

# transatlantic

Association of Commonwealth Universities  
36 Gordon Square, London WC1H 0PF  
tel: 020 7380 6704, fax: 7387 2665  
email: harkness@acu.ac.uk

# REPORT



The newsletter of the  
Harkness Fellows Association  
and Atlantic Fellows

ISSUE 12, SPRING 2007

## CAN NEWS EVER BE OBJECTIVE?

David Edmonds (HF 1993-94) spoke to a Harkness seminar in March 2006, on the theme **"Can News Ever Be Objective?"** His talk is reproduced below. He was speaking in a purely personal capacity, and not on behalf of the BBC.

Getting a journalist to talk about truth, some may think, is a bit like asking a corporate lawyer to discuss charity or a supermodel obesity. Truth and Journalism are, in the eyes of the public, not natural bedfellows. But believe it or not, we at the BBC World Service like to believe that we believe in truth.

If you type into a search engine the words 'objectivity' and 'journalism', the region of the world which pops up most often, you won't be surprised to know, is the Middle East. Last year, Barbara Plett, one of our Middle East correspondents, was reprimanded for a report she filed on *From Our Own Correspondent* where correspondents are given a bit more of a licence to express personal opinions. She'd been on the West Bank as Yasser Arafat lay dying in late 2004: there were thousands of people on the streets, and overcome by emotion, she described how as the helicopter carried 'the frail old man rose from his ruined compound, I started to cry'. The BBC was deluged with complaints, and after an inquiry by the governors, it was determined that she had ... and I quote ... 'breached the guidelines on due impartiality'.

I've worked for the BBC for sixteen years now, on and off. My job is to produce radio documentaries. These are broadcast on the BBC World Service around the world, to Texas and Togo, to Muslims in Cairo, Hindus in Delhi, to villages and cities, to farmers and lawyers. The BBC, of course, prides itself on its news objectivity: we want to be judged on our 'objectivity' – our objectivity provides much of the rationale for our existence. It's what our reputation rests on. If there was a generally held perception that the BBC was not objective, our days would soon be numbered. Support for the BBC – and its licence fee – would collapse if many members of the public believed that the BBC had a systematic bias in favour of one political party over another, or had an institutional view on the National Health Service or rail privatization or university fees.

I've used the word 'objectivity', but there are other words which are thought to be synonyms for 'objectivity'. They include, 'balance', 'fairness', 'impartiality', 'neutrality'. In fact, I don't think these words mean the same at all – or rather, it would make sense to allocate them slightly different meanings. And one of the things I'd like to do later in this talk is prise these concepts apart – while trying to explain why the notion of objectivity is such a slippery one. Indeed the concept of 'objectivity' can be battered with so many problems that it's not at all clear how it can survive. Let us try and define what one might mean by objectivity. A working definition is this: when I'm attempting to describe the world objectively, I'm attempting to describe the world as it actually is to the best of my abilities and free of my prejudices.

I don't want to spend too long on the first and most obvious problem. What are my prejudices, and how on earth can I free myself from them? I have a certain educational background, I'm male, of a certain age, I have political views, I've been brought up

with cultural assumptions particular to my family, and general assumptions shared by the wider society. Naturally, all this, and a zillion additional factors, will influence the way I see the world. And the truth is that the BBC is full of people like me, in lots of ways: similar educational background, similar values. Some people say that the BBC has a liberal bias: others that it is biased towards the middle-class, others towards events south of the Watford gap – or a combination of all these things.

In any case, to be objective I'm asked to shed these formative influences on my life: to remain a rational creature, but to abstract myself entirely from my values and views. Now in some ways this is perfectly feasible. I'm a West Ham supporter, and if reporting on West Ham's triumphant quarter final cup victory against Manchester City, I may be able to hide the joy from my voice. Yet I can't shed all my beliefs. The idea that some entirely abstract individual can observe the world is an utterly incoherent one: I have to view the world through a particular prism. There is no "view from nowhere".

That's all a little philosophical: let me talk about some more practical problems that affect everyday journalists. If it's true that journalists have a front seat to history, it's also true that many problems faced by journalists are also faced by historians. And most of these problems have to do with choice.

