edit to a new shot entailed a brief screen of blackness, of the kind that might herald a
15 commercial break – except that it was still a full two years before ITV would be launched.
16 Perhaps to avoid too much of that choppy editing, each shot was held far longer than would
17 ever be the case today. And all of the action was shot relatively close up, with the ongoing
18 business of the Queen, the bishops and the maids of honour filling the screen. There were
19 almost no long or wide shots, as would be used now to establish the Abbey as our majestic
20 venue. The coronation could have been happening at TV Centre, for all we could see of our
21 ancient royal church (except that TV Centre, too, was still seven years away).

22
23 For the next coronation, surely, the BBC will have something to say about staging, just to
24 give the whole thing a bit more zip. As the exultant introduction to the Coronation Anthem,
25 Zadok the Priest, rocked the Abbey, I was agog to realise that Her Majesty wasn’t even
26 moving. It is perhaps the most glorious music in the English canon, and it played out to an
27 unchanging shot of two empty chairs. Then, at the crucial moment, when St Edward’s Crown
28 finally made it on to Her Majesty’s head, the shot was largely obscured by the back of
29 Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr Geoffrey Fisher's bald head.

30
31 And yet for all its olde-worlde charm, with its deferential tone and its RKO Pictures music,
32 this was – in its bones – precisely the same kind of broadcast that we’ll have for the next
33 coronation. The BBC had rigged up fixed cameras, had tested the angles, had rehearsed the
34 commentary – and they will again. Despite the customarily clipped tones of the time, Richard
35 Dimbleby didn’t sound much different then from how David Dimbleby would sound now.
36 The next coronation will, no doubt, be very different from the last, for reasons that are way
37 above my pay grade – seeing the 1953 ceremony again offered a stark reminder of just how
38 much Church and aristocracy it contained. Yet in essence, it will be the same: the anointing of
39 a new British head of state. The pomp and the pageantry, and all the gold coaches and silver
40 robes, make great telly in and of themselves. But Royal occasions have their own special
41 claim to TV-event status. Uniquely among major TV broadcasts, they contain no element of

42 competition. And even in 2013, I can't see them introducing a phone vote to pick the king
43 ("Don't vote now – your vote won't be counted, but you may still be beheaded").
44 Yet what they do all offer is a moment of genuine, if often unrecognised, resolution – this is
45 the moment when our head of state or the line of succession is confirmed, at a royal wedding,
46 or when the preceding head of state is interred, at a royal funeral.
47 Sixty years on, the British are uniquely good at putting those moments on the telly, and our
48 skills can still be traced back to the 1953 ceremony. So congratulations to Her Majesty on the
49 anniversary of her coronation – and a doff of the cap, too, to the pioneering BBC technicians
50 who helped the world share it with her.

Document 34

Does the 'Daily Mail' really hate women?

It has more female readers than any other newspaper. Yet many critics say that, day after day, the 'Mail' belittles women and offers a misogynist view of the world

The Independent, Sally Feldman, Wednesday 01 April 2009

(Sally Feldman is dean of the School of Media, Arts and Design at the University of Westminster)

1 Women, Germaine Greer once said, have no idea how much men hate them. But given the
2 avid female following of the Daily Mail, despite its lamentable portrayal of women, you can't
3 help wondering whether they hate themselves even more than men do.

4 That's what Mail columnist Allison Pearson implied this week when, in the wake of the
5 expulsion of ultra-vicious Grace from the Big Brother house, she asked: "Are girls really
6 doomed to be bitches?" While shooting at a few familiar targets - footballers' wives;
7 professional mothers who terrorise others at the school gate - what she failed to note was the
8 unsisterliness that is constantly exhibited in her very own newspaper. The same edition, for
9 example, worried that Victoria Beckham was getting too thin, expressed fears that Kirsty
10 Young may be wrong for Desert Island Discs, and featured a close-up of Madonna's wrinkled,
11 veiny hands to show how they betray her age.

