Day 30 - PM Leveson Inquiry 1 1 polite in our discourse, and it's wrong to be 2 2 (2.05 pm)deliberately offensive. 3 MR JAY: I call Mr Bunglawala, please. The one exception, it seems to us -- the one glaring 4 4 MR INAYAT BUNGLAWALA (sworn) exception, it seems to us, is that in recent years the 5 Questions by MR JAY 5 coverage of Muslims has not improved. Sometimes we come MR JAY: First of all, please, make yourself comfortable, 6 across some very, very disturbing headlines which seem 6 7 7 Mr Bunglawala. Could you provide us with your full to us to be aimed at fermenting prejudice against 8 8 name? Muslims. Rather than reporting facts, it's aimed at 9 9 stirring up prejudice towards the British Muslim A. Sure. My name is Inayat Bunglawala. 10 10 Q. Thank you. You are representing an organisation called community. 11 11 Engage, which is a limited company by guarantee. Can Q. Thank you. In relation to that, in the briefing paper, 12 you tell us who Engage is and what its purposes and 12 although it's not in front of us now, you give some 13 objects are? 13 examples of headlines: "Muslim schools ban our culture", 14 A. Sure. Engage was set up almost four years ago now and 14 "Muslims tell us how to run our schools", "Britain has 15 85 [underlined] Sharia courts" and "BBC put Muslims 15 it's a Muslim advocacy organisation which seeks to 16 encourage greater civic participation on the part of 16 before you". 17 17 British Muslims in our democracy. Those are examples from certain sections of the 18 So we try -- during election time, we encourage 18 press which you draw attention to Parliament; is that 19 voter registration drives, we encourage people to take 19 20 an interest in politics, if they have concerns, to raise 20 A. That's right. We believe these headlines are -- we 21 them with their MPs. We make this information available 21 believe these headlines only serve to increase prejudice 22 on our website so people can easily identify who their 22 towards Muslims and they are designed to increase it, 23 23 local politicians are. which is actually the more disturbing fact. 24 24 In addition to that, we also seek to ensure a fairer Q. Can I put this general point to you before we look at 25 25 your submission to the Inquiry: we all believe in free portrayal, a more balanced portrayal of the faith of Page 1 Islam and in pursuit of that we're often in contact with 1 1 2 the Press Complaints Commission and newspapers, with 2 3 a view to seeking a correction of misrepresentations 3 4 that we believe we have seen in newspapers. 4 5 O. Thank you. You provided the Inquiry with a submission 5 6 in writing dated 31 October 2011. Do you have that 6 7 available? 7 8 A. Yes, I do. 8 9 Q. That submission, if you look at page 54254, third line, 9 10 refers to a parliamentary briefing page on Islamophobia, 10 11

speech. How do you define or where do you see the boundary between fair comment on the one hand and

Page 3

which you enclose. It's not in the bundle which has been made available to the Inquiry but I have downloaded it from your website. It's an all-party parliamentary group on Islamophobia briefing note, dated September of

I just touch on one or two points you make there in relation to Islamophobia in the media. I know you don't have the document in front of you but are there any specific points there you could highlight, your concerns about Islamophobia and the media?

21 A. Yes. At Engage we believe that as a society in recent 22 years we've moved away from overt racism. We recognise

23 that racism is wrong, we recognise that stereotypes of

24 people are generally wrong, you know, to propagate

25 these. We recognise it's important to be generally Page 2

unfair, unbalanced discriminatory comment on the other,

if the answer isn't already to be found in my question?

I apologise but it's defining the boundary, please.

A. I can fully accept that newspapers are there to report stories and if Muslims are involved in those stories, there will be facts about Muslims or the faith of Islam which they need to touch upon, especially in a time when we're facing a terror threat from Al Qaeda. It would be

11 impossible for newspapers to avoid the subject of Island 12 and Muslims.

13

14

15

16

17

Where I think a line needs to be drawn is on a clear falsehood on -- where newspapers just tell plain falsehoods in their headline, where they seem to be fermenting prejudice, whereas if we replace the word "Muslim" with another minority group, we would very quickly recognise this is unacceptable.

18 19 So I think the same standards should be applied to

20 Muslims as to any other faith group or any other

21 minority group community.

22 Q. Thank you. You're entitled, of course, to refer to 23 clause 12 of the PCC code, which contains a general

24 anti-discrimination provision, both in terms of race and

25 religion.

Page 4

1 (Pages 1 to 4)

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2010.

- A. Yes, that's right. I remember about ten years ago the
- 2 Sun printed a terrible headline, something about the
- 3 "gay Mafia" -- I think it was referring to ministers
- 4 that were in Tony Blair's government at the time who
- 5 happened to be gay -- and the Sun faced criticism from
- 6 all quarters for that headline, and I don't think we've
- 7 seen the Sun repeat that kind of homophobia again, or
- 8 seen that overt homophobia, and I think it's a good step
- 9 that we've moved away from that. I'd like to see
- something similar happen in connection with reporting on
- 11 British Muslims as well.
- 12 Q. Thank you. In your submission, you provide some
- specific examples, Mr Bunglawala. If you look at 54254,
- this was a piece in the Daily Star:
- 15 "Poppies banned in terror hot spots."
- 16 A. Yes.

- 17 Q. Can you tell us about that?
- 18 A. This was a piece in the Daily Star which claimed that
- 19 the sale of poppies was banned in areas with large
- 20 Muslim populations: Leeds, Bradford and elsewhere. We
- 21 looked into this story -- it seemed incredible to us --
- and very quickly found that they had no basis
- whatsoever. Just because poppies may not be on sale
- does not mean the poppies are banned. You know, poppies
- 25 need to be sold by somebody in the first place.

## Page 5

- 1 past, but my understanding is that in recent years the
- 2 PCC may have moved on a bit and may have been more
- 3 willing to accept third-party complaints.
- 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's interesting.
- 5 The second thing is I think there's a typographical
- 6 error in your statement and I just -- because I was
- 7 surprised to read it.
- 8 A. It yes, I saw that.
- 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: "This complaint was successfully
- 10 resolved by the commission and the publication of a
- 11 clarification which we felt ..."
- 12 It should have been "inadequately"?
- 13 A. Yes, exactly. I spotted that as well. You're a good
- 14 editor.
- 15 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: As it reads, it seems that you were
- satisfied with the correction.
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could we make sure that the copy that
- 19 goes online has the correction put in, because otherwise
- 20 it's positively misleading.
- 21 A. We can resend that to you, most probably.
- 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We might be able to do it -- I've
- just written in "in".
- 24 MR JAY: The second example, please, Mr Bunglawala. This
- 25 relates to a story in December 2007 and a subsequent

# Page 7

- 1 So we challenged the Daily Star to prove that a ban
- 2 had been in place and they were unable to substantiate
  - their story. It was taken up by the PCC and in the end
- 4 a one-paragraph clarification was printed.
- 5 It's not just that headline. If you look at the
- 6 headline, "Poppies banned in terror hot spots", and then
- 7 the subheading is "Muslim snub to forces". It's that
- 8 headline which is very damaging. It's clearly meant to
- 9 portray Muslims as being disrespectful of the armed
- 10 forces, disrespectful of Remembrance Day and the
- sacrifices that soldiers have made in the past.
- The fact that the Star could not find any evidence
- 13 to substantiate that story and responded with
- 14 a one-paragraph clarification, I just find it -- it's
- 15 almost -- you get -- you just get demoralised. You say,
- 16 "I've gone through the process of trying to get it
- 17 corrected. We've been to the PCC, and what we're seeing
- is a little one paragraph response." We have no idea
- 19 how many people -- who's going to see that and how that
- 20 can undo the damage done by the original headline.
- 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Could I ask two questions, please.
- 22 The first is: did the PCC accept a complaint from Engage
- as opposed to from an individual?
- 24 A. I believe in this case they did, sir. It is true that
- 25 we've had an issue with third-party complaints in the

# Page 6

- 1 court case involving Lord Ahmed. Could you tell us
- 2 about that?

4

- 3 A. Yes. Lord Ahmed is a peer. He was involved in a car
  - accident at the time, in December 2007.
- 5 A newspaper, in covering this case of the accident,
- 6 referred to him as a "Muslim peer", and we wrote to the
- 7 PCC because the PCC's code of practice says that
- 8 a person's faith should not be mentioned in a story if
- 9 it's irrelevant to the story, and we couldn't understand
- what Lord Ahmed's Islamic faith had to do with the fact
- that he'd been involved in a car accident. We thought
- 12 it was fairly straightforward -- a fairly
- straightforward breach of the PCC code of practice.
- 14 Unfortunately, the PCC did not uphold our complaint
- and said they believed that the fact that Lord Ahmed was
- Britain's first Muslim peer therefore made it relevant
- 17 to the story of his car accident, which -- I mean,
- again, it just strikes us as totally contradicting their
- 19 own code of practice.
- 20 Q. Thank you. I understand you'd like to pass over the
  - third example but you do want to talk about the fourth
- one, a complaint to the Daily Mail. Again, to be clear,
- 23 was that Engage's complaint or an individual's --
- A. Yes, this was a complaint by Engage. The article
   actually mentioned Engage. It was an article by Melanie
   Page 8

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

- 1 Phillips.
- 2 Q. It was directed to your body, so of course you had the
- 3 right to complain about it.
- 4 A. Yes.

15

16

17

18

21

- 5 Q. But the piece claimed that you were an extremist
- 6 Islamist group funded by the government, statements of
- 7 fact and/or opinion with which you strongly disagreed?
- 8 A. Yes. "Extremist Islamist group" -- I fear we might not
- 9 get very far with that. Melanie Phillips, she has
- 10 a particular world view in which quite a few groups seem
- 11 to fall into that category, so I don't think we're going
- 12 to get very far with that one, but she made a clear
- 13 error of fact in that story where she claimed that
- 14
- Engage was a body funded by the government.

So we wrote to the managing editor at the Daily Mail and made clear that we've never received a penny from the government, we've never applied for a penny from the

government. So we wanted, first, an acknowledgment of

19 the factual error that was in their story, and secondly

20 an apology for making that error.

It's been seven months since this story appeared and

22 since we first complained to the PCC and it's still in

23 the process of being resolved. What happened is we 24 complained to the PCC. The PCC then forwards our

25 complaint on to the Mail. The Mail writes to the PCC.

Page 9

- 1 The PCC forwards the Mail's response on to us. It's
- 2 like a ping-pong game in which the PCC seems to be
- 3 playing more of a postman role rather than the
- 4 regulatory body it's supposed to be, and that is of
- 5 concern.
- 6 After seven months of this ping-pong, we still 7
  - haven't got the word "apology" out of the Daily Mail.
- 8 They're still refusing to acknowledge they made an error
- 9 and -- because there was a paragraph -- we said we want 9
- 10 this as an apology and they keep striking the word
- 11 "apology" out of it. We just -- I think if I was to try
- 12 to draw blood out of a stone, it might be easier than
- 13 getting an apology out of the Mail, it seems.
- 14 Q. Thank you. "Muslim plot to kill Pope", I think we've 15 seen that one before. It's a Daily Express front page.
- 16 A. Well, this was astonishing, Mr Jay, because this was
- 17 a front-page story and normally newspapers are quite
- 18 careful about -- if there's an ongoing criminal case and 19
- there are allegations against individuals, they will put
- 20 words in brackets or in speech marks to denote that this
- 21 is what people are saying rather than a statement of
- fact, but here there were no speech marks. It was just 23 clear "Muslim plot to kill Pope" as statement of fact as
- 24
- opposed to anything else.
  - Very quickly, it became apparent -- I believe within Page 10

- 48 hours or so -- that this was a non-story. The police
- 2 released all the people that had been arrested in
- 3 connection with this incident, without charge, but the
- 4 Express had done a front page and two full inside pages,
- 5 pages 4 and 5, given over to this story of a so-called
- 6 Muslim plot to kill the Pope.
- 7 When it came to a redress for this story, they
- 8 printed a one-sentence clarification on page 9. Again,
- 9 I hope the Inquiry will consider the way newspapers seek
- 10 to redress the mistakes they make and damage they cause
- 11 and whether it is in any way commensurate with the harm
- 12 they are doing --
- 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You don't know the sentence they
- 14 said, do you?
- 15 A. Unfortunately not.
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not in the paper.
- A. No. My apologies, sir. 17
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. 18
- 19 MR JAY: Okay. Maybe the sixth and seventh examples there
- 20 we'll pass over. I think you want to tell us about
- 21 a different example which isn't in here, a "Christmas is
- 22 banned" headline in the Daily Express?
- 23 A. Yes. This was a headline in the Daily Express,
- 24 a front-page story, actually, "Christmas is banned, it
- 25 offends Muslims". I recall this story because it was

Page 11

- 1 one of the few times that I ever actually purchased the
- 2 Daily Express, and I took this story home, I read it,
- 3 and there was no mention in the story whatsoever of any
- 4 Muslim who was saying he was offended by Christmas. It
- 5 turns out that it was a council in south London which
  - had renamed their festivities and renamed it to
- 7 something called a "Winterval" just to make clear that
- 8 they were celebrating a number of festivities over
  - a number of time.

6

- 10 So we contacted again the Daily Express and got no
- 11 joy from them, saying that this was a headline they
- 12 could not substantiate. There was no Muslim quoted to
- 13 say they were being offended by Christmas, so how could
- 14 they justify the headline? To this day, I've had no
- 15 satisfactory response from the Express or the PCC.
- 16 The only reasoning I could see was that it would
- 17 help them shift papers, that it would help their front
- 18 page become a talking point in -- all over the UK and
- 19 get people worked up, get people -- get people's backs 20 up. That to me seems the only plausible explanation of
- 21 a story that had no substance whatsoever.
- 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's not quite fair, because it
- 23 does have a substance if the council had done it, but
- 24 your complaint is slightly different.
- 25 A. Yes, yes, sir. There was no basis for the "it offends Page 12

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

22

Muslims" headline. 1 to be here a conflict of interest here, that when we're 1 2 2 complaining about a story which may have appeared in If I can just point out to the Inquiry that this 3 3 particular front page was subsequently used by the far their own newspapers, that they are sitting on the 4 4 committee that adjudicates the value of these right, the British National Party, on their placards. 5 5 The actual front page of the Daily Express with what complaints. There must be a better answer. headline, "Christmas is banned, it offends Muslims", 6 6 I believe the Inquiry has heard suggestions that 7 7 perhaps former journalists should be on such appears on BNP placards now. It's clear that the far 8 a committee. That seems to us to be an eminently 8 right, in the shape of the BNP, are making use of this 9 9 headline to try to generate support and try to appeal to sensible suggestion. 10 10 Just for -- another point we would like to make is a wider section of the public for their own agenda, 11 11 that often the apologies that are made by these which is clearly an anti-minority one. 12 12 MR JAY: I think we've actually found -- or rather, newspapers are very tiny. As you just saw, in one case 13 it was one sentence --13 Ms Patry Hoskins has found -- the one line in the 14 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That wasn't even an apology; that was Daily Express in relation to the "Muslim plot to kill 15 15 merely an update. Pope" story. It does look as if it's hidden away. It 16 says: 16 A. Yes, you're quite right, sir. There was an update on 17 a front-page story that appeared, so we hope the Inquiry 17 "Six men arrested and quizzed by counter-terrorism 18 18 will, again, look at ensuring that when retractions and police probing a plot in London to attack the Pope were 19 apologies are made, they are in some way commensurate to 19 all were released without charge, Scotland Yard said 20 yesterday." 20 the prominence given to the original story and the 21 21 damage done by the original story. That, I think, was the day after. 22 22 After a while, we have to question -- when a paper A. Yes. See, they were very keen to highlight the Muslim 23 angle when they were arrested, but when they were 23 like the Daily Express or Daily Star keeps repeating the 24 24 released, no word mentioned that they were Muslim then. same mistakes in terms of inaccurate coverage of Muslims 25 and keeps repeating one-sentence or 25 Q. That's a very fair point, Mr Bunglawala. Page 13 Page 15 1 a one-paragraph apologies, we have to ask how sincere 1 Section 2 of your paper gives examples of successful 2 2 those apologies are, of what value they are and whether legal challenges and third-party complaints to the PCC. 3 3 these newspapers are taking it seriously. So we hope Unless you specifically wish to, I don't think it's 4 necessary to alight on any of those, but I think what we 4 that the Inquiry will look at getting a proper redress 5 5 would like to hear specifically from you, Mr Bunglawala, for errors that are made. 6 is your recommendations, your suggestion for the future, LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You mentioned the PCC but you can 6 7 7 go to the PCC about the Express or the Star, can you? which deal with two matters: one, procedure, how 8 complaints can be made by organisations such as yours, 8 A. Unfortunately not, no. As Mr Desmond made clear -- the 9 9 proprietor of the Express made clear in his own and secondly, the substance. 10 A. Yes. A couple of points, Mr Jay. One is we would hope 10 testimony here, he has withdrawn his newspapers from being allowed to be adjudicated by the Press Complaints 11 that if the Press Complaints Commission is going to 11 12 replaced or reformed, attention will be given to the 12 Commission, which again strikes us as a most mystifying 13 13 position for us to be in, because the Daily Express and speed with which the body will deal with complaints. 14 14 I mentioned earlier that we've been in negotiation with the Daily Star are perhaps two of the most egregious 15 the Daily Mail now for seven months for a simple apology 15 offenders when it comes to stories which are mistaken or 16 for a clear factual error and we still haven't got an 16 incorrect or inaccurate when it comes to reporting about 17 17 British Muslims, and now the PCC has no jurisdiction apology or a clarification for that story. 18 18 over them, which is a very odd situation to be in. We question how valuable any correction will be 19 19 MR JAY: Thank you. That's very clear, Mr Bunglawala. months after the original story has appeared. So 20 clearly there needs to be an improvement in the speed by 20 I don't have any further questions for you, but 21 21 which a body deals with complaints from individuals. Lord Justice Leveson may. 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think your characterisation of the 22 Secondly, we have a concern about the make-up of the 23 23 Press Complaints Commission and the fact that serving position is very moderate. Thank you very much indeed. 24 editors are often on the committee which adjudicates A. Thank you very much, sir.

25

these complaints and it just seems to us -- there seems

Page 14

25

MR JAY: So thank you very much, Mr Buglawala.

١,			
1	Before I call the next witness it has nothing to	1	Q. Thank you. And you're the chief executive
2	do with Mr Bunglawala I have been asked to show you,	2	A. I am.
3	on behalf of the Daily Star, a file full of articles	3	Q of the Science Media Centre. The headline message
4	which relate to treatment of these issues. It's	4	which you wish to impart is probably to be found in the
5	obviously not right for me to put it to the witness, but	5	final paragraph on page 54258, a message which you then
6 7	it is right that you should see them in due course.	6	elaborate:
	(Handed)  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. Actually, this	7	"While the media was not solely responsible for the
8	is a point that was made during the course of the	9	MMR scare and lessons have been learned by all
10	evidence, wasn't it, and Mr Dingemans said that he would		concerned, some of the underlying values still remain in
11	provide a bundle.	10	parts of our newsrooms the appetite for a great scare
12	MR JAY: Yes, and here it is. I have obviously read it,	11 12	story, the desire to overstate a claim made by one expert in a single small study, the reluctance to put
13	but	13	one alarming piece of research into a wider, more
14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I shall read it.	14	reassuring context, journalistic balance which conveys
15	MR CAPLAN: May I just mention one thing in relation to the	15	a scientific divide where there is none, the love of the
16	last witness and the delay on behalf of Associated	16	maverick and so on."
17	newspapers? Can I just say that my understanding is	17	Those are the key themes which you develop.
18	that the most recent position is that there is	18	Is it also fair to say, if it's not putting it
19	correspondence between the parties as recently as the	19	disparagingly, that the general public does not always
20	13th and 23 January, and it is all to do, in fact, with	20	apply a rigorous scientific method to its world view?
21	the final wording of the clarification, but it is	21	Witness, for example, belief in astrology or, in the
22	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's not just gone on the	22	United States in particular, belief in creationism?
23	back-burner?	23	A. Indeed. I think our view is that the responsibility of
24	MR CAPLAN: No.	24	the press is to allow all of those opinions to be
25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. I'm sure that	25	reflected but that their facts are accurate.
	Page 17		Page 19
1	M.B. I. I. W. I. I. I. I. I. I. I. I.	1	O. D. 14
1	Mr Buglawala will be pleased to hear that, but his point	1	Q. Right.
2	about timeousness is real and I'm not seeking to	2	A. You're entitled to your opinions; you are not entitled
3	apportion responsibility.  MR CAPLAN: I think it's near an end and there's	3	to your facts.
4 5		4 5	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, you're not entitled to your own facts. You have to have the facts. The MMR scandal may
	a resolution in immediate sight.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm pleased to hear it.	6	not be a very good example, given that, of course, that
6	MR JAY: The next witness, please, is Fiona Fox.	7	
8	MS FIONA BERNARDETTE FOX (sworn)	8	was supported by the peer review journal. I think it was the Lancet.
9	Questions by MR JAY	9	A. It's actually a wonderful example. Are there other
10	MR JAY: Please make yourself comfortable, Ms Fox and your		people to blame? Yes, absolutely, and most of the
11	full name for the Inquiry.	11	responsibility lies with one individual scientist, who's
12	A. Fiona Bernadette Fox.	12	been discredited, but I think on this one you cannot
13	Q. Thank you. You have provided a submission on behalf of	13	absolve the media, and the reason I would say that is
1.0			•
	*	14	because it was just a small study, it had not been
14	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs	14 15	because it was just a small study, it had not been replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with
14 15	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the	14 15 16	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with
14 15 16	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?	15	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should
14 15 16 17	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?  A. It is.	15 16	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with
14 15 16	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?	15 16 17	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should never have been splashed on the front pages.
14 15 16 17 18	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?  A. It is.  Q. Could you tell us, please, about the Science Media Centre. Who or what is it?	15 16 17 18	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should never have been splashed on the front pages.  And I think the other crime of the media in relation to MMR was what we call false balance, where time and
14 15 16 17 18 19	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?  A. It is.  Q. Could you tell us, please, about the Science Media Centre. Who or what is it?  A. We are an independent press office for science set up by	15 16 17 18 19	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should never have been splashed on the front pages.  And I think the other crime of the media in relation
14 15 16 17 18 19 20	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?  A. It is.  Q. Could you tell us, please, about the Science Media Centre. Who or what is it?	15 16 17 18 19 20	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should never have been splashed on the front pages.  And I think the other crime of the media in relation to MMR was what we call false balance, where time and time again the editor demanded that the fact that
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?  A. It is.  Q. Could you tell us, please, about the Science Media Centre. Who or what is it?  A. We are an independent press office for science set up by the whole of the scientific community in 2002, and we	15 16 17 18 19 20 21	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should never have been splashed on the front pages.  And I think the other crime of the media in relation to MMR was what we call false balance, where time and time again the editor demanded that the fact that 99.99999 per cent of medical science believed this
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?  A. It is.  Q. Could you tell us, please, about the Science Media Centre. Who or what is it?  A. We are an independent press office for science set up by the whole of the scientific community in 2002, and we were set up after stuff that went wrong so GM, BSE,	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should never have been splashed on the front pages.  And I think the other crime of the media in relation to MMR was what we call false balance, where time and time again the editor demanded that the fact that 99.99999 per cent of medical science believed this vaccine to be safe had to be balanced in every article
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?  A. It is.  Q. Could you tell us, please, about the Science Media Centre. Who or what is it?  A. We are an independent press office for science set up by the whole of the scientific community in 2002, and we were set up after stuff that went wrong so GM, BSE, MMR to be on the kind of front line between the	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should never have been splashed on the front pages.  And I think the other crime of the media in relation to MMR was what we call false balance, where time and time again the editor demanded that the fact that 99.99999 per cent of medical science believed this vaccine to be safe had to be balanced in every article by Andrew Wakefield or one of his supporters. So you
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	the Science Media Centre dated 5 December 2011. It runs to 12 pages. Is that your formal evidence to the Inquiry which you're going to elaborate?  A. It is.  Q. Could you tell us, please, about the Science Media Centre. Who or what is it?  A. We are an independent press office for science set up by the whole of the scientific community in 2002, and we were set up after stuff that went wrong so GM, BSE, MMR to be on the kind of front line between the scientific community and the very, very controversial	15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	replicated, nothing had been proven, it conflicted with all the previous scientific evidence, and so it should never have been splashed on the front pages.  And I think the other crime of the media in relation to MMR was what we call false balance, where time and time again the editor demanded that the fact that 99.99999 per cent of medical science believed this vaccine to be safe had to be balanced in every article by Andrew Wakefield or one of his supporters. So you have the terrible situation where a MORI poll showed, at

- 1 the British public thought that medical science was 2 divided. That's the bit on which the media let the 3 public down. 4 I mean, if you were sitting in a GP's surgery 5 thinking that medical science was divided about whether 6 this vaccine would give your child autism, it's a wonder 7 that anyone vaccinated their children. Even Wakefield 8 didn't do that. He never claimed that everybody agreed 9
- 10 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I understand that, but I was 10 11 actually sort of trying to provide the context of the 12 support which Dr Wakefield received from a highly
- 13 respected, peer-reviewed medical journal, which may have 14 contributed to a lack of understanding, whereas some of
- 15 the other examples you give don't have that defence. It
- 16 isn't a full defence. I'll put the word "defence" in
- 17 inverted commas. Partial excuse. Would you agree with 18 that?
- 19 A. Yes, absolutely agree, and I think if you look at the 20 role of almost everybody in that saga, nobody comes out 21 smelling of roses. But as this Inquiry is about the 22 role of the media, then that's the role --
- 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Absolutely. But for balance 24 purposes, without seeking to in any way remove the
- 25 responsibility for the research from Wakefield, there Page 21
- 1 was the support originally given to it by the Lancet. 2 But the whole issue of balance is itself an interesting

one. 4 MR JAY: Yes.

