

The Thomson Reuters Foundation Fellowship Programme  
at the University of Oxford

# How it began

by Neville Maxwell



*Reprint 2008*

*This is a reprint of the text originally published in 1993 by  
the Reuters Foundation Programme at Green College*

# How it began

by Neville Maxwell

The seed of the programme was planted in 1980/81 when a new Warden at Queen Elizabeth House, Keith Griffin, asked me to take over direction of the Visiting Fellowship Programme. QEH was then a hybrid institution, part University part independent, and quasi- collegiate. The British Council-funded programme of visiting fellowships, designed to introduce “persons of authority or influence” in the Commonwealth and developing world to the University and provide a base for them there, was central to the House’s purpose and role. I agreed to take it over, but set a condition: that, with a reasonable application of the rubric “persons of ... influence”, journalists could be included among the Visiting Fellows, so that over time their numbers might be built up, ultimately perhaps to create an Oxford equivalent of the Nieman Program.

I had known of the Nieman Program since my time in the Washington bureau of *The Times*, when I had visited it at Harvard and come to know some Nieman Fellows. As time went on and I was posted as South Asia correspondent I came to know colleagues, Americans and others, who experienced the Nieman year. All were, in very different ways, outstanding journalists when they were awarded their Fellowship and I noted how much they benefited from that year. All spoke with enthusiasm, even devotion, of the Nieman Program, and what the opportunity of free-ranging study at Harvard had meant to them, personally and professionally.

A career shift had taken me to an academic appointment at Oxford after a long posting in South Asia, via London University's School of Oriental & African Studies; but I was maintaining my links with journalism, and thought that both Oxford and journalists would be enriched if something like the Nieman Program could be built up here. Not only would outstanding journalists from overseas benefit from a year in Oxford, I argued, but, by the fact of their direct knowledge of the political and social realities of their own countries, they would contribute to the University, its dons as well as students. (In South Asia I had noted that political scientists from abroad as a rule brought their own theories to the study of the area's politics, and that those tended to be far removed from what experience had taught my foreign correspondent colleagues and myself.) The Warden accepted my condition and wished the idea well, but expressed scepticism that I could find the funding to make it a reality.

For some time it appeared that his scepticism was well founded. The British Council did not then consider journalists suitable material for fellowships at Oxford, and other funders approached were no more forthcoming. Then came a letter from a Reuters man, "Gubby" Guebenlian, who had heard on the Fleet Street grapevine of my search for funding to bring journalists to Oxford. It emerged that Michael Nelson, the general manager, reacting to charges that the Western news agencies were exploiting third world societies, had decided that Reuters should be seen as doing something to reverse the flow of benefit. His idea was that Reuters should fund fellowships to take journalists from developing societies into universities in the West. He came to QEH for discussions which immediately proved the convergence of our projects.

There followed a meeting convened by Mike Nelson at his house in Annecy, Eastern France. Before making the Oxford contact he had established a link with Stanford University, California, where some years before Lyle Nelson, head of the department of journalism, had won munificent funding from the Knight Foundation to create a programme conceived to rival Harvard's.

The plan was that Reuters should establish a foundation to offer fellowships, two a year to both Stanford and Oxford and in due course one to a French university: the founding trustees were Mike, Reuters editor-in-chief Michael Reupke, Lyle Nelson and myself, and we were soon to be joined by Robert Escarpit from the University of Bordeaux and *Le Monde*.

There were hesitations at our Annecy meeting on only one aspect of the scheme we were launching. Should applicants for the Fellowships be expected to hold university degrees? That had been an issue when Harvard was first considering the admission of journalists as Nieman Fellows, and those concerned with executing the Nieman bequest had insisted that there be no such requirement (which would, in fact, have excluded the vast majority of American journalists at that time); and we quickly agreed that degrees would not be required of prospective Reuter Fellows either.

Advertising for the first Reuter Fellowships brought in a strong and numerous response, over a hundred applications. The Foundation called on retired Reuter correspondents to winnow them and final selection from a short-list of about 20 was made by the Trustees and Foundation director, who were to meet annually by rotation in the three universities.

The panel chose for Oxford in 1983/84 an Indian journalist, Arun Sinha, and a Kenyan, Wanjiru Ciira. I knew of Arun Sinha's reporting for the *Indian Express* from Bihar, where I had recently seen for myself the intractable and protracted class/caste war that created a condition of low-level insurgency in the state. Arun's application made clear that he proposed to use his fellowship to write a book about that vicious rural conflict, so the contradiction inherent in such an intention appeared at the beginning.

