

SANDIPTA CHATTERJEE  
MEMORIAL LECTURE – I



SUNANDA K. DUTTA-RAY



THE SCHOOL OF MEDIA, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE  
JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY  
KOLKATA  
2013

**First published August 2013**

**© Jadavpur University**

**All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owner.**

**Published by The School of Media, Communication  
and Culture, Jadavpur University  
Kolkata 700 032**

**Printed by Typographia  
3 Bow Street, Kolkata 700 012  
Cell: 9830105753, Dial: 033 4003 7687  
e.mail: typographia.tga@gmail.com**



Television journalist Sandipta Chatterjee's earthly voyage was rather abruptly cut short on December 2, 2012 when she succumbed to cardiac arrest at the young age of 34.

A bright and lively presence on the screen, Sandipta graduated in History from Calcutta University, before obtaining a diploma in Mass Communication from Viswa Bharati, Shantiniketan. While in Shantiniketan, she regularly filed news and feature stories for some news channels. She joined TARA NEWS as an anchor in February 2005; on this channel, she scripted and presented a women's show named *Priyo Bandhobi*. Later that year she joined STAR ANANDA (now ABP ANANDA) where she worked till the end as an anchor and deputy producer. Apart from presenting news bulletins, she regularly hosted a whole range of shows on news and current affairs, sports, culture as well as science. During the run-up to the 2011 Assembly elections in West Bengal, she produced a three part series titled *Anyo Vote* which focused on offbeat campaign tools such as political cartoons, songs and dramas.

A professional to the core, Sandipta was engaged in a tireless enterprise to improve and update her skills. On the personal plane, she was in intense love with life with an array of interests – an appetite for literature, a passion for classical music, an attachment to the world of flowers and animals, and fervor for the celestial objects.

After her tragic demise, Sandipta Chatterjee's friends and colleagues – who remembered her as a soft, caring and beautiful soul who never failed to leave a pleasant impres-

sion on whoever came in contact with her - approached the School of Media, Communication and Culture, Jadavpur University, Kolkata to organize an annual lecture programme as a tribute to her memory. It was further agreed that the theme of the lecture would be the role of ethics in society in general and the media world in particular, an issue she held dear to her heart. The inaugural lecture was delivered by Shri Sunanda K. Dutta-Ray, the veteran journalist and political commentator. The School is honoured to bring out the illuminating and thought-provoking lecture in print.

SANDIPTA CHATTERJEE  
MEMORIAL LECTURE – I



SUNANDA K. DUTTA-RAY

Published by:

THE SCHOOL OF MEDIA, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURE  
JADAVPUR UNIVERSITY  
KOLKATA  
2013

## SUNANDA K. DATTA-RAY

Sunanda K. Dutta-Ray is a very senior and highly venerated newspaper columnist and political analyst. During an illustrious career spanning five decades, he has added numerous feathers to his cap and contributed to a host of Indian and foreign papers and journals from *Time Magazine* to *The Telegraph*. He was Editor-in-Residence at East-West Center, Honolulu; and acted as Editorial Consultant to Singapore's *The Straits Times* newspaper. He was also a Supernumerary fellow, Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Senior Visiting Fellow at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore.

However, one aspect of his multiple identities that probably towers over the rest was his stint as the Editor of *The Statesman*, Calcutta and New Delhi, in the 1980s. His association with *Statesman* began in the 1960s as Junior London Correspondent after he had graduated in English from the University of Calcutta. In 1980 he became its Deputy Editor and in 1986, the Editor.

His wide array of publications includes *Waiting for America: India and the US in the New Millennium*; *Bihar Shows the Way*; *Smash and Grab: The Annexation of Sikkim*; and an edited volume *Issues and Challenges in Asian Journalism*.

He shifted to Singapore in 2007 to work on a book with Lee Kuan Yew, the founder of modern Singapore and its most revered statesman, at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies based on a series of one-to-one conversations coupled with a host of classified documents. The book was published in 2009 under the title *Looking East to Look West: Lee Kuan Yew's Mission India* and won that year's Vodaphone Crossword book award.

## ETHICS AND THE MEDIA

---

One of the shortest stints of my working life was lecturing to journalism students at what is now called the Wee Kim Wee School of Communication and Information at Singapore's Nanyang Technological University. It was also one of the most fulfilling experiences of a career that has zigzagged through four countries over 54 years. I greatly enjoyed the learning experience, especially the interaction with young people both in and out of class. It is a pleasure to be among students again, and I hope I shall have the benefit of your views too.