3

5 You set out some ground rules, Ms Fox, at 54259, 6 getting the basics right in relation to the empirical 7 sciences and you explain the difference between various 8 types of study, what it means when you say that the risk 9 is doubled. This is all meat and drink to a scientist 10 or probably someone with an A level in a scientific 11 subject, but these are points which are not always 12 caught up in media reporting of the sciences; is that 13 right?

14 A. I think that's right, but I do think that if you -- one 15 of the points I haven't made yet, which I'm really keen 16 to make, is that the best ally of science are the 17 science reporters. We have some fantastic science 18 journalists in this country and I believe that if you 19 put them in a room with very eminent scientists and 20 members of the public that it would take them a couple 21 of hours to come up with these basic guidelines for

- 22 science coverage. It is things that are very
- 23 straightforward. If you say that taking aspirin doubles
- 24 your risk of heart disease or cancer, that sounds
- 25 massive. If you look at the actual figures, and that Page 22

- 1 means a rise of cancer from 1 in 1,000 to 1.5 in 1,000, 2 then people will make different judgments.
- 3 So there's a really basic thing, that you will ask
- 4 journalists: don't just put the increased risk in 5 percentage terms or doubling or trebling terms; also
- 6 give us the numbers. Very basic, not difficult. The
- 7 reason newspapers don't do it is because it doesn't have
- 8 the same impact, so then it becomes a question about the
  - news editor wanting to terrify us with the scary
- figures, and we're saying that actually the science
- 11 journalists and health journalists don't agree with
- 12 that. They want a more balanced message.
- Q. You also point out there's a difference between a small 13 14 experimental study on a rat on the one hand and a series
- 15 of randomised control trials testing efficacy on homo
- 16 sapiens on the other hand.
- 17 A. Indeed, and I think this takes us back to MMR and it's
- 18 slightly, very slightly, a defence of the Lancet here
- 19 because it was a very, very small study. I think it was
- 20 12 children. Most studies are preliminary and
- 21 provisional. The vast majority will not be replicated,
- 22 and indeed will be overturned because they're small.
- 23 They're very important scientifically, but they're not
- 24 important to the public at that stage.
- 25 I mean, the irony, of course, is by the time we've Page 23
- proved the risk or by the time we've proved that the 1
- 2 treatment works, it will be boring to the newspapers
- 3 because it will have been through massive trials with
- 4 tens of thousands of people.
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Of course, to be fair to the
- 6 Lancet -- I have to try to be fair to everybody -- there
- 7 was the issue about where the sample came from in the
- 8 first place.
- 9 A. Indeed. That's right. They were lied to. That's very
- 10 difficult to check for. The peer review system doesn't
- 11 actually check against that.
- 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, I'm just trying to be balanced
- 13 to everybody.

15

- 14 A. I think it's very, very relevant because we are not
  - saying that we don't want the media to report on these.
- 16 I mean, that would be going back 20 years to where
- 17 science was in a ghetto and wasn't covered. We want all
- 18 these studies to be reported, we're delighted to see
- 19 them but we want them on the inside pages. They should
- 20 not be on the front -- can I give you an example from
- 21 the last couple of days?
- 22 MR JAY: So we get our bearings right in our submission, if
- 23 you go to 54260, please, you deal with the issue of
- 24 headlines. It's a big point I know you make, Ms Fox,
- 25 that you're concerned about sensational, misleading or

- 1 sometimes down right inaccurate headlines as much as the 1
- 2 underlying text.
- 3 You've found for us a very recent example which
- 4 illustrates that point, I think.
- 5 A. I brought a couple of examples. I think it's important
- 6 to say that no matter what day or what week I had come,
- 7 I would come with topical examples. I mean, this is
- 8 routine, and what you have is very, very excellent
- 9 science journalists who take care to write an article,
- 10 accurate, balance, measured and third party experts, but
- 11 they leave at 8 o'clock and the subeditors, who don't
- 12 seem to go out in daylight hours, arrive at 9 or
- 13 10 o'clock, skim-read the article and put often a very
- 14 inaccurate headline on it, and I think that causes --
- 15 especially now with new media, very often it's the
- 16 headline that gets tweeted, and if that headline is that
- 17 red wine gives you cancer, then that can be alarming.
- 18
- The one from today --
- 19 Q. I have been asked you to slow down.
- A. You can ask. I shall try.
- 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's actually important for
- 22 a different reason. It's very important that what you
- 23 say is available to everybody who wants to read it, and
- 24 the only way it will be available to everybody is if
- 25 this lady can manage to catch it all.

- out like this in the end, but it has to --
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm going to try again.
- 3 A. Okay.
- 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Please slow down. It's a subject
- 5 obviously you feel extremely strongly about.
- 6
- 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm very keen to hear it but I'm
- 8 actually keen that everybody else hears it as well.
- MR JAY: As you point out, with all these ethical trials,
- 10 the first trial, once you've moved past your rats, is
- 11 a safety trial on human beings and the purpose is only
- 12 to determine whether the drug is safe, not whether it
- 13 works. If it's established to be safe, you then move on
- 14 to the efficacy trials, that's right, and this was
- 15 a safety trial --
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. -- which showed a very slight improvement but in no
- 18 way --

1

12

- 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And then you'll do it qualitatively
- 20 and then quantitatively; is that right?
- 21 A. Indeed. I mean, you go into the next set of trials and
- 22 then phase two trials and then face three and then you
- 23 try in the population. As I said earlier, we do think
- 24 these stories should be reported because they are
- 25 breakthroughs in a sense, but they are nowhere near

## Page 27

#### 1 A. I apologise.

4

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2 So this was a lovely story from yesterday, which --

3 I don't know if you were just watching Leveson on the

- television but was on the news last night, of a stem
- 5 cell break through, and the first proof in a safety
- 6 trial that stem -- embryonic stem cells could actually
- 7 be safe to give to humans, which is extraordinary in
- 8 itself, it's a real break through, it's been a long time
- 9 coming, but it was not an efficacy trial. It didn't
- 10 test for whether these stem cells will cure blindness;
- 11 it was just a first trial to check that the stem cells
- 12 get to the place they're meant to get and are not
- 13 rejected by the immune system.

As it happens, the two -- only two -- patients who have been given the treatment showed a tiny, tiny improvement in their sight, but that's not what it was testing for and those two patients may have shown that improvement totally by chance. Yet we wake up today to a headline which says "Once they were blind, now they see -- patients cured by stem cell miracle". No

21 patients have been cured. It is not true that they were 22 blind and now they see. This is just inaccurate.

23 I know that hundreds of thousands of people with 24 (inaudible) degeneration who are blind will have been 25 given false hope by this. We all hope that it will turn

- a cure. They're nowhere near a miracle. We shouldn't
- 2 be seeing "miracle" or "cure" on stories unless they are
- 3 proven to be such and this study wasn't even asking
- 4 this, and therefore it cannot be proof.
- 5 MR JAY: Thank you.
- 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand.
- 7 MR JAY: Ms Fox, towards the bottom of 54260, you offer
- 8 a gentle bouquet to the Guardian newspaper, which you
- 9 say is the first paper ever to appoint a news editor and
- 10 three subeditors with specialisms in science and
- 11 environment, and by implication you're hoping -- perhaps
  - not expecting -- to see that pattern replicated
- 13 elsewhere; is that right?
- 14 A. Yes. Strangely, many of the science, health and
- 15 environment journalists stay on that beat. They hope to
- 16 be promoted to become science editor or health editor
- 17 but they rarely go down the editorial route. So you do
- 18 find that the newspaper which is packed with humanities
- 19 graduates tends to have editors and subeditors who don't
- 20 understand some of the basic rules of science. We're
- 21 not saying everyone has to have a science degree. We're
- 22 not saying they all have to go through arduous training,
- 23 but we do think for some subeditors and news editors on
- 24 the paper, as well as the specialists, to have some
- 25 understanding in the basics of science would benefit --Page 28

2

3

4

8

9

11

- 1 it would see the end to some of these either overhyping
- 2 headlines or terrifying headlines.
- Q. Thank you. Taking the extremes, 54261, this deals with
- 4 the issue of probability and what happens at the outer
- 5 end of your probability graph or curve. Could you
- 6 develop for us that issue, particularly in relation,
- 7 please, to the 65,000 swine flu death figure?
- 8 A. Yes. This is a tricky one, because what self-respecting
- 9 journalist is going to hear our chief medical officer
- 10 telling us that 65,000 people could die of swine flu and
- 11 not report it? I don't in any way ask them not to
- 12 report it, but I do think there is a special
- 13 responsibility to make clear that that was the very
- 14 worst possible outcome, and that was explained very
- 15 clearly by Liam Donaldson, the chef medical officer. It
- 16 was from a model. These modelling exercises are not
- 17 absolutely exact science. They give a range of
- 18 probabilities.
- 19 Ironically, as I said, what happened was the media 20 a year later kind of turned on the medical establishment 21
- and on Liam Donaldson: "You told us 65,000 people were 21 22 going to die, you hyped this, you did it in order to
- 23 sell or buy the vaccine from GSK", et cetera, et cetera,
- 24 and actually he had never said that. Scientists were
- 25 worried about swine flu. They were right to be worried. Page 29
- Again, it's about the headlines and the top line 1
- 2 reflecting the range of possibilities. On something
- 3 like this which really matters -- I think the climate
- 4 change one was a classic example, you know.
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Take it slowly. Let's just focus on
- 6 swine flu and then we'll go onto climate change.
- 7 A. Okav.
- 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I just have to take it slowly.
- 9 So right to identify there's a range, wrong not to
- 10 provide the context, and absolutely wrong to criticise
- when it comes within the range but not at the extremes. 11
- 12 A. Correct.
- MR JAY: It's a similar point analytically in relation to 13
- 14 climate change, because 11 degrees is at the outer level
- 15 of probability?
- 16 A. Yes.
- 17 Q. In other words, very unlikely.
- 18 A. Yes, and that particular press briefing the Science
- 19 Media Centre ran and there were four scientists on the
- 20 panel and I watched them at such pains to repeat time
- 21 and time again -- because the questions were coming from
- 22 the floor, you know: "Will it be like The Day After
- 23 Tomorrow? Will London freeze over because of this 11
- 24 degrees?" And time and time again, the four scientists
- 25 said, "90 per cent of the models come back and show us Page 30

it's likely to be around 2 degrees warning, but some -a tiny minority of models show us 11 degrees."

And what did every newspaper do the next day? Everybody splashed with 11 degrees. In fact, one

5 newspaper, that was the front page, a massive big 6 "11 degrees" with a picture from "The Day After

7 Tomorrow", which is a terrifying blockbuster movie.

So again -- and I think I said in the evidence that again, a year later, Radio 4 did a documentary accusing 10 the scientific community of exaggerating the impact of climate change and cited this briefing, which was 12 incredibly unfair and I actually emailed each of the 13 journalists who had been present at that press briefing 14 and asked them for an email back to send to these 15 producers on Radio 4 to say that it was not the 16 scientists. In fact, many of them were very upset that their peers would no longer trust them because they'd

17 18

gone out and told the media that we were going to have 19 11 degrees warming.

Q. Thank you. A related theme but it may be all part and parcel of the same point: extraordinary claims need

22 extraordinary evidence, which I suppose, as a matter of

23 logic, must be right.

24 A. Yes.

2

15

25 Q. You give an example of the human clone story. An Page 31

extraordinary claim which needed extraordinary evidence; 1

in fact there wasn't any evidence.

A. Yes. In some ways, I think this possibly could sum up 3 4 our 12 pages of evidence and sum up my view, that the

5 disjuncture between the scientific community and your

6 average newsroom is that within science extraordinary

7 claims demand extraordinary evidence. Within

8 a newsroom, I actually think it's the exact opposite.

9 The more extraordinary, the more shocking, the more

10 sensational, the more the rush to publish.

11 So "MMR leads to autism" was extraordinary. This 12 was a very safe, effective vaccination campaign that had

13 wiped out these diseases. Of course it was

14 extraordinary, but for the newsrooms, that was

the reason to splash it on the front page. For me, that

16 was a reason to step back, ask some questions, see

17 whether those results had ever been found before, wait

18 until they were replicated or at least put it on page 10

19 with those caveats. But that's not the case and I think

20 there's an element of that that we've seen today in this

21 coverage.

22 Q. Then you point out that very often claims even in 23 scientific journals, although they usually are very

24 heavily caveated, turn out not to be true. That,

25 I suppose, is the life history of science, that most Page 32

1	claims in science turn out not to be true.	1	A. No. He's wonderful. These very, very, very media
2	A. That's right. The example I give of the XMRV virus	2	friendly.
3	again, I don't know if you know anything about chronic	3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I didn't call him "ordinary".
4	fatigue syndrome or ME	4	A. No, no. What I'm reflecting is that wouldn't work with
5	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: For the purposes of everybody else		many scientists. They wouldn't be able to write and
6	tell us.	6	communicate in the way that Brian Cox can. He's now
7	A. I don't know how we disagree, but it is a disease which	7	a celebrity scientist, and I say that in a good way.
8	affects many, many people which causes chronic fatigue	8	I think you know, to stress it's very important
9	and many people cannot work. Some children have MECFS	9	that I stress this again and again. The science, health
10	but they have never found a biological cause. They've	10	and environment journalists who write for the tabloids
11	found many things that contribute to it and there are	11	and on newspapers are brilliant. They are genius.
12	treatments that are effective, but for many people, to	12	Every single day they communicate very complicated and
13	discover that a virus has been found in the samples of,	13	very important science to a mass audience.
14	I think, 60 per cent of patients was extraordinary. We	14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think you've just created tomorrow
15	found a biological cause. And not only that, it	15	morning's headline on this subject.
16	promised an effective treatment. The treatments we have	16	A. I hope not.
17	can alleviate the symptoms but they don't cure the	17	MR JAY: Trying to bring together themes in the context of
18	disease.	18	getting the balance right, point number one, you're not,
19	So this was huge hope for everybody. It was	19	of course, arguing in favour of any form of censorship;
20	published in a good journal and it was run on the front	20	you're seeking to attain the right balance between
21	pages, but again, I think the question newsrooms should	21	different reviews.
22	have asked is: this is extraordinary. Has it been	22	Secondly, you recognise this is under the heading
23	replicated? Has it been found before? The answer is	23	"Inconvenient truths" that some issues are very
24	is: no. No one has ever found it before and this is the	24	heavily politicised and polarised. For example, GM
25	first study. Let's put it in the inside pages.	25	crops; for example, climate change.
	Page 33		Page 35
1	In fact in the Ctates manufacture manifest and	1	T ( C () 1 1 () C ()
1	In fact, in the States, people were running out	1	In terms of practical recommendations for this
2	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had	2	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend
2	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then,	2 3	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?
2 3 4	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came	2 3 4	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported
2 3 4 5	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it,	2 3 4 5	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago
2 3 4 5 6	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've	2 3 4 5 6	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they
2 3 4 5 6 7	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends	2 3 4 5 6 7	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here from	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here fror the Sun, he spoke about having engaged a scientist to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 n17 18	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.  So I think that's probably our most solid proposal,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here from the Sun, he spoke about having engaged a scientist to write science stories in a straightforward,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 n17 18 19	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.  So I think that's probably our most solid proposal, apart from that Leveson has given us this wonderful
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here from the Sun, he spoke about having engaged a scientist to write science stories in a straightforward, user-friendly way. I can't remember the name of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 n17 18 19 20	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.  So I think that's probably our most solid proposal, apart from that Leveson has given us this wonderful opportunity to step back and just to dream about the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here fror the Sun, he spoke about having engaged a scientist to write science stories in a straightforward, user-friendly way. I can't remember the name of the scientist.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.  So I think that's probably our most solid proposal, apart from that Leveson has given us this wonderful opportunity to step back and just to dream about the kind of culture change in newsrooms which would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here fror the Sun, he spoke about having engaged a scientist to write science stories in a straightforward, user-friendly way. I can't remember the name of the scientist.  A. I imagine it's Brian Cox.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 n17 18 19 20 21 22	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.  So I think that's probably our most solid proposal, apart from that Leveson has given us this wonderful opportunity to step back and just to dream about the kind of culture change in newsrooms which would eradicate many of the problems. Most scientists owe
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here from the Sun, he spoke about having engaged a scientist to write science stories in a straightforward, user-friendly way. I can't remember the name of the scientist.  A. I imagine it's Brian Cox.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It was Cox.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 n17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.  So I think that's probably our most solid proposal, apart from that Leveson has given us this wonderful opportunity to step back and just to dream about the kind of culture change in newsrooms which would eradicate many of the problems. Most scientists owe a huge debt to our newspapers for communicating science.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here from the Sun, he spoke about having engaged a scientist to write science stories in a straightforward, user-friendly way. I can't remember the name of the scientist.  A. I imagine it's Brian Cox.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It was Cox.  A. He's not an ordinary scientist.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 n17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.  So I think that's probably our most solid proposal, apart from that Leveson has given us this wonderful opportunity to step back and just to dream about the kind of culture change in newsrooms which would eradicate many of the problems. Most scientists owe a huge debt to our newspapers for communicating science. There's actually quite a small amount that needs to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	buying tests for this virus, buying treatments which had helped alleviate other symptoms of this virus and then, within months, a group from Imperial College London came to the SMC. They tried to find it, couldn't find it, a group in Holland, a group in the States, and now we've had about ten studies. They cannot find it, and it ends it up it was contaminated samples.  Again, it was in Science. It was in a good journal. It's right that the journalists write it up but not splash it on the front page. It's too preliminary.  So we love science on the front page and there's some fantastic science stories. There's plenty of opportunities but I think it would resolve a lot of problems if journalists just didn't overclaim for these studies.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When Mr Dominic Mohan was here from the Sun, he spoke about having engaged a scientist to write science stories in a straightforward, user-friendly way. I can't remember the name of the scientist.  A. I imagine it's Brian Cox.  LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It was Cox.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 n17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Inquiry, given those matters, how would you recommend that the right balance is achieved?  A. I'm very pleased how many science journalists supported our recommendation for guidelines because ten years ago the scientific community recommended guidelines and they were very fiercely rejected by journalists. But actually most of the science journalists themselves say that these guidelines would help them to win the arguments with their editors and their news desks about the kind of prominence to give to these stories.  So I think as long as the science reporters were involved in drafting those, they could then be used for training, for editors and subeditors and general news reporters as a part and parcel of journalist accreditation. They could also be used by a PCC or a strengthened PCC to adjudicate on a complaint.  So I think that's probably our most solid proposal, apart from that Leveson has given us this wonderful opportunity to step back and just to dream about the kind of culture change in newsrooms which would eradicate many of the problems. Most scientists owe a huge debt to our newspapers for communicating science.

1 damaging the public interest. I do -- you know, the 1 went to the Press Complaints Commission on that 2 whole theme of this Inquiry is about public interest, 2 particular issue and the response was: "James Delingpole 3 and I have to say sometimes it doesn't matter but 3 has robust, strong opinions and it was all in the ..." 4 sometimes it really does. With the example of MMR, with 4 So I think, again, there is no strong recommendation 5 the examples of GM, which is a technology that the 5 here. There are different views within the scientific 6 British public and policy-makers have rejected based on 6 community but there is just a sense, getting back to one 7 inaccurate claims about its damage to human health --7 of my original points, that -- this thing about: you are 8 you know, these things matter. 8 entitled to your opinions; you are not entitled to your 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: When you say it would be the work of 9 facts, and that there should still be some requirement 10 a couple of hours to create guidelines, have you put 10 for factual accuracy on issues like climate change, 11 your mind to them? 11 vaccines and things which matter so much. 12 A. The list that I came up with in the evidence took me two 12 Q. You did provide us with the ruling of the PCC in 13 minutes and quite a few people agreed with it, but there 13 relation to the UEA against the Daily Telegraph case and 14 is actually a new project funded by government, which is 14 Professor Jones. It is quite complex, and if you don't 15 a national science journalism training coordinator which 15 mind I'm not going to go into the detail of it, although 16 has only just come about and we're very excited about, 16 I've studied it. I've passed it on to Lord Justice 17 and he is actually in the process of putting those 17 Leveson. Maybe that's something I can take up with the 18 guidelines together. 18 PCC, if there's time. 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well --19 Can I ask you, please, moving on through your 20 A. Would you like to see them? 20 paper -- we haven't looked at the case studies at 54267. 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Do you have a timeframe? 21 All four of them are interesting, but the two I'm going 22 A. He probably has something he could -- it may be work in 22 to ask you about, the first and the last, the stillbirth 23 progress and it could be improved on, but I think he 23 and sleep position paper in the BNJ and then recognising 24 probably has something he could deliver very soon. 24 the link to longer lifespan. Can you tell us briefly 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. 25 about those, please? Page 37 Page 39 MR JAY: Thank you. Please clarify 54264, under the heading A. I have to say I don't know much more about those than 1 1 2 "Columnists". Precisely whom are you referring to 2 was presented in evidence. I wonder if you would object 3 3 there? if I went through a couple from this week instead with 4 A. Oh, there are many, many columnists. We love 4 similar messages; is that okay? 5 columnists, we love opinionated people. We're quite 5 O. Certainly. 6 opinionated at the Science Media Centre. Our beef with 6 A. One was just from last week from the Sun. I don't know if you can see -- it was a full page in the Sun, which 7 these columnists is that sometimes, much like the 7 8 previous witness said, they are stating things that are 8 is quite hard to achieve: 9 blatantly inaccurate and we question whether newspapers 9 "Breast cancer risk all over shops' shelves." 10 can disregard accuracy when it comes to their 10 And basically what the story is saying is commonly 11 columnists. 11 used chemicals that are all around us in products are 12 The complaint that came alongside my complaint from 12 linked to breast cancer. It's a classic example of an 13 UEA, the University of East Anglia, was about 13 article which should not have been given this prominence 14 Phil Jones, the scientist whose thousands and thousands 14 or headline. It was a very small study, it has several 15 of emails were stolen, hacked into and put out on the 15 flaws in it, it was in a relatively obscure journal and 16 Internet about climate change. 16 it showed that traces of these chemicals are found in 17 17 the breast tissue of women with breast cancer but it It was a very difficult time for him at the time. 18 Now four independent inquiries -- parliamentary 18 didn't test the breast tissue of women without breast 19 19 cancer, healthy women. So it didn't do a control. inquiries, university inquiries, independent 20 inquiries -- have ruled in his favour, that he was not 20 Now, it's interesting that the traces of these 21 21 guilty of lying about climate change, presenting some chemical was were found -- many toxicologists would have 22 22 big hoax, and yet you still have columnists like expected them to be found -- but it certainly is not 23 23 Delingpole who, under the masthead of the Daily terrifying and there's no evidence that the chemicals 24 Telegraph, continue to write, persistently, that he is 24 cause the cancer. Neither has there been any study ever 25 a liar and a fraud and a hoaxer, and I know that UEA 25 before showing that these chemicals cause breast cancer,

Page 38

1 so I'm aware that three major cancer research charities 1 It is a creation of news editors because they like it. 2 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: What's possible is that everybody' wrote to the Sun about this. 3 Again, the Sun does fantastic health and science 3 written up the story, somebody has written it up under 4 4 coverage on many occasions, but you don't have to go this headline, then, as everybody scans each other's 5 many weeks before you will get the -- what we call the 5 online editions, the next paper says, "Hmm, that's 6 6 a good way of putting it", and lifts an equivalent scare quotes. 7 7 headline and so it goes virally around the newsrooms of My final one was, again, from last week. It was 8 8 a story the Science Media Centre launched -- again, Fleet Street. I'm not saying that's happened --9 another very exciting story about the prospect that we A. I think that's entirely possible. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It's rather more plausible than 10 10 will be able to stop the transfer of mitochondrial 11 11 diseases, terrible incurable diseases like muscular everybody --12 dystrophy. There was a patient -- case study where 12 A. It may not matter, but I just think the fact that we are 13 a woman had seven children, all of whom had died --13 powerless to change it, I think that was the point 14 very, very tragic -- and last week the government 14 I wanted to make to you. The framing has been set 15 announced that it's going to have a year-long public 15 because it's controversial and because it works for the 16 consultation on a new approach where you would take some 16 news editor, we are landed with it. It will be 17 17 impossible to change it. healthy mitochondria from the donor and replace the 18 mother's damaged mitochondria, and so the child could --18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Ms Fox, this is very, very 19 19 but it's quite a radical technique. It's quite new. interesting, but why isn't this covered by a simple 20 But all of the papers -- every single one of the 20 requirement for accuracy? 21 21 papers went with this "Child with three parents". A. Very good question. That's what we are asking for. 22 Nobody in the whole of science -- none of the patients 22 We're not asking for special treatment or regulation but 23 I've spoken to, the clinicians, the researchers, the 23 we're asking for the best possible standards of accuracy 24 24 stem cell -- nobody I've ever spoken to about this in relation to these --25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The code requires accuracy. 25 technique believes that this is going to be a baby with Page 41 Page 43 three parents. They think it's going to have some A. I know, yes. As you heard from the previous witness, 1 2 2 there is also the situation which we've raised where material from a donor in the way that you do when you 3 3 only the individual scientist involved in the article have a kidney transplant, but we have: "Children with 4 three parents to be born in two years", "Babies with 4 that's inaccurate is able to go to the PCC. 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Have you been able to go to the PCC's three parents planned" ... 6 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's the Financial Times? A. No, although I think it's quite important to say that 6 7 A. It is. "Babies with two mothers and one father within 7 when we set up in 2002, we decided not to go down that 8 three years", "Three parent IVF closer to approval", 8 route, that we would -- our philosophy was that the 9 9 media will do science better when scientists start to do "Three parent IVF." 10 Does it matter? The articles were beautiful, and in 10 the media better. So our focus -- apart from this half fact, most of this story was reported in a way that 11 11 an hour that I've got in this room, most of my life is 12 I would say is the best of science reporting, but we are 12 aimed at persuading scientists to accept what they've 13 13 got, to live with it and to engage much effectively and about to have a year-long national debate. It will 14 14 culminate, in a year's time, in a parliamentary debate actually, over ten years we've seen a dramatic 15 because they have to enact legislation to legalise this. 15 improvement in coverage of science, partly because of 16 Is it helpful that it's going to be framed forever in 16 the wonderful science journalists but also because more 17 17 and more scientists -this -- and when I have spoken to the science 18 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Don't feel you have to speak quickly journalists, the point they make is: "Our news editors 19 love it. It's controversial. They love it." And maybe 19 because it's only half an hour. I can extend the time. 20 we should be scared what we wish for because maybe if it 20 A. Okay. 21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'm just concerned that smoke seems 21 wasn't controversial, it wouldn't get any coverage. 22 to be emanating from the shorthand writer. 22 MR JAY: It is remarkable in that case that every one of 23 23 those newspapers has chosen the same headline. A. I'm sorry. 24 A. And some of them are in inverted commas but nobody uses 24 MR JAY: Well, those are all my questions. In fact, it's 35 25

it. Not even the opponents of this technique use it.