I knew that the Nieman Foundation discouraged, even vetoed, use of its fellowships for book-writing, and understood the reasoning: that for a Fellow to spend his year researching and writing must mean that he missed, or at least skimmed on, the rich and enriching banquet of lectures and courses that Harvard

offered. Just the same would apply to a journalist Fellow at Oxford. But there were other considerations. For a journalist to have a published book in his c.v. marked a career step forward provided it was written to academic standards, documented where possible, impersonal except where the journalist's on-the-spot experience was germane - and the latter ingredient could well make such a book more telling than an academic could produce. Arun Sinha's *Against the Few: Struggles of India's Rural Poor* (published in 1991, after cruel delay by the publisher) was just such a book.

This account is chronological but it is appropriate here to look forward to the other books written in these first years. Victor Lai, in the second year of intaking journalists to the QEH Programme, had no thought of writing a book when he arrived from Fiji. But after partaking broadly from Oxford's intellectual smorgasbord (as all in-coming Fellows were encouraged to do in their first weeks) his auditing of seminars and lectures in the fields of ethnic studies and the politics of development led him to a revelation: that the concatenation of political forces in Fiji was leading ineluctably towards a military coup. He found an interested and supportive academic adviser in David Butler, and publication of his *Fiji: Coups in Paradise - Race, Politics and Military Intervention* in 1990 was only narrowly anticipated by the events he had long foreseen and predicted. In 1988/89 Roger Highfield, science correspondent of *The Daily Telegraph*, came on a one-term fellowship (more on that abbreviation later) to finish his highly praised co-authored study, *The Arrow of Time*.

The following year Claire Hargreaves, also from *The Daily Telegraph*, joined for two terms, left to complete fieldwork in Colombia, returned for a further spell of writing in 1990/91. The result was the vivid and important study *Snowfields: The War on Cocaine in the Andes*, striking in its combination of scholarly research and adventurous, indeed perilous, fieldwork. Subir Bhaumik, of *Ananda Bazar Patrika*, used a two-term fellowship to produce a voluminous manuscript on the practice of every South Asian state of suborning its neighbours by supporting, indeed often fomenting, armed insurgencies. Out of that he hewed a coherent study which, like Arun Sinha's, was to fall prey

to publishers' delay and bungling. At last Subir reported that *Insurgent Crossfire* had been published in India in 1997. Mike Baker, education correspondent of the BBC, used a one-term fellowship in 1993 to finish his book, *Who Rules Our Schools?*

The inclusion of the two Reuter Fellows in the 1983/84 intake to the QEH Visiting Fellowship Programme was the crucial first step. It facilitated the task of building up the numbers of journalist Fellows by virtue of the inducement that, with the support of Reuters, such were already being welcomed into Oxford University. Through the next decade the numbers of journalist Fellows increased year by year, reaching 22 in 1992/93; and by the end of that academic year more than a hundred journalists had held Fellowships.

Until the final two years of that period the Reuter Foundation's support stayed more or less constant, the balance needed to fund the growing intake came from a diverse range of new sources. Sometimes those were newspapers, for example *The Straits Times* and *Asahi Shimbun*, who funded Fellows from their own staffs, but foundations were the most fruitful area for fund-raising. The Rotary Foundation's early involvement was especially welcome since it freed the Programme from its third-world confine by bringing in the first north Americans. Then came the Shinyoung Foundation in Seoul, the Daiwa Foundation of Tokyo, the Ford Foundation, the Foreign Office for European journalists, later the British Council for New Zealand journalists. But perhaps the most important for the development of the Programme was the Leverhulme Trust, whose support began in 1988.

The specialisation on journalists from the developing world set by the emphasis of both the Reuter Foundation and Queen Elizabeth House was one limiting factor I was pleased to overcome (for the benefit of the third world Fellows as well as those journalists who could come from other zones); but I also chafed at the absence from the Programme of British journalists. Their inclusion might, over time, help to "promote and elevate the standards of journalism" in this country (such was the purpose of Agnes Wahl Nieman in making her bequest to Harvard); but, more certainly and immediately, the inclusion of British

---

journalists would provide a peer link with and guide to the host society for the foreign Fellows. Applications to the Leverhulme Trust led to six years of funding to bring British journalists into the Programme.