It's an honour to be asked to deliver the first Sandipta Chatterjee Memorial Lecture. It's my loss not to have known her personally. But I am sure you would not have instituted a Memorial Lecture in her honour if she was not held in high respect and considerable affection. Nor would you have chosen the topic you have if you did not strongly identify her with ethical journalism.

Ethics is like obscenity. Repeatedly pressed to define obscenity, an American Supreme Court Judge at last exclaimed in frustration, "I can't define it but I know it when I see it."

You don't need a definition of unethical behaviour.

Even a technical juvenile aged 17 years, six months and 12 days knows the difference between good and evil, whether or not the law holds him accountable for his misdeeds.

Indian newspapers are heir to two traditions. Jawaharlal Nehru supported – at least in theory – absolute freedom of the press, regardless of consequences. Sardar Vallabbhai Patel, on the other hand, thought press support was meaningless if it depended on the government being right. My point is that its relationship with the government is only one section of a newspaper's life. As the shocking gang rape in Delhi illustrated, here are other areas of reporting where the press can serve the public. We need not be obsessed with what governments do or don't. We should be far more concerned with society.

Let me recount a personal experience in this connection. I started my career as a reporter on a small town weekly newspaper in the English provinces. When I returned to India in 1960, at the age of 23, having already joined *The Statesman* in London, I had to make a major adjustment in defining news. A boat disaster in southern Bengal killing a dozen villagers highlighted the contrast. It would have been headline news in Britain. Here, the nameless dead merited a single paragraph without a heading tucked away at the end of a column, "filler" in newspaper parlance.

Suppose the accident had occurred in the area my first paper, the 40-page provincial weekly *Stockport Advertiser*, covered. Photographers would have fanned out taking pictures while we reporters squabbled over survivors, friends and relatives. Each of us had to fill three or four pages devoted to particular localities and was desperately possessive about people and events with a connection with those areas. One drowning victim might have had in-laws in my district; another may have spent holidays in a fellow reporter's area. With each reporter claiming proprietary rights over such stories, a victim with connections in two or more districts plunged us into heated argument. There was none of that over the Bengal drowning because – to put it bluntly – readers of *The Statesman* were not thought to be interested in what happened to villagers in the Sunderbans. It was a question of class. Many years later – only recently in fact – I read an article in *The Hindu* by Robin Jeffrey, author of a very well-researched book titled *India's Newspaper Revolution*. Jeffrey says that "Stories from the lives of close to 25 per cent of Indians (Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes) are unlikely to be known – much less broadcast or written about."

I am not going to try to lay down an Ethical equivalent of the Ten Commandments. I am not even sure that the profit motive that by definition underlies all business enterprises – and it would be foolish to pretend the Media does not fall in that category – can be bound down by a Code of Ethics. But I am



absolutely certain there can be no good Journalism without full respect for Ethics. What may not always be possible for an Institution is at all times essential for an Individual.

So, what we are really discussing is ETHICS AND THE JOURNALIST or ETHICS AND JOURNALISM.

Journalism is something you and I understand. The Media is too huge. It's too complex. It involves too many other financial and political interests. It's like Freedom of the Press. Whose freedom does it signify? Similarly, one might ask who will bear the burden of Media Ethics. The Writer? The Editor – a vanishing breed nowadays! Managers and Circulators? Or the Proprietor?

Nobody discusses Ethics and the Judiciary. Or Ethics and the Bureaucracy. But Ethics and the Media was of absorbing public interest long before Mr Justice Markandey Katju took the stage as probably the most vocal and high-profile chairman that the Press Council of India has ever had. There are learned books on Ethics and the Media. I don't know about Jadavpur University but Ethics is a compulsory course at both the undergraduate and postgraduate levels at the NTU. The University of British Columbia has a Professor of Journalism Ethics.

The second focus is on Politics. Politics and the Media are both under the microscope of Ethics.

They are also two sides of same coin. Some of you may remember a right-of-centre political party called Swatantra. One of its leaders, the late Piloo Mody, used to say that if someone wasn't good enough to get into any other profession, he became a journalist. Then, as journalists among his listeners began to bristle with anger, Piloo added that if someone was so ill-equipped that he couldn't even be a journalist, he entered politics and became a Member of Parliament.

What Piloo Mody left unsaid was that every politician – no matter how successful his career – also yearns to shine as a journalist. This is a worldwide phenomenon.

Stalin's editorship of the Soviet paper, *Pravda*, which means truth, probably gave rise to the saying, "There is no Pravda

in *Izvestia*, and there is no *Izvestia* in *Pravda*." *Izvestia* means news. It was the name of another Soviet paper. Zhou Enlai passed the main pages of the *People's Daily* every evening. Watching him do so in the Great Hall of the People during his visit to Beijing, an envious Richard Nixon wished he, too, could lay out the news in a major American daily. One can rest assured that no whisper of the Watergate scandal would ever have reached the pages of the *Washington Post* had his wish been granted.

At home, Raja Rammohun Roy, the first modern Indian in public life, Mahatma Gandhi and Annie Besant all had their own newspapers. Jawaharlal Nehru didn't until *The Statesman* gave him the idea. It offered him five-hundred rupees a month to write a weekly column. Instead, Nehru founded the *National Herald*. His daughter was not content with just that one paper. She wanted them all after 25 June 1975.

Chaudhury Charan Singh's Kisan Trust published two papers. One was *Asli Bharat*, the other *Real India*. One might wonder which was which. Whether *asli* Bharat is the real India? Or is real India *asli* Bharat? How to tell one from the other? Recent pronouncements by Mr Mohan Bhagwat, the Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh head, make it sound simple. Just look at the rape statistics, he says. There are no rapes in Bharat. They take place only in India.

People expect a more explicit commitment to Ethics from Politics and the Media than from, say, the legal or accountancy professions because both are still seen as public service. This might appear to fly in the face of contemporary facts. But it is true that the Media and Politics bear more directly on the lives of the multitude than most other activities.

Moreover, the Media is something everyone thinks he knows all about. Everybody is a Journalist in the largest democracy in the world. When a newspaper or a TV channel describes me as a political commentator, I am in the august company of every peon and *pheriwalla* in the country. They, too, comment just as freely and volubly on every issue under the sun. Even humble

commentators are more in the public eye than owners. When people speak of the Media, they don't think of tycoons like Mr Mukesh Ambani or Mr Samir Jain. They might think of Mr Rupert Murdoch in today's Britain just as they thought of Lord Beaverbrook in the past. But in India, people identify the Media with its practitioners. They think of Sandipta Chatterjee or Rajdeep Sardesai. They think of Journalists and Journalism.

P. Sainath, the Magsaysay Award winning rural affairs editor of *The Hindu*, says, "Newspapers might be a business or a part of a business. TV channels might be a business or a part of a business. Journalism is not a business but it is a profession."

For most of us it is also a vocation. Though I will stop short of calling it a mission, it certainly is not usually a business for most journalists. As in everything else, there are the exceptions. But I would prefer not to dwell on journalists who operate as politicians and lobbyists. My concern here is with the men and women who live only by their pen.

So, it's really ETHICS AND THE JOURNALIST or ETHICS AND JOURNALISM that we should be discussing.

India has some 80,000 publications. I am told we are the only country in the world with more than forty 24-hour news and current affairs television channels. Many more channels are waiting to enter the market. The entertainment and media industry – significantly, the two are clubbed together – is booming. Its annual growth of between 17 and 19 per cent leaves the national economy far behind. With 20 million additional literates every year, the Internet, smart phones and tablets are not yet a threat. The emphasis is still on conventional reading. The Media's revenue was assessed in 2007 at Rs 500,000 crores. Advertising accounted for more than 38 per cent of that figure.

Advertisers are crucial to the Media's survival. As the earthy Canadian tycoon, Roy Thomson, who bought *The Times* of London, put it, news is only "the stuff you separate the ads with."

The Media has to grapple with complex problems of business and management that do not directly concern journalists.

As I said before, the Media is an Institution. The Journalist is an Individual.

Individuals are sensitive to the difference between good and bad, truth and falsehood. The institutional conscience is less easily aroused. Individuals can be reclaimed or compelled. It took the entire weight of Her Britannic Majesty's government to bring some discipline to bear on one corner of Mr Murdoch's empire. The inquiry into the Culture, Practices and Ethics of the Press under Lord Justice Leveson lasted 16 months. The massive report – 1,987 pages – was presented on 29 November 2012. The world is waiting to see what action Mr David Cameron's government will take on it.

Some might say Murdoch's *News of the World* was unlucky only in being caught out. You may remember the scandal of British MPs claiming fraudulent expenses. Several sub-continental luminaries were among the guilty parliamentarians. The *Daily Telegraph* published their names. It's anybody's guess how many million pounds the *Daily Telegraph* paid for that story.

It confirmed my belief there is seldom such a thing as a scoop. What is hailed as a scoop is usually a leak. Those who saw the film *All the President's Men*, starring Robert Redford and Dustin Hoffman, will know that. It was confirmed 30 years later that Deep Throat, the secret informer who guided the two reporters, was an FBI man who had his own reasons for getting even with President Nixon.

You can justify both examples – of the *News of the World* and the *Daily Telegraph* – by saying they hacked, lied, bribed, corrupted – whatever – in a good cause. Like the gods stealing the nectar of immortality from the churning of the ocean of milk in our epics. Or in other words, the end justifies the means.

Even the most idealistic of us must admit Journalism doesn't operate in a vacuum. Shyam Benegal was once asked if cinema had lost its social focus. He replied that filmmakers alone were not responsible for films on social issues. "The audience here too should want to watch it." He added, "Today's audience just

wants to be titillated.” Television is succeeding spectacularly in that.

It's the same with newspapers. When Mr Katju denounces astrology as “pure nonsense” – if nonsense can ever be pure – he is only repeating the verdict of the First and Second Press Commissions which called on papers not to publish astrological predictions. No one took the least notice. Astrology, like *vaastu*, appeals to a huge mass of Indians whom circulation and advertising managers cannot afford to ignore. Be it ever so exalted, no institution is immune from what Ronald Reagan euphemistically called “the magic of the marketplace.” Hence the dumbing down that is just as marked in the Page Three froth of some of our major English-language dailies as in TV programmes.

Some years ago PriceWaterhouse Cooper produced a detailed report on the media for the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry. I wasn't at all surprised to see a footnote under one of the financial tables in the report reading: “The figures above include only the **legitimate revenues** in each segment.” This oblique admission of illegitimate revenues recalls a comment to the International Press Institute by the veteran Singapore statesman, Mr Lee Kuan Yew. How can you expect the media to check political corruption, he asked, since media houses are themselves corrupt. Mr Lee had in mind Indonesia and the Philippines, but looking back to the so-called Niira Radia tapes (and plenty of other less dramatized evidence), India doesn't lag too far behind.

Nehru used to refer to some of the bigger national dailies as the Jute Press. It was a term of contempt. He meant that a jute mill owner who also owned a newspaper chain did not adopt different ethical standards for his different investments. Sometimes one helped the other. There was an outrageous instance once of inaccurate stock market quotations in a newspaper. The suspicion was that the figures had been fudged to benefit the proprietor's investments.

There is a reverse side, too, to this overlapping of media and

commercial interests. The proprietor of a major national daily whose independent-minded editor strongly criticized New Delhi's action on a particular issue found his other businesses were not getting coal – remember, the mines were nationalized in those days – or railway wagons. That courageous editor was sacked. Technically, however, the government was not guilty of exercising censorship. No one ordered the proprietor to dismiss his editor. I was reminded of Chakravarti Rajagopalachari rising above Nehru's abstraction and Patel's demand that the media should be authority's handmaiden. He said, "A government is protected by the vigilant care of the press. But who can look after the press except the conscience of the editor."

On the plus side, Sonia Singh, NDTV's editorial director, says there are more women than men in the media. If so, this contrasts with the national trend of 33 per cent female participation in the country's labour force.

Two problems that are much in the news now are "paid news" and "private treaties". The Press Council has produced a report on the subject. Undoubtedly, these are abuses, but they are abuses that affect the Media more than they affect Journalists. I mean they are institutional abuses. By and large, the individual reporter, feature writer or subeditor is not involved in proprietorial decisions to sell space or pass off advertisements as news. The *Straits Times* in Singapore, where I worked for several years as editorial consultant, has a separate "advertorial" department which also employs journalists to handle such writing. Some of these journalists might have preferred to be in the paper's mainstream but I doubt if they feel professionally demeaned in any way.

Not that journalists are not open to corruption. But while the Press Council rightly raises the issue of corporate subversion, it says nothing about government manipulation of news. Thanks to the government's all-pervasive influence – happily, somewhat reduced since economic liberalization – the phenomenon of the "embedded journalist" was an integral part of our lives long before the Iraq war when the American army

hosted favoured reporters. Delhi journalists who lived in government houses, used government transport, went abroad on officially sponsored trips and enjoyed private access to ministers could hardly be accused of being independent.

Let me give you a minor example of this abuse. When I represented *The Statesman* in London, one of my colleagues arrived as a guest of the British authorities. It was his first foreign trip and, naturally, shopping was his first priority. He wanted to buy a suit. I took him to the men's section of a big department store where he surprised me. My colleague was tall and thin. The suit he wanted was for someone short and fat. The mystery was solved. Some finance ministry official had allowed my colleague the foreign exchange entitlement for a higher rank of journalist. In return he had to take back a suit for the official. Of course, *The Statesman* was paying for it!

Institutions and Individuals are in the same boat when it comes to benefiting from patronage. It began when Nehru's government gave media houses as well as individual journalists prime urban land. Some newspapers built high-rise blocks in Bombay which they rented out while continuing to publish from poky little dens. Some journalists I know – or their children and grandchildren – have made a killing from their plots in Delhi.

Patronage is a pernicious feature of the Indian system. Dr Manmohan Singh called journalists “the conscience-keepers of society.” He expects journalists to “point out what is wrong not only with the administration and government but also society at large”. They can't do so if they are beholden to authority. Safety lies in distance. A famous editor of *The Statesman*, Ian Stephens, worried about meeting India's rulers because he didn't want to be co-opted into the establishment.

Mr Katju was thinking of Institutions – not Individuals – when he said “Self-regulation is an oxymoron”. Self-regulation is not an oxymoron when it comes to individual journalists.

Perhaps aberrations like my colleague who wanted to buy a suit in London might not have been quite so much the norm if

journalism had been a better-paid and more socially respected profession. One thinks of Queen Victoria reprimanding her prime minister, Lord Palmerston, when some cabinet secret was leaked to the newspapers. That came of allowing journalists into the ranks of higher society, she fumed.

Journalists as a whole are not paid well. As Mr Katju says, the standard of education is not always high either. There are no professional rules and regulations. The combined effect of these factors is heightened because journalists spend all their time observing and writing about what they think of as the high and the mighty. It's understandable perhaps that chroniclers should crave to be players. You will often hear journalists - usually veterans - claiming credit for important political decisions. It's psychological compensation.

I saw an American film once about the happenings in a small newspaper office all through one night. The editor asks the sub-editor in charge of the paper's church and weather notices if there's anything he wants. "Yes, sir!" replies the sub. "I want to be designated Editor, Heaven and Earth." Vanity is often a journalist's second name. Tom Wicker of the *New York Times* wrote that the surest way to "buy" a journalist was for Henry Kissinger to call him by his first name. Senior Indian journalists make a point of referring to the equivalent of Dr Kissinger by his first name or nickname ... of course, only behind his back.

Many senior editors are self-important - even pompous - men. I was treated to a demonstration of this when a senior editor from Delhi visited London. He attended a small press briefing by the Indian deputy high commissioner in his room, but would not sit across the desk like the four or five of us. He placed his chair as near the DHC's as he could, and during the briefing - which was only an informal chat - slowly edged closer and closer to the official. The caste system exists even in Britain. The butler in one of Arthur Clarke's novels announces, "Three reporters, my lord, and a gentleman from *The Times!*"

I would hate to think that Jadavpur turns out such status-



conscious snobs. I would also hate to think that any of you are as circumscribed as my journalism students sometimes seemed to be in Singapore.

I am not referring to government control. The NTU curriculum and syllabus had been devised in the United States. All the textbooks were American. So were many of my academic colleagues. But our students were all Singaporean, 99 per cent of them ethnic Chinese, and one per cent ethnic Malay. For me this posed problems, both minor and major, that were not recognized as such.

Like India, Singapore follows British spelling. That's what my students learnt at home and at school. That is what they would have to write in their jobs after leaving the NTU. Yet, the exercises they did for me used American spelling. I puzzled over this and asked the reason. Eventually, one of the girls provided the explanation. "Spellcheck" she said. They were captives of the computer.

My co-lecturer, a young Canadian, took great pride in his work. He had painstakingly changed the names of people and places in the exercises at the end of the text books to make them seem Asian. Thus, an exercise about John Smith and Henry Wood fishing for sharks off Cape Cod in Massachusetts became Koh Kim Chee and Lee Bin Poon, two Chinese Singaporeans, fishing for sharks in the nearby Johore Straits. The first time the Canadian gave his class that exercise a voice piped up from the back: "There are no sharks in the Johore Straits!"

There were instances of a more serious mismatch. Our basic textbook said a journalist is by definition an adversary of the government. It added that under pressure, a journalist should plead the First Amendment. This is a uniquely American constitutional device. It does not exist in that form in any other country. Moreover, any journalist who declares himself the permanent adversary of the government in Singapore will be regarded – and treated as – an opposition activist. It is our good fortune that no one in India is similarly handicapped.

I said at the outset that I would make no attempt to lay down an equivalent of the Ten Commandments for Journalism Ethics. As I also said, the difference between good and bad is obvious even to a seventeen-year-old.

But I'll touch on some points that worry me.

A particular grouse of mine is the increasingly poor quality of subbing in our English-language dailies. I include this as an ethical failure because it shows that everyone wants to be a stellar writer with a by-line. Anyone of any competence wants to be in the public eye. No one is willing to spare the time and effort for backroom duty. Our major newspapers are suffering grievously because of this national obsession with the limelight.

The Radia tapes drew attention to another ambition that cannot be reconciled with good Journalism. Money and power matter more than professional pride.

The importance of accuracy, impartiality and truthfulness cannot be over-emphasized. But a sense of responsibility may be even more important. An Indonesian editor told a conference in Hongkong that I attended that if a bus and a rickshaw were involved in a collision, he could not afford to write that the bus driver was Javanese and the rickshaw-cyclist Chinese. We have to be equally careful in India. It is the price of multicultural harmony. That has an international dimension too. We cannot afford the indifference of Pamela Constable, a *Washington Post* correspondent in New Delhi, who said it was no business of hers if one of her reports on Kashmir led to bloodshed in Pakistan. I wouldn't be surprised if *Washington Post* reporters were instinctively (and under instruction too) more sensitive to repercussions where American interests are more closely involved.

The quality of reporting, slanted headlines and misleading news are other weaknesses. Our reporters may not ask questions like the famous "Have you stopped beating your wife". Our subs may not give headings like the classic QUEEN IN PALACE BRAWL which suggested that Her Majesty and

Prince Philip were engaged in fisticuffs. (It was really about a footballer named Gerry Queen having trouble with the Crystal Palace team.) But a CBI raid on a house is often reported as confirmation of the raided person's guilt. This happened most regrettably and recently with His Holiness the Karmapa Lama, head of the Karma Kaju sect of Buddhism. Having received a large amount of donation in cash, the Karmapa Lama applied to the Reserve Bank of India for permission to keep the money. The raids took place while his application was pending. The reports carried a strong hint of clandestine, if not criminal, operations. Such misrepresentation is sometimes the result of sloppy journalism, and sometimes of mischief. Both are to be strongly condemned.

Once when I told Mr Lee that Indian newspapers were exciting, the Singaporean politician at once asked "In what sense?" He had not found them "exciting in the sense of a vision of a new India and how to get there." Despite all the nit-picking and the personal carping in our papers, imaginative out-of-the-box thinking on large issues is not our forte.

I am indebted to Robin Jeffrey for a plus point. A police inspector told him during a train journey in South India that newspapers had made the police's job more difficult. How, Jeffrey asked. The policeman replied, "Once, if one policeman went to a village, the people were afraid. Now, six police may go to a village and people are not afraid. Newspapers have made them know that the police are not supposed to beat them."

The young men and women who enter journalism start out with high hopes and shining ideals. Of course, they will take some knocks in their professional life. Of course, some compromises may have to be made along the way. But there is always scope for manoeuvre. It is always possible to ensure – returning to Robin Jeffrey's example – that people know the police are not meant to beat them.

This need not be done in an adversarial capacity. As Sir Harry Evans, some time editor of the *Sunday Times* in London, said, "Government just cannot govern well without reliable

independent reporting and criticism. No intelligence system, no bureaucracy, can offer the information provided by free competitive reporting; the cleverest agents of the secret police are inferior to the plodding reporter of the democracy." There might not have been an election in 1977 if the press had been allowed to function normally during the Emergency.

To end on a local note, India's first newspaper was launched in this city in 1780. That is something all of us can be proud of even if the paper was a British achievement. But that meteoric flight ended two years later, largely because of scurrilous writing. That is a warning none of us can ever afford to forget.