Page 42

25

minutes on my watch. Not that we're counting.

LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think it's a very interesting area 1 graduate training scheme; is that right? 2 2 because it seems so easy to fix. If you're pleased with A. Yes. 3 the reporting, the general stories, then it doesn't seem 3 Q. You've won a number of awards, which you haven't 4 to be beyond the wit of man to devise a mechanism for 4 referred to in your statement, but could you just tell 5 ensuring that everything else flows from that. But it 5 us what those are, please? 6 may underline a slightly more serious problem, which is A. They were mainly in connection with the Buckingham 6 7 7 all about the culture in the sense, not in the normal Palace intruder story in 2003. There were a couple of 8 sense we've been using it during the Inquiry but in the 8 British Press Awards: scoop of the year and the Hugh 9 sense of needing a headline that grabs attention and the 9 Cudlipp award for excellence in tabloid journalism, and 10 10 extent to which sufficient attention is paid to the link there was a What The Papers Say scoop of the year and 11 between the story and the headline. That's not just in 11 the London Press Club. 12 science; that's in criminal justice, to my certain 12 Q. Thank you. It was Mr Morgan who told us a little bit 13 knowledge, and I'm sure many other fields as well. 13 about this. It is covered in his book. You were sent 14 As regards the climate change story, presumably 14 undercover into Buckingham Palace as a footman. You put 15 there are all sorts of potential remedies open to that 15 in a proper application and everything else. 16 particular scientist if he's been defamed. 16 A. Yes. 17 A. I only know of one complaint that he's made to the Press 17 Q. Although you didn't say you were a journalist. Indeed, 18 Complaints Council and that has not been upheld. 18 there's a photograph of you on the balcony here and you 19 19 I don't think he feels like that. left just as George Bush was arriving. That's more or 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: All right. Having got your time, is 20 less it, isn't it? 21 there anything else that you would like to share with 21 A. Yes. 22 22 Q. I'm not going to go into that. Mr Morgan said there was 23 A. Let me just have a quick --23 a huge public interest in that story and you would LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Take a moment just to check you've 24 24 doubtless agree? A. Absolutely, yeah. I mean, there was very much 25 said all you want to say, because I do agree it's very 25 Page 45 Page 47 1 a security scandal there. The vetting procedures were 1 important. 2 shameful, actually. There was just one woman in 2 A. No, I think you have managed to get all of my points out 3 a personnel office. They did very cursory checks, other 3 of me. Thank you very much. Thank you for the 4 opportunity. We really appreciate it. 4 than a CRB check. They didn't check into my background 5 whatsoever. They didn't check who I was being paid LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed. 6 by --6 MR JAY: Thank you. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'll rise for just a few minutes. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, they probably thought you were 8 (3.12 pm)8 being paid by them. 9 9 A. Well, of course, but on the same front I could have been (A short break) 10 in a training camp in Afghanistan for the past four 10 (3.19 pm)years rather than working for the Daily Mirror. 11 MR JAY: The next witness is Mr Ryan Parry, please. 11 12 MR RYAN LEE PARRY (affirmed) 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There's an interesting comparison. 13 A. As a result of the story, the government appointed Dame 13 Questions by MR JAY 14 Butler-Sloss to head up a security review and that 14 MR JAY: Thank you. Make yourself comfortable, please, 15 Mr Parry and first of all could you provide us with your 15 review concluded Her Majesty was at risk and they 16 full name? 16 appointed Brigadier Jeffrey Cook as the head of security 17 to oversee vetting procedures. So I think that's A. It's Ryan Lee Parry. 17 18 a clear indication of how they viewed the story. 18 Q. Thank you. In the file in front of you, probably under 19 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I wasn't belittling the story, 19 tab 4, you'll find a witness statement dated 13 January 20 this year and signed by you. Is this your formal 20 Mr Parry, in any way. 21 21 A. Thank you. evidence to the Inquiry in answer to a notice which was 22 22 served on you? Q. The substance of your evidence is about the 23 23 Christopher Jefferies story, with which you were first A. It is. 24 Q. You are employed by the Daily Mirror and have worked 24 involved on the evening of 27 December 2010. You went 25 25 there since the year 2000, having joined as part of its down to Bristol and in terms of the chronology, Page 46 Page 48

- 1 Mr Jefferies was arrested on 30 December.
- 2 Can I ask you this general question: did you receive
- 3 any briefings from the local police, the Avon and
- 4 Somerset police, in relation to any aspects of the story
- 5 and/or in relation to Mr Jefferies?
- 6 A. Personally I did not receive any briefings in relation
- 7 to Mr Jefferies. We were in constant contact with the
- 8 police press office. We did attend the press
- 9 conferences at the Avon and Somerset police hours, where
- we were given guidance and briefings as to how the
- investigation was progressing, yes.
- 12 Q. Mr Jefferies, as I said, arrested on 30 December. That
- sets the clock running or the possibility of liabilities
- arising in the context of the Contempt of Court Act.
- 15 Presumably you were aware at the time of the existence
- of the Act and the obligations it imposed; is that
- 17 correct?
- 18 A. Yes. Of course, I was fully aware that proceedings were
- active once an arrest has been made, but ultimately my
- 20 role was to -- it was to compile a background article on
- 21 Mr Jefferies, as would be normal practice with any
- 22 murder investigation.
- 23 Q. Can I ask you this: how can you provide an article which
- 24 gives full background -- if any of that is going to be
- 25 negative, how do you reconcile that with the

- Contempt of Court Act? Is there not a possible tension
- 2 at the very least?

1

- 3 A. Yes, I accept that there is a tension, but the argument
- 4 for that would be not all negative information would
- 5 prejudice a fair trial, and in compiling this article,
- 6 the aim was to be as balanced as possible, while
- 7 providing our readers with a full and in-depth view of
- 8 the person arrested in connection with this death.
- 9 Q. The first of the articles which you had some involvement
- with was published on 31 December 2010, and your
- evidence starts to deal with this at paragraph 13 of
- 12 your witness statement.
- The upshot was that the Mirror was receiving
- information from sources, both by phone and email, to
- the general effect that Mr Jefferies was eccentric,
- he was highly intelligent, he was well read and he had
- wild blue hair; is that right?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. You then had anonymous reports from neighbours and
- a former tenant called to offer information as well, but
- 21 that call was dealt with by someone else, not you; is
- 22 that correct?
- 23 A. Yes.
- 24 Q. The article which you were responsible you deal with at
- paragraph 19. Could I ask you, please, to look at Page 50

- 1 tab 2, page 31975.
- 2 A. Yes.
- 3 Q. This is the front page of the Daily Mirror for
- 4 31 December. The front page is not your responsibility;
- 5 is that right?
- 6 A. Yes.
- 7 Q. Nor indeed is the article we see at 31976.
- 8 A. Yes. Although, as indicated in my statement of claim,
- 9 I did have a minor role in some of the quotes towards
- 10 the end of that article.
- 11 Q. The right-hand side of the top article on 31976. The
- piece, however, which was largely yours is at 31978; is
- 13 that correct?
- 14 A. Yes.
- 15 Q. Can I just ask you a few questions about this. The
- 16 headline "The Nutty Professor", you make it clear the
- Daily Mirror were not the only paper to use that. Was
- the headline your decision?
- 19 A. No.
- 20 Q. Can I ask you about the subheadlines:
- 21 "Bizarre past of Joanna Yeates murder suspect."
- 22 Again, is that your decision?
- 23 A. No.
- 24 Q. The decision of a news editor or subeditor presumably;
- 25 is that right?

## Page 51

- 1 A. Yes.
- 2 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just looking at them now, do you see
- 3 that they may cause potential prejudice to jurors?
- 4 A. Well, obviously hindsight's a wonderful thing, and
- 5 looking back, we -- everybody at the Daily Mirror is
- 6 very regretful of the coverage and we do apologise to
- 7 Mr Jefferies for vilifying him in such a way, but you
- 8 have to understand at the time it was such a high
- 9 profile murder investigation. There was huge public
- interest and concern over the tragic death of
- 11 Joanna Yeates.
- 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that. Actually, let me
- share this with you, Mr Parry: that's one of my
- 14 concerns, that everybody in retrospect will say, "Well,
- 15 that clearly went too far and this clearly was wrong and
- that shouldn't have happened and we'll put in place
- 17 mechanisms to try to prevent it in the future" -- until
- the next enormous story comes along and it all just
- 19 drains away.
- 20 A. I accept that, but I think you'll find that this
- 21 particular story was perhaps, you know, a watershed
- 22 moment for the industry. It wasn't -- an eye opener.
- 23 It wasn't just the Daily Mirror. It was a number of
- 24 newspapers who fell foul of this.
- 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand that, and that's what Page 52

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

- 1 lots of stories -- people might have said the same after
- 2 the death of the late Princess of Wales, or after all
- 3 the problems surrounding the McCann story. But here it
- 4 is. It comes around again. A watershed moment? Well,
- 5 I hope so, but I'm concerned about it and I'd be
- 6 interested for your view.
- 7 A. Sure, absolutely, but, I mean, what can we do as an
- 8 industry? As a reporter, as a journalist, I am happy
- 9 with the way I conducted myself on this particular
- 10 story. I tried to present as balanced an article as
- 11 possible and the decisions that are made at an editorial
- 12 level are out of my hands. I can only advise my content
- 13 desk as to which direction I feel the story is going,
- 14 and from the feeling on the ground of -- you know, from
- 15 speaking with other reporters, but all we can do is
- 16 learn from this and hopefully improve for the future.
- 17 MR JAY: The general impression given by the article, your
- 18 choice of language, your phraseology -- we see "local
- 19 oddball" four lines from the top. We see "arrogant and
- 20 rude" about 15 lines down. We see "odd, lonely young
- 21 man who was never seen with a girlfriend" towards the
- 22 bottom of the left-hand column. We see, rather oddly,
- 23 in the next column:
- 24 "He was a strange boy, quiet but restless."
- 25 Then lower down:

- "... eccentic manner ... long-term bachelor status 1
- 2 sparked unfounded school gossip that he was gay."
- 3 Then finally there's a story about throwing books
- 4 and pens across the room. Of course it's unfair, as
- 5 I've just done, to take out isolated phrases, but if you
- 6 aggregate them, you have a certain picture, don't you?
- 7 A. I agree, but if you're going to aggregate those, I'm
- 8 point out a few of the positive lines.
- 9 Q. Fair enough.
- 10 A. We have, in the third column along:
- 11 "He was very positive and pastoral in school."
- 12 In the final column, a former master was quoted as
- 13 saying:
- 14 "He was dedicated in his job, strongly academic and 15 deeply involved. He was respected and his students used 15
- 16 to get good results."
- 17 And then towards the end of the article,
- 18 a Mr Gervin(?) is quoted:
- 19 "He's a witty man, very sociable, pleasant and
- 20 gregarious, a man who enjoyed the company of others.
- 21 I am absolutely stunned by his arrest, I really am. It
- 22 is extraordinary."
- 23 Q. It's whether those positives -- the effect they have on
- 24 counterbalancing the negative, really, and the impact of
- 25 the negative in terms of an ongoing criminal

# Page 54

- 1 investigation and the Contempt of Court Act. Do you see
- 2
- A. Yes, I do see that, but I was trying to present a true
- 4 reflection of this man's character, and having gathered
- 5 information from many different sources, past and
- present, in the life of Mr Jefferies, this was the 6
- 7 picture that was painted.
- 8 Q. It's a collection of anecdotes from those who knew him,
- 9 many of them a long time previously. Is that not a fair
- 10 way of putting it?
- 11 A. Well, some of the anecdotes were from many years
- 12 previously, but there were some quotes from neighbours
- 13 who obviously knew him very recently.
- 14 Q. May I move on, please, to the second article, which was
- published on new year's day 2011. Paragraph 28 of your 15
- 16 statement. In particular, paragraph 29. The theory
- 17 that you were exploring, whether Ms Yeates' killer had
- 18 been lying in wait in her flat. You say you obtained
- 19 specific confirmation from the police that this was
- 20 a line of inquiry that they were not ruling out?
- 21 A. Yes.
- 22 Q. Along with a whole range of other lines of inquiry they
- 23 were pursuing, though; is that right?
- 24 A. Yes.
- 25 Q. Can I ask you, please, to look first of all, before we Page 55

1 look at the article, at tab 5, and an email which is it

- 2 is 54686.
- 3 A. Yes.
- 4 Q. This, I think, is this part of the copy for the new
- 5 year's day article?
- A. This is part of the copy for -- yes, it was.
- 7 Q. I had more specific questions actually about another
- 8 email. It's 54703, which was forwarded to you. Have
- 9 you found that one?
- 10 A. Yes.

12

18

- 11 Q. This comes from a pupil who was at the school between
  - 1989 and 1994, who knew Mr Jefferies. A lot of this is
- 13 extremely positive, isn't it?
- 14 A. Yes.
- Q. Can I just identify that which is positive? If you look
- 16 six lines down from the top:
- 17 "To be honest, it is quite inconceivable to think
- 19 this for a number of reasons. Firstly, he was not an

that Mr Jefferies could be involved with something like

- 20 aggressive man and certainly not violent, contrary to
- 21 many others' comments, although as stated, I didn't
- 22 experience him for a prolonged period of time. He was
- 23 also very intelligent and articulate, so his solution
- 24 was normally a witty retort to express himself rather
- 25 than anything remotely physical. This can be Page 56

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

6

9

characterised by what may be an urban legend about him that was bounded about by teaches also of an event in which he was approached ..."

We needn't go into that particular example.

"He was a slight man that appeared quite weak and never did any sport and at 65 [I think there are some words missing] I don't think that he could easily overpower a young active woman, rather than the opposite."

10 This is very strong evidence in his favour, isn't 11 it?

A. Yes. 12

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

22

Q. Did you capture that evidence in your article, do you 13 14 think?

15 A. Yes, I feel we definitely did bear in mind that this 16 article wasn't the background article of the previous 17 day. This was mainly focused on developments in the 18 investigation, so obviously we're constrained when it 19 comes to space of how many words we can get in there, 20 but towards the end of that article, if you see there, 21 it's quoted: 22

"Another former pupil added: 'He's not an aggressive man and certainly not violent. He was also very intelligent and articulate, so his solution was normally a witty retort to express him rather than anything

Page 57

of language, the precision with which the author has

2 expressed himself. You must have thought: "Well, this

3 man has taken the trouble to write this, he's done it

4 rather well, this is rather important evidence." Did

5 you go through that thought process at the time or did

you go through a different thought process?

7 A. I imagine I will have gone through that thought process,

8 but as I say, we only have limited words on the page and

we have to edit down substantial quotes like that to

10 pick out the ones that we feel are the most relevant,

11 and the fact that we used the quote "He is not an

12 aggressive man and certainly not violent" to describe

13 a person who has been arrested on suspicion of murder

14 I would say certainly negates anything else that we're 15

talking about.

16 Q. There's other material. I just refer to it. 54690:

17 "Mr Jefferies was my English teacher 25 years ago. 18 I find it impossible to believe he could be the

19 murderer."

20 546919: 21 "He spoke nicely, had a nice voice and he always

22 appeared totally harmless." 23

There was a lot of convergent material which suggested, okay, he's a bit eccentic, okay, English teachers at public schools are a bit eccentric, or

Page 59

1 remotely physical."

2 And that was taken from that email that you referred 3

Q. Yes, but there's only just part of it, though. I think the point I'm trying to make is that there was much more, as I've already read out: "quite inconceivable to think that Mr Jefferies could be involved, "not strong enough to overpower a young active woman".

Then if you look at the next page of the email, 54704, it's really the last three lines:

"Also being eccentric, introverted and slightly wacky does not make you a killer. Even if it did, then I could name at least six other teachers at Clifton that could be suspects, and I'm sure that most other public schools have similar characters!!"

The point I'm trying to make is that rather sums it up, doesn't it, in a well-expressed and insightful email? Would you agree with that?

19 A. Yes, I would agree with that, but that was one of many 20 emails we received on Mr Jefferies. I did try to get a flavour from all the correspondence and all the sources that we dealt with into all the articles.

23 Q. Did that particular email, when you read it -- and you

24 assessed it, presumably, not just in terms of its

25 substance but the way in which it was expressed, its use 25 Page 58

1 sometimes are, but that's all it amounts to. The whole

2 story is built on this very flimsy piece of timber,

3 isn't it?

24

25

4 A. The story is built on what I felt was a true reflection

5 of Mr Jefferies' character. I mean, the article on the

6 31st was intended to be a background article into

7 Mr Jefferies as a man, taking in several different

8 sources, and if he came across as an oddball, as an

9 eccentric, then that's because the evidence suggested

10 that he was.

LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The trouble is that once you start 11

12 down this exercise, then where do you stop? You know,

13 how much do you go? Then you really are stepping into

14 somebody else's territory, namely an active criminal

15 investigation.

16 MR JAY: We haven't looked at the front page and article

17 itself. We should. It's tab 2, 319868, Mr Parry.

18 Evidently the headline is not yours. We know that.

The point the Lord Chief Justice made, both in the context probably of the headline and more generally, was

21 if you look at the opening words of your piece:

22 "Joanna Yeates' killer may have been waiting for her 23 inside her basement flat as she returned home."

24 Then there's some DNA studies:

> "They were also given until Tuesday to continue Page 60

19

- 1 questioning of the landlord."
- 2 Lord Judge said: well, the person who had access to
- 3 the flat was obviously the person referred to in the
- 4 headline but the only person you identify as having that
- 5 access was Mr Jefferies, so we have a link here which
- 6 put Mr Jefferies clearly in the frame, regardless,
- 7 perhaps, of the headline. Would you accept that?
- 8 A. Yes, I would.
- 9 Q. I think you had some involvement with 31987. Indeed,
- 10 you referred to it. Although Mr Smith is the byline,
- 11 this was a joint effort, I think, was it not?
- 12 A. Yes.
- Q. I think it's the reference in particular on the 13
- 14 right-hand side to "peculiar ways". Where do you feel
- 15 that that was an appropriate turn of phrase in the
- 16 context of someone who had been arrested for this
- 17 particular type of offence? Do you see that?
- 18 A. Yes, I see that. Again, that wasn't a word that I would
- 19 have put into my copy.
- 20 Q. You mentioned lessons learnt. In terms of your own
- 21 journalism -- of course, there hasn't been normally case
- 22 quite like this overt last 13 months, but are there any
- 23 pieces, articles you want to draw to our attention which
- 24 you feel demonstrate that this case might properly be
- 25 seen as a watershed?

- A. None that jump to mind, I have to say, but I don't have
- 2 any involvement with those decisions. I mean, that's
- 3 certainly something for the content desk and the
- 4 executives of the newspaper.
- 5 Q. Sorry, one last question or series of questions. One
- 6 factor operating here is that you're not the only
- 7 journalist on the ground. Is this right: you are quite
- 8 friendly with many of your colleagues on other papers,
- 9 although you complete with them?
- 10 A. Yes.
- 11 Q. So are you aware generally on the grapevine, the
- 12 discussions you're having at the time in December 2010,
- 13 of the sort of things they may be writing about at the
- 14 same time as you're writing about them? Is that right?
- A. Yes. I wouldn't be doing my job if I didn't know that. 15
- 16 Q. No. But is there a sense that there is a pervading
- 17 pressure almost to outdo your colleagues and present
- 18 a story in a way which is particularly powerful,
- 19 particularly impressive, particularly eye-catching? Do
- 20 you feel that that's a possible factor operating on you
- 21 on this occasion?
- 22 A. No, I wouldn't say that at all. There's a pressure on
- 23 you, as a reporter, to deliver and furnish the content
- 24 desk with all the relevant facts and all the stories of
- the day, all the best information that's around and 25

# Page 62

- 1 that's a part of a journalist's role, and if I didn't do
- 2 that, I wouldn't be doing my job properly.
- 3 Q. I think you're saying you discount the possibility that
- 4 these outside pressures were operating on your judgment,
- 5 I'm not saying to distort the picture but to paint and
- 6 describe the picture in a particular way, namely a way
- 7 which some might argue is sensationalist and hyperbolic.
- 8 You don't accept that?
- A. I don't accept that, no, because as I say, we went to
- 10 a number of different sources on Mr Jefferies and
- 11 everything that we heard seemed to gel with the picture
- 12 painted in that article, that he was a very eccentric,
- 13 highly intelligent character, and that is why the term
- 14 "the nutty professor" was used, whether that was right
- 15 or wrong, but certainly it was a true reflection of the
- 16
- 17 MR JAY: I think I've covered in my questions to you what
- 18 other evidence there may have been, but thank you very
- 19 much, Mr Parry.
- 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Mr Parry, I appreciate that you are
- 21 a reporter on the Mirror. I was told by somebody -- but
- 22 it may not be the Mirror, it may have been
- 23 News International -- that there was an application to
- 24 go to the Supreme Court in connection with this case.
- 25 Do you know anything about that?

# Page 63

- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'd like to know what the position
- 3
- A. I think we're appealing, certainly.
- MR BROWNE: Still no decision of the Supreme Court. We'll
- 6 let the Inquiry now.
- 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'd be very grateful.
- 8 MR JAY: The Sun has withdrawn its application, or rather
- 9 NGN has, but the Mirror are still maintaining theirs.
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much. I would 10
- 11 certainly like to know because it's not unimportant.
- MR JAY: Thank you, Mr Parry.
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you, Mr Parry. 13
- 14 MR JAY: Mr Gary O'Shea next, please.
  - MR GARY TIMOTHY O'SHEA (sworn)
- 16 Questions by MR JAY
- 17 MR JAY: Thank you, Mr O'Shea. Make yourself comfortable
- 18 and if you could give us your full name.
- 19 A. Gary Timothy O'Shea.
- 20 Q. Thank you. I hope you have to hand a witness statement
- 21 that you signed dated 17 January of this year, which has
- 22 two exhibits. This is your formal evidence to the
- 23 Inquiry pursuant to a request which was served on you;
- 24 is that so?
- 25 A. That is correct, yes.

Page 64

- 1 Q. You've been employed by NGN, the Sun, since 2003 as
- 2 a journalist and you wrote a number of pieces in
- 3 relation to Mr Jefferies on 1 January 2011, together
- 4 with others; is that right?
- 5 A. Yes, that's correct.
- 6 Q. Can we just trace the genesis of one of the pieces. You
- 7 deal with this at the bottom of page 54911. I can
- 8 summarise the position: a staff reporter had
- 9 a conversation with an ex-pupil of Mr Jefferies and she
- 10 taped it and transcribed it and that is exhibit GTO1,
- 11 but I don't think you saw GT01 at the time. Instead,
- 12 you saw GTO2, which was a memorandum which the staff
- 13 reporter prepared based on her interview with the
- 14 ex-pupil. Is that so?
- 15 A. You're almost correct. What actually happened was the
- 16 transcript was drawn -- the full transcript was shown
- 17 just more recently for the benefit here of the Inquiry.
- 18 My colleague, Caroline Grant, who carried out the
- 19 interview, just produced the memo, as such, the
- 20 memorandum, and she extracted from the taped interview
- 21 the quotes which she believed were most pertinent, put
- 22 them in the memo and the memo was put to me. We've put
- 23 the transcript together for the benefit of the Inquiry
- 24 so that the Inquiry can see that we quoted this
- 25 gentleman faithfully and accurately in the piece.