The introduction of British journalists illuminates a factor which worked strongly in support of the Programme's development in that period—the eclecticism, openness and freedom from bureaucracy of Queen Elizabeth House as it then was. There was no other institution within the University where a programme to bring in journalists could have been created in the absence of the launching thrust of a generous grant, but piecemeal and over time as happened in this case. In the University the most common, and perhaps most relished, exercise of power lies in obstruction, in preventing things happening and the committee system lends itself ideally to such negations. In QEH in those days, however, I reported only to the Warden; and Keith Griffin's successors, Arthur Haziewood and Robert Cassen, judged my efforts to be beneficial to the House and fully harmonious with its purposes, and were content to let me get on with development of the journalists' side of the Visiting Fellowship Programme.

Financially QEH helped greatly too. As the number of journalists grew (as did the number of traditional Visiting Fellows, especially from South Asia) the Programme expanded what it offered, and so I could steadily increase the fees charged. The capitation levy of overheads taken by the House on the Fellows still left a growing war-chest for the Programme, and that enabled me to reach out to offer additional Fellowships for journalists, with funding sufficient to cover travel, fees and living allowance at the rates we had set for Reuter Fellows.

A fruitful area for such trawling lay in the short-list of applicants for Reuter Fellowships, of whom as a rule only five or six out of about 20 would be selected. At Trustees' meetings I could note the strong applicants necessarily passed over, content in the knowledge that no sooner would they have suffered the disappointment of failure to win a Reuter Fellowship than they would receive an offer of a Programme-funded Fellowship. When selecting for the Reuter Foundation we had to

keep in mind the balance of its awards, past and present, but when it came to the QEH intake the factors were different.

The Leverhulme grant set me thinking about another key element of the developing Programme, and to questioning how closely it should follow its Harvard model. In the more than 50 years of its existence the Nieman Foundation has maintained the rule that its Fellowships are always for the full nine months of the Harvard academic year; the same goes for the Knight Program at Stanford, and indeed for most of the now many imitative programmes at other American universities. When the founding Trustees met at Annecy in 1983 we did not consider any alternative to that established pattern. But when planning advertising of Fellowships for application by British journalists I imagined hollow laughter following initial interest when the small print was read. No British editor would be likely to consider for a moment a request from a valued journalist for a nine months' leave of absence to pursue non-journalistic studies at Oxford and most certainly none would bind himself to reemploying such flibbertigibbets if they went anyway. So probably only those who were not much valued could apply, or those ready to brave the prospect of seeking a new job on leaving the Programme.

I had a good deal of sympathy for that editorial position, and accepted that the towering standing of the Nieman Program in the USA and internationally put it in a different position from the fledgling Oxford version. Furthermore initial experience with the non-journalist Fellows in the QEH Programme had shown that all but a few could accomplish in a shorter period study for which nine months was allowed; and I felt that nine months away from job responsibilities would often be too long an absence for a mid-career journalist, who would likely find on return that another filled his post, and might meet some resistance when he sought a better one.

Therefore I decided that the Fellowships for British journalists should be offered for varying periods: three, six or—only rarely, perhaps when an applicant was pregnant with a book—nine months. In Oxford, that meant Fellowships for one, two or three

---

of the University's eight-week terms, with a fortnight at each end for settling in and winding-up for those who came for the shortest period. Experience soon proved that a three-month Fellowship could be immensely refreshing, broadening and career-developing for the well-chosen Fellow, while six months, covering two terms and the intervening vacation, appeared to be the optimal period.

That change opened the Oxford opportunity to a greatly widened pool of potential British applicants, and soon I recommended the new range of Fellowships to the Reuter Foundation and other funders. All but one or two adopted it.

There is perhaps a negative aspect to this variation on the Nieman model, and I remember being chided for having made it by a Knight Fellow at Stanford. She suggested that the existence of fellowships for less than the academic year at Oxford, if it became widely known in the USA, would encourage editors to refuse to grant leaves for nine months, and thought that would be deprivatory to the journalists.