First, there is the choice of stories. We at the World Service face a particular problem here. We're broadcasting from Britain, from Bush House in the centre of London, but somehow we're supposed to compile the news as though we were broadcasting from Mars: we're not supposed to be British-centric, we're supposed to look down at the world from up above. Even were this possible, we face a plethora of difficulties. For example, is each death to be weighed equally? Is a flood in Louisiana of equal newsworthiness to a flood in Bangladesh? One could find legitimate reasons for according the New Orleans flood higher priority: America is a Superpower, the economic and political repercussions will be more far reaching etc. etc. But there is a whole set of what may be called incommensurable decisions – stories that are like apples and oranges – stories that seem impossible to compare because you have to weigh them up on entirely different scales. How on earth do you judge the significance of Liverpool winning the European cup against say Tessa Jowell resigning, or compared to a plane crash in Guatemala in which 100 are killed? I saw an article in the Guardian recently in which Peter Bazalgette – the head of the independent production company Endemol – was crowing about the coverage in the mainstream media of Big Brother, Endemol's most successful creation. He pointed out that George Galloway's eviction from the Big Brother house was third in the running order

continued on page 2

Can News Ever Be Objective?	1-3
Fellows' News	3
Forthcoming Events	5
In Memoriam	5

on the BBC's flagship news programme, *The News At Ten*, below the Palestinian elections but above the education white paper and above Google bowing to pressure by the Chinese censors.

In reality, the selection of stories is dictated by a whole set of considerations that have little or nothing to do with objectivity. Let me mention a couple. Stories are chosen in part not because of their importance but because of their entertainment value. Even in the BBC, ratings matter. We don't have the same commercial pressures as other broadcasters – so we don't need to worry about advertising, or about the business interests of our owners. But we do need to care about our viewers and listeners. There are plenty of worthy and weighty subjects that seem to bore our listeners rigid no matter how imaginatively we cover them. EU institutions are one example. *File-on-Four*, the investigative programme on Radio 4, covers several foreign stories a year: every time it does so, the audience plummets. People are much more engaged by a story of corruption involving garbage-collection in Hull than they are about human rights abuses in Zimbabwe. When Tip O'Neill was speaker of the House of Representatives he said 'All politics is local': and the same goes, if to a lesser extent, for journalism. And so for us journalists, choosing news is never *just* about what we regard as the most important stories: it's also about selecting what our viewers and listeners think are the most important or entertaining stories. Or rather, what we *think* they *think* should be covered. The media is an industry like any other, and it has consumers like any other.

Some stories sell better than others. The weird or the eccentric. The one-legged grannie who swims the Channel in a duck suit. Bad news is almost always better than good. Death, destruction, catastrophe, chaos...that's all fabulous. Harmony, peace, serenity, tranquillity...disastrous. The public has an inexhaustible appetite for scare stories. Incidentally, a study in the US showed that those who watched a lot of television regarded the world as a much more frightening place than those who watched it less.

Then there are very practical considerations about covering stories. Print is purer than radio in this regard, and radio is not as hidebound as television, but people who work in television will tell you that items are routinely selected on the basis of the best pictures available, not the best stories. Of course, as technology democratises, as more and more pictures become accessible from a multiplicity of sources, and are then instantly transferable at the touch of a button, such considerations will become increasingly irrelevant. The tsunami, for example, affected what would normally be regarded as remote parts of the world: but there was plenty of footage, taken by tourists and others – and it was on our screens in seconds – yanking our consciences into action. And giving the news requires the telling of stories: journalists have to find the micro illustrations to illuminate the macro news: a piece about AIDS demands a victim. For one about the Tsunami a correspondent will track down an orphan or grieving parent.

OK, so you've stripped yourself of your prejudices - or failed to - and you've dealt with your first choice, the choice of story. Now you face a second choice...the choice of words.