# Page 65

- his memories of Mr Jefferies, who was his teacher. His
- 2 memories were not always flattering. They were not
- 3 always kind. A decision was made that we would carry
- 4 his memories in the newspaper. We quoted him fairly and
- 5 accurately, I believe, as you'll see from the
- 6 transcript, and we have accepted -- and I'm happy to
- 7 accept here -- that our tone of coverage should have
- 8 been more neutral and dispassionate, and I can accept
- 9 that including this material in the piece which appeared
- 10 on that day -- that we didn't adhere to perhaps our
- 11 obligations to report on this case in a dispassionate
- 12 and neutral manner.
- 13 Q. Some degree of editorial decision is made by you. The
- 14 starting point is this is under the rubric or headline
- 15 "Obsessed with death". The evidence that Mr Jefferies
- 16 is said to be obsessed with death is based on a film
- about the Holocaust, which obviously is all about the 17
- 18 systematic murder of millions of people, but why is that
- 19 worthy of remark, save perhaps favourable remark because
- 20 that's exactly the sort of thing that school children of
- 21 a certain age should be shown because it is so
- 22 important.
- 23 A. The "obsessed with death", as you can see there from the
- 24 memo and from the transcript which we've provided to you
- 25 is -- that's a verbatim quote from this gentleman. That Page 67
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you. That's very helpful.
- MR JAY: Thank you. I'm not going to ask you to look at
- 3 GTO1, but GTO2, 54880, just a couple of points on that,
- 4 maybe how they struck you at the time in the context of
- 5 a piece which was under the headline "Obsessed with
- 6 death". It's under tab 8 if you're working from the
- 7 same bundle, Mr O'Shea.
- 8 A. Yes, I have it here in front of me.
- 9 Q. First of all, there's a reference to a Holocaust film.
- 10 Its given its German title and then translated, "Nacht
- 11 und Nebel", which is "Night and Fog", a film about Nazi
- 12 death camps. That film was made, we know, in 1955. The
- 13 source had given a slightly different description of it.
- 14 It probably doesn't matter much. He said it was "Night
- 15 and Day", made just after the war, so the facts were
- 16 slightly wrong but someone must have corrected it at
- 17 NGN. But then the source said, I quote:
- 18 "It was filmed at Auschwitz and he [that's
- 19 Mr Jefferies] just wanted to show us death."
- 20 I just wonder what the significance of that is in
- 21 the context of a film about concentration camps, why 22 there's anything remarkable or objectionable about it.
- 23 A. I never said there was anything objectionable about
- 24 a teacher showing an historical film on the Holocaust on
- 25 the pupils. What we did was -- this pupil was giving Page 66

- 1 was his mature recollection, looking back on his
- 2 memories of Mr Jefferies.
- 3 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: "Mature"? You're talking about 25
- 4 years here.
- 5 A. Yes, that's what I say.
- 6 He was looking back, this was his memory, and as
- 7 I've acknowledged, it's not a very flattering memory but
- 8 I guess at the same time it's probably not unusual for
- 9 a pupil sometimes to look back on whatever teachers they
- 10 had and perhaps not have very fond memories of some of 11
- 12 This was a case in point. This pupil contacted us.
- 13 He wished to share with us his memories on Mr Jefferies.
- 14 He didn't seek payment from us. He didn't receive
- 15 payment from us. These were his honest recollections
- 16 and a decision was made to include those recollections
- 17 in the newspaper.
- 18 MR JAY: Would you agree, though, that in a negative
- 19 context, because of the use of the term "obsessed with
- 20 death"?
- 21 A. As I said to you a few moments ago, we've accepted the

acknowledgment of the fact that we -- our presentation

- 22 fact that our coverage of this story should have been
- 23 more neutral and dispassionate. We made a libel
- 24 settlement with Mr Jefferies and I believe that's an 25
  - Page 68

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

- 1 should have been different than it was.
- 2 Q. The article itself, let's have a look at it now. The
- 3 front page is under tab 2 at 31983.
- 4 A. Tab 2. Yes, I have it in front of me now, yes.
- 5 Q. The headline itself is not your responsibility, but we
- 6 see "obsessed with death" four lines into the piece,
- 7 don't we?
- 8 A. Yes. Once again, the headline is the verbatim quote
- 9 from the gentleman who contacted us and a decision was
- made by a subeditor in the office or the editor of the
- day that that was what they were going to use for the
- headline. I don't have any input into the presentation
- or the headline process.
- 14 Q. No, no.
- 15 A. I was in Bristol at the time. Those are decisions that
- 16 would have been made in London and I was geographically
- 17 divorced from that decision-making.
- 18 Q. Of course that's accepted. The way you then put it:
- 19 "The former student said eccentric English teacher
- 20 Jefferies made them watch films about Nazi death camps
- 21 and scared some children with his macabre fascination".
- Now, "macabre" is your choice of adjective, isn't
- 23 it?
- 24 A. I don't have my original copy as I filed it to London,
- so looking back a year on, I can't tell you whether
- 1 I chose that particular word myself. Perhaps we can
- 2 make enquiries at the office to see if that copy is
- 3 available as I filed it and come back to you on it.
- 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We could do, if you feel that for

- 5 your own purpose it is would be worthwhile. But you're
- 6 an experienced crime reporter, I assume?
- 7 A. I'm not a crime reporter.
- 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You're not?
- 9 A. No, I don't move in those circles. I'm a general news
- 10 reporter and there was a group of three or four general
- 11 news reporters on the ground in Bristol at that time.
- 12 I was one of them. We worked together every day,
- 13 I guess, as a co-op of equals, I suppose. We would, in
- a diplomatic fashion, decide each day what each of us
- should be doing and we would take guidance also from the
- desk in London. I'm not a crime reporter, I'm not
- 17 a crime specialist, no.
- 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Are you aware of the contempt of 18
- 19 court legislation?
- 20 A. Yes. Now, with contempt of court, there are various
- 21 legal nuances, there are shifting interpretations,
- shifting applications with those announces, and I take
- the view, not unreasonably, that there are people at my
- newspaper, lawyers, who were better able than me to make
- - Page 70

- 1 MR JAY: So you feel that "macabre" might not have been in
- 2 your choice --
- 3 A. I'm not saying it was or it wasn't. It's just a year
- 4 on, I can't give you an honest answer, but I'm sure
- 5 we'll endeavour to get you one.
- 6 Q. I think we'll leave that one with you. It's not going
- 7 to matter in the big picture.
- 8 A. Okay.

14

- Q. The piece continues at 31985.
- 10 A. I have it before me.
- 11 Q. It's just what you meant by "academic obsession" in the
- left column three paragraphs down.
- 13 A. I think, looking back on that now, the gentleman
  - contacted us. I don't think he used the term "academic
- obsession"; I think he was quite straightforward and he
- just said "an obsession with death", and perhaps we were
- trying to qualify it by pointing out that this was not
- 18 necessarily a straightforward obsession with death but
- 19 perhaps how death is presented either cinematically or
- 20 poetically or in literature, and I think there was
- 21 reference to that -- a novel as well, a Victorian novel
- that Mr Jefferies had taught as well. So ...
- 23 Q. It may be the point, really, that because Mr Jefferies
- 24 had shown some interest in a Victorian murder novel and
- because he'd shown his -- or some students,

## Page 71

- 1 I understand, at a film club, but the precise context
- doesn't matter -- these were adolescent students who
- 3 obviously are 15, 16, 17 -- a French film which was
- 4 extremely highly regarded in France and the Continent,
- 5 a well-known Holocaust film, didn't really justify, did
- 6 it, the soubriquet "obsession with death", which in this
- 7 context might lead one to think that he was the sort of
- context inight lead one to think that he was the sort of
- 8 person who might want to kill people. Would you accept
- 9 that?

15

- 10 A. Again, these were the recollections of one of his former
- pupils. I don't know Mr Jefferies personally. I did
- meet him twice down there in quick succession, but once
- again, these are the honest recollections. The
- 14 transcript is there. You have the transcript and I hope
  - you'll agree we have faithfully reported what that
- student said to us.
- 17 I think, yes, what I'm happy to concede is that
  - 8 there should have been filters applied to the material
- 19 from that gentleman, and we should have taken -- we
- 20 probably shouldn't have quoted him at the length that we
- 21 did and we've acknowledged that. We've put our hand up
- 22 to that, and -- yes.
- 23 Q. One thing that you weren't aware of from exhibit GTO2,
- because it wasn't available, it hadn't been transcribed,
- was that the source told your colleague -- this is in Page 72

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

1 GTO1: 1 the newspaper whereby when a reporter like myself has 2 "To be honest, my school -- I have really bad 2 a dilemma, I can go to my news desk and put that dilemma 3 3 memories of it so I basically destroyed everything when to them. They in turn can go to the managing editor, 4 4 Richard Caseby, and he can pick up the phone to the 5 So this person had a very negative memory of this 5 Press Complaints Commission. So there is internal 6 particular school, which might --6 processes whereby dilemmas can be sorted out. As I say, 7 A. He did. 7 we don't often go wrong and when it does look like we're 8 Q. -- indicate that he wasn't giving an altogether 8 about to go wrong, we're usually put right. 9 objective picture in relation to Mr Jefferies. Had you 9 MR JAY: The final question is really the same question 10 known that fact, would this article have been 10 I put to the Mr Parry, whether you felt at the time or 11 differently phrased, do you think? 11 feel now that you were under competitive pressure, 12 A. I think this pupil didn't come to us in isolation. 12 flowing either from your general position at the 13 There were other pupils who either spoke to us directly 13 newspaper or because your competitors were there on the 14 or spoke to news agencies that were working the story or 14 ground, to present the story in as pungent and as 15 they were quoted at length in other newspapers. The 15 powerful a way as it could possibly bear. Do you feel 16 content in this story chimed with what we were hearing 16 that's a fair observation or not? 17 from other people who had attended this school. 17 A. It's fair to say that it's a competitive business. It's 18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Not all of them, because we've just 18 fair so say that we're competitive people and that I'm 19 seen a different account. 19 a competitive person. But I'd like to think that my own 20 A. Yes, but you've seen a different account via emails that 20 competitive instincts don't blind me personally to going came into the Daily Mirror office. I have no access 21 21 about my job with, you know, a fair and even-handed 22 22 manner. I acknowledge -- one much the things that 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Of course you haven't. I am not 23 I wanted to acknowledge when I came in here -- that our 24 24 for a moment suggesting that you have, but it's one much coverage, our tone, should have been more dispassionate 25 the problems if you start to do this sort of job where 25 and neutral. As I say, though we are competitive Page 73 Page 75 proceedings are active. You run the risk of creating 1 people, I don't let those competitive instincts blind me 1 a prejudicial climate which could impact on a subsequent 2 2 whatsoever in how I go about my job. 3 trial. I know what you've said and I understand that, 3 MR JAY: Thank you very much, Mr O'Shea. 4 but that's the risk, isn't it? 4 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you, and thank you for starting 5 and concluding your evidence in the same way. Thank 5 A. As you know, we've been found to be in contempt of 6 6 count. 7 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, yes. 7 MR JAY: Sir, finally Mr Stephen Waring, please. MR STEPHEN WARING (sworn) 8 A. What you're saying to me is a given. I can't argue with 8 9 9 that because the courts have ruled on that. We're bound Questions by MR JAY 10 by that and that's something that we have to take into MR JAY: First of all, please, Mr Waring, your full name? 10 11 A. Stephen Waring. 11 account in the future. 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You see, it raises the question that 12 Q. Thank you very much. You provided us with a witness 13 13 statement dated and signed on 16 January this year with I actually asked Mr Parry as well, that I hope -- and 14 I have no doubt that every single time there's an 14 five exhibits. Is this your truthful evidence? 15 incident, people say, "Well, we must learn", and that 15 A. It is. 16 works until there's another groundbreaking, very 16 Q. Thank you very much. You are currently the publishing 17 important story, and then, because everybody else is 17 director of the Sun. You've worked at the Sun for 24 18 doing it, understandably perhaps, everybody does it. 18 years in various positions and you were the duty editor 19 on 31 December, 1 January 2010, 2011; is that right? 19 A. I understand that that's an issue that you're grappling 20 with in your intention to perhaps formulate some sort of 20 A. That's correct. 21 21 Q. Because Mr Mohan was on holiday; is that correct? a mechanism whereby a situation like this happens again. 22 22 A. Correct. I understand that. What I would say is this: we don't 23 23 Q. Did you have any dealings with Mr Mohan about this often go wrong, we don't often make mistakes, and 24 I think when we do make mistakes, they're honest 24 particular case? 25 25 mistakes and there's a constant referral process within A. I spoke to the editor on Sunday, which was the day of

Page 74

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1 the January 1 edition. We had a general chat about the 2 coverage and he said to me he thought we should be more 3 balanced. 4 Following the January 1 publication, the Attorney 5 General issued an advisory notice as well and I took 6 that on board and we were more balanced from then on, 7 but we had had an advisory on the Saturday as well. 8 Q. So Mr Mohan expressed that view to you on the Sunday, 9 which I think would have been or rather was 2 January 10 2011; is that right? 11 A. Correct. 12 O. There are three articles with which we are concerned, 13 all published on the same day. We were looking most 14 particularly at the front page. It's under tab 2, 15 I hope, Mr Waring, page 31983. You'll see the front 16 page. It continues on 31985. Are you with me? 17 A. Yes. 18 Q. Mr O'Shea has told us about that. Were you responsible 19 for the headline or was someone else? 20 A. I was responsible for it and I'd just like to make 21 a point on record that I'd like to express my sincere 22 personal regrets that my actions contributed to and 23 exacerbated the acute personal distress felt by 24 Mr Jefferies, his friends and his family due to the 25 articles that we published. I apologise personally and Page 77 on behalf of the Sun newspaper for not taking more 1 2 appropriate precautions to prevent this. 3 Yes, I was responsible for the headline. 4 Q. Did you have any discussions with Mr O'Shea about it --5 I appreciate he was 120 miles away at the time in 6 Bristol -- or was this a discussion you had with the 7 news editor before this was published? 8 A. As I say in the statement, it was -- my discussions were 9 with the news editor. It's not practice to talk 10 directly to reporters on a normal basis. 11 Q. Look at page 31984. I think there are two separate 12 pieces, one on the left-hand side, which I think you 13 call article 2 --14 A. Correct. Q. -- in your statement and then the main piece. Mr O'Shea 16 told us he had no involvement in this. When you see 17 a piece like this and before it's published, do you 18 subject it to a line-by-line analysis? What do you do, 19 Mr Waring, to satisfy yourself that it's within, as it 20 were, the Contempt of Court Act and within the law of 21 defamation and, insofar as it is relevant, the law of 22 privacy? 23 A. It's quite a lengthy process that ends up with 24 a line-by-line analysis. On this particular day, the 25 Attorney General had made some comments to the BBC World 25

Page 78

At One programme, which he -- it wasn't an advisory notice, but he said words to the effect that: "I don't want to comment on today's particular coverage, but I would point out that the contempt of court rules are there to protect the rule of law."

Clearly this story was going to figure as a major piece in tomorrow's edition. It had been on the front page of the previous seven edition of the Sun and other papers and it would actually stay on the front page for ten more editions.

Now, I immediately spoke to our senior lawyer by phone while he was on his holiday, Mr Walford, who I think gave evidence a couple of weeks ago. We discussed that morning's coverage in the other papers, in our own paper. I hadn't edited the previous day but I was in charge, obviously, of this edition and I talked to him about the Attorney General's comments, and we discussed the need for a fine line to be drawn as to how far we could go.

Clearly we'd subjected Mr Jefferies to some unfavourable scrutiny throughout that previous edition. There was even more on the news list for that day's edition, including -- I was asked if we wanted to pursue some lines in some of the other papers, two of them being that he was an associate of a convicted paedophile Page 79

and that a murder from 1974 was being reopened into 1 2 Glenis Caruthers' death as a result of his arrest. Both 3 of those lines seemed to me to be far beyond the mark of 4 where we should be going, and also some of the material 5 supplied even in these transcripts and other stories 6 were too strong.

I perfectly readily accept that what we did publish was too strong, but I attempted with the lawyer, and the night lawyer when he came in in the evening, to try and strike a balance between what we could say and what would keep us the right side of the law. Obviously those decisions were wrong, we made the wrong decision, we committed contempt of court and we committed a libel, for which we apologise.

- Q. Can I just ask you, please, about the headlines, all 15 16 three of them, or subhead lines. The first one, "What
- 17 do you think I am ... a pervert?" Did you choose that?
- 18 A. Yes.
- 19 Q. The one underneath, "Landlord's outburst at blonde".
- 20 Of course, a different blonde woman but Jo Yeates was
- 21 blown. Was that your choice of --
- 22 A. Yes.
- 23 Q. Then the one at the top, and one has to read it over the 24 top of the next page: "Murdered Jo: suspect followed me, says woman."

Page 80

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

Day 30 - PM Leveson Inquiry 1 The combined effect of that was to suggest that 1 2 Mr Jefferies was the sort of person who might follow 2 3 a blonde woman and be accused of being a pervert, which, 3 4 even without the advantage of hindsight, was straying 4 5 way over the line, wasn't it? 5 A. I agree it was. The overall impression here is far too 6 7 7 strong and there was a distinct lack of balance. 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Help me, Mr Waring. It's very easy 8 9 for lawyers to look at these things in the cold light of 9 10 day and to criticise. I'm conscious of that, and I'm 10 11 conscious that it's equally very easy to do so when the 11 12 Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales has made his 12 13 views perfectly clear. But you are a very experienced 13 14 editor. This is a job you've done many, many times for 14 15 a very, very large number of editions. 15 16 A. Mm. 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Help me, because to my untutored 17 17 18 mind -- untutored in the way of the operation of 18 19 newspapers -- this isn't even close, and I'm just 19 20 interested to know your thinking. I'm not suggesting 20 21 you decided: "I'm going to try and test the laws of 21 22 contempt here", because I don't for a moment think that, 22 23 but I am keen to understand, if I can, if you can now 23 24 24 reconstruct your thought process that suggested that 25 this was appropriate, permissible, on the right side of 25 genuinely is, for our newsroom. Page 81 1 the line. I understand what you've said now, but I'm 1 2 2 just trying to understand. 3 3 A. I'll take that -- to me there are three elements to 4 this. There's the material we'd previously published 4 A. Mm-hm. 5 the day before, ie the first day of Mr Jefferies' 6 arrest, and there was a lot of critical comment about 6 7 7 his character from four unnamed pupils, ex-teachers, 8 people -- former acquaintances, and that set 8 9 9 a particular tone, which coloured my judgment wrongly, 10 10 but that coloured the judgment. 11 There was the nature of the story, which, just to 11 A. I agree, under the licence that we felt we'd got 12 put it in context, this story had been, as I say, on the 12 13 13

front page for seven previous editions, there was a general bafflement as to the motive for this appalling murder, and Mr Jefferies' inconsistency, as it was perceived in his story the day before he was arrested seemed, wrongly, to be the great breakthrough, and this led to a great outpouring of adverse comment about his character.

The police felt that he said something about seeing Jo and two acquaintances outside her flat, which was inconsistent with something else. Whether the rights and wrongs of that, that's one of the reasons why he was arrested and this story had been the focus of national attention for a long period of time. Certainly his Page 82

character became part of the scrutiny.

But the key aspect of this is the light in which this was legalled. I can't speak for the lawyer's own mind, but we are talking about an era where there was a far more liberal interpretation about what we could get away with in print.

I'll give you two specific examples, one of which is the arrest of the Night Stalker, Delroy Grant, and another one, the 21/7 bombers' arrest, both of which under the present Attorney General, I'm sure, would have produced contempt of court summons.

Since the new Attorney General took his post, he's made it clear that he wants a strict application of contempt. In an address to the City University last month, he said, "Before I was appointed, I perceived a tendency in the press to test the boundaries of what was acceptable in the reporting of criminal cases", so he made it clear that he wanted to tighten up that law. Since he was appointed, he's brought more contempt of court cases than were brought in the previous ten years, I believe, and he has certainly changed our attitude as to how we report arrests and we have changed the culture of the paper on the back of the Jefferies' case. I know it's been described as a watershed moment, but it

LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's a word that was used by

Page 83

somebody earlier. But it's not just contempt, is it?

It's also defamation and all the rest of it.

LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And it comes on the back of all the

concerns about McCann and all the other breaking stories

of enormous interest. You heard me ask, I think, each

of the previous witnesses whether sometimes a story is

so big that perhaps not as much attention is paid to how

far it is appropriate to go.

previously. I mean, the law is on the statute books, but it's the application of it which counts. When the 14 contempt case was brought against us over Mr Jefferies, 15 there was another huge story six months later where we 16 had a heated debate about whether we should cover

17 material that we'd got. This was the conviction of Levi

18 Bellfield for the murder of Milly Dowler. We got an

19 enormous amount of material about Mr Bellfield, as you 20

might imagine, which we knew our rivals also had, which

21 we wanted to put in the paper, but the --

22 Mr Justice Wilkie still had another charge overnight of 23

the attempted abduction of Rachel Cowles. The jury was

24 still out. There was a long conversation about whether

we should use this material and Mr Jefferies' name

Page 84

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	obviously came up and the procedure and the mistakes	1	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand. Thank you.
2	made over Jefferies and we talked about it in great	2	MR JAY: Thank you.
3	detail and decided not to put any of it in the paper.	3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We've actually finished before 4.30
4	So we reported that day's court action and none of our	4	MR JAY: There we go.
5	background material.	5	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Right. Thank you very much.
6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: And those who went further?	6	10 o'clock tomorrow.
7	A. Well, two of our rival papers published a lot of	7	(4.23 pm)
8	detailed background material, which was good exclusive	8	(The hearing adjourned until 10 o'clock the following day)
9	material, had a commercial value, you might say. The	9	
10	exclusive story of what a monster Mr Bellfield is. The	10	
11	Sun didn't have that. But they were brought summonses	11	
12	for contempt. They're currently facing those charges.	12	
13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The Sun is?	13	
14	A. No, not the Sun; the two rival papers.	14	
15			
16	point.	16	
17	A. Yes. Beyond that, in the autumn there was	17	
18	a high-profile murder again with an arrest which we had	18	
19	interesting background on which we left out. This year	19	
20	there was another arrest relating to Stepping Hill	20	
21	Hospital. It's something which has affected us and	21	
22	changed our attitude. That change of attitude would	22	
23	have come in if there had been no Leveson Inquiry, no	23	
24	Bribery Act, no investigation into media standards. It	24	
25	came about because the Attorney General decided he was	25	
23	Page 85	23	Page 87
	- 1.61 44		- 1.61 01
1	going to change the way he interpreted contempt and he		
2	was going to apply it that's changed our attitude.		
3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Interesting.		
4	MR JAY: The final point, Mr Waring: is it possible that		
5	there was a mindset 13 months ago which worked like		
6	this: that, given what you knew or thought you knew in		
7	relation to inconsistencies in Mr Jefferies' story and		
8	the picture which was building up of someone who was		
9	eccentric, that you felt in your waters, as it were, he		
10	was probably guilty and it's that feeling which led you		
11	to test the margins of what was permissible or not?		
12	A. No. No. I didn't act on that behalf on that belief		
13	at all. Mr Jefferies was an unusual character, we've		
14	vilified him, we didn't present it in a balanced way,		
15	but it wasn't through a conviction that this was		
16	a guilty man.		
17	MR JAY: Thank you, Mr Waring.		
18	A. Could I just say one other thing? Please don't judge my		
19	colleagues by the errors I've made in this edition,		
20	because they are a bunch of very committed, hard-working		
21	individuals, the finest journalists in Fleet Street, and		
22	the Sun is a very vibrant paper that is a compassionate		
23	paper. We produce 100,000 items a year. We got this		
24	one badly wrong and I admit that, but these mistakes do		
25	happen.		
	Page 86		

