

# Media Rights Monitor February 2003 Vol. 8 No. 2

## In This Issue

1. Draft Declaration on Right to Communicate Stirs Controversy
  - ◆ Draft Declaration On The Right To Communicate
2. Freedom Of Information Wins Major Legal Victory In South Africa
  - ◆ Citizens Should Have Access To Information To Challenge Wrongdoing
3. MRA Initiates Civic Education Programme Ahead of Elections
4. Kabissa Holds Internet Skill-building Workshops In Lagos
5. Foundation Announces Plans For 2003 Commonwealth People's Forum In Abuja
6. CPU Launches Blueprint for Independent Media Self-Regulation
7. US "War On Terror" Undermines Human Rights, Free Speech, Says Human Rights Watch
8. New Publication: 'Breaking The Digital Divide: Implications For Developing Countries'
9. Zamfara Gov Revokes Fatwa On Isioma Daniel
10. Smart Adeyemi Re-elected NUJ President
11. Course Holds On Using Internet For Human Rights
12. Institute Holds Workshop On African Human Rights System
13. Newspaper Executives Ponder Future Of Advertising Revenue
14. Training Manual On Effective Writing Available Online
15. Electronic Information Sources Available On World Movement's Web Site
16. Sub-regional TV News Agency Launched in West Africa
17. Aspen Institute Appoints New President, CEO
18. Women's Media Center To Conduct Campaign To Improve Healthcare Journalism
19. Center Launches Project to Monitor Corruption, Openness
20. ATTACKS ON THE PRESS IN JANUARY 2003
21. MEDIA/PRESS FREEDOM AWARDS

## Draft Declaration on Right to Communicate Stirs Controversy

A controversy is brewing over a draft Declaration on the Right to Communicate being proposed for adoption at the World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) scheduled to take place in Geneva, Switzerland, in December.

The Draft, prepared on December 15, last year by Professor Cees J. Hamelink, supposedly on behalf of representatives of States governments, inter-governmental organisations, the United Nations, representatives from the private sector, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and civil society organisations (CSOs), contains six parts namely: Information Rights, Cultural Rights, Protection Rights, Participation Rights, Implementation and Monitoring Methods, and Duties and Responsibilities.

Hamelink is a professor of communication science, specialising in international communication and serves as a consultant to many international organisations including the United Nations, the UN Centre for Human Rights, the International Federation of Journalists and Inter Press Service.

The WSIS is being organized pursuant to the UN General Assembly resolution 56/183 of December 21, 2001, which directed that the Summit should address "the whole range of relevant issues related to the information society".

Parties to the Declaration on the Right to Communicate, if it is adopted, will be States governments, inter-governmental organisations, the United Nations, representatives from the private sector, non-governmental organisations and civil society organisations

But ARTICLE 19, the Global Campaign for Free Expression, based in London is asking non-governmental organisations not to endorse the Declaration, saying it undermines rather than promote the further realization of human rights.

ARTICLE 19 has criticized the document as containing “serious flaws” and imposing “a number of vague, broad restrictions on the right to freedom of expression, contrary to international law.”

Besides, it said, the Draft equally seriously “fails to elaborate clearly the implications of the right to communicate and what States need to do to respect this right.”

In an extensive nine-page analysis of the Draft, ARTICLE 19 noted that the Declaration seeks to impose a number of wide-ranging and in some cases thoroughly discredited restrictions on freedom of expression, citing as an example, a provision in the draft containing a requirement of protection against misleading information.

Mr. Toby Mendel, ARTICLE 19’s Law Programme Director, said: “False news provisions have been widely abused around the world and have been condemned by both international and national courts. The right to communicate must, at a minimum, respect established rights, including the right to freedom of expression.”

He argued that the draft also fails to set out in any useful detail the positive content of the right to communicate, observing that “several of its provisions reiterate, word-for-word, rights already recognised in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, sometimes with minor, usually unhelpful, additions.”

ARTICLE 19 noted that the draft contains only one brief clause on the issue of equitable access to the media and the means of communication, which is central to any legitimate conception of the right to communicate.

Mr. Mendel said: “ARTICLE 19 endorses, in principle, the idea of an authoritative statement on the right to communicate. However, we are of the view that there is the potential within the framework of existing rights to accommodate the legitimate claims made in the name of the right to communicate. Any elaboration of it must not trench on recognised rights but rather offer an interpretation that expands and strengthens them.”

ARTICLE 19 therefore urge other NGOs not to endorse the draft Declaration, which undermines rather than promote the further realisation of human rights.

It promised to release “a comment on the right to communicate soon, analysing various proposals from a freedom of expression perspective and setting out our views on what it could usefully include.”

## **Draft Declaration On The Right To Communicate**

*(First Draft prepared on December 15, 2002, by representatives of States Governments, Intergovernmental Organisations, United Nations Organisations, representatives from the private sector, Non-governmental Organisations and Civil Society Organisations towards the World Summit on the Information Society taking place in Geneva, Switzerland, in December 2003)*

### **Preamble**

**P**arties to the present Declaration, [The States Governments, Intergovernmental Organisations, United Nations Organisations, Representatives from the private sector, Non-governmental Organisations and Civil Society Organisations]

Bearing in mind the Charter of the United Nations, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the UNESCO General Conference Resolution 4.121, the UNESCO General Conference Resolution 3.2, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the UN General Assembly Resolution 53/22;

Convinced that the time has come for the international community to formally recognize the right to communicate;

Bearing in mind that the formal recognition of the right to communicate is essential to the broader cause of defending all human rights worldwide;

Whereas communication is the foundation of all social organization and therefore is basic to the life of all individuals and their communities;

Emphasizing that communication is a fundamental participative and interactive process, which is essential to the sustainable development of individuals and communities;

Convinced that all individuals should have equal opportunities to participate actively in all means of communication and to benefit from such means while preserving the right to protection against their abuses;

Reaffirming the critical necessity of the dialogue among civilizations in order to seek a new system of international relations based on inclusion, cooperation, and solidarity;

Mindful of the significant role of the right to communicate for this dialogue;

Determined to take new steps forward in the commitment of the international community to achieve substantial progress in its human rights endeavours;

Recalling that the aim of this Declaration is not to substitute the notion of the right to communicate for any rights already recognized by the international community, but to increase their scope with new elements in the context of the right to communicate;

Welcoming the contributions of all stakeholders to the World Summit on the Information Society (2003 and 2005);

***Agree upon the following articles:***

#### **Part I - Information Rights**

1. Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference by public or private parties and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers;

Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to express his thoughts, conscience and religion without interference by public or private parties, either alone or in community with others and in public or private;

Everyone has the right to be properly informed about matters of public interest; this right includes access to information on matters of public interest held by public or private sources;

Everyone has the right that there should be fair and equitable access to public means of local and global communication resources and facilities for conventional and advanced channels of communication, to distribute information, ideas and opinions;

Everyone has the right to expect that the resources needed for public communication, such as the Electro-Magnetic Spectrum- remain the common heritage of humankind and will not be appropriated by private parties;

#### **Part II - Cultural Rights**

Everyone has the right to freely participate in the cultural life of their community, to enjoy the arts and to share in scientific advancement and its benefits; this includes the right to artistic, literacy and academic creativity and independence;

Everyone has the right to the protection of the moral and material interests resulting from any scientific, literary or artistic production of which he is the author; in particular the moral rights of individual creative artists need strong protection;

Everyone has the right to a fair use of copyrighted work for purposes like criticism, comment, news reporting, teaching or research; this should not be considered an infringement of copyright protection;

Everyone has the right to express themselves, access information and to create and disseminate their work in the language of their choice, and particularly in their mother tongue;

Everyone is therefore entitled to quality education and training that fully respect their cultural identity; the right to use their own languages in educational and media institutions funded by the state; and the right to have adequate provisions created for the use of minority languages where needed;

All people have the right to promote, protect and preserve their cultural identity, national and international cultural property and heritage.

### **Part III - Protection Rights**

Everyone has the right be protected against forms of communication that are discriminatory in terms of gender, race, class, ethnicity, religion, language, sexual orientation, and physical or mental condition;

Everyone has the right to be protected against the deliberate dissemination of misleading and distorted information by national as well as international information enterprises;

Everyone has the right to demand that the media of mass communication respect standards of due process in the coverage of trials and thus not presume guilt of defendants before a verdict of guilt by a court of law has been established;

Everyone has the right to be protected against interference with their personal sphere and autonomy by public or private parties (including the media of mass communication);

Everyone has the right to use of methods of encryption in order to be able to conduct communications in anonymity;

Everyone has the right to be protected against forms of electronic surveillance that threaten privacy and confidentiality of communications;

Children have the right to be protected against harmful media products and commercial and other exploitation; they have the right to media products that are designed to meet their needs and interest and foster their healthy physical, mental and emotional development;

Women have the right to equal access to information and knowledge, as well as equal opportunities as participants and decision-makers in all aspects related to the shaping of public policies and frameworks concerning mass media and ICTs;

Everyone has the right to be protected from all forms of propaganda, in whatsoever country conducted, which is either designed or likely to provoke or encourage any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression;

Everyone has the right to be protected from incitement to hate, prejudice, violence, war, and genocide;

Everyone has the right to cyber-security meaning that human integrity and dignity are fully respected and protected in the new electronic environment (cyber-space) against the abuse of information and communication technologies by governments and by non-state agencies;

### **Part IV - Participation Rights**

Everyone has the right to participate in public decision making about the provision of information, the development and utilization of knowledge, the preservation, protection and development of culture;

Everyone has the right to participate in public decision making about the choice, development and application of communication technologies, and the structure and policies of media industries;

Everyone has the right to acquire skills necessary to participate fully in public deliberation and communication; this requires facility in reading, writing, storytelling, critical media awareness computer literacy and education about the role of communication in society;

Everyone has the right to access and equitable use of cyberspace.

### **Part V - Implementation and monitoring methods**

Effective implementation of the standards contained in this Declaration is essential to the promotion and safeguarding of the human right to communicate;

The rights and freedoms that form part of the right to communicate can only be restricted under the conditions that limitations are prescribed by international law, necessary in democratic societies, effective to the achievement of democratically adopted public objectives, proportional to those objectives and of temporary duration.