And here we face some examples where it is quite impossible to be objective. We don't need to call the Israeli-built wall that cuts into the West Bank either a Security Wall (as some Israelis call it) or an Apartheid Barrier (as some Palestinians call it). We can just call it A WALL. But sometimes we can't sit on the linguistic fence: we have to choose sides. Take the names we use to describe countries or cities. Should we call Burma, Burma, or should we call it Myanmar? There are a surprising number of these problems. Bombay or Mumbai...the change in the names of Indian cities was pushed by Hindu nationalists....you'll remember when Rhodesia became Zimbabwe. What about Londonderry or Derry? Names are more than just randomly-selected designators. They carry connotations. Names are often changed for a purpose: as a conscious break with a colonial past, for example. Protestants might refer to a town by one name, Catholics by another. [As a footnote, I'm a radio man, I deal in words – in television, dilemmas have an added layer. The BBC had to make a decision about whether or not to show last month's Danish newspaper cartoons depicting the Prophet Mohammed – it was thus bound to alienate one side or another]. But back to

words: the BBC can't adopt both names for Burma or Londonderry – it would be ridiculously time-consuming to do so - yet if it adopts the usage of the Burmese Junta and calls Burma Myanmar, is it not conferring legitimacy on that regime?

Incidentally, I call the Burmese Junta a regime – but regime is a frowned upon word. Which brings one to another problem with words....

As you probably know, at the World Service the use of the word terrorist is discouraged. With satellite and cable, the distinction between the World Service and domestic BBC is beginning to erode: you can now access Radio 4 on broadband from anywhere in the world. So the BBC must grapple with the issue generally. Of course, one person's terrorist is another person's freedom fighter. Nelson Mandela, Yitzhak Shamir, Yasser Arafat, Gerry Adams, Robert Mugabe, they've all been described as terrorists by some, and freedom fighters by others.

The BBC Russian Service was criticized in Russia during the Beslan massacre for avoiding the term terrorist. How dare we use 'neutral' language when children had been murdered? 'Terrorism' was surely the appropriate term for such egregiously barbaric and repellent deeds – not least because domestic BBC had no difficulty deploying the term for the July 7th attacks in London.

Political theorists talk about Essentially Contestable Concepts. Essentially Contestable Concepts are those which, because they are value laden, are necessarily up for grabs. Even 'democracy' is an essentially contestable concept. Until recently you wouldn't find a political leader anywhere in the world who didn't espouse the benefits of democracy, even in brutal dictatorships. The Soviet Union always maintained the fiction that it was democratic. To describe a country or a practice as democratic is to be positive about it. (As a digression, I should add that this is no longer true. One of the most intriguing contemporary debates around democracy – particularly in the Middle East - is not about what form democracy should take, it's not about the relative powers of the executive, legislative and judiciary, but rather, it's about whether democracy should be introduced at all – whether democracy is just a model the west imposes on the rest of the world even though, the argument goes, there are legitimate alternatives'.)

OK: you've stripped yourself of your prejudices, and you've made two choices - You've chosen your stories, and you've chosen your words. Now the most difficult task of all – your third choice - you have to select the facts to describe the story.

There's a bomb in Iraq. The average news despatch from a correspondent is about a minute. What are the pertinent facts? That ten people died? That ten people died and two of them were children? That ten people died, two of them policemen? That ten people died and two of them were American? That ten people died and the group the Jihadi Agents Of Vengeance is claiming responsibility? That ten people died and their blood and limbs were scattered across the tarmac? Are such lurid descriptions appropriate? Does transmitting the full horror of a situation require such gory details? The point, of course, is that there's an infinite number of facts, and there's a limit as to how many facts one can use. And one can accurately report some facts, and still be completely biased: for example if one only reported Serbian-committed atrocities, and not Kosovan atrocities.

So, choice of stories, choice of words and pictures, choice of facts. Electronic broadcasters have an additional dilemma. We are not merely reporters, describers and stenographers. We act as platforms on which others can air their views. We offer a medium through which opinions can be heard. This throws up a conundrum. Whose views do we solicit? There are many sides to an argument. Let's shift our bombing story from Iraq to London. You've got a bus bombing in London and you want a debate about it. The debate will include at least one British Muslim: but who is supposed to represent Muslim opinion? A radical, a moderate, an angry young man, a community leader? The temptation for broadcasters in a debate is always to seek two diametrically opposed positions: it makes for a more knock-about discussion. But the soggy middle might be the territory occupied by majority opinion. Minority opinion tends to get over-represented.