A	14:24 15:4	anti-discrimin	arrogant 53:19	70:18 72:23	20:21 65:21	27:25
abduction 84:23	admit 86:24	4:24	article 8:24,25	70.10 72.23	believes 41:25	breast 40:9,12
able 7:22 35:5	adolescent 72:2	anti-minority	20:22 25:9,13	B	belittling 48:19	40:17,17,18,18
41:10 44:4,5	advantage 81:4	13:11	40:13 44:3	Babies 42:4,7	Bellfield 84:18	40:25
70:24	adverse 82:18	<b>apart</b> 36:19	49:20,23 50:5	baby 41:25	84:19 85:10	<b>Brian</b> 34:22 35:6
absolutely 20:10	advise 53:12	44:10	50:24 51:7,10	bachelor 54:1	benefit 28:25	Bribery 85:24
21:19,23 29:17	advisory 77:5,7	apologies 11:17	51:11 53:10,17	back 23:17 24:16	65:17,23	<b>briefing</b> 2:10,14
30:10 47:25	79:1	15:11,19 16:1	54:17 55:14	30:25 31:14	Bernadette	3:11 30:18
53:7 54:21	advocacy 1:15	16:2	56:1,5 57:13	32:16 36:20	18:12	31:11,13
absolve 20:13	affirmed 46:12	apologise 4:5	57:16,16,20	39:6 52:5 68:1	BERNARDET	<b>briefings</b> 49:3,6
academic 54:14	Afghanistan	26:1 52:6	60:5,6,16 63:12 69:2	68:6,9 69:25	18:8	49:10
71:11,14	48:10 <b>age</b> 67:21	77:25 80:14 apology 9:20	73:10 78:13	70:3 71:13	<b>best</b> 22:16 42:12 43:23 62:25	briefly 39:24 Brigadier 48:16
accept 4:6 6:22	agencies 73:14	10:7,10,11,13	articles 17:3	83:23 84:5 <b>background</b>	better 15:5 44:9	brilliant 35:11
7:3 44:12 50:3	agenda 13:10	14:15,17 15:14	42:10 50:9	48:4 49:20,24	44:10 70:24	bring 35:17
52:20 61:7	aggregate 54:6,7	appalling 82:14	58:22 61:23	57:16 60:6	beyond 45:4 80:3	Bristol 48:25
63:8,9 67:7,8 72:8 80:7	aggressive 56:20	apparent 10:25	77:12,25	85:5,8,19	85:17	69:15 70:11
acceptable 83:17	57:22 59:12	appeal 13:9	articulate 56:23	backs 12:19	big 24:24 31:5	78:6
accepted 67:6	<b>ago</b> 1:14 5:1 36:5	appealing 64:4	57:24	back-burner	38:22 71:7	Britain 3:14
68:21 69:18	59:17 68:21	appeared 9:21	asked 17:2 25:19	17:23	84:9	Britain's 8:16
access 61:2,5	79:13 86:5	14:19 15:2,17	31:14 33:22	bad 73:2	biological 33:10	<b>British</b> 1:17 3:9
73:21	agree 21:17,19	57:5 59:22	74:13 79:23	<b>badly</b> 86:24	33:15	5:11 13:4
accident 8:4,5,11	23:11 45:25	67:9	asking 28:3	bafflement 82:14	bit 7:2 21:2	16:17 21:1
8:17	47:24 54:7	appears 13:7	43:21,22,23	<b>balance</b> 19:14	47:12 59:24,25	37:6 47:8
account 73:19,20	58:18,19 68:18 72:15 81:6	appetite 19:10 application	aspect 83:2 aspects 49:4	20:19 21:23	Bizarre 51:21 Blair's 5:4	<b>brought</b> 25:5 83:19,20 84:14
74:11	84:11	47:15 63:23	aspirin 22:23	22:2 25:10 35:18,20 36:3	blame 20:10	85:11 85:11
accreditation	agreed 21:8	64:8 83:13	assessed 58:24	80:10 81:7	blatantly 38:9	<b>BROWNE</b> 64:5
36:16	37:13	84:13	associate 79:25	balanced 1:25	<b>blind</b> 26:19,22	BSE 18:22
accuracy 38:10 39:10 43:20,23	<b>Ahmed</b> 8:1,3,15	applications	Associated 17:16	20:22 23:12	26:24 75:20	Buckingham
43:25	<b>Ahmed's</b> 8:10	70:22	assuage 36:25	24:12 50:6	76:1	47:6,14
accurate 19:25	aim 50:6	applied 4:19	assume 70:6	53:10 77:3,6	blindness 26:10	Buglawala 16:25
25:10	aimed 3:7,8	9:17 72:18	astonishing	86:14	blockbuster 31:7	18:1
accurately 65:25	44:12	apply 19:20 86:2	10:16	balcony 47:18	<b>blonde</b> 80:19,20	building 86:8
67:5	<b>Al</b> 4:10	appoint 28:9	astrology 19:21	<b>ban</b> 3:13 6:1	81:3	<b>built</b> 60:2,4
accused 81:3	alarming 19:13	appointed 48:13	attack 13:18	<b>banned</b> 5:15,19	blood 10:12	bunch 86:20
accusing 31:9	25:17	48:16 83:15,19	attain 35:20	5:24 6:6 11:22	blown 80:21	bundle 2:11
achieve 40:8	alight 14:4 allegations 10:19	apportion 18:3 appreciate 46:4	attempted 80:8 84:23	11:24 13:6	blue 50:17 BNJ 39:23	17:11 66:7 <b>Bunglawala</b> 1:3
achieved 36:3	alleviate 33:17	63:20 78:5	attend 49:8	<b>based</b> 37:6 65:13 67:16	BNP 13:7,8	1:4,7,9 5:13
acknowledge	34:3	approach 41:16	attended 73:17	<b>basement</b> 60:23	board 77:6	7:24 13:25
10:8 75:22,23 acknowledged	allow 19:24	approached 57:3	attention 3:18	basic 22:21 23:3	body 9:2,14 10:4	14:5 16:19
68:7 72:21	allowed 16:11	appropriate	14:12 45:9,10	23:6 28:20	14:13,21	17:2
acknowledgme	ally 22:16	61:15 78:2	61:23 82:25	basically 40:10	bombers 83:9	<b>Bush</b> 47:19
9:18 68:25	all-party 2:13	81:25 84:10	84:9	73:3	book 47:13	business 75:17
acquaintances	alongside 38:12	approval 42:8	attitude 83:21	basics 22:6 28:25	books 54:3 84:12	<b>Butler-Sloss</b>
82:8,21	altogether 73:8	arduous 28:22	85:22,22 86:2	<b>basis</b> 5:22 12:25	boring 24:2	48:14
act 49:14,16 50:1	amount 36:24	area 45:1	Attorney 77:4	78:10	born 42:4	buy 29:23
55:1 78:20	84:19	areas 5:19	78:25 79:17	<b>BBC</b> 3:15 78:25	bottom 28:7	buying 34:2,2
85:24 86:12	amounts 60:1 analysis 78:18,24	argue 63:7 74:8 arguing 35:19	83:10,12 85:25 audience 35:13	bear 57:15 75:15	53:22 65:7 <b>bound</b> 74:9	<b>byline</b> 61:10
action 85:4	analytically	arguing 53:19 argument 50:3	Auschwitz 66:18	bearings 24:22 beat 28:15	boundaries	
actions 77:22 active 49:19 57:8	30:13	arguments 36:10	author 59:1	beautiful 42:10	83:16	call 1:3 17:1
	<b>Andrew</b> 20:23	arising 49:14	autism 21:6	beef 38:6	boundary 4:2,5	20:19 35:3
58:8 60:14 74:1	and/or 9:7 49:5	armed 6:9	32:11	<b>behalf</b> 17:3,16	bounded 57:2	41:5 50:21
actual 13:5 22:25	anecdotes 55:8	arrest 49:19	autumn 85:17	18:13 78:1	bouquet 28:8	78:13
acute 77:23	55:11	54:21 80:2	available 1:21	86:12	boy 53:24	called 1:10 12:7
added 57:22	angle 13:23	82:6 83:8,9	2:7,12 25:23	beings 27:11	brackets 10:20	50:20
addition 1:24	Anglia 38:13	85:18,20	25:24 70:3	<b>belief</b> 19:21,22	Bradford 5:20	calls 70:25
address 83:14	announced	arrested 11:2	72:24	86:12	breach 8:13	camp 48:10
adhere 67:10	41:15	13:17,23 49:1	average 32:6	believe 2:4,21	break 26:5,8	campaign 32:12
adjective 69:22	announces 70:22	49:12 50:8 59:13 61:16	avoid 4:11	3:20,21,25	46:9	camps 66:12,21
adjourned 87:8	anonymous 50:19	82:16,24	<b>Avon</b> 49:3,9 <b>award</b> 47:9	6:24 10:25	<b>breaking</b> 18:25 84:6	69:20 cancer 22:24
adjudicate 36:17	answer 4:4 15:5	arrests 83:22	awards 47:3,8	15:6 22:18 59:18 67:5	breakthrough	23:1 25:17
adjudicated	33:23 46:21	arrive 25:12	aware 41:1	68:24 83:21	82:17	40:9,12,17,19
16:11 adjudicates	71:4	arriving 47:19	49:15,18 62:11	believed 8:15	breakthroughs	40:24,25 41:1
aujuuleates		l	<u> </u>	]		,
J.						

	_	_	_		_	_
<b>CAPLAN</b> 17:15	16:22	81:13 83:13,18	community 3:10	41:16	45:18	83:22
17:24 18:4	characterised	clearly 6:8 13:11	4:21 18:21,24	contact 2:1 49:7	count 74:6	cure 26:10 28:1
capture 57:13	57:1	14:20 29:15	31:10 32:5	contacted 12:10	counterbalanci	28:2 33:17
car 8:3,11,17	characters 58:15	52:15,15 61:6	36:6 39:6	68:12 69:9	54:24	cured 26:20,21
care 25:9	charge 11:3	79:6,20	company 1:11	71:14	counter-terror	currently 76:16
careful 10:18	13:19 79:16	Clifton 58:13	54:20	contains 4:23	13:17	85:12
Caroline 65:18	84:22	climate 30:3,6,14	comparison	contaminated	counting 44:25	cursory 48:3
carried 65:18	charges 85:12	31:11 35:25	48:12	34:8	country 22:18	curve 29:5
carry 67:3	charities 41:1	38:16,21 39:10	compassionate	contempt 49:14	counts 84:13	Cui ve 29.3
Caruthers 80:2	chat 77:1	45:14 74:2	86:22	50:1 55:1	couple 14:10	D
case 6:24 8:1,5	check 24:10,11	clinicians 41:23	competitive	70:18,20 74:5	22:20 24:21	
10:18 15:12	26:11 45:24	clock 49:13	75:11,17,18,19	78:20 79:4	25:5 37:10	<b>Daily</b> 5:14,18 6:1 8:22 9:15 10:7
32:19 39:13,20	48:4,4,5	clock 49.13 clone 31:25	75:11,17,18,19	80:13 81:22	40:3 47:7 66:3	
41:12 42:22	checks 48:3	close 81:19	competitors	83:11,14,19	79:13	10:15 11:22,23 12:2,10 13:5
61:21,24 63:24	chef 29:15	closer 42:8	75:13	84:2,14 85:12	course 4:22 9:2	13:14 14:15
67:11 68:12	chemical 40:21	club 47:11 72:1	compile 49:20	86:1	17:6,9 20:6	15:23,23 16:13
76:24 83:23	chemicals 40:11	code 4:23 8:7,13	compiling 50:5	<b>content</b> 53:12	23:25 24:5	16:14 17:3
84:14	40:16,23,25	8:19 43:25	complain 9:3	62:3,23 73:16	32:13 35:19	38:23 39:13
Caseby 75:4	chief 19:1 29:9	cold 81:9	complained 9:22	context 19:14	48:9 49:18	46:24 48:11
cases 83:17,20	60:19 81:12	colleague 65:18	9:24	21:11 30:10	54:4 61:21	51:3,17 52:5
catch 25:25	child 21:6 41:18	72:25	complaining	35:17 49:14	69:18 73:23	51:3,17 52:5 52:23 73:21
category 9:11	41:21	colleagues 62:8	15:2	60:20 61:16	80:20	damage 6:20
caught 22:12	children 21:7	62:17 86:19	complaint 6:22	66:4,21 68:19	court 8:1 49:14	11:10 15:21
cause 11:10	23:20 33:9	collection 55:8	7:9 8:14,22,23	72:1,7 82:12	50:1 55:1	37:7
33:10,15 40:24	41:13 42:3	College 34:4	8:24 9:25	Continent 72:4	63:24 64:5	damaged 41:18
40:25 52:3	67:20 69:21	coloured 82:9,10	12:24 36:17	continue 38:24	70:19,20 78:20	damaged 41:18
causes 25:14	chimed 73:16	column 53:22,23	38:12,12 45:17	60:25	79:4 80:13	37:1
33:8	<b>choice</b> 53:18	54:10,12 71:12	complaints 2:2	continues 71:9	83:11,20 85:4	Dame 48:13
caveated 32:24	69:22 71:2	columnists 38:2	6:25 7:3 14:2,8	77:16	courts 3:15 74:9	dated 2:6,14
caveats 32:19	80:21	38:4,5,7,11,22	14:11,13,21,23	contradicting	cover 84:16	18:14 46:19
celebrating 12:8	choose 80:17	combined 81:1	14:25 15:5	8:18	coverage 3:5	64:21 76:13
celebrity 35:7	chose 70:1	come 3:5 22:21	16:11 39:1	contrary 56:20	15:24 22:22	day 6:10 12:14
cell 26:5,20	chosen 42:23	25:6,7 30:25	45:18 75:5	contribute 33:11	32:21 41:4	13:21 25:6
41:24	Christmas 11:21	37:16 70:3	complete 62:9	contributed	42:21 44:15	30:22 31:3,6
cells 26:6,10,11	11:24 12:4,13	73:12 85:23	complex 39:14	21:14 77:22	52:6 67:7	35:12 55:15
censorship 35:19	13:6	comes 16:15,16	complicated	control 23:15	68:22 75:24	56:5 57:17
cent 20:21,25	Christopher	21:20 30:11	35:12	40:19	77:2 79:3,14	62:25 66:15
30:25 33:14	48:23	38:10 52:18	concede 72:17	controversial	covered 24:17	67:10 69:11
Centre 18:14,19	chronic 33:3,8	53:4 56:11	concentration	18:24 42:19,21	43:19 47:13	70:12,14 76:25
19:3 30:19	chronology	57:19 84:5	66:21	43:15	63:17	77:13 78:24
38:6 41:8	48:25	comfortable 1:6	concern 10:5	convergent	covering 8:5	79:15 81:10
certain 3:17	cinematically	18:10 46:14	14:22 52:10	59:23	Cowles 84:23	82:5,5,16 87:8
45:12 54:6	71:19	64:17	concerned 19:9	conversation	Cox 34:22,23	daylight 25:12
67:21	circles 70:9	coming 26:9	24:25 44:21	65:9 84:24	35:6	days 24:21
certainly 40:5,22	cited 31:11	30:21	53:5 77:12	conveys 19:14	<b>co-op</b> 70:13	day's 79:22 85:4
56:20 57:23	City 83:14	commas 21:17	concerns 1:20	convicted 79:25	CRB 48:4	deal 14:7,13
59:12,14 62:3	civic 1:16	42:24	2:19 36:25	conviction 84:17	create 37:10	24:23 50:11,24
63:15 64:4,11	claim 19:11 32:1	commensurate	52:14 84:6	86:15	created 35:14	65:7
82:25 83:21	51:8	11:11 15:19	concluded 48:15	Cook 48:16	creating 74:1	dealings 76:23
cetera 29:23,23	<b>claimed</b> 5:18 9:5	comment 4:2,3	concluding 76:5	coordinator	creation 43:1	deals 14:21 29:3
challenged 6:1	9:13 21:8	79:3 82:6,18	conducted 53:9	37:15	creationism	dealt 50:21 58:22
challenges 14:2	claims 31:21	comments 56:21	conferences 49:9	<b>copy</b> 7:18 56:4,6	19:22	death 29:7 50:8
chance 26:18	32:7,22 33:1	78:25 79:17	confirmation	61:19 69:24	crime 20:18 70:6	52:10 53:2
<b>change</b> 30:4,6,14	37:7	commercial 85:9	55:19	70:2	70:7,16,17	66:6,12,19
31:11 35:25	clarification 6:4	commission 2:2	conflict 15:1	correct 30:12	criminal 10:18	67:15,16,23
36:21 38:16,21	6:14 7:11 11:8	7:10 14:11,23	conflicted 20:15	49:17 50:22	45:12 54:25	68:20 69:6,20
39:10 43:13,17	14:17 17:21	16:12 39:1	connection 5:10	51:13 64:25	60:14 83:17	71:16,18,19
45:14 85:22	clarify 38:1	75:5	11:3 47:6 50:8	65:5,15 76:20	crisis 20:25	72:6 80:2
86:1	classic 30:4	committed 80:13	63:24	76:21,22 77:11	critical 82:6	debate 42:13,14
changed 83:21	40:12	80:13 86:20	conscious 81:10	78:14	criticise 30:10	84:16
83:22 85:22	clause 4:23	committee 14:24	81:11	corrected 6:17	81:10	debt 36:23
86:2	clear 4:13 8:22	15:4,8	consider 11:9	66:16	criticism 5:5	December 7:25
character 55:4	9:12,16 10:23	commonly 40:10	constant 49:7	correction 2:3	crops 35:25	8:4 18:14
60:5 63:13	12:7 13:7	communicate	74:25	7:16,19 14:18	Cudlipp 47:9	48:24 49:1,12
82:7,19 83:1	14:16 16:8,9	35:6,12	constrained	correspondence	culminate 42:14	50:10 51:4
86:13	16:19 29:13	communicating	57:18	17:19 58:21	culture 3:13	62:12 76:19
characterisation	48:18 51:16	36:23	consultation	<b>council</b> 12:5,23	36:21 45:7	decide 70:14
	l	1	I	1	l	l

	_		_	_		_
decided 44:7	difference 22:7	donor 41:17 42:2	<b>effort</b> 61:11	ethical 27:9	23:14	72:15
	23:13	doubled 22:9				fall 9:11
81:21 85:3,25			egregious 16:14	evening 48:24	expert 19:12	
decision 51:18	different 11:21	doubles 22:23	either 29:1 71:19	80:9	experts 25:10	false 20:19 26:25
51:22,24 64:5	12:24 23:2	doubling 23:5	73:13 75:12	event 57:2	explain 22:7	falsehood 4:14
67:3,13 68:16	25:22 35:21	doubt 74:14	elaborate 18:16	even-handed	explained 29:14	falsehoods 4:15
69:9 80:12	39:5 55:5 59:6	doubtless 47:24	19:6	75:21	explanation	family 77:24
decisions 53:11	60:7 63:10	<b>Dowler</b> 84:18	election 1:18	everybody 21:8	12:20	fantastic 22:17
62:2 69:15	66:13 69:1	downloaded	element 32:20	21:20 24:6,13	exploring 55:17	34:13 41:3
80:12	73:19,20 80:20	2:12	elements 82:3	25:23,24 27:8	express 10:15	<b>far</b> 9:9,12 13:3,7
decision-making	differently 73:11	<b>Dr</b> 21:12	else's 60:14	31:4 33:5,19	11:4,22,23	52:15 79:18
69:17	difficult 23:6	drafting 36:13	email 31:14	43:4,11 52:5	12:2,10,15	80:3 81:6 83:5
dedicated 54:14	24:10 38:17	drains 52:19	50:14 56:1,8	52:14 74:17,18	13:5,14 15:23	84:10
deeply 54:15	dilemma 75:2,2	dramatic 44:14	58:2,9,18,23	everybody's 43:2	16:7,9,13	fascination
defamation	dilemmas 75:6	draw 3:18 10:12	emailed 31:12	evidence 6:12	56:24 57:25	69:21
78:21 84:3	Dingemans	61:23	emails 38:15	17:10 18:15	77:21	fashion 70:14
	_					
<b>defamed</b> 45:16	17:10	drawn 4:13	58:20 73:20	20:16 31:8,22	expressed 58:25	father 42:7
<b>defence</b> 21:15,16	diplomatic 70:14	65:16 79:18	emanating 44:22	32:1,2,4,7	59:2 77:8	<b>fatigue</b> 33:4,8
21:16 23:18	directed 9:2	dream 36:20	embryonic 26:6	37:12 40:2,23	extend 44:19	<b>favour</b> 35:19
<b>defer</b> 70:25	direction 53:13	drink 22:9	eminent 22:19	46:21 48:22	extent 45:10	38:20 57:10
define 4:1	directly 73:13	drives 1:19	eminently 15:8	50:11 57:10,13	extracted 65:20	favourable 67:19
defining 4:5	78:10	<b>drug</b> 27:12	empirical 22:6	59:4 60:9	extraordinary	fear 9:8
definitely 57:15	director 76:17	due 17:6 77:24	employed 46:24	63:18 64:22	26:7 31:21,22	feel 27:5 44:18
degeneration	disagree 33:7	duty 76:18	65:1	67:15 76:5,14	32:1,1,6,7,9,11	53:13 57:15
26:24	disagreed 9:7	dystrophy 41:12	enact 42:15	79:13	32:14 33:14,22	59:10 61:14,24
degree 28:21	discount 63:3	l	enclose 2:11	Evidently 60:18	54:22	62:20 70:4
67:13	discourse 3:1	E	encourage 1:16	exacerbated	extremely 27:5	71:1 75:11,15
degrees 30:14,24	discover 33:13	earlier 14:14	1:18,19	77:23	56:13 72:4	feeling 53:14
31:1,2,4,6,19	discredited	27:23 84:2	endeavour 71:5	exact 29:17 32:8	extremes 29:3	86:10
delay 17:16	20:12	easier 10:12	ends 34:7 78:23	exactly 7:13	30:11	feels 45:19
deliberately 3:2	discriminatory			67:20	extremist 9:5,8	fell 52:24
	4:3	easily 1:22 57:7	engage 1:11,12		ex-pupil 65:9,14	felt 7:11 60:4
delighted 24:18		East 38:13	1:14 2:21 6:22	exaggerating		
Delingpole 38:23	discussed 79:13	easy 45:2 81:8,11	8:24,25 9:14	31:10	ex-teachers 82:7	75:10 77:23
39:2	79:17	eccentic 54:1	44:13	example 7:24	eye 52:22	82:20 84:11
deliver 37:24	discussion 78:6	59:24	engaged 34:18	8:21 11:21	eye-catching	86:9
62:23	discussions	eccentric 50:15	Engage's 8:23	19:21 20:6,9	62:19	fermenting 3:7
Delroy 83:8	62:12 78:4,8	58:11 59:25	England 81:12	24:20 25:3		4:16
demand 32:7	disease 22:24	60:9 63:12	<b>English</b> 59:17,24	30:4 31:25	F	festivities 12:6,8
demanded 20:20	33:7,18	69:19 86:9	69:19	33:2 35:24,25	face 27:22	fields 45:13
democracy 1:17	diseases 32:13	edit 59:9	enjoyed 54:20	37:4 40:12	faced 5:5	fiercely 36:7
demonstrate	41:11,11	edited 79:15	enormous 52:18	57:4	facing 4:10 85:12	<b>figure</b> 29:7 79:6
61:24	disjuncture 32:5	<b>edition</b> 77:1 79:7	84:7,19	examples 3:13	fact 3:23 6:12	figures 22:25
demoralised	disparagingly	79:8,16,21,23	enquiries 70:2	3:17 5:13	8:10,15 9:7,13	23:10
6:15	19:19		ensure 1:24	11:19 14:1	10:22,23 14:23	file 17:3 46:18
denote 10:20	dispassionate	86:19	ensuring 15:18	21:15 25:5,7	17:20 20:20	filed 69:24 70:3
		editions 43:5	_	37:5 83:7		
<b>describe</b> 59:12 63:6	67:8,11 68:23 75:24	79:10 81:15	45:5 entirely 43:9	excellence 47:9	31:4,16 32:2	<b>film</b> 66:9,11,12 66:21,24 67:16
		82:13			34:1 42:11	
described 83:24	disregard 38:10	editor 7:14 9:15	entitled 4:22	excellent 25:8	43:12 44:24	72:1,3,5
description	disrespectful 6:9	20:20 23:9	20:2,2,4 39:8,8	exception 3:3,4	59:11 68:22,25	filmed 66:18
66:13	6:10	28:9,16,16	environment	excited 37:16	73:10	films 69:20
designed 3:22	distinct 81:7	43:16 51:24	28:11,15 35:10	exciting 41:9	factor 62:6,20	filters 72:18
desire 19:11	distort 63:5	69:10 75:3	equally 81:11	exclusive 85:8,10	facts 3:8 4:8	<b>final</b> 17:21 19:5
desk 53:13 62:3	distress 77:23	76:18,25 78:7	<b>equals</b> 70:13	excuse 21:17	19:25 20:3,5,5	41:7 54:12
62:24 70:16	disturbing 3:6	78:9 81:14	equivalent 43:6	executive 19:1	39:9 62:24	75:9 86:4
75:2	3:23	editorial 28:17	era 83:4	executives 62:4	66:15	<b>finally</b> 54:3 76:7
desks 36:10	divide 19:15	53:11 67:13	eradicate 36:22	exercise 60:12	factual 9:19	Financial 42:6
Desmond 16:8	divided 21:2,5	editors 14:24	error 7:6 9:13,19	exercises 29:16	14:16 39:10	<b>find</b> 6:12,14
destroyed 73:3	divorced 69:17	28:19,23 36:10	9:20 10:8	exhibit 65:10	fair 4:2 12:22	28:18 34:5,5,7
<b>detail</b> 39:15 85:3	<b>DNA</b> 60:24	36:14 42:18	14:16	72:23	13:25 19:18	46:19 52:20
detailed 85:8	document 2:18	43:1	errors 16:5	exhibits 64:22	24:5,6 50:5	59:18
determine 27:12	documentary	effect 50:15	86:19	76:14	54:9 55:9	fine 79:18
develop 19:17	31:9	54:23 79:2	especially 4:9	existence 49:15	75:16,17,18,21	finest 86:21
29:6	doing 11:12	81:1	25:15	expected 40:22		finished 87:3
	U		established	-	fairer 1:24	
developments	62:15 63:2	effective 32:12		expecting 28:12	fairly 8:12,12	Fiona 18:7,8,12
57:17	70:15 74:18	33:12,16	27:13	experience 56:22	67:4	first 1:6 5:25
devise 45:4	<b>Dominic</b> 34:17	effectively 44:13	establishment	experienced 70:6	<b>faith</b> 1:25 4:8,20	6:22 8:16 9:18
die 29:10,22	Donaldson 29:15	efficacy 23:15	29:20	81:13	8:8,10	9:22 24:8 26:5
died 41:13	29:21	26:9 27:14	et 29:23,23	experimental	faithfully 65:25	26:11 27:10
	I		1	I	<u> </u>	1