The implementation of this Declaration requires the creation of an international ‘Communication Rights Ombudsman’, an autonomous person, independent of state bodies; it protects the right to communicate in relation with state bodies, local government bodies, those holding public authority and private parties;

Any person who believes that his/her right to communicate has been violated by any act, action or inaction (of a state body, a local government body or person holding public authority, or a private party) may ask the Ombudsman to intervene on his/her behalf, by submitting a petition for the start of proceedings.

The Ombudsman may also institute the proceedings on his own initiative. The Ombudsman may also deal with more general issues relevant to the protection of the right to communicate. The proceedings before the Ombudsman shall be non-formal and free-of-charge for the petitioners.

The Ombudsman gives an assessment of the facts and circumstances of the individual case, and judges whether in the case in question there have been violations of the right to communicate. In his report he also indicates how the right to communicate has been violated and whether there have been any other injustices.

On establishing violations or irregularities the Ombudsman may take measures by:

- Submitting to the body caused the violation or injustice a proposal, opinion, criticism or recommendation.
- Proposing that the body repeat a certain procedure in accordance with the law.
- Proposing compensation.
- Proposing some other way of remedying the injustice, which has been done to you.
- Propose the initiation of disciplinary proceedings against officials of the body who have caused the established injustice.
- Informing the public about his finding of the facts and steps that have been taken.

The ‘Ombudsman Office’ will establish procedures for periodic review, development and modification of this Declaration.

#### **Part VI – Duties and responsibilities**

Everyone has a responsibility to promote and defend the right to communicate, to treat all people in accordance with this right, and to create the conditions for all people to enjoy the right to communicate;

Everyone should recognize the following obligations as a necessary complement to the right to communicate:

- the obligation to respect thoughts and ideas of all other people;
- the obligation to respect the expression of thoughts and ideas by all other people;
- the obligation to respect the privacy and security of all other people;
- the obligation to respect the creative work of all other people;
- the obligation to respect the pursuit of autonomous cultural development by all other people;
- the obligation to share our knowledge and experience with all other people;
- the obligation to participate in processes of public decision making and ensure that capable leadership is chosen.

*First Draft done at Amsterdam/Geneva December 15, 2002*

## **Freedom Of Information Wins Major Legal Victory In South Africa**

**I**n a major victory for exponents of open government, a Pretoria High Court has ordered the Auditor-General of South Africa to grant a private company access to thousands of documents relating to the government's controversial acquisition of Strategic Defence Packages (SDP) for arms procurement.

The decision of Judge W. J. Hartzenberg is the first major judgment involving the interpretation of the Promotion of Access to Information Act 2 of 2000, the South African freedom of information law. South Africa is the only African country that has such a law

Judge Hartzenberg ordered the Auditor-General to provide, within 40 days, to a private company, CCII Systems (Pty) Limited, access to a range of documents relating to the government's controversial Strategic Defence Packages for arms procurement.

The company, previously a supplier to the Department of Defence, was de-listed in what it considered an unlawful and politically motivated action. It sued the department seeking to determine the basis for the decision to terminate its business relationship with the ministry.

Relying on the exemption clauses in the South African freedom of information law, the ministry refused the request. It argued that the documents are too vast and some contain information supplied in strict confidence by third parties and that some contain information that are critical to defence and security of the state.

The court however observed that the arguments of the department were wrong. It ruled that rather than deny access to the documents on the basis that some are of critical importance to defence and security, it is the responsibility of government to identify, with reasons, specific documents for exemption from public access.

The court's decision suggests that the exemption clauses in the Act should be narrowly interpreted, bearing in mind the purpose of the Act, which is to foster openness, transparency and accountability.

### **Citizens Should Have Access To Information To Challenge Wrongdoing In the High Court of South Africa Transvaal Provincial Division.**

*Case no. 463/2002*

*15 November 2002*

In the matter between

CCII Systems (Proprietary) Limited	-	Applicant
And		
Shuaket Fakie N.O)	-	First Respondent
Sam Baqwa N. O)	-	Second Respondent
Bulelani Ngcuka N.O)	-	Third Respondent
M G P Lekota N.O)	-	Fourth Respondent

#### **Judgment**

During the years 1998 to 2001 the acquisition of the Strategic Defence Package (SDP) at an estimated cost of 30.3 billion Rand was highly topical. Because of doubts, criticisms and allegations of impropriety the first respondent, the Auditor-General, performed a high level review but despite that, public disquiet persisted. During November 2000 the first, second and third respondents were appointed as a joint commission to investigate the propriety of the entire SDP. They conducted the investigation and eventually submitted a report on 14 February 2001. It was accepted and approved by Parliament.

This application is one for access to information obtained by the commission during the investigation. It is brought in terms of Act 2 of 2000, the Promotion of Access to Information Act (the Act). The applicant is a supplier of specialized software and computer systems for defence applications. It was excluded as a supplier of sub-systems to be installed on corvettes ordered by the Department of Defence for use by the South African Navy. It believes that the exclusion was unlawful. The second respondent is the Public Protector. The third respondent is the National Director of Public Prosecutions. The fourth respondent is the Minister of Defence. Although no relief was claimed against the second, third and fourth respondents, they all chose to oppose the application. The second and third respondents support the principle of freedom to information but oppose the application on the basis that it will not be in the interest of the Republic of South Africa, good governance, proper relationships with major investors and the security of the country that access be granted to the applicant. The fourth respondent relies on absolute and qualified privilege in terms of the Act.

The applicant applied to the first respondent on 28 November 2001 for the following documents:

- ♦ all draft versions of the report;
- ♦ all audit files concerning the SDPs from 1 January 1998 to 20 November 2001;
- ♦ all correspondence concerning the SDPs between the first respondent and the Department of Defence from 1 January 1998 to 20 November 2001; and
- ♦ all correspondence concerning the SDPs between the first respondent and the second respondent's office from 1 January 1998 to 20 November 2001.

The application was done on the prescribed form and in terms of section 18 of the Act.

The first respondent's reply thereto, dated 18 January 2002, gave three grounds on which the request was refused. They were:

- ♦ "The number of documents is too vast. We do not have the resources or capacity to go through the contents of each and every document and evaluate the information contained therein. The work involved in carefully going through the vast quantity of documentation and processing your request would substantially and unreasonably divert our resources from our core business. The request is therefore refused in terms of section 45(b) of the Act."
- ♦ "The documents contain information that was supplied in strict confidence by various third parties. The bulk of the information and documentation was supplied after their confidentiality was guaranteed. We are unable to breach our undertaking. Further, the nature of our work and the need to obtain information from various sources to enable us to carry out our function in the public interest may be jeopardized by our disclosure of information supplied in confidence. The request is therefore refused in terms of section 37 of the Act."
- ♦ "The documents contain detailed information relating, inter alia to the defence and security needs of the Republic and apart from having been supplied in confidence their disclosure may also prejudice the position of Republic in that regard. The request is therefore refused in terms of section 41(a) of the Act."

The first respondent invited the applicant, if it disagreed with its decision, to bring a court application.

On 18 February, 2002, the applicant brought the present application. Its prayers were for an order directing the first respondent to provide the applicant with the documents specified above and for costs against respondents who oppose the application.

In its answering affidavit the first respondent disclosed that in the main the documents emanated from Department of Defence and Armscor. Armscor is the procurement arm of the Department of Defence. The members of the investigating team were only allowed to inspect documents under conditions of strict security and confidentiality and were not allowed to remove any original documents. Documentation consisting of about 700,000 pages was perused and about 135,000 pages were copied. Approximately 60 people from three agencies conducting

the investigation were involved. Of them, 27 were from the first respondent's team. For purposes of his response to the request he only took into account the 135,000 pages (according to the joint report the exact figure is 134,768 pages) which were copied. Although the documents in his possession are not an audit file he was prepared for the sake of convenience to regard them as such. Apart from the 135,000 pages, the audit file comprises working papers, cabinet minutes, minutes of ministerial committee meetings, documents emanating from the Department of Finance which were mainly feasibility studies and economic models, counter investment agreements from the Department of Trade and Industry and draft reports. The total number of pages came to 225,000. The contracts which comprise the SDP, including the counter investment contracts are current and being reciprocally performed. According to him, much of the information contained in the contracts are confidential and worthy of protection, and disclosure thereof will be detrimental to the well-being of the Republic.

What the first respondent does not deal with is how the different documents in its possession have been filed and indexed. It is inconceivable that the investigating team did not have a filing system. One would imagine that it would now be much easier to find and evaluate documents than what the position was when the information was gathered. The first respondent also does not deal, otherwise than in general terms, with the resources available and what the inroad on its ordinary activities will be if the request is to be considered in terms of the Act. It is alleged that the task will "irrespective of how many people are involved, require the expenditure of man hours well in excess of a year". It is not very helpful to form an idea as how long it will take to complete the task. I understand "man hours" in excess of a year to imply that one man will work longer than a year to complete the task. Twelve men may be able to complete it in just over a month and twenty in three weeks. The first respondent "regrets" that he is unable to furnish the court with greater particularity.

In its replying affidavit the applicant limited its request to what has become known as "the reduced record" which relates to the acquisition of the Corvettes and in particular to:

- ♦ the de-selection of the applicant as the supplier of the Combat Suite's Information Management System and the selection instead of the Detexis Diecerto Combat Suite Databus;
- ♦ the selection of the supplier of the System Management System, the Navigation Distribution System and the Integrated Platform Management System Simulator;
- ♦ the role of African Defence Systems (Pty) Ltd. (ADS) in the supply of the Combat Suite for the Corvettes and its conflict of interest by virtue of its involvement in the supply of the Corvettes at various different levels; and
- ♦ the conflict of interest of Shamin Shaikh (the Chief of acquisitions in the Department of Defence).