In the World Service, covering as we do, cabinet reshuffles in South Korea or Botswana, we would rather, given the choice, have English speakers. It's tiresome to have to constantly voice-over interviews. Consequently there's a built-in bias. Those who speak English in the Middle East, for example, tend to be the wealthiest, most urbane, best educated, most liberal. The same speakers tend to crop up time after time. And they're not necessarily representative of the proverbial Arab street.

But even in the Western context, does objectivity require us to reflect opinion in a proportionate manner? If extreme racist views are held by a sizeable minority, must those views be represented to the degree that they're held by the general population? Even if you think it should, what about those cases where the majority opinion is factually ignorant. In the United States, 45% of people believe God created man in his present form within the last 10,000 years. That's almost half of the population. Only 10% of the population believe that evolution occurred without any involvement of God. What is NPR – our poor-relation across the Pond – to do? Must debates about evolution reflect popular opinion, even when it's misinformed, incoherent or gibberish? A new book is just out on the New York Times. Apparently, during World War II, the editor of the New York Times refused to publish letters condemning the Holocaust, because he thought he'd then have to publish letters in support of it.

I want to end with two further complications. We have assumed that (a) we can get to the facts and (b) we and the facts are entirely separate. I'll explain what I mean by this in a moment. But it's not true, of course, that we can always get to the facts, not least because there's a whole bunch of people trying to hide things from us, or lie to us, or spin us angles. There are businesses which aren't transparent and public relations companies that are paid to place stories – even in the BBC we're bombarded with PR companies pushing stories our way: they're paid a lot of money to do so, and they're remarkably effective.

Second, there is what we might call the Heisenberg effect, after Heisenberg's Uncertainty Principle. We have an image of the journalist as detached observer: as a watcher of events, not a participant in them. But the process of observing and describing, as Heisenberg understood, can colour the results. How journalists cover stories has an impact on all sorts of things, such as the way politicians behave. Journalists might draw attention to a particular phrase or aspect of a policy – John Major's Back-To-Basics – for example. This can become the story. Herbert Matthews of the New York Times is known as the man who created the myth of Fidel Castro. At the extreme, you get somebody like William Randolph Hearst. There's a famous story about Hearst that some of you might know. During the build up to the Spanish American War, Hearst sent a journalist and an illustrator, Frederic Remington, to Cuba to cover the mounting tension. Remington didn't particularly want to go and when he got there he found there was no story. He cabled Hearst. 'EVERYTHING IS QUIET. THERE IS NO TROUBLE HERE. THERE WILL BE NO WAR. WISH TO RETURN. REMINGTON'. Hearst wrote back immediately. 'PLEASE REMAIN. YOU FURNISH THE PICTURES AND ILL FURNISH THE WAR.' The point is that newspapers want to sell copies, so they have an interest in creating news, as well as passively responding to it.

So I've bombarded you with so many difficulties surrounding the notion that journalist and the BBC can be objective that there appears to be nothing going for it: the idea that journalists can be objective would seem nothing more than a comforting fiction. Can it be rescued?

Let me conclude with a few remarks.

Compare the BBC with the State radio of North Korea. My Korean being a little rusty, I have never listened to the state radio of North Korea. But I think I can safely assume that it may not be the best place to hear an entirely accurate picture of what is going on in Pyongyang. When we say the BBC is unbiased, what we mean is that it attempts to get the facts right, and aims not to take a position on contentious issues. Those are not the ambitions of Radio North Korea: Radio North Korea is a propaganda outfit: it systematically aims to present the world in a particular way, and it is consciously driven by a particular ideology. It may know a portrait of events is a distortion, and not care. Fox News has a slogan: 'We report, you decide!' I'm actually rather a fan of Fox

News: it's impressively slick and entertaining. But the implication that it merely lays the facts out for us to make up our own judgement about them, is laughably Orwellian. So what we must mean by the BBC being objective is a statement in part about intent...about how the BBC tries to behave.