28:9 33:25	free 3:25	Gervin 54:18	grappling 74:19	45:9,11 51:16	33:19 35:16	inadaquatalı:
						inadequately
39:22 46:15	freeze 30:23	<b>getting</b> 10:13	grateful 64:7	51:18 60:18,20	53:5 64:20	7:12
48:23 50:9	French 72:3	16:4 22:6	great 19:10	61:4,7 66:5	72:14 74:13 77:15	inaudible 26:24
55:25 66:9	friendly 35:2	35:18 39:6	82:17,18 85:2	67:14 69:5,8		Inayat 1:4,9
76:10 80:16	62:8	ghetto 24:17	greater 1:16	69:12,13 77:19	hopefully 53:16	incident 11:3
82:5	friends 77:24	girlfriend 53:21	gregarious 54:20	78:3	hoping 28:11	74:15
Firstly 56:19	front 2:18 3:12	give 3:12 21:6,15	ground 22:5	headlines 3:6,13	Hoskins 13:13	include 68:16
five 76:14	10:15 11:4	23:6 24:20	53:14 62:7	3:20,21 24:24	Hospital 85:21	including 67:9
fix 45:2	12:17 13:3,5	26:7 29:17	70:11 75:14	25:1 29:2,2	hot 5:15 6:6	79:23
flat 55:18 60:23	18:23,25 20:17	31:25 33:2	groundbreaking	30:1 80:15	hour 44:11,19	inconceivable
61:3 82:21	24:20 31:5	36:11 64:18	74:16	health 23:11	hours 11:1 22:21	56:17 58:6
flattering 67:2	32:15 33:20	71:4 83:7	group 2:14 4:17	28:14,16 35:9	25:12 37:10	inconsistencies
68:7	34:11,12 46:18	given 11:5 14:12	4:20,21 9:6,8	37:7 41:3	49:9	86:7
flavour 58:21	48:9 51:3,4	15:20 20:6	34:4,6,6 70:10	healthy 40:19	huge 33:19 36:23	inconsistency
flaws 40:15	60:16 66:8	22:1 26:15,25	groups 9:10	41:17	47:23 52:9	82:15
Fleet 43:8 86:21	69:3,4 77:14	36:2,19 40:13	GSK 29:23	hear 14:5 18:1,6	84:15	inconsistent
flimsy 60:2	77:15 79:7,9	49:10 53:17	<b>GTO1</b> 65:10	27:7 29:9	Hugh 47:8	82:22
floor 30:22	82:13	60:25 66:10,13	66:3 73:1	heard 15:6 44:1	human 27:11	Inconvenient
flowing 75:12	front-page 10:17	74:8 86:6	<b>GTO2</b> 65:12	63:11 84:7	31:25 37:7	35:23
flows 45:5	11:24 15:17	gives 14:1 25:17	66:3 72:23	hearing 73:16	humanities	incorrect 16:16
flu 29:7,10,25	<b>full</b> 1:7 11:4 17:3	49:24	<b>GT01</b> 65:11	87:8	28:18	increase 3:21,22
30:6	18:11 21:16	giving 66:25 73:8	guarantee 1:11	hears 27:8	humans 26:7	increased 23:4
focus 30:5 44:10	40:7 46:16	glaring 3:3	Guardian 28:8	heart 22:24	hundreds 26:23	incredible 5:21
82:24	49:24 50:7	Glenis 80:2	guess 68:8 70:13	heated 84:16	hyped 29:22	incredibly 31:12
focused 57:17	64:18 65:16	<b>GM</b> 18:22 35:24	guidance 49:10	heavily 32:24	hyperbolic 63:7	incurable 41:11
Fog 66:11	76:10	37:5	70:15	35:24		independent
follow 81:2	fully 4:6 49:18	<b>go</b> 16:7 24:23	guidelines 22:21	height 20:25	<u>I</u>	18:20 38:18,19
followed 80:24	<b>funded</b> 9:6,14	25:12 27:21	36:5,6,9 37:10	help 12:17,17	idea 6:18	indicate 73:8
following 77:4	37:14	28:17,22 30:6	37:18	36:9 81:8,17	identify 1:22	indicated 51:8
87:8	furnish 62:23	39:15 41:4	guilty 38:21	helped 34:3	30:9 56:15	indication 48:18
<b>fond</b> 68:10	further 16:20	44:4,5,7 47:22	86:10,16	<b>helpful</b> 42:16	61:4	individual 6:23
footman 47:14	85:6	57:4 59:5,6	Н	66:1	illustrates 25:4	20:11 44:3
forces 6:7,10	future 14:6	60:13 63:24		hidden 13:15	imagine 34:22	individuals
forever 42:16	52:17 53:16	74:23 75:2,3,7	hacked 38:15	high 52:8	59:7 84:20	10:19 14:21
form 35:19	74:11	75:8 76:2	hair 50:17	<b>highlight</b> 2:19	immediate 18:5	86:21
formal 18:15		79:19 84:10 87:4	half 44:10,19	13:22	immediately	individual's 8:23
46:20 64:22			hand 4:2 23:14	<b>highly</b> 21:12 50:16 63:13	79:11	industry 52:22
former 15:7	game 10:2	goes 7:19 43:7	23:16 64:20	72:4	immune 26:13	53:8
50:20 54:12 57:22 69:19	Gary 64:14,15	<b>going</b> 6:19 9:11 14:11 18:16	72:21	high-profile	impact 23:8	<b>information</b> 1:21
72:10 82:8	64:19	24:16 27:2	Handed 17:7	85:18	31:10 54:24	50:4,14,20 55:5 62:25
formulate 74:20	gathered 55:4	29:9,22 31:18	hands 53:12	Hill 85:20	74:2	
forwarded 56:8	gay 5:3,5 54:2	39:15,21 41:15	happen 5:10		impart 19:4	input 69:12
forwards 9:24	gel 63:11	41:25 42:1,16	86:25	hindsight 81:4 hindsight's 52:4	Imperial 34:4	inquiries 38:18 38:19,19,20
10:1	general 3:24	47:22 49:24	happened 5:5	historical 66:24	implication	
foul 52:24	4:23 19:19		9:23 29:19	historical 66:24 history 32:25	28:11	inquiry 2:5,12 3:25 11:9 13:2
	36:14 45:3	53:13 54:7	43:8 52:16		important 2:25	
<b>found</b> 4:4 5:22 13:12,13 19:4	49:2 50:15	66:2 69:11 71:6 75:20	65:15	hitting 18:25 Hmm 43:5	23:23,24 25:5	15:6,17 16:4
25:3 32:17	53:17 70:9,10	79:6 80:4	happens 26:14	hoax 38:22	25:21,22 35:8	18:11,16 21:21 36:2 37:2 45:8
33:10,11,13,15	75:12 77:1,5	81:21 86:1,2	29:4 74:21	hoaxer 38:25	35:13 44:6	46:21 55:20,22
33:23,24 40:16	78:25 82:14	good 5:8 7:13	happy 53:8 67:6	holiday 76:21	46:1 59:4	64:6,23 65:17
40:21,22 56:9	83:10,12 85:25	20:6 33:20	72:17	79:12	67:22 74:17	65:23,24 85:23
74:5	generally 2:24 2:25 60:20	34:9 35:7 43:6	hard 40:8 hard-working	Holland 34:6	imposed 49:16 impossible 4:11	inside 11:4 24:19
four 1:14 30:19	62:11	43:21 54:16	86:20	Holocaust 66:9	43:17 59:18	33:25 60:23
30:24 38:18	62:11 <b>General's</b> 79:17	85:8	86:20 <b>harm</b> 11:11	66:24 67:17		insightful 58:17
39:21 48:10	generate 13:9	gossip 54:2	harmless 59:22	72:5	impression 53:17 81:6	insofar 78:21
53:19 69:6	genesis 65:6	government 5:4	head 48:14,16	home 12:2 60:23	impressive 62:19	instincts 75:20
70:10 82:7	genius 35:11	9:6,14,17,18	head 48:14,16 heading 35:22	homo 23:15	impressive 62:19	76:1
fourth 8:21	gentle 28:8	37:14 41:14	38:1	homophobia 5:7	improved 3:5	intelligent 50:16
Fox 18:7,8,10,12	gentle 28:8 gentleman 65:25	48:13	headline 4:15 5:2	5:8	37:23	56:23 57:24
22:5 24:24	67:25 69:9	<b>GP's</b> 21:4	5:6 6:5,6,8,20	honest 56:17	improvement	63:13
28:7 43:18	71:13 72:19	grabs 45:9	11:22,23 12:11	68:15 71:4	14:20 26:16,18	intended 60:6
frame 61:6	genuinely 83:25	graduate 47:1	12:14 13:1,6,9	72:13 73:2	27:17 44:15	intention 74:20
framed 42:16		graduates 28:19	19:3 25:14,16	74:24	inaccurate 15:24	interest 1:20
framing 43:14	geographically 69:16	Grant 65:18 83:8	25:16 26:19	hope 11:9 14:10		15:1 37:1,2
France 72:4	George 47:19	grapevine 62:11	35:15 40:14	15:17 16:3	16:16 25:1,14 26:22 37:7	47:23 52:10
fraud 38:25	George 47.19 German 66:10	graph 29:5	42:23 43:4,7	26:25,25 28:15	38:9 44:4	71:24 84:7
	Jerman 00.10	8 F 2/	72.23 73.7,1	20.23,23 20.13	JU.J TT.T	, 1.2 1 0 1.7

	_	_	_	_		_
interested 53:6	18:7,9,10 22:4	jurisdiction	75:21 81:20	26:3 27:2,4,7	39:24	78:15
81:20	24:22 27:9	16:17	83:23	27:19 28:6	long-term 54:1	maintaining
interesting 7:4	28:5,7 30:13	jurors 52:3	knowledge 45:13	30:5,8 33:5	look 2:9 3:24	64:9
22:2 39:21	35:17 38:1	jury 84:23	known 73:10	34:17,23,25	5:13 6:5 13:15	Majesty 48:15
40:20 43:19	42:22 44:24	justice 6:21 7:4,9	KIIOWII 73.10	35:3,14 36:19	15:18 16:4	major 41:1 79:6
45:1 48:12	46:6,11,13,14	7:15,18,22	L	37:9,19,21,25	21:19 22:25	majority 23:21
85:19 86:3	53:17 60:16	11:13,16,18	lack 21:14 81:7	39:17 42:6	50:25 55:25	make-up 14:22
internal 75:5	63:17 64:8,12	12:22 15:14	lady 25:25	43:2,10,18,25	56:1,15 58:9	making 9:20
International	64:14,16,17	16:6,21,22	Lancet 20:8 22:1	44:5,18,21	60:21 66:2	13:8
63:23	66:2 68:18	17:8,14,22,25	23:18 24:6	45:1,20,24	68:9 69:2 75:7	man 45:4 53:21
Internet 38:16	71:1 75:9 76:3	18:6 20:4	landed 43:16	46:5,7 48:7,12	78:11 81:9	54:19,20 56:20
interpretation	76:7,9,10 86:4	21:10,23 24:5	landlord 61:1	48:19 52:2,12	looked 5:21	57:5,23 59:3
83:5	86:17 87:2,4	24:12 25:21	Landlord's	52:25 60:11	39:20 60:16	59:12 60:7
interpretations	Jefferies 48:23	27:2,4,7,19	80:19	63:20 64:2,7	looking 52:2,5	63:16 86:16
70:21	49:1,5,7,12,21	28:6 30:5,8	language 53:18	64:10,13 66:1	68:1,6 69:25	manage 25:25
interpreted 86:1	50:15 52:7	33:5 34:17,23	59:1	68:3 70:4,8,18	71:13 77:13	managed 46:2
interview 65:13	55:6 56:12,18	34:25 35:3,14	large 5:19 81:15	73:18,23 74:7	Lord 6:21 7:4,9	managing 9:15
65:19,20	58:7,20 59:17	37:9,19,21,25	largely 51:12	74:12 76:4	7:15,18,22 8:1	75:3
introverted	60:5,7 61:5,6	39:16 42:6	late 53:2	81:8,17 84:1,5	8:3,10,15	manner 54:1
58:11	63:10 65:3,9	43:2,10,18,25	launched 41:8	85:6,13,15,23	11:13,16,18	67:12 75:22
intruder 47:7	66:19 67:1,15	44:5,18,21	law 78:20,21	86:3 87:1,3,5	12:22 15:14	man's 55:4
inverted 21:17	68:2,13,24	45:1,12,20,24	79:5 80:11	Levi 84:17	16:6,21,22	margins 86:11
42:24	69:20 71:22,23	46:5,7 48:7,12	83:18 84:12	liabilities 49:13	17:8,14,22,25	mark 80:3
investigation	72:11 73:9	48:19 52:2,12	laws 81:21	Liam 29:15,21	18:6 20:4	marks 10:20,22
49:11,22 52:9	77:24 79:20	52:25 60:11,19	<b>lawyer</b> 79:11	liar 38:25	21:10,23 24:5	mass 35:13
55:1 57:18	81:2 82:5,15	63:20 64:2,7	80:8,9	libel 68:23 80:13	24:12 25:21	massive 22:25
60:15 85:24	83:23 84:14,25	64:10,13 66:1	lawyers 70:24	liberal 83:5	27:2,4,7,19	24:3 31:5
involved 4:7 8:3	85:2 86:7,13	68:3 70:4,8,18	81:9	licence 84:11	28:6 30:5,8	master 54:12
8:11 36:13	Jeffrey 48:16	73:18,23 74:7	lawyer's 83:3	lied 24:9	33:5 34:17,23	masthead 38:23
44:3 48:24 54:15 56:18	<b>Jo</b> 80:20,24 82:21	74:12 76:4 81:8,12,17	lead 72:7	lies 20:11 life 32:25 44:11	34:25 35:3,14 37:9,19,21,25	material 42:2 59:16,23 67:9
58:7	Joanna 51:21	84:1,5,22 85:6	leads 32:11 learn 53:16	55:6	39:16 42:6	72:18 80:4
involvement	52:11 60:22	85:13,15 86:3	74:15	lifespan 39:24	43:2,10,18,25	82:4 84:17,19
50:9 61:9 62:2	<b>job</b> 54:14 62:15	87:1,3,5	learned 19:8	lifts 43:6	44:5,18,21	84:25 85:5,8,9
78:16	63:2 73:25	justify 12:14	learnt 61:20	light 81:9 83:2	45:1,20,24	matter 25:6
involving 8:1	75:21 76:2	72:5	leave 25:11 71:6	limited 1:11 59:8	46:5,7 48:7,12	31:22 37:3,8
in-depth 50:7	81:14		led 82:18 86:10	line 2:9 4:13	48:19 52:2,12	39:11 42:10
Ironically 29:19	joined 46:25	K	Lee 46:12,17	13:13 18:23	52:25 60:11,19	43:12 66:14
irony 23:25	<b>joint</b> 61:11	keen 13:22 22:15	Leeds 5:20	30:1 55:20	61:2 63:20	71:7 72:2
irrelevant 8:9	<b>Jones</b> 38:14	27:7,8 81:23	left 47:19 71:12	79:18 81:5	64:2,7,10,13	matters 14:7
<b>Islam</b> 2:1 4:8	39:14	keep 10:10 80:11	73:4 85:19	82:1	66:1 68:3 70:4	30:3 36:2
Islamic 8:10	journal 20:7	keeps 15:23,25	left-hand 53:22	lines 53:19,20	70:8,18 73:18	<b>mature</b> 68:1,3
Islamist 9:6,8	21:13 33:20	key 19:17 83:2	78:12	54:8 55:22	73:23 74:7,12	maverick 19:16
Islamophobia	34:9 40:15	kidney 42:3	legal 14:2 70:21	56:16 58:10	76:4 81:8,12	McCann 53:3
2:10,14,17,20	journalism	<b>kill</b> 10:14,23	legalise 42:15	69:6 79:24	81:17 84:1,5	84:6
Island 4:11	37:15 47:9	11:6 13:14	legalled 83:3	80:3,16	85:6,13,15	mean 5:24 8:17
isolated 54:5	61:21	72:8	legend 57:1	line-by-line	86:3 87:1,3,5	21:4 23:25
isolation 73:12 issue 6:25 22:2	<b>journalist</b> 29:9 36:15 47:17	killer 55:17	legislation 42:15	78:18,24 <b>link</b> 39:24 45:10	<b>lot</b> 34:14 56:12 59:23 82:6	24:16 25:7 27:21 47:25
24:7,23 29:4,6	53:8 62:7 65:2	58:12 60:22	70:19	61:5	85:7	53:7 60:5 62:2
39:2 74:19	journalistic	<b>kind</b> 5:7 18:23 29:20 36:11,21	length 72:20 73:15	linked 40:12	lots 53:1	84:12
issued 77:5	19:14	67:3	lengthy 78:23	list 37:12 79:22	love 19:15 34:12	means 22:8 23:1
issues 17:4 35:23	journalists 15:7	knew 55:8,13	lessons 19:8	literature 71:20	38:4,5 42:19	meant 6:8 26:12
39:10	22:18 23:4,11	56:12 84:20	61:20	little 6:18 47:12	42:19	71:11
items 86:23	23:11 25:9	86:6,6	let's 30:5 33:25	live 44:13	lovely 26:2	measured 25:10
<b>IVF</b> 42:8,9	28:15 31:13	know 2:17,24	69:2	local 1:23 49:3	lower 53:25	meat 22:9
l	34:10,15 35:10	5:24 11:13	level 22:10 30:14	53:18	lying 38:21 55:18	<b>MECFS</b> 33:9
J	36:4,7,8 42:18	24:24 26:3,23	53:12	logic 31:23		mechanism 45:4
James 39:2	44:16 86:21	30:4,22 33:3,3	Leveson 6:21 7:4	London 12:5	M	74:21
January 17:20	journalist's 63:1	33:7 35:8 37:1	7:9,15,18,22	13:18 30:23	macabre 69:21	mechanisms
46:19 64:21	journals 32:23	37:8 38:25	11:13,16,18	34:4 47:11	69:22 71:1	52:17
65:3 76:13,19	joy 12:11	40:1,6 44:1	12:22 15:14	69:16,24 70:16	Mafia 5:3	media 2:17,20
77:1,4,9	judge 61:2 86:18	45:17 52:21	16:6,21,22	lonely 53:20	Mail 8:22 9:15	18:14,18 19:3
Jay 1:3,5,6 7:24	judgment 63:4	53:14 60:12,18	17:8,14,22,25	long 26:8 36:12	9:25,25 10:7	19:7 20:13,18
10:16 11:19	70:25 82:9,10 judgments 23:2	62:15 63:25	18:6 20:4	55:9 82:25 84:24	10:13 14:15	21:2,22 22:12 24:15 25:15
13:12 14:10 16:19,25 17:12	jump 62:1	64:2,11 66:12 72:11 74:3,5	21:10,23 24:5 24:12 25:21	longer 31:17	Mail's 10:1 main 36:25	29:19 30:19
10.19,43 17:14	Jump 02.1	14.11 14.3,3	24.12 23.21	Jonger 51.17	maii 30.23	27.17 30.17
L	•		•	•	•	-

21.10 25.1	20:5,19 23:17	82:24	nicely 59:21	officer 29:9,15	overturned	52:13 60:17
31:18 35:1 38:6 41:8 44:9	32:11 37:4	nature 82:11	night 26:4 66:11	Oh 38:4	23:22	
						63:19,20 64:12
44:10 85:24	Mm-hm 84:4	Nazi 66:11 69:20	66:14 80:9	okay 11:19 27:3	owe 36:22	64:13 74:13
medical 20:21	model 29:16	near 18:4 27:25	83:8	30:7 40:4	o'clock 25:11,13	75:10
21:1,5,13 29:9	modelling 29:16	28:1	non-story 11:1	44:20 59:24,24	87:6,8	part 1:16 31:20
29:15,20	models 30:25	nearly 20:25	normal 45:7	71:8	O'Shea 64:14,15	36:15 46:25
meet 72:12	31:2	<b>Nebel</b> 66:11	49:21 78:10	once 26:19 27:10	64:17,19 66:7	56:4,6 58:4
<b>Melanie</b> 8:25 9:9	moderate 16:23	necessarily	normally 10:17	49:19 60:11	76:3 77:18	63:1 83:1
members 22:20	<b>Mohan</b> 34:17	71:18	56:24 57:24	69:8 72:12	78:4,15	Partial 21:17
memo 65:19,22	76:21,23 77:8	necessary 14:4	61:21	ones 59:10		participation
65:22 67:24	moment 45:24	need 4:9 5:25	note 2:14	one-paragraph	P	1:16
memorandum	52:22 53:4	31:21 79:18	notice 46:21 77:5	6:4,14 16:1	packed 28:18	particular 9:10
65:12,20	73:24 81:22	needed 32:1	79:2	one-sentence	paedophile	13:3 19:22
memories 67:1,2	83:24	needing 45:9	novel 71:21,21	11:8 15:25	79:25	30:18 39:2
67:4 68:2,10	moments 68:21	needn't 57:4	71:24	ongoing 10:18	page 2:9,10	45:16 52:21
68:13 73:3	monster 85:10	needs 4:13 14:20	nuances 70:21	54:25	10:15 11:4,8	53:9 55:16
memory 68:6,7	month 83:15	36:24	number 12:8,9	online 7:19 43:5	12:18 13:3,5	57:4 58:23
73:5	months 9:21	negates 59:14	35:18 47:3	open 45:15	19:5 31:5	61:13,17 63:6
men 13:17	10:6 14:15,19	negative 49:25	52:23 56:19	opener 52:22	32:15,18 34:11	70:1 73:6
mention 12:3	34:4 61:22	50:4 54:24,25	63:10 65:2	opening 60:21	34:12 40:7	76:24 78:24
17:15	84:15 86:5	68:18 73:5	81:15	operating 62:6	51:1,3,4 58:9	79:3 82:9
mentioned 8:8	Morgan 47:12	negotiation	numbers 23:6	62:20 63:4	59:8 60:16	particularly 29:6
8:25 13:24	47:22	14:14	nutty 51:16	operation 81:18	65:7 69:3	62:18,19,19
14:14 16:6	MORI 20:24	neighbours	63:14	opinion 9:7		77:14
61:20	morning's 35:15	50:19 55:12	05.14	opinion 9:7	77:14,15,16	parties 17:19
merely 15:15	79:14	Neither 40:24	0	38:6	78:11 79:8,9 80:24 82:13	partly 44:15
message 19:3,5	mothers 42:7	neutral 67:8,12	object 40:2	opinions 19:24		party 44.13 parts 19:10
23:12	mother's 41:18	68:23 75:25		20:2 39:3,8	pages 11:4,5	party 13:4 25:10
messages 40:4	motive 82:14	never 9:16,17	objectionable	opponents 42:25	18:15,25 20:17	pass 8:20 11:20
method 19:20	move 27:13	20:17 21:8	66:22,23	opportunities	24:19 32:4	pass 8.20 11.20 passed 39:16
miles 78:5	55:14 70:9	29:24 33:10	objective 73:9	34:14	33:21,25	pastoral 54:11
millions 67:18	moved 2:22 5:9	53:21 57:6	objects 1:13	opportunity	paid 45:10 48:5	patient 41:12
Milly 84:18	7:2 27:10	66:23	obligations	36:20 46:4	48:8 84:9	patient 41.12 patients 26:14,17
mind 37:11	movie 31:7	new 25:15 37:14	49:16 67:11	opposed 6:23	pains 30:20	26:20,21 33:14
39:15 57:15	moving 39:19	41:16,19 55:15	obscure 40:15	10:24	paint 63:5	41:22
62:1 81:18	MPs 1:21	56:4 83:12	observation	opposite 32:8	painted 55:7	Patry 13:13
83:4			75:16		63:12	Fatty 13.13
03.4	marredon /((),')')	norma 22.0 26.4		57.0	D-1 47 7 14	nottown 29.12
mindent 96.5	murder 49:22	news 23:9 26:4	obsessed 66:5	57:9	Palace 47:7,14	pattern 28:12
mindset 86:5	51:21 52:9	28:9,23 36:10	67:15,16,23	order 29:22	panel 30:20	payment 68:14
ministers 5:3	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16	<b>payment</b> 68:14 68:15
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 <b>Murdered</b> 80:24	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 <b>obtained</b> 55:18	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 <b>Murdered</b> 80:24 <b>murderer</b> 59:19	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 <b>obtained</b> 55:18 <b>obviously</b> 17:5	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 <b>Murdered</b> 80:24 <b>murderer</b> 59:19 <b>muscular</b> 41:11	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 <b>obtained</b> 55:18 <b>obviously</b> 17:5 17:12 27:5	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 <b>Murdered</b> 80:24 <b>murderer</b> 59:19 <b>muscular</b> 41:11 <b>Muslim</b> 1:15 3:9	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 <b>obtained</b> 55:18 <b>obviously</b> 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 <b>obtained</b> 55:18 <b>obviously</b> 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 <b>Murdered</b> 80:24 <b>murderer</b> 59:19 <b>muscular</b> 41:11 <b>Muslim</b> 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 <b>obtained</b> 55:18 <b>obviously</b> 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 <b>obtained</b> 55:18 <b>obviously</b> 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 <b>obsession</b> 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 <b>obtained</b> 55:18 <b>obviously</b> 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18  Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24  Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1 86:24	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18  Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24  Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25 newsrooms	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15 offends 11:25	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1 overnight 84:22	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21 42:1,4,5	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10 23:2 24:4
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1 86:24 mitochondria	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12  N Nacht 66:10 name 1:8,9 18:11	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25 newsrooms 19:10 32:14	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15 offends 11:25 12:25 13:6	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1 overnight 84:22 overpower 57:8	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21 42:1,4,5 Parliament 3:18	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10 23:2 24:4 26:23 29:10,21
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1 86:24 mitochondria 41:17,18	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18 Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24 Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12  N Nacht 66:10 name 1:8,9 18:11 34:20 46:16	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25 newsrooms 19:10 32:14 33:21 36:21	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15 offends 11:25 12:25 13:6 offensive 3:2	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1 overnight 84:22 overpower 57:8 58:8	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21 42:1,4,5 Parliament 3:18 parliamentary	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10 23:2 24:4 26:23 29:10,21 33:8,9,12 34:1
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1 86:24 mitochondria 41:17,18 mitochondrial	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18  Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24  Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25 newsrooms 19:10 32:14 33:21 36:21 43:7	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15 offends 11:25 12:25 13:6 offensive 3:2 offer 28:7 50:20	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1 overnight 84:22 overpower 57:8 58:8 oversee 48:17	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21 42:1,4,5 Parliament 3:18 parliamentary 2:10,13 38:18	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10 23:2 24:4 26:23 29:10,21 33:8,9,12 34:1 37:13 38:5
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1 86:24 mitochondria 41:17,18 mitochondrial 41:10	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18  Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24  Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25 newsrooms 19:10 32:14 33:21 36:21 43:7 NGN 64:9 65:1	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15 offends 11:25 12:25 13:6 offensive 3:2 office 18:20 48:3	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1 overnight 84:22 overpower 57:8 58:8 oversee 48:17 overstate 19:11	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21 42:1,4,5 Parliament 3:18 parliamentary 2:10,13 38:18 42:14	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10 23:2 24:4 26:23 29:10,21 33:8,9,12 34:1 37:13 38:5 53:1 67:18
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1 86:24 mitochondria 41:17,18 mitochondrial 41:10 Mm 81:16	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18  Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24  Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12  N Nacht 66:10 name 1:8,9 18:11 34:20 46:16 58:13 64:18 76:10 84:25 national 13:4	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25 newsrooms 19:10 32:14 33:21 36:21 43:7 NGN 64:9 65:1 66:17	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15 offends 11:25 12:25 13:6 offensive 3:2 office 18:20 48:3 49:8 69:10	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1 overnight 84:22 overpower 57:8 58:8 oversee 48:17 overstate 19:11 overt 2:22 5:8	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21 42:1,4,5 Parliament 3:18 parliamentary 2:10,13 38:18 42:14 Parry 46:11,12	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10 23:2 24:4 26:23 29:10,21 33:8,9,12 34:1 37:13 38:5 53:1 67:18 70:23 72:8
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1 86:24 mitochondria 41:17,18 mitochondrial 41:10	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18  Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24  Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25 newsrooms 19:10 32:14 33:21 36:21 43:7 NGN 64:9 65:1	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15 offends 11:25 12:25 13:6 offensive 3:2 office 18:20 48:3	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1 overnight 84:22 overpower 57:8 58:8 oversee 48:17 overstate 19:11	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21 42:1,4,5 Parliament 3:18 parliamentary 2:10,13 38:18 42:14	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10 23:2 24:4 26:23 29:10,21 33:8,9,12 34:1 37:13 38:5 53:1 67:18
ministers 5:3 minor 51:9 minority 4:17,21 31:2 minutes 37:13 44:25 46:7 miracle 26:20 28:1,2 Mirror 46:24 48:11 50:13 51:3,17 52:5 52:23 63:21,22 64:9 73:21 misleading 7:20 24:25 misrepresentat 2:3 missing 57:7 mistaken 16:15 mistakes 11:10 15:24 74:23,24 74:25 85:1 86:24 mitochondria 41:17,18 mitochondrial 41:10 Mm 81:16	51:21 52:9 59:13 67:18 71:24 80:1 82:15 84:18 85:18  Murdered 80:24 murderer 59:19 muscular 41:11 Muslim 1:15 3:9 3:13 4:17 5:20 6:7 8:6,16 10:14,23 11:6 12:4,12 13:14 13:22,24  Muslims 1:17 3:5,8,14,15,22 4:7,8,12,20 5:11 6:9 11:25 13:1,6 15:24 16:17 mystifying 16:12  N Nacht 66:10 name 1:8,9 18:11 34:20 46:16 58:13 64:18 76:10 84:25 national 13:4	28:9,23 36:10 36:14 42:18 43:1,16 51:24 63:23 70:9,11 73:14 75:2 78:7,9 79:22 newspaper 8:5 28:8,18 31:3,5 62:4 67:4 68:17 70:24 75:1,13 78:1 newspapers 2:2 2:4 4:6,11,14 10:17 11:9 15:3,12 16:3 16:10 17:17 23:7 24:2 35:11 36:23 38:9 42:23 52:24 73:15 81:19 newsroom 32:6,8 83:25 newsrooms 19:10 32:14 33:21 36:21 43:7 NGN 64:9 65:1 66:17	67:15,16,23 68:19 69:6 obsession 71:11 71:15,16,18 72:6 obtained 55:18 obviously 17:5 17:12 27:5 52:4 55:13 57:18 61:3 67:17 72:3 79:16 80:11 85:1 occasion 62:21 occasions 41:4 October 2:6 odd 16:18 53:20 oddball 53:19 60:8 oddly 53:22 offence 61:17 offended 12:4,13 offenders 16:15 offends 11:25 12:25 13:6 offensive 3:2 office 18:20 48:3 49:8 69:10	order 29:22 ordinary 34:24 34:25 35:3 organisation 1:10,15 organisations 14:8 original 6:20 14:19 15:20,21 39:7 69:24 originally 22:1 other's 43:4 outburst 80:19 outcome 29:14 outdo 62:17 outer 29:4 30:14 outpouring 82:18 outside 63:4 82:21 overall 81:6 overclaim 34:15 overhyping 29:1 overnight 84:22 overpower 57:8 58:8 oversee 48:17 overstate 19:11 overt 2:22 5:8	panel 30:20 paper 3:11 11:16 14:1 15:22 28:9,24 39:20 39:23 43:5 51:17 79:15 83:23 84:21 85:3 86:22,23 papers 12:17 41:20,21 47:10 62:8 79:9,14 79:24 85:7,14 85:15 paragraph 6:18 10:9 19:5 50:11,25 55:15 55:16 paragraphs 71:12 parcel 31:21 36:15 parent 42:8,9 parents 41:21 42:1,4,5 Parliament 3:18 parliamentary 2:10,13 38:18 42:14 Parry 46:11,12	payment 68:14 68:15 PCC 4:23 6:3,17 6:22 7:2 8:7,13 8:14 9:22,24 9:24,25 10:1,2 12:15 14:2 16:6,7,17 36:16,17 39:12 39:18 44:4,5 PCC's 8:7 peculiar 61:14 peer 8:3,6,16 20:7 24:10 peers 31:17 peer-reviewed 21:13 penny 9:16,17 pens 54:4 people 1:19,22 2:24 6:19 10:21 11:2 12:19,19 20:10 23:2 24:4 26:23 29:10,21 33:8,9,12 34:1 37:13 38:5 53:1 67:18 70:23 72:8