12 So how come the newspaper that, from its inception, has set out to champion, befriend and
13 appeal to women, seems so savagely to have turned against them? When the Mail was first
14 launched nearly a hundred years ago by the press baron Lord Northcliffe, his stated aim was
15 to create a newspaper for what was then an untapped readership. The Mail was the first paper
16 to have a women's page and the first to set out to reflect and define what has now come to be
17 dubbed "Middle England". It stood for family values, for fairness and justice, and above all
18 for Britishness.

19 When the paper went tabloid in 1970, it was selling 1.9m copies. It continued to be "the paper
20 read by the wives of the people who run the country". It was a time when Women's Liberation
21 was on the rise. The Mail began to express alarm at the UK's enthusiasm for permissiveness.
22 Some would say its mistrust of the modern took a marked turn towards extremism when the
23 long-term editor David English, widely regarded as an editorial genius, was succeeded by
24 Paul Dacre with his blunt, less subtle package.

25 For the Mail, the legacy of the Sixties is an unwelcome one. "Sex is non-existent at the Mail,"
26 mused a former reporter. "I think they used to put bromide in the water - it's such a libido-free
27 zone." That attitude pervades its attitude to abortion. While purporting to speak up for unborn
28 foetuses, the paper's subtext is really about the women who must be punished for their
29 wantonness. "Headlines frequently reinforce the messages of the anti-choice lobby,"
30 according to Anne Quesney, director of the pro-choice campaigning organisation Abortion
31 Rights. "One would believe that abortion is overwhelmingly traumatic, shameful and
32 dangerous and is recklessly undertaken by women. In reality, reproductive rights are crucial
33 to women's equality."

34 Nonetheless, the paper continues to hold sway with its legion female fans. Of its readership,
35 an unmatched 53 per cent are women. Only the Express (49 per cent) and the Mirror (48 per
36 cent) come close. From the start it has mirrored the formula of what were originally its only
37 rivals: women's magazines. The Mail's most enduringly successful component is what the

38 women's magazines have always referred to as "triumph over tragedy". It excels in eking out
39 heartbreaking revelations and confessions, dazzling readers with scoop after tear-wrenching
40 scoop. What other paper would have persuaded Margaret Oaten to confide her reactions to her
41 husband's public shame?

42 And yet to some, the Mail has departed from its reliable role as big sister and developed into
43 something nasty. The recipe is simple: an anxiety to alarm us mixed with a prurient but
44 "sympathetic" glimpse of the fallibility of the famous. How sad that Jerry Hall may have
45 resorted to Botox. How tragic that skinny Kate Moss has cellulite. The Mail's well developed
46 interest in cellulite puts it in the role of watchful neighbour, sniffing disapprovingly as it leans
47 over the garden wall to share malevolence disguised as concerned gossip. The Guardian's
48 Polly Toynbee is in no doubt: "The Daily Mail is an enemy of all women everywhere. They
49 set women up to knock them down. To destroy them for any reason they can find."

50 Executive women, single parents, and most especially working mothers are the favoured
51 targets. Favourite heroines are those who give up work to stay at home. "The traditional
52 family unit is in meltdown due to plunging moral values and the rise of single parents," the
53 paper said this week, reporting on a survey claiming that one in nine mothers believe that
54 single parents are responsible for a "breakdown in family life in Britain today". Toynbee adds:
55 "The Daily Mail constantly harks back to a kind of mythical golden age in which women
56 knew their place. It's a Janet and John picture of the world. The newspaper, and the Femail
57 pages in particular, seem locked into a conspiracy with the reader to lament the present and
58 deplore the modern."

59 Paul Dacre is a daunting figure with a taste for strong language and women who stick to
60 skirts. "It's not that Paul hates women," said a journalist who worked with him for years. "He
61 once said that every article should be an editorial - and he sees himself as someone who in
62 part is giving the readers what they want, and in part is a moral crusader who truly believes
63 that his core readership must share his world view. It's not misogyny - it's common sense.
64 Paul's view would be, 'We sell to two-and-a-half million copies and over half our readers are
65 women. How can we be anti-women?'" The answer is, I suspect, that many buy it despite
66 themselves. "Some of me probably is a bit mean, and the Daily Mail seems to tap into that. I
67 admit I enjoy it," said a marketing executive. The Mail reminds us that celebrities have the
68 same problems as the rest of us. It caters for our prurience.