I mentioned at the start that 'objectivity' is supposed to be synonymous with impartiality and with neutrality. But I don't think that it's helpful to collate these words. I think we should separate their meanings. Let's start with impartiality. If I allow all views onto the Today programme, if I provide a balance of views over time, then I'm being *impartial*. I'm representing various strands of opinion. *Impartiality* is about opinion.

If I strip language of value-laden terminology, terms like terrorist or freedom fighter, and disguise my value judgements, then I'm being *neutral*. *Neutrality* is about language.

But, and this is the key, only if I describe the world as it actually is, am I being *objective*.

Let's return to the 'Terrorist-Freedom/fighter conundrum'. Some of the best minds in the BBC have got themselves entangled in a terrible kaffuffle over this. I don't think I'm giving any state secrets away when I quote you a passage from the latest editorial advice to reach the journalistic coalface. After a long explanatory note advising us to use the term 'terrorist' sparingly, if at all, the following appears.

*Words can be used with deadly precision to make clear what has happened and still convey the awful consequences without needing to resort to labels. For example, Denis Murray, the Northern Ireland correspondent, reported the wake of the Omagh Bombing in 1998. His commentary shows how to get close both to the reality of what has happened and to the emotions and feelings of his audience without any labels or tags:*

And here it gives Denis Murray's despatch. Let me read it to you.

*There should have been a carnival here, instead there was carnage. Saturday afternoon shoppers here because it was safe, crowded together away from a bomb scare. Instead the bomb was in their midst.*

*It killed fourteen women and three young girls...*

*It killed five men and four young boys...three of them came from County Donegal, another was a 12 year old boy from Madrid, they were all friends on an exchange scheme.*

*It killed three generations of one family...a 65 year old grandmother, her pregnant 30 year old daughter and her 18 month old daughter.*

*A litany of the dead...of the slaughtered innocents*

Now, this might well be a fine piece of writing, but why this is thought to be value neutral defeats me. Yes, it successfully avoids using the word 'terrorist', but it does use the phrase 'slaughtered innocents'. Would perpetrators of bombings describe their victims as 'slaughtered innocents'? More fundamentally, the reason it's a powerful despatch is precisely because it leaves us in no doubt as to the wickedness of the act.

And perhaps that's no bad thing. If one believes – as deep down we all believe – that values are not merely relative...that it's not just a matter of opinion that Hitler was a bad chap, or that torturing innocent children is wrong...then values are very much a part of the world. To describe the world with value-laden language may then not be neutral, but it may be objective. If I describe the Soham murders as vile, that's not neutral, but it is right – they were vile. And it could be argued that failing to identify right and wrong in a report entails a failure to perceive the world correctly. In which case, objectivity – far from requiring that value-laden terms be stripped from our reporting – would actually demand their use.

Now, whether the BBC should go down this route, and be objective in this sense is a different matter. There are huge pitfalls in making our value judgements explicit – our judgement is fallible, we may be accused of double standards, most situations are grey, not black and white, our reputation in Britain and around the world may suffer, and so might our ratings. All these are compelling reasons for sticking to the neutral. So, yes, the BBC may well be right in aiming for neutrality rather than for objectivity. My point is simply this: the two are not the same. We can aim for one or the other – not both.

---

# Fellows News

---

## Publications etc

---

**Hugh Brogan** (HF 1962-64) published his biography of Alexis de Tocqueville in December 2006 (Profile, £30). Typical of enthusiastic reviewers was Hilary Spurling in *The Observer*, who said "a biography as humane, learned, humorous and perceptive as this extends our understanding of ourselves and where we came from, as well as painting an incomparable portrait of one of the sharpest and most sympathetic writers of all time." Hugh Brogan says that his work on the subject was begun at Yale while he was a Harkness Fellow and "is incalculably indebted to the Commonwealth Fund".