29.18   29.18   29.18   29.18   29.18   29.18   29.18   29.18   29.18   29.18   29.18   29.15   29.1							
percented 82:16	75.10 76.1	nloving 10.2	62.2	20.18	nnoviding 50.7	augstioning 61:1	magan 20:12
people 12:19 perceived 22:16							
percented 82:16						-	
Satisary   Percentage 235   Sillouis 24:23   Possible 23:23   Possible 23:23   Possible 23:23   Possible 23:23   Possible 23:24   Possible 23:25   Possible 2					l =		,
percentage 235 perfectly 807	_			•			_
Perfect 98.07   39.19.25 46.11   75.15   post 83.12   60.06.614   73.12.6 41.15   67.02.5   76.9   postman 10.3   postman 10		,					
Section   Sect							
period 56:22         59:25 55:14.25         66:14 76:70.10         postman 10:3         68:8 72:20         47:25 52:9         76:9         receive 9:2.6         68:14         receive 9:2.6							
8.225 6.11 permissibed 81.25 86.11 governed 62.18 80.15 86.18 st. 36.44 st. 24 person steel 91.6 st. 22.12 st. 25.15 problem 45.6 person for 81.7 st. 24.15 st. 25.15 problem 45.6 person for 81.7 st. 25.2 st. 25.2 procedure 14.7 st. 25.2 person 48.3 person 48.3 person 48.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.5 procedure 14.7 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 person 48.3 person 48.3 person 48.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.9 poticially 71.20 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.9 poticially 71.20 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.9 poticially 71.20 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.9 poticially 71.20 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.9 poticially 71.20 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.9 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.9 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 st. 27.9 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 person 48.2 personal 48.3 personal 48.3 personal 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.4 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.4 procedure 48.1 process 63.1 st. 25.2 procedure 48.1 process 63.4 procedure 48.1 procedure 48.1 process 63.4 procedure 48.1 procedure 48.							
Persistelly   pleased 18.1.6   pleased 18.1.6   powerful 62.18   provided 27.13   provide			_				,
Section   Processed   Section   Process   Se			_				
persistently   38:24   plenty 34:15   providence 34:15   politis 32:10   5:22 10:25   4:418   quite 510 10:14:23   7:325   politis 34:14   providence 34:13   7:325   providence 48:1   procedure 14:7   8:17   procedure 14:7   8:17   procedure 14:7   8:17   procedure 14:8   4:18   procedure 14:7   procedure 14:8   4:18   procedure 14:7   procedure 14:1   proced					-		
98324 person 198. 59:13 61:23.44 72:87 38:5 75:19 81:2 person 17:22 77:23 person 17:22 77:23 person 14:24 12:18 23:13 24:24 person 14:25 15:10 13:22:1				-			
persons 0.88	1 -			•	l =		
59:13 61:23,44 72:87 73:8 75:19 81:2 personal 77:22 77:23 77:23 poticially 71:20 potestally 71:20 pote							
72.373.5   personal 73.22   personal 48.3   pe							
75:19 81:2 poetically 71:20 poetically 71:20 presonal 79:22 precise 72:1 precise 72:2 precise 73:2 precise 73				•	77:13,25 78:7		
personally 49.6 77.23 77.25 personally 49.6 77.26 77.25 77.25 77.25 77.25 77.25 77.25 77.25 77.25 17.26 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.27 17.28 17.29 17.2	75:19 81:2		78:9	procedures 48:1		36:24 37:13	
Presonally 49:6   13:22:15:10   Precise 72:1   Precise 73:2   Precision 59:1   Precise 73:2   Precision 59:1   Precision 59		poetically 71:20	precautions 78:2	48:17	85:7	38:5 39:14	recollection 68:1
Personally 49:6   72:11 75:25   179:18:1   72:11 75:25   179:18:1   72:11 75:25   179:18:1   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:24   72:13 34:15   72:13 74:25 78:23   72:13 74:25 78:23   72:13 74:25 78:23   72:13 74:25 78:23   72:13 78:		point 3:24 12:18	precise 72:1	proceedings	publishing 76:16		recollections
personid 48:3					pungent 75:14		
personis 48:3							
persuading 32:23 5:18 perjudicial 74:2 preliminary produce 86:23 prejudicial 74:2 preliminary produce 86:23 produce 86:23 produce 86:23 produce 86:13 produc							
Persuading   44:12	-						
## 44:12							
pertinent 65:21							
pervert 80:17  ### Since Series							
Percent 80:17	-			•			
81:3							
Phase 27:22   Phillips 91,9   Presented 40:2   Phillips 91,9   Presented 40:2   Phillips 91,9   Presented 40:2   Phillips 91,9   Phillips 91							
Phillsp 9:1,9 Phillsp 9:1,9 Phillsp 9:1,9 Phillsp 9:1,9 points 2:16,19 points 2:26,19 points 2:16,19 points 2:26,19 points 2:16,19 points 2:16,19 points 2:26,19 points 2:16,19 points 2:26,19 po							
Phillips 9:1.9   philosophy 44:8   phone 50:14-75:4   79:12   photograph   49:3,48,9   phrase 61:15   49:3,48,9   phrase 61:15   phrase 73:11   phrase 73:11   phrase 73:11   phrase 73:11   phrase 54:5   politicisa 1:23   politicisa 5:24   politicisa 5:24   politicisa 5:25   physical 56:25   politicise 35:24   politicis 1:20   pressure 62:17   pressure 63:4   pressure 63:4   pressure 63:4   pressure 63:4   pressure 63:4   prominence 13:55:7 63:5,6.11   71:7 73:9 86:8   piece 5:14,18 9:5   19:13 51:12   66:2,21 66:5 67:9 69:6   67:9 69:6   67:9 69:6   67:9 69:6   67:9 68:25 6:2   position 16:13.23   polition 5:20   portraya 1:25   folica 5:24   previously 5:9   provide 1:7 5:12   provide							- '
Philosophy 44:8   14:10 22:11.15   58:25   presented 40:2   prospersor 37:23   polarised 35:24   presenting 38:21   prospersor 37:23   prospersor 37:14   22:19 23:4   racism 2:22.23				•	-	-	
Display							
Properties   Pro						03.21	
Police 11:1 13:18   49:3,4,8,9   prises 11:1 3:18   49:3,4,8,9   prises 2:2 3:18   project 37:14   policy-makers shraseology   37:6   30:18 31:13   39:1 45:17   15:20 36:11   35:24   politicis 35:24   politicis 45:25   politicis 45:25   politicis 5:20   politic 5:20   pressure 62:17   pick 59:10 75:4   pict 65:7 63:5,6,11   71:7 73:9 86:8   popies 5:15,19   5:23,24,24.6:6   71:9 78:15,17   79:7 7:12   provise 61:23   19:13 51:12   propagate 2:14   propagate 2:14   propagate 2:24   propagate 2	-		_			R	
47:18					-	race 4:24	
phrase 61:15 phrased 73:11 phrased 73:11 phraseology         55:19 82:20 phrases         14:11,23 16:11 18:20 19:24 prolonged 56:22 prominence         22:19 23:4 prolonged 56:22 prolonged 56:13 prolonged 56:14 prolonged		-					
Description   Single   Singl	phrase 61:15	55:19 82:20	14:11,23 16:11	project 37:14	22:19 23:4		referral 74:25
53:18 phrases 54:5 physical 56:25 physical 56:25 physical 56:25 fs:1         politic 3:1:23 politicisal 3:24 politicisal 3:25 politicisal 3:24 politicisal 3:25 politicisal 3:24 politicisal 3:24 politicisal 3:25 politicisal 3:24 politicisal 3:25 politicisal 3:24 politicisal 3:26 politicisal 3:24 politicisal 3:26 politicisal 3:26 politicisal 3:24 politicisal 3:26 politicisal 3:27 politicisal 3:26 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:29 politicisal 3:29 politicisal 3:29 politicisal 3:26 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 politicisal 3:28 p	phrased 73:11	policy-makers		prolonged 56:22	25:13 32:18	,	referred 8:6 47:4
phrases 54:5 physical 56:25 physical 56:25 physical 56:25 physical 56:25 physical 56:25 politicised 35:24 politics 1:20 politics 1:23 politicised 35:24 politics 25:24 politics 1:20 politics 1:20 politics 1:20 politics 1:23 politics 25:4 politics 1:20 politics 1:23 politics 25:4 politics 1:20 politics 1:23 politics 1:23 politics 1:23 politics 1:23 politics 25:4 feet site promoted 28:16 promoted 28:16 promoted 28:16 promoted 28:16 promoted 28:16 propagate 2:24 propagate 2:2	phraseology	37:6	30:18 31:13	prominence	33:25 37:10	Radio 31:9,15	58:2 61:3,10
physical 56:25         politicised 35:24         75:5 83:16 politics 1:20 pressure 62:17 politics 1:20 pressures 63:4 prosumbly proper 16:4 propagate 2:24 propagate 2:24 propagate 2:24 properly 61:24 properly 61:24 properly 61:24 properly 61:24 properly 61:24 proposal 36:18 proved 24:1.1 prospect 41:9 proposal 36:18 proved 24:1.1 proved 24:1.1 proved 24:1.1 proved 1:7 5:12 position 16:13,23 positive 54:8,11 positive 54:8,11 positive 54:8,11 positive 54:23 print 83:6 print 83:6 print 83:6 print 83:6 privacy 78:22 plausible 12:20 posibilities 30:2 privacy 78:22 plausible 12:20 posibilities 30:2 privacy 78:22 provide 1:5 38:13 67:24 49:26:5 60:13 71:23 relating 85:20 privacy 78:22 provide 2:5 18:13 67:24 49:26:5 60:13 71:23 relating 85:20         promised 33:16 promoted 28:16 proposal 33:16 pr		polite 3:1	39:1 45:17	15:20 36:11	38:15 47:14	raise 1:20	referring 5:3
58:1 pick 59:10 75:4 picture 31:6 54:6 picture 31:6 pict	phrases 54:5	politicians 1:23			52:16 61:6,19	raised 44:2	38:2
pick 59:10 75:4         poll 20:24         62:22 75:11         proof 26:5 28:4         75:2,8,10         randomised         23:15         reflecting 30:2         35:4           55:7 63:5,6,11         71:7 73:9 86:8         poppies 5:15,19         45:14 49:15         proseumably         proper 16:4         82:12 84:21         range 29:17 30:2         35:4           piece 5:14,18 9:5         5:23,24,24 6:6         population 27:23         prevent 52:17         properly 61:24         37:17 43:6         rarely 28:17         reflection 55:4         60:4 63:15           60:2,21 65:25         population 27:23         population 27:23         prevent 52:17         78:2         proposal 36:18         proprietor 16:9         proprietor 16:9         proprietor 16:9         Qaeda 4:10         read 7:7 12:2         regardless 61:6         regardless 61:6         regardless 61:6         regretful 52:6         regretful 52:6         regretful 52:6         regretful 52:6         regretful 52:6         regretful 52:6         regulatory 10:4         regulatory 10:4         reglection 55:4         7:12 2         regulatory 10:4         regretful 52:6         regretful 52:6         regretful 52:6         regretful 52:6         regulatory 10:4         regretful 52:6         regulatory 10:4         reglection 30:2         36:3 36:2         reglection 4:1         reglection 55:4         75:12				•	, ,		
picture 31:6 54:6 55:7 63:5,6,11 71:7 73:9 86:8 piece 5:14,18 9:5 9iece 5:14,18 9:5 66:5 67:9 69:6 71:9 78:15,17 79:7 pieces 61:23 65:2 65:6 78:12 ping-pong 10:2,6 placards 13:4,7 place 5:25 6:2 24:8 26:12 24:8 26:12 24:8 26:12 25:16 placible 12:20         propicture 31:6 54:6 proping 5:15,19 11:6 13:15,18 proping 10:14,23 proping 10:14,23 proping 10:14,23 proping 10:24 proping 10:25 proping 10:25 proping 10:25 proping 10:25 proping 10:25 proping 10:25 proping 20:26 proping 20:27 pro		•					
55:7 63:5,6,11 71:7 73:9 86:8 piece 5:14,18 9:5 19:13 51:12 60:2,21 65:25 66:5 67:9 69:6 71:9 78:15,17 79:7 pieces 61:23 65:2 population 27:23 position 16:13,23 65:6 78:12 ping-pong 10:2,6 placards 13:4,7 place 5:25 6:2 placards 13:4,7 place 5:25 6:2 24:8 26:12 positive 54:8,11 positive 54:8,11 positively 7:20 platins 76:18 positive 54:23 platins 12:20 positives 54:23 positives 54:23 platins 12:20 positives 54:23 positive 54:23 positives 54:23 positive 54:23 positives 54:23 positives 54:23 positive 54:23 positives 54:23 positives 54:23 positives 54:23 positives 54:23 positive 54:23 positives 54:23 positives 54:23 positives 54:23 positive 54:23 positives 54:24 positives 54:24 positives 54:25 po	•	-		1 <del>-</del>			
71:7 73:9 86:8 piece 5:14,18 9:5			_				
piece 5:14,18 9:5 19:13 51:12 60:2,21 65:25 66:5 67:9 69:6 71:9 78:15,17 79:7 pieces 61:23 65:2 65:6 78:12 ping-pong 10:2,6 placards 13:4,7 place 5:25 6:2 place 5:24,24 6:6 population 27:23 populations 5:20 portray 6:9 portray 6:9 position 16:13,23 17:18 39:23 64:2 65:8 place 5:25 6:2 positions 76:18 positive 54:8,11 positive 54:8,11 positive 54:8,11 planned 42:5 plausible 12:20 possibilities 30:2 privacy 78:2 proposal 36:18 proprietor 16:9 proposal 4:10 proposal 4:19 proposal 4:10 proposal 4:19 proposal 4:19 proposal 4:19 proposal 4:19 proposal 4:19 proposal 4:19 proposal 4:10 proposal 4:19 proposal 4:10 proposa		,					
19:13 51:12						,	
Figure 20   Figure 3							
66:5 67:9 69:6 71:9 78:15,17         portray 6:9 portrayal 1:25         previous 20:16 38:8 44:1         proprietor 16:9 prospect 41:9         Qaeda 4:10 qualify 71:17 qualifatively 27:19         read 7:7 12:2 regardless 61:6 regards 45:14 registration 1:19           pieces 61:23 65:2 65:6 78:12 ping-pong 10:2,6 placards 13:4,7 place 5:25 6:2 21:6 plain 4:14 planned 42:5 plain 4:14 planned 42:5 plausible 12:20         64:2 65:8 previously 55:9 positions 76:18 privacy 78:22         provious 20:16 38:8 44:1 proved 24:1,1 prove 6:1 qualitatively 27:19 quantitatively 27:19 quantitatively 27:20 quantitatively 27:20 quanters 5:6 quantitatively 27:20 quanters 5:6 quantitatively 27:20 quarters 5:6 quantitativ			_		33:10		_
71:9 78:15,17 79:7 pieces 61:23 65:2 position 16:13,23 ping-pong 10:2,6 placards 13:4,7 place 5:25 6:2 positions 76:18 24:8 26:12 positive 54:8,11 55:16 positive 54:8,11 52:16 positive 54:8,11 positively 7:20 plain 4:14 plained 42:5 plausible 12:20 possibilities 30:2 possibilities 30:2 privacy 78:22  38:8 44:1 57:16 79:8,15 79:7 prove 41:9 prospect 41:9 prospect 41:9 prospect 41:9 prospect 41:9 prospect 41:9 quality 71:17 qualitatively 27:19 quantitatively 27:19 quantitatively 27:20 quantitatively 27:20 quantitatively 27:20 quarters 5:6 quar					0		
79:7         1:25         57:16 79:8,15         protect 79:5         qualify 71:17         50:16 58:6,23         registration 1:19           pieces 61:23 65:2         position 16:13,23         79:21 82:13         prove 6:1         qualitatively         80:23         regretful 52:6           65:6 78:12         17:18 39:23         83:20 84:8         proved 24:1,1         27:19         readers 50:7         regulation 43:22           placards 13:4,7         75:12         55:12 82:4         28:3         provide 1:7 5:12         quantitatively         readily 80:7         regulatory 10:4           place 5:25 6:2         positive 54:8,11         Princess 53:2         17:11 21:11         question 4:4         really 22:15 23:3         36:7 37:6           plain 4:14         positively 7:20         printed 5:2 6:4         46:15 49:23         23:8 33:21         37:4 46:4         related 31:20           planned 42:5         posibilities 30:2         privacy 78:22         18:13 67:24         49:2 62:5         60:13 71:23         relating 85:20							
pieces 61:23 65:2         position 16:13,23         79:21 82:13         prove 6:1         qualitatively         80:23         regretful 52:6           65:6 78:12         17:18 39:23         83:20 84:8         proved 24:1,1         27:19         readers 50:7         regretful 52:6           ping-pong 10:2,6         64:2 65:8         previously 55:9         proven 20:15         quantitatively         readily 80:7         regulation 43:22           place 5:25 6:2         positions 76:18         84:12         provide 1:7 5:12         quarters 5:6         real 18:2 26:8         reglatory 10:4           52:16         56:13,15         print 83:6         30:10 39:12         14:18 15:22         30:3 36:25         relate 17:4           plain 4:14         positively 7:20         printed 5:2 6:4         46:15 49:23         23:8 33:21         37:4 46:4         related 31:20           plausible 12:20         possibilities 30:2         privacy 78:22         18:13 67:24         49:2 62:5         60:13 71:23         relating 85:20						,	
65:6 78:12							
ping-pong         10:2,6 placards         64:2 65:8 75:12         previously         55:9 5:12 82:4         proven         20:15 28:3         quantitatively 27:20 reads         readily         80:7 regulation         43:22 regulatory         10:4 regulatory <th< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></th<>				•			
placards 13:4,7 place 5:25 6:2         75:12 positions 76:18         55:12 82:4 84:12         28:3 provide 1:7 5:12 quarters 5:6 quarters 5:6         reads 7:15 regulatory 10:4 rejected 26:13           24:8 26:12 positive 54:8,11 52:16         positive 54:8,11 princess 53:2 print 83:6 print 83:6         30:10 39:12 print 83:2 print 83:2 print 83:2 print 83:2 print 83:6 provided 2:5 positives 54:23 positives 54:23 provided 2:5 positives 54:23 provided 2:5 print 83:2 print 83:2 provided 2:5 print 83:2 print 83:3 print							
place 5:25 6:2         positions 76:18         84:12         provide 1:7 5:12         quarters 5:6         real 18:2 26:8         rejected 26:13           24:8 26:12         positive 54:8,11         Princess 53:2         17:11 21:11         question 4:4         reall 9:22:15 23:3         36:7 37:6           52:16         positively 7:20         printed 5:2 6:4         46:15 49:23         23:8 33:21         37:4 46:4         related 31:20           planned 42:5         positives 54:23         privacy 78:22         privacy 78:22         18:13 67:24         49:2 62:5         60:13 71:23         relating 85:20				_			
24:8 26:12       positive 54:8,11       Princess 53:2       17:11 21:11       question 4:4       really 22:15 23:3       36:7 37:6         52:16       56:13,15       print 83:6       30:10 39:12       14:18 15:22       30:3 36:25       relate 17:4         plain 4:14       positively 7:20       printed 5:2 6:4       46:15 49:23       23:8 33:21       37:4 46:4       related 31:20         plausible 12:20       possibilities 30:2       privacy 78:22       18:13 67:24       49:2 62:5       60:13 71:23       relating 85:20	_						
52:16       56:13,15       print 83:6       30:10 39:12       14:18 15:22       30:3 36:25       relate 17:4         plain 4:14       positively 7:20       printed 5:2 6:4       46:15 49:23       23:8 33:21       37:4 46:4       related 31:20         plausible 12:20       possibilities 30:2       privacy 78:22       18:13 67:24       49:2 62:5       60:13 71:23       relate 7:4							
plain 4:14         positively 7:20         printed 5:2 6:4         46:15 49:23         23:8 33:21         37:4 46:4         related 31:20           planned 42:5         positives 54:23         provided 2:5         38:9 43:21         54:21,24 58:10         relates 7:25           plausible 12:20         possibilities 30:2         privacy 78:22         18:13 67:24         49:2 62:5         60:13 71:23         relating 85:20	52:16			30:10 39:12	-		relate 17:4
plausible 12:20   possibilities 30:2   privacy 78:22   18:13 67:24   49:2 62:5   60:13 71:23   relating 85:20			_		23:8 33:21	37:4 46:4	
43:10   possibility 49:13   probabilities   76:12   74:12 75:9,9   72:5 73:2 75:9   relation 2:17		l =					_
	43:10	possibility 49:13	probabilities	76:12	74:12 75:9,9	72:5 73:2 75:9	relation 2:17
	L	<u> </u>	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