The applicant no longer requires the documents specified above i.e. the correspondence concerning the SDPs between the first respondent and the department of defence and between the first respondent and the second respondent. The first respondent, in the answering affidavit, denied that such correspondence existed. The applicant was in possession of some of those letters and attached it to its replying affidavit. In a further affidavit the first respondent accused the applicant of having led it into a trap! It attached all the relevant letters. The applicant accepts the first respondent's declaration under oath that all the documents have been supplied.

The Open Democracy Advice Centre (ODAC) brought an application in terms of Rule 16A of the rules of court to be allowed to address the court as *amicus curiae*. It was opposed by the respondents. ODAC wanted to have that application heard well in advance of the hearing of the matter. I indicated that they can bring the application just before the hearing and eventually arranged with counsel that such application, if necessary, can be brought after argument by the parties. After the argument, I invited Ms. Bawa, who represented ODAC, to address the court on matters which were relevant and not yet raised. Not surprisingly she sided totally with the applicant and castigated the respondents for not advancing open democracy.

Mr. Maritz, for the first respondent, in an ingenious argument asks for the dismissal of the application on the following basis: He says that when the first respondent informed the applicant that it was entitled in terms of section 45(b) of the Act to refuse the request (the volume objection), the applicant should have brought a new request in term of section 18 for access to the reduced record. He relies on a letter, dated 1 August 2002, by the first respondent to the applicant. In that letter it is stated that the original request was broad, that the applicant conceded in the replying affidavit that it was not aware of the bulk of the record, that in the opinion of the first respondent it should have been aware thereof and that the applicant watered down its request to the reduced record. It is then said that the request for the reduced record constitutes a new request and an irregular request in that it was not preceded by a section 18 request. The applicant is formally invited to withdraw the application, tender costs and to draft a new application. Mr. Maritz adopts the reasoning in the letter and says that it appears from the joint report that 700,000 pages were perused and that 134,768 pages were copied. He says that the applicant therefore knew of the bulk of the record and had to expect to be met with a volume objection.

I do not agree. Section 81(3) of the Act provides that there is an onus on the party claiming that the refusal of a request for access complies with the provisions of the Act. Furthermore in terms of section 9, some of the objects of the Act are to give effect to the constitutional right of access to any information held by the State, and to establish voluntary and mandatory mechanisms which enables persons to obtain access to records of public and private bodies as swiftly, inexpensively and effortlessly as reasonably possible. Moreover, section 2(1) of the Act provides that when interpreting a provision of the Act the court must prefer a reasonable interpretation consistent with the objects of the Act over an alternative interpretation inconsistent therewith. The letter of 18 January 2002 is vague. It does not say how many documents are in the possession of the first respondent and what his resources are. It did not discharge any onus. The procedure which Mr. Maritz wants the court to sanction is slow, expensive and cumbersome. Moreover the first respondent knows very well what documents the applicant requires, does not deny that it is in possession thereof but proffers a reason why it is not necessary for it to go and look for them. A new section 18 request will not give any new information to the first respondent to alleviate the obligation imposed upon it by statute.

Before dealing with chapter 4 of the Act and the protection that it gives to the respondents, it is necessary to address another aspect i.e. the question of what exactly is meant by a record. The respondents contend that all the documents comprise one record. Mr. Maritz goes so far as to argue that if there are draft reports amongst its papers, access not only to them but to all the documents, the record, may be refused in terms of section 44(2) (C) of the Act.

“Record” is defined in section 1 of the Act as “any recorded information...regardless of form or medium...in the possession or under the control of that public... Body”. Section 29(2) gives an idea of what recorded information the legislature had in mind. If I understand the section correctly, it related to information in written and printed form, video recordings and photographs, tape recordings, computer data or possibly other forms of recordings, yet to be invented. It stands to reason that a single page can constitute a “record”. If there is one page about one subject in the possession of the public body, it is a “record”. If, however, there are 700,000 pages on one subject, one page of which is the requester’s marriage certificate of his marriage in China, and he wants access thereto he can fill out a request in terms of section 18 for the marriage certificate. The “record” required is the one page and not the 700,000 pages. In my judgment each item in itself constitutes a record as envisaged in the Act, be it an original or not.

It is clear that the respondents do not allege that all the documents in the first respondent’s possession are entitled to protection in terms of the provisions of chapter 4 of the act. It has invoked the provisions on which they rely in a generalized way. The contention is that some of the documents enjoy the protection against disclosure which is provided for in one

or more of the sections in chapter 4 of the Act. Not one of those documents were identified. The defence is therefore that the requested documents are so voluminous that the first respondent cannot reasonably be expected to analyse them all in order to identify those which may be protected from disclosure.

In my view and because of the onus created in section 81, it will be necessary for the information officer to identify documents which he wants to withhold. A description of his entitlement to protection is to be given, one would imagine, as in the case of a discovery affidavit in which privilege is claimed in respect of some documents. The question of severability may come into play. Paragraphs may be blocked out or annexure or portions may be detached. The provisions of section 82 of the Act read with section 80 cover the case where there is a dispute about the question if a document or only a portion thereof is to be disclosed and the decision of the court is required to rule if a document is protected in whole or in part.

The approach of the respondents, even in respect of the reduced record makes it impossible to evaluate if the respondents justifiably claim privilege in respect of documents and if portions thereof are not to be given access to. In the result, I agree with Mr. Rogers that the only objection which has in fact been raised is the volume objection. If regard is had to the media coverage which this matter enjoyed and the prominence of the members of the joint commission, this is certainly a case where maximum access is necessary to dispel any suspicion of a cover-up. It is not good enough to hide behind generalities. If it means that the first respondent has to employ extra staff, it must be done. The applicant alludes to conflicts of interest and political pressure. If at all feasible, such suspicions must be put to rest.

The applicant argues that if he was de-selected as supplier due to political pressure or some impropriety, a comparison between draft reports and the final one may indicate that that is what happened. Conversely, if there was no impropriety the very same comparison will prove that. That raises the question what the object of section 44 is. It was submitted that it is not to hamper a public body in its administration and formulation of policy and to guard against the supply of confidential information prematurely. Senior and junior officials must be able to talk freely about the development of policy matters and their interaction at a stage before finalisation should not at that stage be accessible. Opportunistic entrepreneurs should not be allowed to obtain information along this route which give them an unfair advantage over their rivals. In my view, it does not deal with historic situations. The joint report has been finalized and accepted by Parliament. At this stage, the draft reports are only of historic importance and cannot obstruct the joint commission in its work. In my view they are no longer protected by the provisions of section 44.

When it comes to confidential matters it is so that section 37 provides that an information officer must refuse access if disclosure will lead to a breach of a duty of confidence and may refuse access if disclosure may lead to cutting off a source of information. One can understand the rationale behind the provision. It is in a strange way to be compared with the position of the police informer. On the other hand, it must be remembered that the definition of a third party in section 1 of the Act specifically excludes "public bodies". It is to prevent technical objections based on what department is really in possession of a document. Ms. Bawa referred me to the matter of *McGehees v CIA* case no. 82-1096 argued on 15 September 1982 in the U.S.D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals in the District of Columbia. The judgment of Circuit Judge Harry T Edwards was delivered on 4 January 1983.

Under the heading "Agency Records" Covered by the Act" he said the following:

"If records obtained from other agencies could not be reached by a FOIA (the American equivalent of the Act) request, an agency seeking to shield documents from the public could transfer the documents for safekeeping to another government department. It could thereafter decline to afford requesters access to the materials on the ground that it lacked "custody" or control over the records and had no duty to retrieve them. The agency holding the documents

could likewise resist disclosure on the theory that, from its perspective, the documents were not “agency records”. The net effect could be wholly to frustrate the purpose of the Act”.

Of course it is likely that there are many instances of information which was given in strict confidence, not by other departments but by third parties. One can understand that there is a duty to protect such third parties and that the respondents would be remiss if they did not do so. In my view however it is for the respondent to identify the record which is to be protected and to state concisely why it maintains that access to it can be withheld. Arguments may arise as to severability and may end up before a judge. Exactly the same considerations apply to documents which may be withheld in terms of section 41 on the basis that its disclosure may cause prejudice to the defence security and international relations of the country or would reveal information specified in section 41(1) (b).

It has been argued that the applicant knows exactly what he wants and is already in possession thereof and that is evident from the particulars of claim in an action which he has instituted against the fourth respondent. The argument is that he does not really need the records. There is a further argument that as he has instituted action against the fourth respondent during August 2002 he is precluded in terms of the provisions of section 7 of the Act to get access. Section 7 provides that the Act does not apply to a record requested after commencement of criminal or civil proceedings. In this matter, the request was long before institution of action. The prohibition against access after commencement of proceedings was obviously included in the Act to see to it that litigants make use of their remedies as to discovery in terms of the rules of the relevant court and to avoid the possibility that one litigant gets an unfair advantage over his adversary. Before a litigant has instituted proceedings and even if he wants to institute proceedings he is, in my view, not prohibited from invoking the provisions of the Act to get access. One of the objects of the Act must be that citizens can get information regarding wrongs perpetrated against them to enable them to hold the wrongdoers accountable in a court of law. See section 9 (c) and especially 9 (e). To interpret the Act that everybody who contemplates legal action is prohibited from requesting access will be to render the Act nugatory for the very purpose for which it was promulgated.

Although I am satisfied that the first respondent is obliged to provide the relevant documents to the applicant, I have come to the conclusion that it may cause prejudice to the Defence Force and the Government to order it to produce the whole reduced record. Mr. Rogers suggested that in such a case a *via media* is to be followed i.e. to order the first respondent to make available those records to which no objection is raised, within a stated period of time, and in respect of the balance of the records of the reduced record, to identify them and state the reasons why access may or must be refused and in respect of which portion of the record it is to be refused. I agree with that submission. Forty court days or eight weeks seem to me to be enough for it to do so.

I make the following order:

1. The first respondent is ordered to provide the applicant by no later than 40 court days from the date of this order with the following records:

1.1 all draft versions of the report submitted to Parliament by the joint investigating team regarding the so-called Strategic Defence Packages for the procurement of armaments for the South African National Defence Force.