69 Occasionally it will confound us with uncharacteristic opinions. A few weeks ago Joan
70 Bakewell wrote a wonderful celebration of feminism. Jenni Murray penned a paean to older
71 women's raunchy sexuality. And even arch-Femail Allison Pearson is often surprisingly,
72 dangerously liberal.

73 These pieces seem placed to reassure the woman reader that the paper is on her side. It's
74 certainly what the editor appears to believe. But no matter how well targeted the Mail may be,
75 how shrewd, how convinced that it is the true beacon for female values, it seems to me to fail
76 in one crucial regard. What the Mail doesn't share with women's magazines is empathy with
77 the sensible, funny, brilliant, warm, supportive, adventurous, brave and generous sides of
78 women. It just puts on a very good act.

Document 35

Media Sexism Investigation: Of course our papers are sexist

Liz Gerard, Published: 12:00 PM January 28, 2018 Updated: 6:07 PM September 17, 2020

<https://www.theneweuropean.co.uk/brexit-news/liz-gerard-papers-sexist-23670>

1 Sexism in the media is deep-seated and progress on the issue is glacial, says LIZ
2 GERARD.

3 Sexism is sewn into the fabric of the media, just as it is in politics, big business,
4 banking, the police and the Forces. Which is not to say that these sectors mean or want
5 it to be. Most men working in these areas honestly believe in equal opportunities; many
6 would declare themselves feminists. They, like the editor of this paper, would be
7 affronted to be accused of sexism. But that doesn't stop their industries being sexist.
8 Because it is still ingrained in the way our country functions – what hardline feminists
9 denounce as the patriarchy.

10 A century on from the suffragette movement and nearly half a century after the Equal
11 Opportunities Act, Britain – even with a woman as prime minister – still marches to a
12 male drum, with its progress chronicled by newspapers that view the world through a
13 male lens. Ten of our twelve national daily papers have male editors; all but one have
14 male political editors. The overwhelming majority of front-page news stories have male
15 bylines. The paper most squarely aimed at women – the Daily Mail – lists five female
16 columnists on its website, against 16 men. The Mail may be marketed at thirty or
17 fortysomething women, but it is run by a man of pensionable age who regards working
18 mothers as an abomination. Every inch of the paper has Paul Dacre's imprint on it,
19 every article is written to fit one man's male-centric agenda. Even those commissioned
20 by women, written by women and focusing on women.

21 A Cabinet reshuffle that leaves 82 men in government instead of 89 (against 38 women)
22 is a 'massacre of middle-aged men'; ministers (sorry, 'girls') walking up Downing Street
23 are apparently not there to discover their new jobs, but taking part in a fashion parade.
24 Everything is reduced to physical appearance or the cost of a wardrobe. To the point
25 that when the two women who run the UK and Scotland meet to discuss Brexit, they are
26 photographed on the front page under a headline 'Legs-It' in which the focus is not on
27 their political differences, but on who has the better pins. The writer and broadcaster
28 MaryAnn Sieghart calls this 'mud-wrestling syndrome': setting one woman against
29 another. The 'Me Too' sexual harassment tidal wave? Get a woman to say it's a witch-
30 hunt and you can argue: 'See! Even a woman thinks it's wrong...' as though that single
31 opinion invalidates everyone else's concern. And when that paper, with its online
32 incarnation, is the most successful news brand in the world, which rival is going to say
33 they've got it wrong? There is an assumption that because the Mail is doing less badly
34 than others, it is providing what people want. And what it provides are stories that set

35 out to put women in their place (fund manager Gina Miller is a 'former model') and
36 judge them (Theresa May excepted) not on what they achieve, but on how they look or
37 in terms of their role in some man's life.