2 11 12 14	1 24.14	4 20 17 44 0	25 0 20 10 14	11 20 22		l
3:11 13:14	resolve 34:14	route 28:17 44:8	25:9 28:10,14	sell 29:23	sincere 16:1	specialisms
17:15 20:18	resolved 7:10	routine 25:8	28:16,20,21,25	send 31:14	77:21	28:10
22:6 29:6	9:23	rubric 67:14	29:17 30:18	senior 79:11	single 19:12	specialist 70:17
30:13 39:13	respected 21:13	rude 53:20	32:6,25 33:1	sensational	35:12 41:20	specialists 28:24
43:24 49:4,5,6	54:15	rule 79:5	34:9,12,13,19	24:25 32:10	74:14	specific 2:19
65:3 73:9 86:7	responded 6:13	ruled 38:20 74:9	35:9,13 36:4,8	sensationalist	sir 6:24 11:17	5:13 55:19
relatively 40:15	response 6:18	rules 22:5 28:20	36:12,23 37:15	63:7	12:25 15:16	56:7 83:7
released 11:2	10:1 12:15	79:4	38:6 41:3,8,22	sense 27:25 39:6	16:24 76:7	specifically 14:3
13:19,24	39:2	<b>ruling</b> 39:12	42:12,17 44:9	45:7,8,9 62:16	<b>sitting</b> 15:3 21:4	14:5
relevant 8:16	responsibility	55:20	44:15,16 45:12	sensible 15:9	situation 16:18	speech 4:1 10:20
24:14 59:10	18:3 19:23	run 3:14 33:20	sciences 22:7,12	sent 47:13	20:24 44:2	10:22
62:24 78:21	20:11 21:25	74:1	scientific 18:21	sentence 11:13	74:21	speed 14:13,20
religion 4:25	29:13 51:4	running 34:1	18:24 19:15,20	15:13	six 13:17 56:16	splash 32:15
reluctance 19:12	69:5	49:13	20:16 22:10	separate 78:11	58:13 84:15	34:11
remain 19:9	responsible 19:7	runs 18:14	31:10 32:5,23	September 2:14	sixth 11:19	splashed 20:17
remark 67:19,19	50:24 77:18,20	rush 32:10	36:6 39:5	series 23:14 62:5	skim-read 25:13	31:4
remarkable	78:3	Ryan 46:11,12	scientifically	serious 45:6	sleep 39:23	spoke 34:18
42:22 66:22	rest 84:3	46:17	23:23	seriously 16:3	<b>slight</b> 27:17 57:5	59:21 73:13,14
remedies 45:15	restless 53:24		scientist 20:11	serve 3:21	slightly 12:24	76:25 79:11
remember 5:1	result 48:13 80:2	S	22:9 34:18,21	served 46:22	23:18,18 45:6	spoken 41:23,24
34:20	results 32:17	sacrifices 6:11	34:24 35:7	64:23	58:11 66:13,16	42:17
Remembrance	54:16	safe 20:22 26:7	38:14 44:3	serving 14:23	slow 25:19 27:4	<b>sport</b> 57:6
6:10	retort 56:24	27:12,13 32:12	45:16	set 1:14 18:20,22	slowly 30:5,8	spots 5:15 6:6
remotely 56:25	57:25	safety 26:5 27:11	scientists 22:19	22:5 27:21	small 19:12	spotted 7:13
58:1	retractions	27:15	29:24 30:19,24	43:14 44:7	20:14 23:13,19	staff 65:8,12
remove 21:24	15:18	saga 21:20	31:16 35:5	82:8	23:22 36:24	stage 23:24
renamed 12:6,6	retrospect 52:14	sale 5:19,23	36:22 44:9,12	sets 49:13	40:14	Stalker 83:8
reopened 80:1	returned 60:23	sample 24:7	44:17	settlement 68:24	SMC 34:5	standards 4:19
repeat 5:7 30:20	review 20:7	samples 33:13	scoop 47:8,10	seven 9:21 10:6	smelling 21:21	43:23 85:24
repeating 15:23	24:10 48:14,15	34:8	Scotland 13:19	14:15 41:13	<b>Smith</b> 61:10	<b>Star</b> 5:14,18 6:1
15:25	reviews 35:21	sapiens 23:16	scrutiny 79:21	79:8 82:13	smoke 44:21	6:12 15:23
replace 4:16	Richard 75:4	satisfactory	83:1	seventh 11:19	<b>snub</b> 6:7	16:7,14 17:3
41:17	<b>right</b> 3:19,20 5:1	12:15	second 7:5,24	shameful 48:2	sociable 54:19	<b>start</b> 44:9 60:11
replaced 14:12	9:3 11:18 13:4	satisfied 7:16	55:14	shape 13:8	society 2:21	73:25
replicated 20:15	13:8 15:16	satisfy 78:19	secondly 9:19	share 45:21	sold 5:25	starting 67:14
23:21 28:12	17:5,6 20:1	Saturday 77:7	14:9,22 35:22	52:13 68:13	soldiers 6:11	76:4
32:18 33:23	22:6,13,14	<b>save</b> 67:19	section 13:10	Sharia 3:15	solely 19:7	starts 50:11
report 4:6 24:15	24:9,22 25:1	saw 7:8 15:12	14:1	shelves 40:9	solid 36:18	stated 56:21
29:11,12 67:11	27:14,20 28:13	65:11,12	sections 3:17	shift 12:17	solution 56:23	statement 7:6
83:22	29:25 30:9	saying 10:21	security 48:1,14	shifting 70:21,22	57:24	10:21,23 46:19
reported 24:18	31:23 33:2	12:4,11 23:10	48:16	shocking 32:9	somebody 5:25	47:4 50:12
27:24 42:11	34:10 35:18,20	24:15 28:21,22	see 4:1 5:9 6:19	shops 40:9	43:3 60:14	51:8 55:16
72:15 85:4	36:3 45:20	40:10 43:8	12:16 13:22	short 46:9	63:21 84:2	64:20 76:13
reporter 53:8	47:1 50:17	54:13 63:3,5	17:6 24:18	shorthand 44:22	Somerset 49:4,9	78:8,15
62:23 63:21	51:5,25 55:23	71:3 74:8	26:20,22 28:12	show 17:2 30:25	soon 37:24	statements 9:6
65:8,13 70:6,7	62:7,14 63:14	says 8:7 13:16	29:1 32:16	31:2 66:19	sorry 44:23 62:5	States 19:22 34:1
70:10,16 75:1	65:4 75:8	26:19 43:5	37:20 40:7	showed 20:24	sort 21:11 62:13	34:6
reporters 22:17	76:19 77:10	80:25	51:7 52:2	26:15 27:17	67:20 72:7	stating 38:8
36:12,15 53:15	80:11 81:25	scandal 20:5	53:18,19,20,22	40:16	73:25 74:20	status 54:1
70:11 78:10	87:5	48:1	55:1,3 57:20	showing 40:25	81:2	statute 84:12
reporting 3:8	rights 82:22	scans 43:4	61:17,18 65:24	66:24	sorted 75:6	stay 28:15 79:9
5:10 16:16	right-hand 51:11	scare 19:8,10	67:5,23 69:6	shown 26:17	sorts 45:15	stem 26:4,6,6,10
22:12 42:12	61:14	41:6	70:2 74:12	65:16 67:21	soubriquet 72:6	26:11,20 41:24
45:3 83:17	rigorous 19:20	scared 42:20	77:15 78:16	71:24,25	sounds 22:24	step 5:8 32:16
reports 50:19	rise 23:1 46:7	69:21	seeing 6:17 28:2 82:20	side 51:11 61:14 78:12 80:11	<b>source</b> 66:13,17 72:25	36:20 Stophon 76:7 8
representing	risk 22:8,24 23:4	scary 23:9				<b>Stephen</b> 76:7,8
1:10	24:1 40:9	scheme 47:1	seek 1:24 11:9	81:25	sources 50:14	76:11
request 64:23	48:15 74:1,4	school 54:2,11	68:14	sight 18:5 26:16	55:5 58:22 60:8 63:10	<b>stepping</b> 60:13
requirement 39:9 43:20	rival 85:7,14	56:11 67:20	seeking 2:3 18:2	signed 46:20	60:8 63:10	85:20
	rivals 84:20	73:2,6,17	21:24 35:20	64:21 76:13	south 12:5	stereotypes 2:23
requires 43:25	robust 39:3	schools 3:13,14	seeks 1:15	significance 66:20	so-called 11:5	stillbirth 39:22
research 19:13	role 10:3 21:20	58:15 59:25	seen 2:4 5:7,8		<b>space</b> 57:19	stirring 3:9
21:25 41:1	21:22,22 49:20	science 18:14,18	10:15 32:20	similar 5:10	sparked 54:2	stolen 38:15
researchers	51:9 63:1	18:20,25 19:3	44:14 53:21	30:13 40:4	speak 44:18 83:3	stone 10:12
41:23	room 22:19	20:21 21:1,5	61:25 73:19,20	58:15	speaking 53:15	stop 36:25 41:10
resend 7:21	44:11 54:4	22:16,17,17,22	self-respecting	simple 14:15	special 29:12	60:12
resolution 18:5	roses 21:21	23:10 24:17	29:8	43:19	43:22	stories 4:7,7
1	1		l 	1	l	l

	l	l	I	l	l <u>-</u>	l
16:15 18:25	subeditors 25:11	surprised 7:7	tension 50:1,3	35:8,14 36:12	today's 79:3	71:17 82:2
27:24 28:2	28:10,19,23	surrounding	term 63:13 68:19	36:18 37:23	told 29:21 31:18	Tuesday 60:25
34:13,19 36:11	36:14	53:3	71:14	39:4 42:1 43:9	47:12 63:21	turn 26:25 32:24
45:3 53:1	subhead 80:16	suspect 51:21	terms 4:24 15:24	43:12,13 44:6	72:25 77:18	33:1 61:15
62:24 80:5	subheading 6:7	80:24	23:5,5 36:1	45:1,19 46:2	78:16	75:3
84:6	subheadlines	suspects 58:14	48:25 54:25	48:17 52:20	tomorrow 30:23	turned 29:20
story 5:21 6:3,13	51:20	suspicion 59:13	58:24 61:20	56:4,17 57:6,7	31:7 35:14	turns 12:5
7:25 8:8,9,17	subject 4:11	swine 29:7,10,25	terrible 5:2	57:14 58:4,7	87:6	tweeted 25:16
9:13,19,21	22:11 27:4	30:6	20:24 41:11	61:9,11,13	tomorrow's 79:7	twice 72:12
10:17 11:5,7	35:15 78:18	sworn 1:4 18:8	terrify 23:9	63:3,17 64:4	tone 67:7 75:24	two 2:16 6:21
11:24,25 12:2	subjected 79:20	64:15 76:8	terrifying 29:2	65:11 71:6,13	82:9	11:4 14:7
12:3,21 13:15	submission 2:5,9	symptoms 33:17	31:7 40:23	71:14,15,20	<b>Tony</b> 5:4	16:14 26:14,14
14:17,19 15:2	3:25 5:12	34:3	territory 60:14	72:7,17 73:11	top 30:1 51:11	26:17 27:22
15:17,20,21	18:13 24:22	syndrome 33:4	terror 4:10 5:15	73:12 74:24	53:19 56:16	37:12 39:21
19:11 26:2	subsequent 7:25	system 24:10	6:6	75:19 77:9	80:23,24	42:4,7 64:22
31:25 40:10	74:2	26:13	test 26:10 40:18	78:11,12 79:13	topical 25:7	78:11 79:24
41:8,9 42:11	subsequently	systematic 67:18	81:21 83:16	80:17 81:22	totally 8:18	82:21 83:7
43:3 45:11,14	13:3	systematic 07.10	86:11	84:7	26:18 59:22	85:7,14,15
47:7,23 48:13	substance 12:21	T	testimony 16:10	thinking 21:5	touch 2:16 4:9	type 61:17
48:18,19,23	12:23 14:9	tab 46:19 51:1	testing 23:15	81:20	toxicologists	type 01.17 types 22:8
49:4 52:18,21	48:22 58:25		26:17	third 2:9 8:21	40:21	types 22.8 typographical
,		56:1 60:17	tests 34:2	25:10 54:10	trace 65:6	7:5
53:3,10,13 54:3 60:2,4	substantial 59:9 substantiate 6:2	66:6 69:3,4	tests 34:2 text 25:2	third-party 6:25	trace 65:6 traces 40:16,20	1.5
62:18 68:22	6:13 12:12	77:14	thank 1:10 2:5	7:3 14:2	,	U
73:14,16 74:17	successful 14:1	tabloid 47:9	3:11 4:22 5:12	7:3 14:2 thought 8:11	tragic 41:14 52:10	
75:14,16 74:17	successfully 7:9	tabloids 35:10	8:20 10:14	21:1 48:7 59:2	training 28:22	UEA 38:13,25
	succession 72:12	take 1:19 22:20	16:19,23,24,25	59:5,6,7 77:2	36:14 37:15	39:13
82:11,12,16,24	sufficient 45:10	25:9 30:5,8		81:24 86:6	47:1 48:10	UK 12:18
84:8,15 85:10 86:7		39:17 41:16	17:8,25 18:13 19:1 28:5 29:3	thousands 24:4	transcribed	ultimately 49:19
	suggest 81:1	45:24 54:5	31:20 37:25		65:10 72:24	unable 6:2
straightforward	<b>suggested</b> 59:24 60:9 81:24	70:15,22 74:10		26:23 38:14,14		unacceptable
8:12,13 22:23		82:3	38:1 46:3,3,5,6	threat 4:10 three 27:22	<b>transcript</b> 65:16	4:18
34:19 71:15,18	suggesting 73:24	taken 6:3 58:2	46:14,18 47:12 48:21 63:18		65:16,23 67:6	unbalanced 4:3
strange 53:24	81:20	59:3 72:19		28:10 41:1,21	67:24 72:14,14	und 66:11
Strangely 28:14	suggestion 14:6	takes 23:17	64:10,12,13,17	42:1,4,5,8,8,9	transcripts 80:5	undercover
straying 81:4	15:9	talk 8:21 78:9	64:20 66:1,2	58:10 70:10	transfer 41:10	47:14
Street 43:8 86:21	suggestions 15:6	talked 79:16	76:3,4,4,5,12	71:12 77:12 80:16 82:3	translated 66:10	underline 45:6
strengthened	sum 32:3,4 summarise 65:8	85:2	76:16 86:17		transplant 42:3	underlined 3:15
36:17	summarise 65:8 summons 83:11	talking 12:18	87:1,2,5	throwing 54:3	treatment 17:4	underlying 19:9
stress 35:8,9		59:15 68:3	theirs 64:9	tighten 83:18 timber 60:2	24:2 26:15	25:2
strict 83:13 strike 80:10	summonses 85:11	83:4	theme 31:20 37:2		33:16 43:22	underneath
strike 80:10 strikes 8:18		taped 65:10,20	themes 19:17 35:17	time 1:18 4:9 5:4 8:4 12:9 20:19	treatments 33:12	80:19
	sums 58:16	taught 71:22			33:16 34:2	understand 8:9
16:12	Sun 5:2,5,7	teacher 59:17	theory 55:16	20:20 23:25	trebling 23:5	8:20 21:10
striking 10:10	34:18 40:6,7	66:24 67:1	they'd 31:17	24:1 26:8	trial 26:6,9,11	28:6,20 52:8
strong 39:3,4	41:2,3 64:8	69:19	thing 7:5 17:15	30:20,21,24,24	27:10,11,15	52:12,25 72:1
57:10 58:7	65:1 76:17,17	teachers 58:13	23:3 39:7 52:4	38:17,17 39:18	50:5 74:3	74:3,19,22
80:6,8 81:7	78:1 79:8	59:25 68:9	67:20 72:23	42:14 44:19	trials 23:15 24:3	81:23 82:1,2
strongly 9:7 27:5	85:11,13,14	teaches 57:2	86:18	45:20 49:15	27:9,14,21,22	87:1
54:14	86:22 Sunday 76:25	technique 41:19	things 22:22	52:8 55:9 56:22 50:5	tricky 29:8	understandably
struck 66:4	Sunday 76:25	41:25 42:25	33:11 37:8	56:22 59:5	tried 34:5 53:10	74:18
student 69:19	77:8	technology 37:5	38:8 39:11	62:12,14 65:11	trouble 59:3	understanding
72:16	supplied 80:5	Telegraph 38:24	62:13 75:22	66:4 68:8	60:11	7:1 17:17
students 54:15	support 13:9	39:13	81:9	69:15 70:11	true 6:24 26:21	21:14 28:25
71:25 72:2	21:12 22:1	television 26:4	think 4:13,19 5:3	74:14 75:10	32:24 33:1	undo 6:20
studied 39:16	supported 20:7	tell 1:12 3:14	5:6,8 7:5 9:11	78:5 82:25	55:3 60:4	unfair 4:3 31:12
studies 23:20	36:4	4:14 5:17 8:1	10:11,14 11:20	timeframe 37:21	63:15	54:4
24:18 34:7,16	supporters 20:23	11:20 18:18	13:12,21 14:3	timeousness 18:2	trust 31:17	unfavourable
39:20 60:24	suppose 31:22	33:6 39:24	14:4 16:22	times 12:1 42:6	truthful 76:14	79:21
study 19:12	32:25 70:13	47:4 69:25	18:4 19:23	81:14	truths 35:23	Unfortunately
20:14 22:8	supposed 10:4	telling 29:10	20:7,12,18	Timothy 64:15	try 1:18 10:11	8:14 11:15
23:14,19 28:3	<b>Supreme</b> 63:24	ten 5:1 34:7 36:5	21:19 22:14,14	64:19	13:9,9 24:6	16:8
33:25 40:14,24	64:5	44:14 79:10	23:17,19 24:14	tiny 15:12 26:15	25:20 27:2,23	unfounded 54:2
41:12	sure 1:9,14 7:18	83:20	25:4,5,14	26:15 31:2	52:17 58:20	unimportant
stuff 18:22	17:25 45:13	tenant 50:20	27:23 28:23	tissue 40:17,18	80:9 81:21	64:11
stunned 54:21	53:7 58:14	tendency 83:16	29:12 30:3	title 66:10	trying 6:16 21:11	United 19:22
subeditor 51:24	71:4 83:10	tends 28:19	31:8 32:3,8,19	today 25:18	24:12 35:17	university 38:13
69:10	surgery 21:4	tens 24:4	33:14,21 34:14	26:18 32:20	55:3 58:5,16	38:19 83:14
	I	I	I	I		I

	İ	i	i	i	i i	
unnamed 82:7	Walford 79:12	we're 2:1 4:10	worked 12:19	1	4	
unreasonably	want 8:21 10:9	6:17 9:11 15:1	46:24 70:12			
70:23	11:20 23:12	23:10 24:18	76:17 86:5	1 23:1 65:3 76:19	<b>4</b> 11:5 31:9,15	
untutored 81:17	24:15,17,19	28:20,21 37:16	working 48:11	77:1,4	46:19	
	, ,	,	_	<b>1,000</b> 23:1,1	<b>4.23</b> 87:7	
81:18	45:25 61:23	38:5 43:22,23	66:6 73:14	<b>1.5</b> 23:1	<b>4.30</b> 87:3	
unusual 68:8	72:8 79:3	44:25 57:18	works 24:2 27:13	<b>10</b> 25:13 32:18	<b>48</b> 11:1	
86:13	wanted 9:18	59:14 64:4	43:15 74:16	87:6,8		
<b>update</b> 15:15,16	43:14 66:19	74:9 75:7,8,18	world 9:10 19:20	<b>100,000</b> 86:23	5	
<b>upheld</b> 45:18	75:23 79:23	we've 2:22 5:6,9	78:25	<b>11</b> 30:14,23 31:2	<b>5</b> 11:5 18:14 56:1	
uphold 8:14	83:18 84:21	6:17,25 9:16	worried 29:25	31:4,6,19	<b>54254</b> 2:9 5:13	
<b>upset</b> 31:16	wanting 23:9	9:17 10:14	29:25	<b>12</b> 4:23 18:15		
<b>upshot</b> 50:13	wants 25:23	13:12 14:14	worst 29:14		<b>54258</b> 19:5	
urban 57:1	83:13	23:25 24:1	worthwhile 70:5	23:20 32:4	<b>54259</b> 22:5	
use 13:8 42:25	war 66:15	32:20 34:6	worthy 67:19	<b>120</b> 78:5	<b>54260</b> 24:23 28:7	
				<b>13</b> 46:19 50:11	<b>54261</b> 29:3	
51:17 58:25	Waring 76:7,8	44:2,14 45:8	wouldn't 35:4,5	61:22 86:5	<b>54264</b> 38:1	
68:19 69:11	76:10,11 77:15	65:22 67:24	42:21 62:15,22	<b>13th</b> 17:20	<b>54267</b> 39:20	
84:25	78:19 81:8	68:21 72:21,21	63:2	<b>15</b> 53:20 72:3	<b>54686</b> 56:2	
user-friendly	86:4,17	73:18 74:5	write 25:9 34:10	<b>16</b> 72:3 76:13	<b>54690</b> 59:16	
34:20	warming 31:19	86:13 87:3	34:19 35:5,10	<b>17</b> 64:21 72:3	<b>546919</b> 59:20	
uses 42:24	warning 31:1	whatsoever 5:23	38:24 59:3	19 50:25		
usually 32:23	wasn't 15:14	12:3,21 48:5	writer 44:22		<b>54703</b> 56:8	
75:8	17:10 24:17	76:2	writes 9:25	<b>1955</b> 66:12	<b>54704</b> 58:10	
, 5.5	28:3 32:2	wider 13:10	writing 2:6	<b>1974</b> 80:1	<b>54880</b> 66:3	
				<b>1989</b> 56:12	<b>54911</b> 65:7	
	42:21 48:19	19:13	62:13,14	<b>1994</b> 56:12		
vaccinated 21:7	52:22,23 57:16	wild 50:17	written 7:23		6	
vaccination	61:18 71:3	Wilkie 84:22	43:3,3	2	<b>60</b> 20:25 33:14	
32:12	72:24 73:8	willing 7:3	wrong 2:23,24	<b>2</b> 14:1 31:1 51:1	<b>65</b> 57:6	
vaccine 20:22	79:1 81:5	win 36:9	3:1 18:22 30:9	60:17 69:3,4		
21:6 29:23	86:15	wine 25:17	30:10 52:15	77:9,14 78:13	<b>65,000</b> 29:7,10	
vaccines 39:11	watch 44:25	Winterval 12:7	63:15 66:16		29:21	
valuable 14:18	69:20	wiped 32:13	74:23 75:7,8	<b>2.05</b> 1:2		
value 15:4 16:2	watched 30:20	wish 14:3 19:4	80:12,12 86:24	<b>20</b> 24:16	8	
	watching 26:3	42:20	wrongly 82:9,17	<b>2000</b> 46:25	<b>8</b> 25:11 66:6	
85:9				<b>2002</b> 18:21 44:7	<b>85</b> 3:15	
values 19:9	waters 86:9	wished 68:13	wrongs 82:23	<b>2003</b> 47:7 65:1		
various 22:7	watershed 52:21	wit 45:4	wrote 8:6 9:15	<b>2007</b> 7:25 8:4	9	
70:20 76:18	53:4 61:25	withdrawn	41:2 65:2	<b>2010</b> 2:15 48:24	9 11:8 25:12	
vast 23:21	83:24	16:10 64:8		50:10 62:12		
verbatim 67:25	way 11:9,11	witness 17:1,5,16	X	76:19	90 30:25	
69:8	15:19 21:24	18:7 19:21	<b>XMRV</b> 33:2	<b>2011</b> 2:6 18:14	<b>99.99999</b> 20:21	
vetting 48:1,17	25:24 27:18	38:8 44:1				
vibrant 86:22	29:11 34:20	46:11,19 50:12	Y	55:15 65:3		
Victorian 71:21	35:6,7 42:2,11	64:20 76:12	<b>Yard</b> 13:19	76:19 77:10		
	43:6 48:20	witnesses 84:8	2 412 41 10117	<b>21/7</b> 83:9		
71:24			yeah 47:25	<b>23</b> 17:20		
view 2:3 9:10	52:7 53:9	witty 54:19	year 29:20 31:9	<b>24</b> 76:17		
19:20,23 32:4	55:10 58:25	56:24 57:25	46:20,25 47:8	<b>25</b> 59:17 68:3		
50:7 53:6	62:18 63:6,6	woman 41:13	47:10 64:21	<b>27</b> 48:24		
70:23 77:8	69:18 75:15	48:2 57:8 58:8	69:25 71:3	<b>28</b> 55:15		
viewed 48:18	76:5 81:5,18	80:20,25 81:3	76:13 85:19	<b>29</b> 55:16		
views 39:5 81:13	86:1,14	women 40:17,18	86:23	<b>2</b> / 33.10		
vilified 86:14	ways 32:3 61:14	40:19	years 1:14 2:22	3		
vilifying 52:7	weak 57:5	won 47:3	3:4 5:1 7:1			
violent 56:20	website 1:22	wonder 21:6	24:16 36:5	<b>3.12</b> 46:8		
57:23 59:12	2:13	40:2 66:20		<b>3.19</b> 46:10		
	week 25:6 40:3,6	wonderful 20:9	42:4,8 44:14	<b>30</b> 49:1,12		
virally 43:7	· ·		48:11 55:11	<b>31</b> 2:6 50:10 51:4		
virus 33:2,13	41:7,14	35:1 36:19	59:17 68:4	76:19		
34:2,3	weeks 41:5 79:13	44:16 52:4	76:18 83:20	<b>31st</b> 60:6		
voice 59:21	well-expressed	word 4:16 10:7	year's 42:14	<b>31975</b> 51:1		
voter 1:19	58:17	10:10 13:24	55:15 56:5	<b>31976</b> 51:7,11		
	well-known 72:5	21:16 61:18	year-long 41:15	<b>31978</b> 51:7,11		
W	went 18:22 39:1	70:1 84:1	42:13			
wacky 58:12	40:3 41:21	wording 17:21	Yeates 51:21	<b>31983</b> 69:3 77:15		
wait 32:17 55:18	48:24 52:15	words 10:20	52:11 55:17	<b>31984</b> 78:11		
	63:9 85:6	30:17 57:7,19		<b>31985</b> 71:9 77:16		
waiting 60:22	weren't 72:23	59:8 60:21	60:22 80:20	<b>319868</b> 60:17		
wake 26:18			yesterday 13:20	<b>31987</b> 61:9		
Wakefield 20:23	we'll 11:20 30:6	79:2	26:2	<b>35</b> 44:24		
21:7,12,25	52:16 64:5	work 33:9 35:4	young 53:20 57:8			
Wales 53:2 81:12	71:5,6	37:9,22	58:8			
i	I					
		=			= =	