1.2 in respect of all audit files concerning the Strategic Defence Packages for the procurement of armaments for the S A National Defence Force from 1 January 1998 to 20 November 2001 dealing with:

1.2.1 the de-selection of the applicant as a supplier of the Combat Suite’s information Management System and the selection instead of the Detexis Diacerto Combat Suite Databus.

1.2.2 the selection of the supplier of the Systems Management System, Navigation Distribution System and the Integrated Platform Management System Simulator.

1.2.3 The role of African Defence Systems (Pty) Ltd, a company controlled by Thompson CSF of France (which later changed its name to Thales International), in the supply of the Combat Suite for the Corvettes and its conflict of interest by virtue of its involvement in the supply of the Corvettes at various different levels, namely as:

1.2.3.1 a member of the consortium constituting the prime contractor for the supply of Corvettes;

1.2.3.2 the supplier of Combat Suite and at the same time being the Combat Suite Integrator.

1.2.3.3 the supplier of various systems and sub-systems for the Combat Suite, including the SMS and the Combat Management System ; and

1.2.3.4 an associate company (i.e. a company in the Thompson–CSF group) of the supplier of the Detexis system;

1.2.4 the conflict of interest of Shamin Shaikh as:

1.2.4.1 the Department of Defence’s Chief of Acquisitions and chairperson or member of various committees and boards involved in the assessment of the SDP; and

1.2.4.2 brother of Schabir Shaikh, who at all material times held an indirect interest in ADS

1.3 all the documents and records in respect of which it has no objection in terms of chapter 4 or section 12 of Act of 2 of 2000; and

1.4 a list of all the documents and records in respect of which it objects in terms of the provisions of the aforesaid Act of 2000, setting out clearly and concisely (a) a description of the document or record, (b) the basis for the objection, (c) an indication if the objection relates to the whole document or only to portions thereof and if so, (d) to which portions.

2. The respondents are ordered jointly and severally to pay the applicants costs of the application inclusive of the costs of two counsel.

The judgment was signed by W. J. Hartzenberg, Judge of the High Court

*Media Rights Monitor* is published monthly by the Media Rights Agenda (MRA), an independent, non governmental organisation established for the purpose of promoting and protecting media freedom and freedom of expression in Nigeria. MRA is registered under Nigerian law and has Observer Status with the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights.

### **Executive Board**

**Morenike Ransome-Kuti**, Chair  
**Edetaen Ojo**, Executive Director  
**Tunde Fagbohunlu**, Legal Director  
**Austin Agbonsuremi**, Publications Director  
**Eze Anaba**, Director of Projects  
**Tive Denedo**, Director of Campaigns

### **Secretariat**

**Edetaen Ojo**, Executive Director  
**Osaro Odemwingie**, Senior Programme Officer and Coordinator, FOI Coalition  
**Ayode Longe**, Publications Officer

**Bukola Ogunleye**, Programme Officer  
**Florence Sam Iroye**, Legal Officer  
**Yemi Jossy Oginni**, Systems Engineers & ICT Specialist  
**Kingsley Aisagbonhi**, Accounts Officer  
**Oluwabunmi Oke**, Administrative Secretary  
**Ronke Akogun**, Receptionist/Secretary  
**John Gbadamosi**, Administrative Assistant  
**Rose Aikhuele**, Office Assistant  
**Mark Dakmi**, Security Officer

### **Editorial Board**

**Edetaen Ojo**, (Chairman); **Eze Anaba**;  
**Tive Denedo**; **Austin Agbonsuremi**

### **Journal**

**Eze Anaba** (Editor)  
**Ayode Longe** (Publications Officer)  
**John Gbadamosi** (Circulation Officer)

All correspondence should be addressed to: The Editor, *Media Rights Monitor*,  
10, Agboola Aina Street, off Amore Street, Off Toyin Street, Ikeja, Lagos  
P. O. Box 52113, Ikoyi, Lagos, Nigeria  
Tel: 234-1-4936033-4, 234-1-4819162, Fax: 234-1-4930831  
E-mail: [pubs@mediarightsagenda.org](mailto:pubs@mediarightsagenda.org);  
Web site: <http://www.internews.org/mra>

## **MRA Initiates Civic Education Programme Ahead of Elections**

**M**edia Rights Agenda (MRA) is embarking on a civic education programme aimed at broadening media debates on the political process and forthcoming elections to include disadvantaged members of the society.

The organisation plans to create a platform for non-elite members of the society such as market women, drivers and artisans, who do not traditionally have access to the media, to engage media professionals to get a better understanding of how they can access the media. The project also aims to ensure that journalists appreciate the importance of reflecting the perspectives of such people in the media debate and discussions around the elections.

The project will begin this month with a one-day meeting between journalists drawn from different media organisations in the print and broadcast sectors and representatives of these traditionally excluded groups.

At the meeting, the non-journalist will present their perspectives and concerns to the media professionals about the media's present coverage of the political process, and in particular, the fact of their inability to effectively access the media to express their political views and participate fully in the process. They will discuss other problems which hinder their effective participation in the political process and the difficulties they encounter in trying to access the media.

It is expected that the media professionals present will brief them on how the media operates, explain the guiding philosophy or editorial policy of their respective media organisation, and advise them on how they can access the media effectively. An objective of the

programme is this interface, which MRA hopes will provide representatives of such disadvantaged groups an opportunity to cultivate valuable contacts in the media.

Under the subsequent phases of the project, MRA will facilitate weekly discussion programmes on radio and television stations geared towards ensuring a broader debate on political issues beyond the elitist class as well as the positive mobilisation of members of these groups to participate in the political process.

The programme is being carried out with support under the Transition Monitoring Group (TMG) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) “Heading Towards 2003 Elections” project funded by the European Union (EU) and the Department for International Development (DFID) of the United Kingdom.

## **Kabissa Holds Internet Skill-building Workshops In Lagos**

**K**abissa, Space for Change in Africa, is organizing two Internet skill-building workshops in Lagos for West African organisations working on issues of human rights, freedom of information, responsive government and democratization.

Participants for the workshops scheduled for February 20 and 21 will be drawn from Nigeria, Sierra Leone, The Gambia, Liberia and Ghana.

They are intended to give the organizations the opportunity to ask questions and interact with an Internet expert, while at the same time providing Kabissa with an effective distribution channel for its learning materials and a platform to collect feedback.

The first workshop, scheduled for February 20, which is for relative newcomers to the Internet, is entitled “INTERNET BASICS FOR YOU (Beginners)”. It will cover topics such as Why is the Internet Important? Getting Connected, Basics of Internet E-Mail, Finding and Using Online Resources – Online Communities, Directories and Mailing Lists.

The second workshop, which will take place on February 21, is for experienced Internet users interested in expanding the use of the Internet. Entitled “INTEGRATING THE INTERNET INTO YOUR ORGANIZATION (Advanced)”, it will cover topics such as Running Your Own Mailing List, eNewsletters and Online Conferences, Establishing and Maintaining a Web Presence.

All participants will receive a free copy of the TIME TO GET ONLINE self-learning materials in print and CD-ROM.

The workshops are being organized with a grant from GTZ, the German corporation for international cooperation, which has commissioned Kabissa to develop learning materials to enable non-profit organizations to use the Internet more effectively in their work.

The project, “Time to Get Online: Simple Steps to Success on the Internet”, is initially targeting organizations in West Africa whose main agenda concern human rights, freedom of information, responsive government and democratization.

The learning materials developed over the last three months are being piloted in the workshops. After the successful completion of the pilot phase, Kabissa will be distributing the materials throughout West Africa through a combination of electronic copies made available through the Kabissa website and hard copies available through partner organizations and on-site workshops.

This project was initially developed out of Kabissa’s experiences with its members and other organizations in the African non-profit sector.

Kabissa’s executive director, Mr. Tobias Eigen, said; “We have found that many organizations are still unaware of the power of the Internet for the non-profit sector, while others remain frustrated by a lack of skills to take advantage of the technology. This project seeks to address these barriers by providing organizations with learning materials and the opportunity to

attend capacity-building workshops that focus on building the awareness and skills necessary to use the Internet effectively.”

He noted that the learning materials will allow organizations to work at their own pace through the stages of Internet usage, from the basics of getting connected to the Internet all the way to using the Internet actively as an advocacy tool.

Through the completion of this project, Kabissa and its local partners in West Africa plan to distribute more than 3,000 copies of the learning materials and reach more than 1,000 organizations through capacity-building workshops.

Each of these organizations is expected to in turn make a better and deeper impact on the lives of people in their communities.

Founded in 1999, Kabissa is a non-profit organization that seeks to use technology to strengthen organizations working to improve the lives of people in Africa. Its programmes focus on providing Internet services, building the capacity of organizations to use technology, and promoting interaction within the African non-profit sector.

More than 450 organizations from 32 countries use Kabissa’s services.

## **Foundation Announces Plans For 2003 Commonwealth People’s Forum In Abuja**

**T**he Commonwealth Foundation has unveiled the 2003 Commonwealth People’s Forum (CPF), scheduled to take place in Abuja from December 1 to 7. The event will run parallel to the next Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM) being hosted by Nigeria in Abuja from December 5 to 8.

A Steering Committee comprising Nigerian civil society leaders and Federal government officials has been formed, with its first meeting planned for March 2003.

Members of the Steering Committee are: Mr Smart Adeyemi, President of the Nigeria Union of Journalists; Mr Ayodele Aderinwale, Executive Director of the Africa Leadership Forum; Professor Ademola Ariyo of the Centre for Public Private Co-operation; Hajiya Bilkisu Yusuf of ABANTU for Development; Mrs Ayo Obe, President of the Civil Liberties Organisation; Mr Olaitan Oyerinde, Assistant General Secretary of the Nigerian Labour Congress; and Chief Bisi Ogunleye of Country Women Association of Nigeria.