The late **Alistair Cooke**, (CFF 1932-34, d 2004) published *Alistair Cooke's American Journey: Life on the Home Front in the Second World War* (Allen Lane, £20) in summer 2006. John Humphrys, reviewing it in *The Times*, said "It is Cooke's great strength as a reporter that he makes you feel you were there."

**Martin Doornbos** (HF 1962-64) published *Global Forces and State Restructuring: Dynamics of State Formation and Collapse* in 2006.

**Aminatta Forna** (HF 1996-97) published *Ancestor Stones*, her debut novel, in 2006. The story of four women born to different wives of a wealthy plantation owner in a country which passes from a single generation from village life, to colonialism, to civil war. The *Washington Post* described the author's writing as akin to 'Isabel Allende at the height of her powers' and the *Daily Telegraph* called the book 'a triumph.'

**Joachim Frank** (HF 1970-72) published *Three-dimensional Electron Microscopy of Macromolecular Assemblies*, (Oxford University Press, New York) in 2006.

**Rem Koolhaas** (HF 1972-74) was the co-designer of a translucent, inflatable ovoid canopy, described by his co-designer as a "cosmic egg", erected as an extension to London's Serpentine Gallery in July 2006.

**Sue Moore** (HF 1991-1993) has published her second jointly authored book, entitled *Wildlife Tourism* (Channel View Publications, Clevedon, England). Her first tourism book, *Natural Area Tourism: Ecology, Impacts and Management* (2002), has become the best-selling title in Channel View's *Aspects of Tourism* series.

**Jan Morris** (CFF 1953-54) published *Europe: an Intimate Journey* (Faber £9.99) in 2006. A reviewer described this book as "delightful, thought-provoking, funny, enriching, informative, and as good as, say, Patrick Leigh-Fermor's *A Time of Gifts*..."

**Baroness Julia Neuberger** (HF 1991-92) preached at the ordination in Dresden in September 2006 of the first rabbi ordained in Germany since the second world war.

**John Nurser** (CFF 1956-57) published *For all Peoples* (WCC Publications, and Georgetown University Press) in 2005.

**William Plowden** (CFF 1958-59) published with Kate Jenkins (daughter of the late **Dr Daniel Jenkins**, CFF 1948-49) *Governance and Nation-Building: the Failure of International Intervention* in July 2006 (Edward Elgar). One reviewer described the book as "a devastating critique of...this crucial aid strategy... a much-needed critical contribution [which] should be required reading for all students of comparative governance and public management".

---

## Appointments, Awards etc

---

**Michel Bataille** (HF 1970-71) after 30 years in private business as CEO of several subsidiaries of a building materials group, has left private industry to become a judge. His current position is judge in a criminal chamber of the appeals court of Northern France.

**Jon Bright** (HF 1990-91) has moved to Birmingham, on secondment from the Department of Community and Local Development, as Director of Policy and Delivery as from September 2006

**Sir Ian Byatt** (HF 1957-58) became Chairman of the Water Industry Commission for Scotland in July 2005.

**Anthony Cary** (HF 1980-82) has been appointed British High Commissioner to Canada. He took up his post in Ottawa in February 2007.

**Sir Graeme Catto** (HF 1975-77) left King's College London and returned to Aberdeen University to take up a professorial position in the College of Life Sciences and Medicine, in October 2005

**Ian Duff** (HF 1972-73) was elected as a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 2006.

**Carolyn Galbreath** (Atlantic Fellow 1999-2000) has been selected to be a Member of the Competition Authority for the Republic of Ireland for a term of five years. She took up the post in April 2006.

**Justin Russell** (HF 1993-94) after "an interesting and enjoyable year at Bazian" returned to the Home Office in summer 2006 to be a policy adviser to the new Home Secretary, John Reid.

**Jean van den Eynde** (HF 1976-78) who manages the Brussels Office of Russell Reynolds Associates, and is a member of the Executive Committee of this global firm of executive search and assessment consultants, was elected Chairman of the AESC - the Association of Executive Search Consultants, based in New York. The AESC is the worldwide organisation of the retained search profession. He is the first non-American in that position.