The introduction of period variation in the Fellowships led me to re-think the expectations on the journalists' performance while at Oxford. With nine-month Fellowships, beginning as soon as I took over the QEH Programme, I had always insisted that Fellows should produce a substantial piece of written work, to academic standards; at the best publishable but, short of that, still very worthwhile as bound monographs—and over the years the QEH Library accumulated shelves of such studies, written both by the administrators and the journalists. I maintained the same expectation with Journalist Fellows on six or nine month tenures but, with experience, developed a different approach with those who came to Oxford for only three months. At eight weeks the Oxford term is so brief and intense that to demand a substantial written paper of most three-month Fellows would be sharply to limit, even deny, the opportunity of full exposure to the rich variety of stimulus and learning that the University offers, in favour of time spent concentrating on research and writing. So I came as a rule to make no such demand on the short-term Fellows, instead helping them develop their core subject for study and leaving it to their own judgement to avoid

dilettantism and to have the discipline to write up their research, if appropriate, after departure.

I also learned to be flexible about Fellows' study projects. Often the project proposed in an application would be addressed to the imagined interest of the selectors rather than expressing that of the applicant, and would therefore fruitfully be open to revision upon the Fellow's arrival in Oxford. When considering study projects I tried to turn the focus away from media subjects, and towards those of an academic kind that could be followed within the University and be likely to broaden the Fellow's intellectual range. The Programme was able, however, to fund necessary research travel and, by good chance, I discovered that the Foreign Office had a scheme by which appropriate visitors from abroad could be given week-long, guided, and funded research tours within Britain. Those became a much valued adjunct to the Fellowships, often being used to introduce Fellows to the "troubles" of Northern Ireland.

As the numbers of journalist Fellows in the QEH Programme increased the relationship between them and those of the original character, senior administrators, became somewhat frictional, and some organisational contradictions appeared. For example, the choice of subjects for the weekly seminars became problematic. The journalists needed authoritative background on matters of current political and social interest, international and domestic (and I kept in mind the need to offer some counter-balance to the deep conservatism of the University's mainstream); the administrator Fellows had distinctly different interests, in development practice and theory. By the later 1980s the journalists had begun to outnumber the administrators, and I decided to split the Programme. I hived off the administrators and set up the Journalists' Fellowship Programme as a separate entity, retaining direction of that while a colleague assumed responsibility for the original Visiting Fellowship Programme.

The new sense of identity derived from the establishment of a separate programme for journalists expressed itself in the compilation of a *Yearbook* 1990/91, and the next year the Fellows, in a brain-storming session, re-named their journal *Crosscurrents*.

---

The change enabled me to concentrate on the journalists and what they might undertake and achieve in the University, and to clarify my own ideas on the future of what, it began to appear, really might become an Oxford version of the Nieman Program.

The Journalists' Fellowship Programme was in model and concept far removed from being a graduate school of journalism, and my key assumption was that while they were in Oxford the Fellows should be encouraged to put aside their narrow professional interests. All were well advanced in their careers, were outstanding in different ways, and could be freed from any obligation to develop their technical skills. By filling gaps in their educational background, by helping them concentrate on the study of subjects that deepened their understanding of the national or international scenes on which they reported, or prepare for new assignments, the Programme could make them better journalists—but only by making of their Fellowships real breaks with their careers.

While most Fellows would be in their late 20s or early 30s, I thought there should be a place in the Programme for more senior journalists, of editorial rank and experience. That view was confirmed by chance when John Carroll, a former Nieman Fellow and by then editor of *The Herald-Leader* in Lexington, Kentucky, called on the then Nieman Curator, Howard Simon, and remarked wistfully on the value another such break from journalism in a university environment could hold for him at that later stage in his career. Knowing of my interest in including senior journalists Howard told him about the Oxford Programme, he applied, and was welcomed. As expected, John Carroll's presence was helpful as well as enjoyable to his younger colleagues and his Oxford term left him refreshed and re-charged for a new post as editor of *The Sun* in Baltimore. The following year I offered a Fellowship to Krishna Raj, who edited, from a cluttered little office in Bombay, the remarkable *Economic & Political Weekly*, which has an international reputation as a scholarly journal and took advantage of his presence to organise at QEH international conferences on South Asia.

Next—on a Leverhulme Fellowship—came Iain Walker, deputy editor of *The Mail on Sunday*, Iain was an unexpected Fellow in that he came from the popular side of the British press. But his study project, on the growing abuse of the *ex parte* injunction as a press gag, and his approach could not have been more serious and effective. With his immensely friendly, bright and stimulating personality, he was an inspiration to all his contemporaries on the Programme. He became a committed and influential supporter of the Programme's future development and his death in a hill-walking accident soon after he left was a blow to such hopes as well as a personal loss. Turning that bereavement into a positive direction which I knew he would have encouraged (and been amused by) I approached the proprietors of his paper with the proposal that in his memory they establish an "Iain Walker Fellowship" for British journalists. They balked at that quite costly proposition but offered instead a generous annual grant for five years, to be used for any appropriate purposes. That funded the memorial lectures in Iain's name.