Other members are Professor Osotimehin of National Action Committee on AIDS; Dr Beko Ransome-Kuti, Executive Director of the Centre for Constitutional Governance; Mrs Nkoyo Toyo, Executive Director of Gender and Development Action; Mrs. V. J. Umaru, Co-ordinator of Women’s Trafficking and Child Labour Eradication Foundation; Mrs. Angela Uyah, Head of Secretariat of the 2003 CHOGM Taskforce; and a representative of The Child Care Trust.

The Committee will oversee the planning and organisation of the CPF in collaboration with the Commonwealth Foundation. The Nigerian National Task Force for CHOGM 2003 will provide the main venue for the CPF, the Shehu Musa Yar’Adua Centre in Abuja.

The People’s Forum, titled “Citizens and Governance”, will showcase the work and contributions of civil society to sustainable development and aims to create opportunities for cross-Commonwealth debates and linkages on development issues.

Central to the 2003 CPF activities is “The Commonwealth Civil Society Meeting”. The meeting, a pan-Commonwealth conference organised by the Foundation, is to “examine the changing environment in which civil society organisations are operating, and citizen participation in governance”.

The Meeting agenda will also include discussions on development issues of common concern to civil society organisations in the Commonwealth, such as youth participation, sustainable development, poverty eradication and HIV/AIDS.

Other Forum activities include roundtables, workshops, seminars and conferences. The Commonwealth Foundation will co-ordinate, promote and assist other organisations wishing to hold their own meetings in Abuja in advance of CHOGM 2003. Field visits to Nigerian civil society organisations will also be arranged to provide an opportunity for civil society representatives from other parts of the Commonwealth to learn more about the work of their Nigerian counterparts.

“The Commonwealth Market Place”, an exhibition and display area to promote people-centred approaches to development, will provide space for informal meetings and networking among participants. The cultural component of this event will be organised by the Nigerian Government through the Federal Ministry of Culture and Tourism. It will focus on showcasing Nigeria’s cultural heritage through a series of themed markets and cultural performances.

## **CPU Launches Blueprint for Independent Media Self-Regulation**

**T**he Commonwealth Press Union (CPU) has released the first detailed study of media self-regulation in the Commonwealth press which also serves as a blueprint for helping countries establish press councils free of government control.

The report, titled *Imperfect Freedom*, is based on more than a year of consultations with journalists and media experts in 39 Commonwealth countries, including a series of self-regulation seminars held in various regions throughout the Commonwealth, including Australasia, Asia, East Africa, West Africa, South Africa and the Caribbean. It aimed to introduce self-regulation in the form of press complaints bodies and press councils. It was compiled and edited by CPU consultant, Ian Beales.

The study identifies the numerous obstacles standing in the way of self-regulation – hostile governments; in-fighting amongst the press; lack of funding; lack of public support; and lack of motivation.

The study highlights the need for a support organisation to provide support services for fledgling press councils. The CPU said once funding is established, it will be ready to act as a lead body in coordinating self-regulation around the Commonwealth.

## **US “War On Terror” Undermines Human Rights, Free Speech, Says Human Rights Watch**

**T**he United States government is undermining human rights principles by ignoring the abuses of its allies in the “war on terrorism,” Human

Rights Watch (HRW) said last month while releasing its 2003 World Report. The report documents the state of human rights, including freedom of expression, in 58 countries during 2002.

The New York-based human rights organisation said although the Bush administration has taken some steps to promote human rights in some countries considered key allies in the US anti-terrorism campaign, its refusal to confront violations in other allied countries has compromised its engagement on human rights.

The group said: “To fight terrorism, you need the support of people in countries where the terrorists live. Cozying up to oppressive governments is hardly a way to build those alliances.”

HRW cites Pakistan, China, Saudi Arabia and Indonesia as countries whose governments’ records on human rights are disturbing. In particular, Pakistani President Pervez Musharraf last year signed three laws which ARTICLE 19, the Global Campaign for Free

Expression in London said will exert a significant chilling effect on freedom of expression, while China justifies its repression of ethnic Uighur Muslims by calling it “anti-terrorism.”

The organisation said besides these, the US government rarely challenges Saudi Arabia on its highly repressive human rights record.

Since September 2001, HRW has been tracking the spread of anti-terrorism legislation around the world and its effects on free expression and other human rights. It has also published a special report, “Human Rights After September 11”.

## **New Publication:**

### **‘Breaking The Digital Divide: Implications For Developing Countries’**

*Author: Elena Murelli*

*Edited and with a foreword by Rogers W’O Okot-Uma*

*ISBN 0-85092-672-6; 168 pages; price £11.50*

**D**ynamism and innovation are predominant features of the emerging information society and knowledge economy. The rapid use and development of new information and communications technologies (ICTs) offer economies new opportunities for growth. In particular, ICT applications promise significant benefits such as improved health care, easier access to public services, increased opportunities for training, work and leisure, and good governance.

However, despite the obvious benefits of ICT, there are still undesirable consequences for developing countries. Within these economies, the varying rates in which countries adopt the use of new technologies and access to ICT contribute to uneven progress and development. The steadily widening digital divide and its impact must be lessened to avoid long-term unwanted consequences.

In ‘Breaking the Digital Divide’, Elena Murelli analyses the various dimensions of the digital divide for developing countries.

The book explores the related issues, such as online development, pertinent to these countries and outlines steps that can be taken to facilitate growth within and between countries. Central to the book’s message is that no developing country can afford to be left behind.

This work will advise and inform organisations and governments wanting to make the transition to an information society and knowledge economy. In particular, the publication will provide a timely contribution to the Commonwealth Action Plan on the Digital Divide.

How to order: Payment by Sterling cheque, international money order, postal order or bank draft must accompany orders. Payment should be in sterling, drawn on a UK bank and made out to the Commonwealth Secretariat. Post and packaging charges should be added to every order in the following way: UK orders: 15 per cent of order value (minimum charge £2.00). Non-UK orders: 25 per cent of order value (minimum charge £3.50).

Send orders to: Rupert Jones-Parry, Publications Section, Commonwealth Secretariat, Marlborough House, Pall Mall, London SW1Y 5HX, United Kingdom. Tel: +44 (0)20 7747 6342; Fax: +44 (0)20 7839 9081; E-mail: r.jones-parry@commonwealth.int.

## **Zamfara Gov Revokes Fatwa On Isioma Daniel**

**T**he Zamfara State governor, Alhaji Ahmed Sanni Yerima, has lifted the Fatwa (death sentence) pronounced on Miss Isioma Daniel, former ThisDay newspaper Style Editor, by his deputy, Alhaji Aliu Shinkafi, over an article alleged to have blasphemed Prophet Mohammed.

Governor Yerima revoked the fatwa as Miss Daniel defended herself in an interview with the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) on January 18.

The Governor said his deputy, Alhaji Aliu Shinkafi did not issue a fatwa but rather said that the Koran recommended a death sentence for blasphemy against prophet Mohammed. He added that his deputy had no authority to issue a fatwa and that it was the press that misquoted him. He therefore urged Moslems to discountenance the fatwa and not carry it out.

Alhaji Shinkafi, while issuing the fatwa, had declared on November 25, 2002 that ‘it is binding on all Moslems wherever they are to consider the killing of the writer as a religious duty.’

Alhaji Shinkafi’s fatwa received widespread condemnation from both local and international groups as well as individuals including Moslem scholars. He did not deny issuing the fatwa.

Speaking from hiding, Miss Daniel told the BBC that some people simply used her story as an excuse to carry out a religious vendetta, unleashing their anger and frustrations with other aspects of their lives on innocent people. She said: “there is no reason why someone should write something and you immediately think it gives you the right to go and kill innocent people.” She maintained that those who carried out the riots were more wrong in what they did than what she wrote adding that no matter what she wrote, it did not give anybody the right to go out on the streets and kill innocent people. Continuing further, she said the children and women and all who died in the riots did not do anything wrong to deserve to be killed because they did not write anything.

Miss Daniel also criticised the politicians for their reactions condemning her and for being more concerned that the pageant was shifted from Nigeria than the people who died. She insisted that the politicians should ask themselves why something so slight could set people off that way.

She condemned the rioters’ reactions which she said were not justified even though she felt guilty that her article caused so much havoc and pain.

Miss Daniel who is presently in hiding outside Nigeria, said it was not possible for her to return to Nigeria soon but hoped that with time, people will forget. She disclosed that she was gradually coming to terms with the consequences of her article and has come to the reality of not having any personal security while being one of the most sought after people in the world. She said living in her state “is quite difficult because I’m not with my family or friends. I am in a place I have never been to before ....”

Her feature story on the Miss World Beauty Pageant titled “The World at their Feet”, published in ThisDay newspaper of November 16, 2002 led to riots in some parts of northern Nigeria because the article contained a sentence allegedly blasphemous to Prophet Mohammed. Hundreds of innocent people were killed and property worth millions of Naira destroyed. She fled Nigeria in the heat the anti-Miss World Beauty contest riots in Kaduna and some other parts of northern Nigeria.

## **Smart Adeyemi Re-elected NUJ President**

**M**r. Smart Adeyemi was reelected President of the Nigeria Union of Journalists (NUJ) at its first national triennial delegates conference held last month at the Administrative Staff College, Badagry in Lagos State. Mr Fred Fabor emerged his deputy. The conference also elected six Zonal Vice presidents, and five other officers to run the union’s affairs for the next three years.

The Conference, tagged “Eko 2003,” took place between January 16 and 19 with the theme “Democracy and 2003: Media as a Think Tank”

Comrade Adams Oshiomhole, President of the Nigerian Labour Congress, who delivered the keynote address at the opening ceremony, enjoined journalists to use their profession as a vehicle to promote equity and justice

Mr. Adeyemi, had in his opening address, disclosed that the NUJ had initiated the Media Alert Series aimed at developing and sustaining the growth of a strong and free media.

He said: “We intend to have a free media that will provide the much needed information required by the public to enable them make informed choices.” He lamented however that the poor financial position of journalists has greatly hampered the struggle in that aspect.