## Announcements

### WORLD ASSOCIATION OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

**Professor Ronald Hilton** (CFF 1937) writes "I have received *Transatlantic Report* with its lead article, "Sustaining Anglo-American Friendship in Hard Times". This is a main aim of the World Association of International Studies (WAIS), of which I am president. While it is a worldwide organization, WAIS has a US-UK axis. Members exchange by e-mail information and views about international affairs in an open forum, with a variety of opinions represented. There are no dues, and membership is by invitation. Since Harkness and Atlantic Fellows have already been vetted, a general invitation is extended to them automatically. Those interested should e-mail [hilton@stanford.edu](mailto:hilton@stanford.edu).

### The Harkness Film

The film produced a couple of years ago by the Association was widely agreed to be an outstanding tribute to the Harkness programme and its ideals. Many members bought copies. Originally on tape, it has now been remastered and is available in the more convenient (and cheaper) form of a DVD. Copies will be available shortly at the price of £9.50. So that we know how many copies to produce in the initial batch, could anyone who would like a copy when it is available please tell Lizzie Martin in the office?

## FORTHCOMING EVENTS

**Sir Howard Davies** (HF 1979-80) will lecture on "Universities in global competition: how well is the UK doing?" at 6.30pm on Wednesday 28 February. (Hong Kong Theatre, St Clements Building, London School of Economics). Professor Simon Lee (HF 1979-80), Vice-Chancellor, Leeds Metropolitan University, will chair the lecture. There is no charge for this event.

**Dame Pauline Neville-Jones** (HF 1961-63) will give a talk on the theme of "Terrorism" at 7.30 pm on Wednesday 16 May 2007 at the Athenaeum, Pall Mall, London SW1. There will be a reception with canapés beginning at 7.00 pm. Dame Pauline Neville-Jones' talk will begin at about 7.30 pm. A discussion will follow. Cost: £25 per head for Harkness Fellows Association Members. £30 per head for non Members. Guests welcome.

## HARKNESS LOGO

Observant readers will have noticed that on the first page of this issue of the newsletter, below the title, is an elegant design of curving lines. This is our new logo, designed us by courtesy of HF Sir Terry Farrell and his designer David Abdo. The design, which will appear on all our stationery, is intended to symbolise the return trips between Europe and the United States made by Fellows over the years – with apologies to antipodean Fellows for not having been able to fit in the whole globe. We are very grateful to Terry and David for helping us with this.



Harkness Fellows Association

## In Memoriam

**Professor W T (Will) Baxter** (CFF 1931-33, Pennsylvania and Harvard, accounting and business history) died in June 2006, seven weeks before his 100th birthday. He had taught at the University of Edinburgh, the University of Cape Town and the London School of Economics (1947-73). He was an honorary graduate of the University of Buckingham. He was the first full-time Professor of Accounting in the United Kingdom, and pioneered the introduction of economic thinking into the teaching of accounting; many regard him as the founding father of academic accounting.

**Dr. Colin Green**, CFF 1958-9 (Harvard, biochemistry), died in September 2006. His Fellowship was spent at Harvard. He was Reader in Biochemistry, University of Liverpool, 1975-88.

**Professor Maurice Kogan** (HF 1960-61) died in January 2007, aged 75. His fellowship was spent at Harvard, Chicago and Stanford. He had a distinguished career, first as a British civil servant and secondly, and

arguably to much greater effect, as an outstandingly thoughtful and realistic scholar working in the field of public policy. As an official in the old Department of Education and Science, he played a key role as organising secretary to the Plowden committee on primary education, whose 1965 report remains to this day a milestone in thinking and policy relating to the education of young children. He left the civil service in 1969 to become a founding professor at Brunel University, where he stayed for the rest of his career and where he wrote some 40 books. He also acted as consultant and adviser to the British government and to international organisations. Among all this he found time to make a valuable contribution to Harkness Fellowships in their final phase; he chaired a panel of experts which sifted applications for fellowships; he advised, as he was well qualified to do, on the technical quality of candidates' applications, leaving judgements about character and general ability to a second panel of selectors.