38 The vast majority of front-page stories across all titles are about men because men still
39 hold the vast majority of the big jobs. They are the movers and shakers. Where women
40 appear, they tend to be there as decoration or victims. Most papers prefer pictures of
41 women to men, but rarely because they have said or done something significant. And
42 even when they have, the emphasis will be on body rather than brain - like Penny
43 Mordaunt in a swimsuit when she was promoted to the Cabinet. Meghan Markle, the
44 Duchess of Cambridge, Kate Moss, Keira Knightly, Helen Mirren, Rita Ora: we see
45 them again and again. Not for their ideas or insight, but because of who they're married
46 to, because they look good in (or out of) clothes or on the red carpet, because they are
47 too fat or too thin, because they look good for their age or have bags under their eyes.
48 And every time they will be assessed, judged. They are marketing tools, not people
49 with an agenda. They are not valued [...]

50 Sieghart, who helped to set up the Women in Journalism group in 1994 in an effort to
51 encourage women to develop their careers and go for the bigger jobs, points to WiJ
52 research last year – reported in these pages – showing that twice as many men are in
53 senior executive positions, twice as many attend the agenda-setting news conferences
54 and four times as many male reporters get their names on the front page. Kath Viner at
55 the Guardian is swimming against the tide, with two women job-sharing the role of
56 political editor, a raft of female department heads, and an even balance between male
57 and female bylines on hard-news, front-page stories. It can be done. Sieghart recalls
58 that when she became comment editor on the Times in the 1980s, there wasn't a single
59 female oped writer. She challenged editor Peter Stothard who said: 'If you can find me
60 someone who can write as well as William Rees-Mogg, we'll give her the space.' And
61 so Libby Purves became the first of many. Purves now writes for the Mail, too, and was
62 in 2016 honoured with the chairman's award at the EI Comment Awards. But two
63 weeks later the Beeb dumped her and her Midweek radio show. These days, as Sieghart
64 points out, men pretty well have a clear run at that premium 9am slot on Radio 4.

65 Start the Week on Mondays is presented by three men (it used to be two men and a
66 woman), the science programme on Tuesday has a male presenter, the arts show that
67 replaced Midweek varies, and Melvyn Bragg has Thursdays with In Our Time. Only on
68 soft Fridays does a woman have a guaranteed slot: Kirsty Young with the gentle Desert
69 Island Discs. The message it sends, even inadvertently, is: serious subjects are for men;
70 women are not allowed to have 'authority'. We see this, too, on television. Women
71 vanish from the screen when they hit their forties while the Dimplebys go on forever.
72 They have 'gravitas'. 'Where are the white-haired women?' asked Anna Ford, who
73 disappeared from view long before her craggy-faced TV-am colleagues David Frost,
74 Robert Kee and Michael Parkinson [...] Where are the female equivalents of John
75 Humphrys, Peter Snow, David and Jonathan Dimpleby, John Simpson and countless
76 other men who work well into their late seventies? It is nothing but very old-fashioned
77 broadcasting sexism and prejudice.' [...]

78 Progress is being made, but it is glacially slow, as Jane Martinson, the Guardian writer
79 who led the latest WiJ research, put it. 'There are signs of hope, with not only the
80 appointment of Katharine Viner as the Guardian's first female editor-in-chief but with

81 more women in the lobby and making a noise in general.' Veteran commentator Roy
82 Greenslade also cites Viner and her team. 'Gradually, I think, the ratio of women to
83 men in established media organisations has increased,' he says. Certainly it has in terms
84 of those wanting to come into the trade. As professor of journalism at City University,
85 Greenslade has noticed that the proportion of women taking the course has been
86 increasing every year, so that for the past five years they have been in the majority [...]
87 Of course everyone points to Viner, rather as they did with Thatcher, as a beacon of
88 hope for ambitious women – or as a sign that they have been whingeing for no reason;
89 as though two in twelve is cause for celebration, proof of equality.

90 The BBC has recently bucked the sexist and ageist trend by choosing 60-year-old Fran
91 Unsworth to replace 48-year-old James Harding as head of news. But the big test will
92 come when Dacre finally retires. A woman at the helm of the Mail – especially if she
93 were to reverse the decline in circulation – would really change the landscape.

94 Liz Gerard worked on national newspapers for 40 years. She now blogs on Fleet Street
95 subjects at www.sub-scribe.co.uk