The conference took far-reaching decisions, affecting journalists in the country and the practice of their profession. These include measures to ensure accountability, transparency and professional ethics among journalists by taking journalists who use their profession to extort money from the public or embezzle the Union’s funds to the Independent Corrupt Practices Commission (ICPC); the dissolution of the two factions of the National Association of Women Journalists (NAWOJ) and plans to hold elections into its offices in the near future.

One of the high points of the conference was the review and public presentation of the book, “Redefining Journalism in a Democracy”.

## **Course Holds On Using Internet For Human Rights**

**T**he Human Rights Education Associates (HREA) is offering an eight-week introductory course on using the Internet for human rights work.

Participants at the workshop, which will take place from March 11 to May 17, will be introduced to proven methods of using the Internet efficiently and effectively, including the use of search engines, Web browsers, listservs, Web-to-email services, information management, and security and privacy tools.

This course involves eight weeks (approximately 40 hours) of reading, exercises, discussion, interaction with students and instructor/facilitator and assignments. E-mail will be the main medium for the course, although participants will need to have periodic access to the Web. The course is based on a participatory, active learning approach, with an emphasis on peer-to-peer learning.

The course is intended for staff members of human rights and social justice organisations, researchers and others who regularly use the Internet in their human rights work or study. Participants will receive a Certificate of Attendance upon completion of the course.

Candidates are expected to have a good written command of English (the working language of the course) and have high competence and comfort with computer use.

An advanced course on the Use of Information and Communication Technologies for Human Rights Work-Advanced course will also be offered for staff members of human rights and social justice organisations who are responsible for information and communication, such as information officers and webmasters or webweavers.

The course fee is US\$300, but scholarships are available for applicants from Africa, the Arab World, Asia, Central and Eastern Europe/Newly Independent States, and Latin America/Caribbean.

The deadline for applications is February 28, although applications will be accepted on a first-come-first-serve basis. Applications can be completed on-line at <http://www.hrea.org/courses/7E.html>

## **Institute Holds Workshop On African Human Rights System**

**T**he Institute for Human Rights and Development in Africa will hold its fifth Annual Workshop on Procedures of the African Regional Human Rights System on August 11 to 20, in Fajara, The Gambia.

The workshop is designed to give participants practical, concrete knowledge of how to use African human rights treaties and enforcement mechanisms in their work.

Specifically, the workshop will cover human rights bodies of the African Union: procedures of the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights, and the upcoming African Court on Human and Peoples' Rights, as well as the African Committee on the Rights and Welfare of the Child. Participants will learn how to apply African human rights law at the national and international level.

Topics to be covered during the workshop will include: an introduction to the international and comparative law of human rights; the African regional system for human rights protection; economic, social and cultural rights; the state reporting procedure before the African Commission; and the individual complaints procedure under the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights.

Other topics are: special procedures of the African Commission including its missions and special rapporteurs; the African Court on Human And Peoples' Rights; and recent developments in the African regional and international systems of human rights such as the African Union, the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD), etc.

Scholars and human rights practitioners specialised in the African regional system as well as the staff of the Institute will serve as lecturers and resource persons at the workshop. The workshop is open to citizens of member states of the AU, especially those working with non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in the field of human rights and development. It is designed for individuals from both common law and civil law systems. A certificate will be given to all successful participants.

Applicants for the workshop are required to submit a curriculum vitae and an application form that includes a description of their current work; how their work affects the population of their countries and how participation in the workshop will advance this work; an outline of an individual project which should show how the skills they gain in the workshop will be applied in a project or activity of their organisation, either promotional or protective; and a letter of support from the head of their organisation affirming the organisation's support for and commitment to implementing the proposed project.

The deadline for submission of applications is June 30, while the list of successful applicants will be announced by July 15.

The workshop is free for accepted participants, although the organizers normally require that travel costs to and from the Gambia will normally be borne by the participant's organisation. But the Institute also covers the travel costs of a limited number participants.

Further information may be obtained from the Institute for Human Rights and Development in Africa, P.O. Box 1896, Banjul, The Gambia. Fax: +220 494 178, Telephone: +220 496 421/ 495330/ 495331/ 495398. E-mail: [info@AfricanInstitute.org](mailto:info@AfricanInstitute.org), Website: <http://www.africaninstitute.org>

## **Newspaper Executives Ponder Future Of Advertising Revenue**

**T**he future of advertising revenues and the challenges facing the business will be the focus of the 2003 Newspaper Advertising Conference scheduled to take place in Amsterdam, The Netherlands, on February 20 and 21.

Organised by the World Association of Newspapers (WAN), the conference is expected to showcase ideas and practices which will have a wide application in difficult market conditions.

WAN said the theme of the conference, "How to succeed in a tough market", first developed in Monaco at the 2002 Advertising conference, remains appropriate.

According to Timothy Balding, the director-general of WAN, “although many markets are showing slow signs of recovery, it is important for newspapers to seek out ideas and practices that apply in difficult market conditions.”

He said finding ways to thrive under tough conditions remains a priority, adding that it is of vital importance to learn from colleagues and marketplaces those ideas and practices that will give practitioners an edge in 2003 and beyond.

WAN said participants would leave the conference with a fresh approach to tried and tested ideas, as well as a “toolbox” of innovative revenue generating opportunities.

Topics to be addressed at the conference include:

“Newspaper advertising works – but how?” The session will include the latest effectiveness measurements, advice on promoting the value of newspaper advertising to customers, and the results of the Global Advertising Effectiveness Research competition. It will discuss what newspaper advertising customers buy and how it can be measured; how newspaper advertising compare with the key broadcast media; and examples of the best promotions of the value of newspaper advertising.

“The creative solution”. The session will examine effective advertising design and how to measure the value of improved creativity. It will also examine how to add value through creative campaign workshops. It will discuss the role of “reach”, “frequency”, and “creativity” in achieving response; as well as advertising that works and advertising that does not.

“Have you got the price right?” The session will examine whether newspaper advertising is easy to buy and if the price is right. It will feature views of an advertising agency on why newspapers need to change the way they charge.

“Packaging and Multimedia”. In addition to several case studies of multimedia operations, this session will examine whether multimedia packages mean incremental revenue for the newspaper and greater value for the client. It will discuss how newspapers can improve response when they are included in a multi-media campaign; discuss case studies of multi-media operations as well as cross border packages that tap into international advertising budgets.

“Best practice from the media alternatives”. This session will examine the broadcast media – how it works and how it is sold; it will discuss best practice in buying and selling Internet advertising, the dangers to newspaper yields that the Internet advertising purchase model presents and how to avoid them; how new research into poster effectiveness has increased share in the medium; and the directory industry, the Yellow Pages.

“People, the essential ingredient for success”. The session will provide advice on how to keep sales teams motivated and the principles of effective sales team targeting, looking at best practices from successful newspapers worldwide.

“Building best practice in Customer Relationship Management”. The session will examine Customer Relationship Management in the newspaper industry, discuss whether it is working in the industry and who are the biggest and best practitioners. It will discuss case studies.

## **Training Manual On Effective Writing Available Online**

**A** major training resource designed to help those working in the not-for-profit sector to hone in their writing skills to better influence, persuade and bring about positive social change has been made available free of charge on the internet.

Writing for Change, originally published as an interactive CDROM by Fahamu and Canada’s International Development Research Centre (IDRC), is designed primarily for people working in the not-for-profit sector, including researchers, scientists, project managers, team members, campaigners, fundraisers, social activists and writers. It comprises three sections: “Effective Writing: core skills”, “Writing for Science”, and “Writing for Advocacy”.

According to the publishers, the “Effective Writing: core skills” section helps to develop the skills needed to write clearly and purposefully, organise ideas and express them well.

They said the “Writing for Science” section shows how to produce writing for publication in specialised journals. It teaches how to build on the core skills of effective writing and add further skills that apply to this specialised type of writing. The section also gives a better chance of getting published, discusses the ethics of authorship, how to respond to editors and correct proofs.

The third section “Writing for Advocacy”, they said, contains a wealth of advice on how to win hearts and minds and how to adapt core writing skills to lobbying or campaigning documents. The section looks at articles, leaflets, newsletters, pamphlets, press releases and posters.

Extra features of Writing for Change include a resource centre with suggestions for further reading and links to useful web sites and resources.

Available in English, French and Spanish on Fahamu’s web site (<http://www.fahamu.org>), the publishers said the resource is one of the most comprehensive available, running into about 900 pages per language.

Firoze Manji, Director of Fahamu, said: “The CDROM version has been so popular. IDRC and Fahamu decided to make the resource available in the public domain as well.”

The rationale for the project, he said, is that people working in research and advocacy organisations need to do lots of writing in the form of project documents, articles for magazines, papers for publication in scientific journals, proposals and newsletters. But many able and committed people find writing time-consuming, boring and difficult.

He noted that rather than sitting at a desk, such people would prefer to be doing the real work of setting up the next experiment, conducting the field research, lobbying politicians or engaging with communities.

Mr. Manji argued that despite this, the world will only know about the quality and significance of their work through the documents that explain or promote it and that their success depends on the ability to communicate ideas to others - often on paper.

Writing for Change, he said, could help achieve that success.

Daniel Buckles of the IDRC explained that: “We supported Writing for Change so that our partners would have a tool to build their capacity to communicate research results in ways that promote action based on evidence and social relevance. The guide focuses on effective writing, important both for communicating science and advocacy work. The combination of guidance on core writing skills, writing for science and writing for advocacy makes this product unique.”

## **Electronic Information Sources Available On World Movement’s Web Site**

**T**he Democracy Information and Communication Technology (ICT) group of the World Movement for Democracy is inviting democracy activists to access electronic information and training resources on its Web site.

The working group, initiated as an outcome of the World Movement’s Second Assembly workshop on “Using Internet and Other Media to Promote Democracy,” is made up of individuals interested in sharing their expertise and ideas on the practical aspects of information and communication technology.

The site includes a guide to many practical resources, including Internet tutorials, training resources, and information on Internet related policy issues. The site also provides

information on: how to get started on the Internet; how to find technical assistance and funding for technology; and how to set up Web sites and e-mail lists.

The World Movement for Democracy is a global network of democrats, including activists, practitioners, academics, policy makers, and funders, who have come together to develop new forms of cooperation to promote the development of democracy.