The turn of the decade into the '90s concentrated my thinking about the Programme's long-term future—if any. The uncertainty lay in my own approaching retirement, due late in 1993. My role continued to be avocational, carried out on the side of my University responsibilities as a senior research fellow: I was not salaried for the directorship of the Programme, there was no funding for any such expenditure. It would not be reasonable to expect a QEH colleague, without my particular commitment, to undertake the responsibility of directing the Journalists' Fellowship Programme which would still need energetic building-up for some years with the inducement of only a very small honorarium. A quantum jump in the level of funding would be needed to cover a director's salary, and Reuters was the obvious source for such an increase. Under a new Director, Stephen Somerville, the Reuter Foundation was increasing its support to the Programme to compensate for the decline in its income consequent on the separation, demonstrating commitment to its future. But I knew that at Reuters there were reservations about QEH as the long-term base for the Programme and by then I had come to hold those too.

While uniquely suitable as the seed-bed, QEH lacked many attributes which would be demanded over time as the Programme developed. At the physical level, there were intense demands on space in the House, and what there was available was jealously guarded and fought over. More importantly, for some years QEH had been going through a time of troubles which it could be foreseen would end with its being taken over by the University, on the University's terms. With that the House's collegiate ambience would be reduced and no doubt the University's bureaucratic forms would be instituted. The attitude the future authorities would take to the Programme could not be foreseen. If the Programme's future were to be secured, I decided, it would be necessary to transplant it to a college—but which one?

I had put the Programme's toe into collegiate waters some time previously, an approach to St Antony's bearing fruit in the form of dining and common-room rights for two or three Fellows at a time, a welcome enlargement of their social range. But the Warden of the time and his successor both doubted that their governing bodies would wish to bring the Programme into closer association with the college. Clearly none of the undergraduate colleges was worth considering: even if any were interested in the Programme, which was doubtful, their hierarchical structure would make them inappropriate hosts. Of the other graduate colleges one struck me as being potentially a highly suitable destination – Green College. I had been a member of common room there for a some time and liked the atmosphere, the absence of the high-table and senior common room ritual, sometimes mummery, affected in other colleges. Its original focus on the medical sciences had been progressively broadened under successive wardens, and in its ten-year plan there was an aspiration to bring in information technology or some media-related studies.

I put up to the Warden, Sir Crispin Tickell, a paper proposing that the Programme transfer to Green College beginning with the academic year 1992/93. It expressed confidence that, given the College's full welcome to the Programme, Reuters could be persuaded to extend and greatly increase its support so that there would be resources to cover the salary and a College

Fellowship for a successor director. The Warden responded warmly, seeing that the Journalist Fellows could be given standing as Visiting Scholars, which would provide all the privileges, access and facilities they needed, and that their membership would introduce a fresh and diverse range of experience to the College community.

By that time there had been a change in the relationship between the Programme and the Reuter Foundation. After Michael Nelson's retirement the independent trustees of the original Foundation, the programme heads in the three participating universities, had been replaced by senior Reuter executives. So the path to convincing Reuters of the merits of the QEH-to-Green College transplantation lay through Stephen Somerville: it would be up to him to persuade Reuters.

I brought Steve to Green College, inviting him to admire that fine perspective of lawns and Observatory building as one leaves the gate-house; and then, over lunch, introduced him to my vision of the future of the Programme: transferred to the College, taking—I proposed—Reuters' name, and endowed so that its future would be indefinitely assured, but with external funding, additional to Reuters', bound to grow over time. To my pleased surprise I found he was already more than half-way there. Suspecting that my conviction that QEH was the ideal early base for the Programme was immutable and wishing to explore alternatives for their Fellows after my retirement, Reuters had sounded out its own University contacts. They had come up with a common recommendation -Green College.