The resources can be accessed on [www.wmd.org/dict/index.html](http://www.wmd.org/dict/index.html)

Interested persons may also join the group's Demo-IT e-mail list, which provides a forum to discuss ideas or problems and to share information related to technology and democracy promotion. To join the list, send an email message to: [Demo-IT-subscribe@yahoogroups.com](mailto:Demo-IT-subscribe@yahoogroups.com)

## **Sub-regional TV News Agency Launched in West Africa**

**A** sub-regional television agency, the West African Television News Agency (WTNA), has been launched. It began operations in Dakar, Senegal on January 1.

WTNA was set up by Senegalese journalist and television presenter, Khalil Guèye, and his audiovisual production company, Generation TV Systems (GTVS).

From its state-of-the-art studios in Dakar, it produces and distributes daily information modules and television magazines covering news stories in West Africa.

Subjects covered include politics, economics, the environment, culture, sport, social events and other issues. But the news agency insists that "sensationalism is taboo" in its coverage of issues.

The new agency says it has an international client-base composed in particular of the American channels, Cable News Network (CNN) and BET, the German channels, Deutsche Welle and ARD, the French Canal France International (CFI) and French-language TV5, as well as the American television news agency APTN and the French agency AITV.

WTNA offers materials in five languages: German, English, Spanish, French and Portuguese.

## **Aspen Institute Appoints New President, CEO**

**T**he Board of Trustees of Washington-based Aspen Institute has appointed Walter Isaacson as president and CEO of the Institute. Mr. Isaacson will be the 10th president of the Institute when he resumes his position in April. He succeeds Elmer W. Johnson, who resigned in August 2002.

The announcement of his appointment was made on January 13 by Mr. William E. Mayer, chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Aspen Institute.

Mr. Isaacson, a former Rhodes scholar, is currently chairman and CEO of the CNN News Group, a company owned by AOL Time Warner. He has served as editorial director of Time Inc. Prior to that, he was managing editor of Time magazine. He is the author of an acclaimed biography of former US Secretary of State, Dr. Henry Kissinger.

Mr. Isaacson is a graduate of Harvard College and of Pembroke College of Oxford University. He is the co-author of *The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made*, a book about American statesmen and the Cold War, and the author of *Kissinger: A Biography*. He is finishing a biography of Benjamin Franklin, which is due to be published late this year.

## **Women’s Media Center To Conduct Campaign To Improve Healthcare Journalism**

**T**he African Women’s Media Centre (AWMC) in developing a campaign to enhance the quality of healthcare coverage in the African media with responsible, accurate and relevant media messages.

With a grant of \$1.5 million received by its parent organization, the International Women’s Media Foundation, from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, the AWMC will launch a campaign which will bring together leaders in the African media to evaluate the quality of health coverage in Africa and then devise strategies and actions to raise the quality of reporting on health issues.

Emily Nwankwo, chair of the AWMC’s Advisory Committee, said: “In this era of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, and with the problems facing most health sectors in African countries, it is crucial that the media play a key role in disseminating accurate information. Only then will the general public become adequately informed and, ultimately, be able to improve their quality of life.”

She argued that “women in Africa bear much of the burden of healthcare and of HIV/AIDS,” adding that “as a leading women’s center in Africa, the AWMC assumes the responsibility of equipping women journalists with the skills and knowledge that will contribute to easing this burden. With the support that we are privileged to receive from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, we can make this a reality.”

A priority of the AWMC has been to train women journalists to report on HIV and AIDS. The center has developed manuals and resource guides on covering HIV and AIDS and has trained women journalists in both French and English speaking African countries to report on the pandemic.

The Centre hopes that the grant from the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation will help it to expand its programs to include other healthcare issues and train more journalists to be effective health reporters.

## **Center Launches Project to Monitor Corruption, Openness**

**T**he Washington-based Center for Public Integrity has launched a new research project to monitor the state of corruption, government accountability and openness in countries around the world. Known as Global Access, the project will utilize a network of investigative reporters, academics and independent experts from around the world to produce international data and studies about corruption, governance and accountability.

In 2002, with a grant from the Foundation Open Society Institute (FOSI), the Center conducted a three-country pilot programme and presented its findings to a high-profile panel of international governance experts. The Center now plans to undertake the project in 25 countries, including Nigeria.

The Center for Public Integrity was established in 1990 and has become one of the leading organizations tracking and reporting on government accountability and ethics, in the United States. Combining a methodological approach of using political science and investigative journalism, the Center has published over 100 reports and 10 books on public service ethics and related issues in the last 12 years.

In 1997, the Center established the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ), represented by 83 of the world’s premier investigative reporters from 44 countries. ICIJ is the world’s first functioning transnational investigative reporting network with the ability to pull together expert reporters from virtually anywhere in the world on practically any issue of global relevance, including corruption.

The Center plans to use this network of investigative reporters, who will work with academics and independent experts from around the world to produce international data and studies about corruption, governance and accountability.

Under the Global Access methodology, for each state, country experts assess nearly 400 “Access Indicators” while local investigative journalists provide reports on the status of each nation’s governance.

The Center said this dual-track approach of quantitative assessments and investigative journalism and perspective, allows Global Access to cover both legal institutions and laws alongside factual reporting of implementation and effectiveness of mechanisms designed to deter abuses of power in countries around the world.

## **ATTACKS ON THE PRESS IN JANUARY 2003**

### **TV Cameraman Assaulted by Policemen**

**M**r. Oluwole Ojo, a cameraman with Galaxy Television was on January 20 assaulted by mobile policemen attached to the Lagos State governor, Bola Tinubu. His television camera was also seized.

Following the beating he received from the policemen, Mr. Ojo was drenched in his blood and later taken to the medical centre in the governor’s office, where he received first aid treatment.

Mr. Ojo had gone to cover a protest by the National Union of Road Transport Workers (NURTW) and a group known as Ikeja Indigenes who were protesting the killing of one of their members. The protesters had marched from central Ikeja, along Awolowo Way to the governor’s office at Alausa, also in Ikeja. At the gate to the Lagos State Secretariat where the governor’s office is located, mobile policemen from the governor’s office swooped on the protesters and took the opportunity to also beat up Mr. Ojo, who with bulky camera could not have been mistaken for a demonstrator.

### **Writer Odia Ofeimun’s Passport Seized**

**T**he international passport of former President of the Association of Nigerian Authors and erstwhile editorial board chairman of *TheNews* and *Tempo* magazines, Mr. Odia Ofeimun, was seized by State Security Service (SSS) officials at the Murtala Mohammed Airport in Lagos on January 11 as he returned from Caracas, Venezuela.

Mr. Ofeimun said as he alighted from an Air France flight and presented his passport to an immigration official, “a staff at the immigration counter obviously spotted a marker on my name in the computer and passed it on to the officer in charge of seizure.”

He said he was led to the SSS office at the airport where he left a statement.

It was the second time his international passport would be seized, the first being in March 1996 during the reign of the late General Sani Abacha while he was travelling to attend a book fair in London. At the time he was Chairman of the editorial board of *TheNews* and *Tempo* magazines which were in the bad books of the Abacha regime.

In a statement to the SSS, Mr. Ofeimun complained: “... the seizure of my passport is disruptive of my effort to live honestly within a trade that sometimes requires that I travel outside to interact with fellow writers, as I have just done in Caracas. In particular, it stands in the way of a literary/research engagement that I have in Europe in the third week of January.”

His passport was returned to him three days later on January 14. No reason was given for the seizure or the return of the passport.

### **Pensioners Attack Tribune Abuja Office**

**O**ver 500 placard-carrying ex-service men on December 5, 2002 invaded the Abuja office of Tribune Newspapers and sacked the workers. The pensioners threatened to set the building housing the Nigerian Tribune and other dailies ablaze but were prevented from doing so by the intervention of some members of the public who pleaded on their behalf.

The newspaper's staff had to run to safety when the pensioners demanded to see the author of a story they were unhappy with. The Tribune offices were locked up after a detachment of policemen dispersed them.

The pensioners were protesting an earlier edition of the Tribune newspaper that carried a report which suggested that they were fake pensioners.

### **Policeman Threatens to Shoot Reporter**

**A** police officer attached to the police post at the West African Examinations Council's (WAEC) office in Ogba, Lagos on December 18, threatened to shoot a reporter with Daily Times newspapers, Mr. Allen Odunze.

Mr. Odunze had gone to WAEC office to conduct an investigation when the policeman ordered him not to pass through the gate regardless of his purpose. An argument ensued between the reporter and the policeman and at a point the officer brought out his gun, cocked it and threatened to shoot Allen if he did not leave the premises.

The intervention of onlookers and the officer's colleague however saved whatever ugly incident might have resulted.

## **MEDIA/PRESS FREEDOM AWARDS**

### **AISI Media Awards On Promoting the Information Society in Africa**

**T**he United Nations Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) has introduced the AISI Media Awards to encourage more informed coverage of the information society and ICT for development issues in Africa.

The AISI Media Awards are aimed at individual journalists and media institutions based in Africa that are "promoting journalism which contributes to a better understanding of the information society in Africa".

The Award is intended to be an annual event, which will honour media institutions and professionals each year. The Award is currently supported by the Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (OSISA). In addition, the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the International Institute for Communication and Development (IICD) have sponsored special interest categories under the framework of the AISI Awards. These are:

The IDRC Award on Reporting ICT Research and Innovation, which is geared towards encouraging media practitioners' focus on issues related to ICT research and innovations in Africa under the framework of the International Development Research Centre's Acacia Programme.

The IICD Award on Local Content Applications, which aims to recognize users of innovative or pioneering applications of ICTs to local content defined as "the expression of the locally owned and adapted knowledge of a community" in Africa.

The IICD Media Award on Local Content which will recognize an outstanding story, campaign, or project in which the significance of local knowledge and content is raised in local, national, or regional fora.

Judging will be based on four categories of entries and winners from each category will be those, who in the opinion of the judges, have made a significant contribution to promoting and raising awareness on the information society in Africa.

There are four categories of entries for the Awards. They are:

- Radio: Programmes from community, commercial and national public radio stations, including news, discussion, documentaries and features.
- Print: Regional, national and local newspapers, including specialist magazines.
- Television: Factual (documentary and features), News.
- Other: Broadcaster of the Year, Promoting African Languages in the Information Society, Media Personality Award (sustained analysis in the news media), Media and ICT application, and the African Diaspora Media.

Entries that cover only international issues are ineligible unless, they relate to, and develop an understanding of, current information society issues in Africa.

Entries made for the Radio and TV categories can be a single programme, a compilation or a series. Web-site entries must include printouts of web pages (A4) with full web address.

Broadcaster of the Year entries should be a compilation of no more than 30 minutes of radio or TV output from a station.

Media Personality Award entries should be submitted for an individual or group of individuals, together with a profile, demonstrating the nominee's commitment to promoting information society issues.

All entries must have been published and broadcast by an African Media institution during the year 2002. Entries can be submitted in more than one category but three copies of all material are needed for each category entered. Also, submissions in African languages should be translated (in the case of print) and/or transcribed into English or French for radio and TV programmes.

Entries must be cassettes for radio entries, VHS tapes for TV entries and original materials for print entries. All material in a language other than French and English must have translation and/or transcription included in the submission. Submissions can be in English, French or Arabic.

The closing date for entries is February 28, 2003. Entries should be submitted to:

Ms Kidist Belayneh (kbelayneh@uneca.org) Economic Commission For Africa, AISI Media Award, DISD, 5th Floor, ECA Building, ECA, PO Box 3001, Menelik II Avenue Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

The selection will be followed by an official notification from the ECA Executive Secretary informing the winners in the case of the AISI Awards. ECA, in collaboration with IDRC and IICD, will notify winners of their selection for the special interest awards.

Prizewinners in the four categories of the AISI Media Awards will receive an amount equal to US\$2,000. For the IDRC Award, the first prizewinner for this special category will receive an amount equal to \$3,000 while the runner-up will get \$1,500. For the IICD Award, the first prizewinner for the first category on innovative or pioneering applications of ICTs to local content will receive an amount equal to \$3,000 while the runner-up will get \$1,500.

The winner under the second category on an outstanding story, campaign, or project in which the significance of local knowledge and content is raised in local, national, or regional fora will receive an amount equal to \$3,000.

### **Bank Institutes Journalism Ethics Award**

**O**mega Bank Plc last month inaugurated an annual "Award on Ethics of Journalism" to encourage and promote ethical business reporting in Nigeria.

Rev. Segun Agbetuyi, the managing director and chief executive officer of the bank, said at the inauguration ceremony that the bank identified with the ethical reorientation of the Nigerian society as an integral part of its social responsibility. He said the award was conceptualized to encourage and reward excellence in business reporting among journalists in the print and broadcast media.

Rev. Agbetuyi announced that “the award will empower the winner to pursue a course of study on ethics of journalism in a higher institution of learning in Nigeria for a period not exceeding one academic session.” The first and second runners-up will receive cash awards.

An eight-man committee was constituted to manage the award. They are Mr. A. N. Udo, Director (Finance and Administration) of the Nigeria Insurers Association; Mr. Bayo Onanuga, the chief executive officer of *TheNews* magazine; Mr. Nosa Igiebor, the chief executive officer of *TELL* magazine; Dr. Reuben Abati, Chairman of the Editorial Board of *The Guardian* newspapers; Mr. Segun Shonubi, the Head of Corporate Affairs of the Chartered Institute of Bankers of Nigeria (CIBN); Mr. R. R. Bakare, the chief executive officer of the Nigerian Institute of Stockbrokers; and Chief Tony Ede, the Assistant Director of Corporate Affairs at the Central Bank of Nigeria.

The committee has Dr. Rotimi Adeola, Omega Bank’s Deputy General Manager (Strategic Planning), as Secretary.

### **Global Award for Human Rights Journalism 2003**

**A**mnesty International is inviting entries for the Global Award for Human Rights Journalism 2003.

The award, which is for non-UK media, recognises excellence in human rights journalism in the written media internationally. It is made for an article that has raised awareness and understanding of human rights issues, whether at a local, national or international level, within the areas covered by Amnesty International’s vision and mission.

To be eligible, entries must have been originally published between March 31, 2002 and February 28, 2003. All entries must take the form of a single written article, whether published in a newspaper, journal, magazine or other print media, or on the Internet. The closing date for nominations is 1 March 2003.

All entries must be nominated by, and submitted through, a non-governmental organisation (NGO), whether local, national or international. Entries cannot be accepted directly from individual journalists, newspapers or other media. Each NGO can nominate a maximum of three entries each. Articles entered can be in any language, but must be accompanied by an English translation. It is the responsibility of those submitting articles to inform the authors that they are doing so.

Entries will initially be assessed by an internal panel at Amnesty International, to ensure that they fulfill the criteria of the Award. They will then be sent to an international panel of judges who will select a shortlist and winner. The final award will be announced at the Amnesty International Media Awards in London on 22 May 2003.

Entries should be sent by the relevant human rights organisation to: Annabel Harris, Amnesty International Media Awards, 99-119 Rosebery Avenue, London EC1R 4RE, United Kingdom or or by e-mail to: [annabel.harris@amnesty.org.uk](mailto:annabel.harris@amnesty.org.uk)

Entries should include a copy of the article in its original published form or, if sent by e-mail, should contain precise details of publication. Copies of the original published article will be required for all short listed entries.

### **BBC/British Council International Radio Playwriting Competition 2003**

**T**he BBC and British Council are on the hunt for the finest writers from across the globe to take part in their international competition for new plays written for the radio.

This is the eighth biennial International Playwriting Competition run by the BBC World Service and the British Council. The play is open to everyone - except for UK residents. There are two categories of top prizes for this year competition. They are: the best play by a writer with English as their second language; and the best play by a writer with English as their first language

The two overall winners will receive: £2,500 sterling (about N500,000) prize-money as well as a trip to London to see their play being recorded for global broadcast and to attend a prize-giving evening. Five runners up, one from each World Service region, will each receive a short-wave radio.

Under the rules of the competition, each person is asked to write a radio play of about 60 minutes on any subject of his or her choice. The finished script should be a minimum of 50 pages of A4 or foolscap paper (or equivalent) and a maximum of 75 pages. The play should have a maximum of six central characters. The play must be the original, unpublished work of the person submitting it. It must not have been previously produced, in any medium.

The contest is open to any writer who is not normally a resident of the UK. No one is allowed to submit more than one play. The play must be written substantially or entirely in English.

Besides being broadcast, the winning entry may be considered for future publication. Each entrant will receive a certificate acknowledging their participation in the Competition.

The play entered in the competition must not, at the time it is submitted, be offered for publication or broadcasting in any other form or medium.

For the winning entry, if a satisfactory recording is made, it will be broadcast on BBC World Service in November 2003. For all other entries, the entering of any play for competition is regarded as constituting a grant to the BBC of broadcasting rights in the play in the terms of the applicable BBC Radio Drama commissioning contract.

Entrants must guarantee that their work does not contain any defamatory matter or any quotation from copyright material without appropriate permission having been obtained.

The BBC and the British Council may arrange for the publication of a book containing some of the plays entered in the Competition. To make this possible, writers are advised to retain their publishing copyright until December 31, 2004.

All plays must reach the BBC or the British Council in London by April 30, 2003. The announcement of the winning plays will be made in September 2003. The overall winning plays will be recorded in October 2003 and the playwrights invited to attend the production process and a prize-giving event.

### **13 Artists Receive 2002 Commonwealth Arts And Craft Awards**

**T**hirteen young artists, representing a diverse range of cultures, experiences, ages and artistic media, have received the 2002 Commonwealth Arts and Crafts Awards funded by the Commonwealth Foundation. They now have the opportunity to travel and study in another Commonwealth country.

Under the Arts and Crafts Awards, a group of artists and craftspeople aged between 22 and 35 years are selected every two years from over 250 applicants to receive an award for travel and study in another Commonwealth country.

The 2002 award recipients were selected from a diverse range of artistic media, ranging from printmaking and sculpture to jewellery and painting. They are: Mohammed Anisuzzaman of Bangladesh, for printmaking; Sonu Aggarwal of India, for sculpture; Barun Chowdhury of

India, for printmaking; Jennifer Gibbs of Jamaica, for jewellery; Christopher Irons from Jamaica, for sculpture; and Bolatito Eweoya from Nigeria, for textiles.

Others are: Uchechukwu Oniyishi from Nigeria, for sculpture; Pax Jakupa Jr from Papua New Guinea, for painting; Adi Cloete from South Africa, for jewellery; Pradeep Chandrasiri from Sri Lanka, for sculpture; Lingikoni Vaka'uta from Tonga, for painting; Lesley-Ann Noel from Trinidad and Tobago, for sculpture; and Lovemore Kambudzi from Zimbabwe, for painting.

The aim of the award is to encourage the sharing of artistic experience and traditions within the Commonwealth. The award gives craftspeople and artists a chance to share their skills, exchange ideas, develop their talents and create a network of artists around the Commonwealth.



***"It is the mass media that make the exercise of freedom of expression a reality. This means that the conditions of its use must conform to the requirements of this freedom, with the result that there must be, inter alia, a plurality of means of communication, the barring of all monopolies thereof, in whatever form, and guarantees for the protection of the freedom and independence of journalists."***

**- The Inter-American Court of Human Rights  
November 13, 1985**

***Media Rights Monitor***

Published by:

**Media Rights Agenda**

10, Agboola Aina Street

Off Amore Street

Off Toyin Street, Ikeja

P. O. Box 52113, Ikoyi

Lagos, Nigeria.

Tel: 234-1-4936033, 234-1-4936034, 234-1-4819162

Phone/Fax: 234-1-4930831

E-mail: [pubs@mediarightsagenda.org](mailto:pubs@mediarightsagenda.org)

Web site: <http://www.internews.org/mra>