Stephen Somerville persuaded Reuters. The college's consent was obtained thanks to the strong support of the project by Jeff Burley, a senior fellow, and the Warden made sure the University was content to acquiesce in the Programme's change of habitat. Reuters agreed to commit itself to an initial quinquennium of funding at £100,000 a year. The required treaties for these potent sovereign entities were drawn up so as to ensure the Programme a high degree of autonomy between its two sponsors. Then I began to explore with the College the space that would be allotted to the Programme and found myself facing problems not very

---

different from those that had played a part in my decision to shift the Programme from QEH.

Though the areas of the College that were offered as possible Programme bases were by no means the broom cupboards that other colleges might have considered appropriate, none was suitable. Then I learned that the College had the use of a mansion, rented from the University, a doubly healthy half a mile away, and it appeared that space for the Programme might be found there.

13 Norham Gardens had originally been the home of the great Canadian physician and Oxford professor of medicine, Sir William Osler, whose widow had bequeathed the property to the University to be the home of future professors of medicine. As professorial status and income declined so the mansion became too grand for the means of the incumbents of the chair of medicine, and parts of it were hived off to other purposes; and in the 1970s the University let the core of the building to the newly established Green College. By the 1990s its residential areas had become the home of the retired, immediately previous Warden; but on the ground floor were two spacious, elegant rooms, and those, the College suggested, might be just right for the Programme. The problem was that one of them was Osler's library which was maintained by the previous Warden, Lord Walton, as a memorial, almost a shrine, visited by physicians from all over the world. To allow the memorial nature of that room to lapse and also to relinquish the adjacent vast office used by his secretary to administer the Osler Foundation did not appeal to Lord Walton and for my part I could see no way in which the character of the Osler library could be maintained if it were to serve the Programme's purposes.

Lord Walton handsomely resolved that dilemma when he brought me a new proposal: that he would cede the domestic areas to the Programme if we would leave the library to the memory of Osler, and share the adjacent office. The prospect opened by his offer was magnificent. Two floors of splendid rooms would be available to the Programme, with the share of one for administration on the ground floor. The first floor would

provide seminar/common room, computer room, director's office, with all utilities; and above were two fine bedrooms, in which lay potential housing for the better-provided-for of future Fellows and therefore a means to defray the rent that would be due to the College. An additional benefit came from Lord Walton's surrender of half the time of his secretary, Rosemary Allan. I had been worried by the impending loss of the Programme's administrator, Stacey Mingos, who had supported my efforts through most of the development years at QEH, ironing-out my lapses in diplomacy, always available as friend and counsellor to the Fellows, but was now moving to London. Rosemary was to prove a fitting successor.

So the transition was achieved. There was some repining in QEH but the protests soon died away and I made amends by providing that Reuter Fellows (as all Programme members were in future to be designated) would be common-room members at QEH, with their dues paid by the Programme.

The re-named Reuter Foundation Fellowship Programme's first year in Green College was strikingly successful. The year's throughput of Fellows was 22, the international provenance of the Fellows was at its widest to date, and in each term there was a body of about 15, which I judged was optimal for that time but could even be increased. The year left the accounts comfortably in surplus. Reuters, as well as turning up some fine furniture from various go-downs, replaced the collection of word-processors built up for the Programme at QEH with a battery of new computers. The access to Green College, its dining nights and sports facilities, gave the Fellows their collegiate link, while the half-mile between College and Programme, with the latter's extensive and lavish facilities, meant that 13 Norham Gardens remained the centre of the Fellows' social experience.

At QEH the weekly Programme seminar, which I used to broaden the Fellows' range of studies and interest, choosing subjects that events made timely and speakers to suit, had been tied in with the House's guest night dinner. That made a sociable coda, but meant that the seminar was closed off abruptly, with speaker and Fellows then being absorbed into the wider House

---

community over dinner—good for QEH, not so for the Programme. At Norham Gardens the dinner became an element of the seminar so that discussion could continue through and after it, thus deepening its role and making the experience fuller and more enjoyable for our speakers—thanks not least to our chef, Jim Murden. A practice that had been occasional in QEH was regularised, with weekly seminars given by Fellows to the Fellows or, when appropriate, to a wider audience in Green College: that gave them experience in presenting their ideas orally to a critical group.

I went for a sojourn abroad on my retirement in September 1993, and the Programme began its next chapter of development under the leadership of the distinguished journalist and author Godfrey Hodgson.





The Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism  
Department of Politics and International Relations  
University of Oxford  
13 Norham Gardens  
Oxford  
OX2 6PS

Phone: +44 (0)1865 611090  
Fax: +44 (0)1865 611094  
<http://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk>