1	Tuesday, 24 January 2012	1	abuse, use of violence, suppression of journalists
2	(10.00 am)	2	around the world who are killed or otherwise
3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Good morning, yes.	3	intimidated, but we also are heavily involved in what we
4	MR JAY: The first witnesses today are Mr Kampfner and	4	call the shades of grey. That is areas where free
5	Mr Heawood, please.	5	expression comes up against competing rights, whether it
6	MR JONATHAN PORTREE HEAWOOD (sworn)	6	is privacy, confidentiality, data protection and
7	MR JOHN PAUL KAMPFNER (sworn)	7	elsewhere, and this brings us and has brought us for
8	Questions by MR JAY	8	several years now very much to the forefront of the
9	MR JAY: First of all, please, respectively your full names	9	debate in Western countries and particularly in the UK.
10	for the Inquiry?	10	Q. Thank you. And yourself, Mr Kampfner?
11	MR KAMPFNER: John Paul Kampfner.	11	MR KAMPFNER: I've been a journalist for longer than I care
12	MR HEAWOOD: Jonathan Portree Heawood.	12	to remember, more than 20 years. I started at Reuters
13	MR JAY: Mr Kampfner, you provided a submission to the	13	as a graduate trainee. I served in Bonn and Moscow.
14	Inquiry dated 13 January of this year. Is this your	14	Then I was the bureau chief of the Daily Telegraph in
15	formal evidence to the Inquiry?	15	Moscow and East Berlin for the events of the late 80s
16	MR KAMPFNER: Yes, it is.	16	and early 90s. I moved to the lobby to be chief
17	MR JAY: Or at least your first submission, because	17	political correspondent of the Financial Times. I moved
18	I understand you may wish to submit another submission	18	to the BBC where I covered politics for the Today
19	later.	19	programme and Newsnight. I became political editor of
20	Does the same apply to you, Mr Heawood, in relation	20	the New Statesman and then editor of the New Statesman
21	to your submission of 30 November of last year?	21	in 2005 to 2008 and since then I moved I kept a lot
22	MR HEAWOOD: Yes, it does.	22	of my what I would call journalistic instincts but
23	Q. Can I ask you first of all, please, respectively to tell	23	moved into the NGO world.
24	us about your organisation and then about yourself.	24	Q. Thank you. Mr Heawood next, please.
25	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just before you do, it's right, isn't	25	MR HEAWOOD: So English PEN is the founding centre of an
	Page 1		Page 3
1	it, that certainly at the seminars one, if not both of	1	international writers' association known as
2	you, actually spoke?	2	PEN International, which now has centres in over 100
3	MR KAMPFNER: I did so, yes.	3	countries around the world. PEN was established in 1991
4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Would it be fair to allow me to	4	by a group of writers who were very concerned to aid
5	incorporate what you said there into the record of this	5	international understanding between writers and that
6	Inquiry?	6	evolved over the years into the free speech NGO that we
7	MR KAMPFNER: I'd be happy to.	7	are today. We see our mission as promoting the freedom
8	MR HEAWOOD: I think my remarks were from the floor at the	8	to write and the freedom to read and identify and remove
9	seminar but likewise.	9	any barriers to those freedoms, whether those barriers
10	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much.	10	are political, legal, social or economic.
11	MR JAY: Mr Kampfner first of all.	11	I have been director of English PEN for six and a
12	MR KAMPFNER: Index on Censorship celebrates its 40th	12	half years. Before that I worked for a think tank.
13	anniversary this year. It was founded as a response to	13	Before that, for the Observer newspaper, where I was on
14	Soviet dictatorship and was designed to promote free	14	the books desk, and before that I was in academia.
15	expression around the world and to highlight areas of	15	Q. Thank you very much. Can I ask you, Mr Kampfner, first
16	censorship around the world. In those days, a much	16	of all, page 54660 I'm working from the numbers we
17	clearer definition between dictatorships and democracy.	17	have furnished for the documents; on the internal
18	Over time it has evolved. In the just over three years	18	numbering it's page 4 of your submission where you
19	I have been involved and I will be leaving at the end	19	set the context for free expression and press freedom in
20	of March Index has changed quite considerably. We	20	a developing environment. May I ask you, please, to
21	embrace the digital age with alacrity. We do	21	encapsulate the points you're making there?
22	considerably more campaigning and lobbying around the	22	MR KAMPFNER: There is a difference there is a huge
23	world in addition to the editorial work that we do and	23	amount of convergence but there are also differences
24	we embrace the term I use is we cover and highlight	24	between press freedom and freedom of expression.
	not just black and white cases of censorship, egregious	25	Freedom of expression is the broader right of
25	Page 2	23	Page 4

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

23

24

25

6

12

18

20

connotations.

individuals, as much as organisations, news organisations, whatever, to express themselves freely in all contexts but within the boundaries of law.

1

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

12

17

We take a -- what I regard as a reasonable but a fundamentally principled view on free expression, which is: where there needs to be curtailment of that free expression, it needs to be very clear and it needs to be narrow. We work from very strong -- a very strong belief not only in the American version of the first amendment but in the European equivalent, namely Article 10, while at the same time not in any way diminishing the competing rights.

Therefore, our brief -- we are not -- Index, even though -- and it's obviously an area you will wish to come to -- we, together with PEN and others, have been leading the libel reform campaign. That could be seen to be -- and we've had very good working relations with newspapers on that front. We represent the interests of no media organisation.

Q. Thank you. You also remind us at the bottom of 54660 of the global repercussions any recommendations made by this Inquiry will have, since the commentary, you point out, in China and Iran, for example, on the government responses to the summer riots. So others are watching us?

9 is a broader concept. Without a vigorous press and 10 without a vigorously free press, then free expression is

it might be useful -- I'm sorry, Mr Jay -- just to

articulate -- I think I've heard you on this subject

before but publicly to articulate where you see the

difference between freedom of expression, which you have

talked about, and freedom of press, which has different

MR KAMPFNER: Freedom of the press is a subsection of

freedom of expression. As I say, freedom of expression

severely damaged, because newspapers, broadcasters and others in the mainstream media remain -- even though

their proportion perhaps is diminishing all the time,

they remain still the most significant conduit of

information and comment and news. That proportion is

16 constantly now being diminished by the rise of

17 unmediated bloggers, citizen journalism, using crowd

sourcing and other methods as well, so -- but one can always exaggerate the extent to which people "don't read

20 newspapers", because even if newspaper circulations

21 inexorably seem to decline, the impact on broadcasters

and others remains strong.

So it is a significant but not the only vehicle for information, and a conduit of freedom of expression for the public. But there are other areas of press

Page 7

1 MR KAMPFNER: Absolutely, and again an area, I imagine, you

- 2 will probe, which is our submission on areas where we
- 3 regard the otherwise understandable incorporation of
- 4 laws and norms into European Union countries, namely
- 5 France and Hungary, can, if done wrongly, have an
- 6 extremely deleterious effect.

So while not exaggerating the importance or the status of the UK decisions made here and statements made

here, such as reported statements that I have alluded to

several times, such as the reported response of the

11 prime minister to the riots in August, which was, on one

level, an understandable instinct to shoot the

13 messenger -- BlackBerry messenger in this care -- and to

say it is the medium that is at fault -- time and again,

15 through diligent research and, we hope, convincing

argument, we seek to prove that invariably it is not the

medium; it is other issues that need to be tackled.

18 Q. Thank you. Mr Heawood, you make similar points, but in

19 your own way. At page 53717, on the internal numbering

20 page 2 of your submission --

21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Just before you pass to Mr Heawood 21

22 Mr Kampfner, you were actually distinguishing between

freedom of expression and freedom of the press.

24 MR KAMPFNER: Mm-hm.

25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think if you're dealing with that, Page 6

Page 5

1 practice, again I'm sure to be gone into, whether it's

2 corporate bullying, poor corporate governance,

3 et cetera, which can act as much as a curb on free

4 expression as more broadly defined.

5 MR JAY: Thank you.

Mr Heawood, page 51717, you provide the context:

7 Article 10 and the changing environment, particularly

8 the introduction of greater technologies and different

9 technologies. In your own words, please, are there any

10 matters you would wish to draw out?

11 MR HEAWOOD: In terms of the introduction of new technology.

digital technology, in a way, it just allows me to build

on a point that John made a moment ago about

14 jurisdiction. I mean, there's an exemplary effect of

15 laws made and practised in this jurisdiction. Other

16 countries may want to emulate them.

17 There's also a very direct effect -- and we've seen

this in libel -- because of the transjurisdictional

19 nature of internal publications, so that suits

repeatedly brought or issued in the high courts for

libels which may have actually taken place involving

22 overseas claimants and/or overseas defendants. I think

23 that's one impact of the digital revolution on the reach

24 of English jurisdiction, one reason to be very careful

about making changes here.

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 The other impact, again as John has noted already, 2 is the fact that we are all now potential publishers. 3 The press, the institutional press, may still play 4 a very particular role. That role has changed, it will 5 continue to change. We're all now not merely consumers 6 of media content; we all have the capacity, the 7 capability to become producers of media content. So 8 I think article 10, which for many may have been a right 9 that was something that was slightly abstract, a right 10 for others, is a right which actually we all now can 11 directly enjoy through access to the Internet, and 12 I think it's one reason why in the submission and today 13 I want to make very clear that I think one thing we have 14 to get right here is the underlying law. I think if we 15 seek to regulate an industry which is actually in the 16 process of transformation and may, in ten years' time, 17 not exist in a recognisable time, we may be regulating, 18 as it were, a stable door, and the horse has bolted. So 19 the law has to be right. 20 MR KAMPFNER: May I just elaborate further on your original 20 21 question about distinguishing between free expression 22 and a free press. 23 The free expression -- having discussed the issues 24 of media, we defend free expression, whether it is

MR KAMPFNER: Thank you. This is an important part of our 1 2 submission, and humbly we would ask you, sir, to 3 consider the view which has very rarely been made to you 4 so far in this Inquiry that while I as an individual and 5 Index as an organisation and I'm sure all right-minded 6 people unequivocally condemn the actions that led to and 7 arose through the phone hacking scandal, and while we --8 as we will set out -- strongly advocate improved 9 regulation and other methods to ensure better behaviour, 10 nevertheless the -- born from my own experience over 11 many years and our work at Index, the weakness of the UK 12 media and the fundamental weaknesses of media in general

are something that should be strongly taken into

Referring -- I go through very briefly in my submission areas upon areas, whether it's entertainment and celebrity journalism, business journalism, sports journalism, and of course one of the fundamental requirements of a good journalist is to nurture their sources, to become friends with the CEO, with the spin doctor, with, if it's a company, the CFO or whatever, in order for them to give you information that could potentially turn into an interesting insight or an interesting story.

My experience, however, of the Westminster lobby in Page 11

of -- a vast amount of the work that we did when we launched the libel reform campaign was to protect the right of speech and writing for people who are not journalists at all: speakers at conferences, as I say, scientists, academics, NGOs whose free speech is chilled by either deliberate acts of oppression or by the use of wrong laws or unbalanced laws, such as English libel. Artistic expression and censorship norms -- there are all manner of UK laws that potentially impede upon that. So it is the right of individuals, organisations, interest groups as well as the media to speak freely. Q. I move on to the next theme. Mr Kampfner, it's 54661 under the rubric "Weaknesses of UK journalism". Mr Heawood, it's 53718, where you make the separate and

doctors, whether it is academics and peer review. A lot

Page 9

power. So there's weakness on the one hand and there's power on the other. First of all, Mr Kampfner, weaknesses. There are two questions I have for you: what are the weaknesses and are they systemic? That's the first question. As a subset of the systemic point and maybe the second question: are they truly systemic, rather than being derived from what you call the laziness and pliancy of some journalists?

different but maybe related point that what is most

troubling about certain media organisations is their

Page 10

the time when I was there from the mid-1990s until ostensibly the mid-noughties was a media that was extraordinarily pliant, particularly -- and I'm not making any political points here but I think I'm highlighting a particular era, and I'm not particularly qualified to talk about the current era because while I, to a small degree, am involved in it, to a much lesser degree than I used to be.

But having been a foreign correspondent and worked with journalists who risked life and limb to eke out information and stories, to come to a culture at Westminster where, with some very notable exceptions, there was a culture almost of feeding -- it was just feeding the beast. I remember the spin doctors -- and I quite often had more sympathy for them than I did for some of the journalists -- would literally say, "All right, we have to feed the beasts today, what are we going to feed them with?" and they would line up to be

I remember one spin doctor, who I don't think it would be fair to name, one day -- I had just started out at the Financial Times and it was all about the soon-to-be-incoming Labour government and it's rapprochement with business. It was about 1996, and he was giving me a story about a new business initiative, Page 12

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

3

4

- and literally dictating pretty much the story to me down the phone, you know: "And then Tony Blair will say this,
- 3 and then this happened and this happened." And I turned
- 4 around and asked him a couple of questions, like: "But
- 5 didn't you say this last week? Didn't this happen?
 - Doesn't this contradict something else?" To which I got
- 7 a response which I always will remember, which is: "Shut
- 8 up, take it down if you want more from where this came
- 9 in the future."

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

7

9

This really was -- and I turned around politely and got on with the guy and said, "Actually, I don't really -- you go and give it to somebody else. I want to do my own --" I'm not trying to sound worthier than anybody else, because obviously if I had lunch with ministers or whatever and they gave me a good story, I would do that story -- it would be crazy not to -- but there was a culture of compliance, of docility.

Now, if someone was on the floor, if there was a politician on floor, they would all give him a kicking. It was a sort of her instinct. When the going was clear, you would do it. But just as you had this very strong -- and it was -- a huge amount was obviously driven by the culture at the time, which was a desperation of politicians to endear themselves with News International, with Associated as well and with all

details of MPs' expense claims and was consistently

- 2 pushed back and the law was used against her and she was
 - taken to court and she took MPs to court,
 - took Parliament to court and fought a very long, very
- 5 painful battle, very much unsupported by the
- 6 institutional press who largely didn't think it was
- 7 a story worth pursuing -- compare what happened to
- 8 Heather Brooke and what happened finally when the
- 9 Telegraph decided that when this disk, this unredacted
- disk which was being prepared ultimately as a result of
- 11 Heather Brooke's campaign -- when that disk came
- illegally into the Telegraph's hands, they decided it
- was one of the biggest stories of the century and they
- 14 would publish over several weeks, as we all know, with
- 15 enormous consequences.

I'm not convinced that the power at this date in law of the lone campaigner was equivalent to the power of a very large newspaper group like the Telegraph to bring something of that importance, of that public interest

- something of that importance, of that public interest into public debate. I'm not suggesting for that reason
- 21 that we should celebrate or fail to question the power
- 22 held by those big beasts of the media. I'd like the
- same power to be enjoyed by other players, other actors,
- 24 other speakers, other publishers, providing they
- 25 follow --

Page 15

- 1 the media groups, but there was a distinct pecking
- 2 order. There was very much a sense of services renders:

Page 13

- 3 you write the story, and the more faithfully you write
- 4 the story, the more stories you are going to get in the
- 5 future.
 - To me, while obviously political journalism is about nurturing your services, that seems to be a travesty of
- 8 this idea which Tony Blair then, later on in his
 - farewell speech, led to him coining the phrase "feral
- 10 beasts". They were occasionally feral but most of the
- 11 time they were locked up.
- Q. Thank you. Mr Heawood, the power of the press. You
 make a number of succinct points on 53718. Can I ask
- make a number of succinct points on 53718. Can I as you, please, to develop those and to deal with the
- apparent confrontation between weakness on the one hand
- and power on the other, and what you mean by "power"?
- 17 MR HEAWOOD: I think it's a necessary power. I think it's
- a power that the press continues to hold and I think
- it's a power that should be there in society, whether
- 20 it's held by the newspapers that we're familiar with or
- some other source that's coming into being, which may be
- 22 certain NGOs or individual campaigners.
- As I talk about in the submission, if you compare what happened to Heather Brooke, who, as an individual
- 25 campaigner, spent several years trying to reveal the
 - Page 14

- 1 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's who has the megaphone, isn
- 2 it
- 3 MR HEAWOOD: Well, the Telegraph on that occasion had the
- 4 megaphone and was able --
- 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand, but Ms Brooks didn't,
- 6 and it works in two ways. It's not merely the ability
- 7 to pick up a story and run with it; it's also the
- 8 ability to drop a story. One of the points that has
- 9 been made is: who is checking up on the press
- themselves, if not the press? The press hold us all to account, whether we be politicians or businesses or
- 12 judges. The court of public opinion is there for the
- judges. The court of puene opinion is there for the
- press to put our behaviour in front of them. But who
- does it for them? Who looks at the press?
- 15 MR HEAWOOD: I agree, and clearly that's the topic of the
- 16 Inquiry, and I think it's worth remarking that if you
- look at parliamentary journalism, if you think about
- speaking truth to power and you think about where power
- is actually held and exercised in this country -- one
- would hope it would be by Parliament. It's democratic
- seats. Parliamentary coverage has fallen by about
- 22 95 per cent in the mainstream press from the second half
- of the 20th century to today. We've gone from 10,000
- words a day in the Times and the Guardian down to about
- 25 500 on a good day. So I think the press is, in all

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

10

sorts of respects, failing to fulfil that consistent role of speaking truth to power.

But I think it comes back to my original point, that it's important to get the law right. We want the individual campaigner to be able to be confident that they can pursue that story. We want the press to be aware that if they choose not to pursue a story or they pursue a story in a way which we are unhappy with as a society and we want legal redress against that, that that redress will be forthcoming.

One of the huge problems in this instance is actually the pocket, the depth of the pocket. It's not simply that the Telegraph can in some way bully government. The Telegraph is still -- you know, they largely follow the laws of the land. I have no objection to the Telegraph. But they have a much deeper pocket than an individual campaigner, and lawyers have similarly hungry pockets for what newspapers can provide.

So I think there is a real problem here with legal costs as well. I think, you know, there's a lot in this Inquiry of seeking to hold journalists to account. It would be interesting to hold lawyers and the legal industry to account as well. I mean, research in libel has shown that the average cost of a libel trial in this Page 17

costs are just enormous, not just for individuals, and

- 2 they are frightening and they are chilling, to use the
 - free expression sense of the term, for individuals and
- 4 for small publications as well, and there is another --
- 5 there is a more editorial argument, which is the

6 pick-up, that when a story is run by a mainstream media 7

organisation, it is deemed by broadcasters and others to

8 have an imprimatur.

> Finally in this area of weakness -- it is a statement that I used at the seminar back in October and it's one I've used in various newspaper commentaries since, and I was pleased that it was taken up by the Times in a leader article a week or so ago -- I would simply emphasise again that if you look back at the main news stories of the past decade, and you can take your pick, but whether it is issues such as weapons of mass destruction, whether it is the failings of the banks and whatever, just simply ask yourself -- and I think it's absolutely crucial to this Inquiry: did the media find out too much of what was going on or too little?

We're not here to hold a candle for the media. What we do -- what I personally and what my organisation fundamentally worries about, however, is that any misplaced increase in restrictions on the media will limit the public's right to know. That is a far bigger Page 19

jurisdiction is 140 times greater than the average cost 1

2 across the EU.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

6

9

3 So I think there are some real issues here about 4 access to justice on the part of the individual. 5

MR JAY: Mr Heawood, we're going to come to this. Let me

just pick out one theme. You talk about empowerment of

7 the individual. You also say, in the penultimate

8 paragraph, 53718, that the press has a voice which is

collectively more powerful than the sum of its readers

10 or users. Might it be said that that is an argument for

the need to regulate the press more, owing to its power? 11

12 MR HEAWOOD: Not necessarily, because I think as I say, one

13 of the reasons for that power is also to do with

14 financial resources, in the same way that companies are

15 more powerful than their individual shareholders or

16 customers. It's not necessarily a desirable property of

17 the press; it's a reality.

18 Q. Okay. I think you --

19 MR KAMPFNER: Sorry, I wanted to come in on a couple of

20 points. Obviously if you take Jonathan's example of

Heather Brooke and MPs' expenses and the Telegraph, 21

22 there were two areas that militated against the

23 individual and worked for the news organisation. One is

Page 18

24 the law. As Jonathan has alluded to and as to be

25 developed later, libel and other legal areas and legal 5

question than whether or not a particular newspaper can do this or that.

3 Q. May I touch on the issue of risk aversion, 54662. If 4 I can just summarise the points you make and then ask

you to comment. You rightly say that investigative

6 journalism is expensive and the returns, if any, may be

7 long-term. There is a need for a vigorous press, what

8 you say or you call a freedom to engage in robust or 9 even grubby comment. Matters of taste must not be

regulated.

11 I think the question is: does that not create a risk 12 of collateral damage?

13 MR KAMPFNER: Well, part of the answer to that question will

14 come in, I would imagine, the more specific comments

15 about regulation and what I would term to be the need

16 for better regulation. We contend that there are

17 already a plethora of laws that, legitimately or

18 otherwise, already curtail the right to investigate and

19 in some cases even the right to express, but the --

20 sorry, I've lost my thread.

21 O. It's the risk of collateral damage.

22 MR KAMPFNER: Yes. There will always be -- there is no such

23 thing as the perfect system. There is no such thing as

24 perfect regulation, which does not mean that we, and

25 you, sir, should not be straining every sinew to find Page 20

are a means for us to try to create a society that

2 2 enables all of us to be equal, to enjoy our dignity and saying, "Oh yes, there will always be victims and that's 3 3 a price to pay." No, because for every individual who our freedoms. 4 4 is wrongfully traduced, whose life is made a misery, I think the way that the privacy law has developed, 5 5 that is an individual tragedy. But if we get regulation where the court seems to see it as a conflict between 6 stronger, details to be discussed, if the 6 rights, is rather problematic. I think to a large 7 7 extent the rights are complimentary. Without a private already-existing strong and copious laws were better 8 8 sphere, it's very hard to enjoy a public sphere in which enforced, which in many cases they are not now, and 9 9 we can express ourselves and speak truth to power and if -- an area I'd like to focus a bit upon at some 10 10 point -- we can improve on editorial lines of vice versa, so I certainly don't want to answer the 11 11 question by suggesting that one right is more important accountability, responsibility and corporate governance, 12 12 then I think you have the building blocks in place. than the other. 13 That will never prevent wrongful things happening --13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But inevitably the courts are going 14 that is both the nature of journalism, as the first 14 to have to balance those two. One could take any of 15 draft, and it's also the nature of human error, and in 15 these privacy cases that have been fought through the 16 some cases bad behaviour -- but you will have a system 16 courts and the court is trying to balance freedom of 17 17 expression on the one hand, the right of the press on that does not chill free speech, but at the same time 18 does make a requirement of looking always at your own 18 the one hand, against the individual rights of the 19 19 person who is complaining about their infringement. standards and your own behaviour as you go along. 20 Q. Mr Heawood, do you wish to add to that point? 20 MR HEAWOOD: I think if you look at it in the same way that 21 MR HEAWOOD: Well, I think I'm broadly in agreement, but 21 any other civil tort is brought to court. I mean, it's 22 I think the words "collateral damage" suggests a kind of 22 required of the claimant to show that some harm, some 23 negligence attitude and I think neither of us is here to 23 real harm has taken place. I think if we inherit what 24 24 we've developed in libel law over the last 800 years, suggest that the press should be negligent in any way. 25 But I think the point is that one would rather live in 25 where we have a reverse burden of proof and we don't Page 21 Page 23 a perhaps slightly too noisy, open society than in expect the claimant to show harm -- I mean, in the libel 1 1 2 2 a slightly too quiet and overly restricted and overly reform campaign we press very hard that there needs to 3 3 be serious and substantial harm for a libel action to be regulated society. 4 Q. Can I ask you this: is it your position that the 4 brought, and I guess we do begin then by asking the 5 starting point, or perhaps the primary right is the 5 claimant in a privacy case, for instance, to show that 6 6 right of free speech, however you wish to articulate it, some real harm has taken place or conceivably will take 7 Article 10 of the Convention, and therefore you need to 7 place as a result of publication. 8 find a justification or reason for curtailing or curbing 8 To that extent, I suppose, you are then presuming --9 9 that right, rather than the other way around, that the you know, free speech is the presumptive right, and then 10 10 primary right may be the private rights of individuals if that harm is established, then you may want to ask 11 and you need to find a reason or justification for 11 the defendant in such a case --12 departing from that right? Do you start from free 12 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I asked the question because that 13 13 rather answers Mr Jay's. But let me give an example. speech, each of you, and then are look for an exception, 14 14 or do you start from a different position? Can I ask One of the people who gave evidence, JK Rowling, a very 15 you first, Mr Heawood? 15 successful authoress, but who wishes not to be in the 16 MR HEAWOOD: Yeah. I think ultimately these are both right, 16 public limelight. She says she writes books. She doesn't want her family photographed. She doesn't want 17 17 and one thing the court may want to look at is the 18 18 ultimate objective of the whole rights portfolio. This to be doorstepped. She doesn't want any of this. 19 19 When you come to describe "serious or substantial is not simply about one right trumping the other. The 20 reason we have a framework of rights and we have, you 20 harm", it might be argued: well, what is the harm?

before the law.

know, 30 articles in total, is to achieve something

equivalent to human dignity, human flourishing, equality

So I think in a way it's not really about one right

being more or less important than another. The rights

Page 22

21

22

23

24

25

1

it. I don't want to put myself in the position of

21

22

23

24

25

success.

People are very interested in her because of her

MR HEAWOOD: I think there are two things here which are

becoming confused, which is the harm of a publication in

a newspaper, which may be the result of a story that has

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

JK Rowling and has chosen to give that story to the
newspaper -- now, that may be morally objectionable, but
unless some real harm is consequent upon it, it seems
problematic to make it illegal.
On the other hand, if you're talking about real
intrusion and somebody actually, as we heard from
JK Rowling, somehow invading her daughter's private
space and putting a note in her daughter's school bag,

been generated by someone who has some connection with

1

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

space and putting a note in her daughter's school bag, or the doorstepping or the long lenses through the window, I think there's a very different wrong that's taking place that has very little to do with Article 10 rights at all. It's about -- it's a form of trespass or

rights at all. It's about -- it's a form of trespass or
a form of intrusion, which I think the law could look at
very severely.

MR KAMPFNER: To answer your Article 10 question, I think
 I would take a more emphatic position. We, as an
 organisation representing freedom of expression in the
 UK and around the world, do regard Article 10 rights as
 fundamental to democracy.
 Where they are impinged upon, where they are

Where they are impinged upon, where they are restricted as necessarily they may be, whether it is shouting "fire" in a crowded theatre, whether it is specific areas of official secrets or operations where there -- we would like there to be public interest

Page 25

defences in some the laws where there are none, where there are competing rights and Article 8 rights as determined by judges -- and we think they should be determined by judges and judges alone -- then they will come up against those competing rights, but we do start from a straightforward Article 10 position.

Jonathan has spoken about JK Rowling. I'd also mention one of the other witnesses who gave you very telling and vivid testimony. When Sienna Miller -- and correct me if I have my facts wrong -- was talking about how the paparazzi were hammering on her windscreen trying to evoke any kind of reaction so they could then snap that less than flattering picture, it's our contention -- not only is that reprehensible behaviour -- and I'd like to come, at the appropriate time, to issues around the progeny of stories, editorial processes and editorial management, and that includes freelancers as well -- but that is covered in the existing law. Were it to be properly enforced, laws on harassment, that kind of behaviour, it may not be preventable in the first instinct, but it sure as anything is, if this is the right term, dealable with regards. MR JAY: You say it's an actionable tort, the tort of harassment and trespass?

Page 26

1 MR KAMPFNER: Yes.

Q. Public interest, please, I can pick up that theme next.
 It's 54664, 53719. I'm going to deal, Mr Heawood, with your points first, 53719.

You make a number of points, but one of them is that public interest should, you say, be a partial defence to otherwise unlawful activity. May I ask you to develop that point, please? Are you saying, for example, in relation to RIPA 2000, interception of communications, that there should be a public interest defence in this context?

MR HEAWOOD: Yes, I think -- and this was in response to a question that Lord Justice Leveson set before the Christmas break. He asked: should it be a complete or partial defence? I'm being quite specific: it should be a partial defence. It's not an absolute get-out-of-jail card. You can't simply wave the public interest card and that's end of story.

I think, as I say in the submission, the nature of the public interest defence will be different in different areas of law. I'm not convinced that you can have a blanket public interest exemption. But I think if you begin from the starting point that the public interest is something along the lines of a publication that actually enhances the ability of the public, in Page 27

1 whole or in part, to play a part in the life of their

society, to understand their society -- and that may be slightly different from the PCC code, for instance. I'm

slightly different from the PCC code, for instance. I'
 not convinced about -- that simply the revelation of

5 hypocrisy is a sufficient definition of "public

6 interest". That seems to open the door to a whole

swathe of publications which don't in any way contribute
to that public interest in the outcome of a story. The
public may be interested as observers, but they don't

have an interest in that more narrow sense.

So I think it is possible to define the public interest. I think what you then have to look at in some cases is the good faith of the journalist and whether they acted with the public interest whole-heartedly in mind or are using it as an excuse for something.

instance, a libel publication is very different from the nature of public interest in, for instance, a breach of the Official Secrets Act. It may not be enough for someone to breach the Official Secrets Act in good faith. Their faith may be very, very, very faulty. You

I think the nature of public interest in, for

22 may want an objective test. The court may want to come

to a decision whether or not it was in the public
 interest for that particular revelation to come out, but

25 I think in different areas of law such as libel, it may Page 28

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1 be what's called a subjective test, where the court
- 2 simply needs to be persuaded that the journalist or
- 3 other publisher acted really with a conviction that it
- 4 was in the public interest for that publication to be
- 5 made. But I think it has to be a narrow definition, and
- 6 on the basis that it's a defence against, as I said
- 7 before, a real tort, that real harm has to have been
- 8 shown.
- 9 Q. Yes, you have a test, as you explained to us, of serious
- 10 and substantial harm, which is a threshold both
- 11 presumably for libel and for privacy, and unless you
- 12 surmount that threshold, one doesn't get into any of the
- 13 consequential balancing arguments.
- 14 MR HEAWOOD: Quite. You don't get off the starting blocks.
- Q. Yes. Fair enough. You also, Mr Heawood, draw our 15
- 16 attention to very definitions of the public interest in
- 17 the middle of page 53720, which we can note.
- 18 MR HEAWOOD: Yes.
- 19 Q. Mr Kampfner, you approach this from a similar angle but
- 20 make different points, 54664. I think it may be said
- 21 that you pose two questions, which you answer. The
- 22 first is: is the problem located in the failure to
- 23 enforce existing laws which are perfectly adequate?
- 24 MR KAMPFNER: The short answer is: yes.
- Q. The second question: in any event, is uncertainty Page 29

- of thing.
- 2 But I would throw it slightly on its head and say in 3 those various laws where -- I mean, I've written a lot 4 about what I regard as an absence of civil liberties in 5 this country which permeates very deeply into a very 6 secretive Whitehall mindset. There is a suspicion 7 invariably of information and there is almost a -- built 8 into the walls, there is a determination to keep as much

information out of the public domain as possible.

One example: when I was editing the New Statesman, we had a very strong story given to us by a whistle-blower in the Foreign Office. We were taken to the official secrets -- we were slapped with an official secrets case, my magazine and the whistle-blower -- interestingly not me myself. It's interesting how, in all these issues, whether it's official secrets or libel, they can pick and choose who they go for at individual times. And it was thrown out on the first day, I'm pleased to say, at the Bailey, because this was a straightforward case of trying to silence a publication in order to save the bacon of a cabinet minister. It's all in the public record.

And there is often a presumption -- one can get into the wrongful or misguided error of always thinking it's the media that is doing too much. I repeat my statement Page 31

- 1 created by the open-textured nature of the public
- 2 interest defence in libel and privacy?
- 3 MR KAMPFNER: Well, the current public interest test,
- 4 insofar as it exists in libel, namely the Reynolds
- 5 defence, we have contended right from the outset, and
- 6 I'm pleased to say I think this seems to now have broad
- 7 consensus in the originals of the draft bill and in the
- 8 joint committee's response to the draft bill and
- 9 hopefully in the final bill soon to be published. We
- 10 think the Reynolds defence is not remotely a strong
- 11 enough public interest defence and a defence of
- 12 responsible journalism.
- 13 So there isn't, in many cases and in other torts, in 14 our view, a strong enough defence of public interest 15 journalism recognised in courts, and as written in our
- 16 submission, it doesn't exist in a series of laws
- 17 where -- I completely agree with Jonathan -- it is 18 a qualified defence. It cannot be an absolute defence.
- 19 You couldn't say, "The fact that we revealed, in a war
- 20 situation, you know -- two hours before troops were
- 21 being sent in a particular place, we revealed that they
- 22 were going to invade this part of a particular country;
- 23 that was a public interest defence." I think any such
- 24 defence would be seen as insufficient where it came to
- 25 endangering life or dealing in operations or that kind Page 30

- 1 of earlier, that in so, so many areas it is extremely
- 2 difficult for the media, faced with a wall of laws and
- 3 other restrictions, to find out otherwise legitimate
- 4 information.
- Q. Can I deal with practical solutions to address the 6 question of uncertainty in the context of public
- 7 interest. It may be a constitutional solution as well.
- 8 Is it a possible solution, you think, for Parliament
- 9 to set out in a statute the broad parameters of what
- 10 public interest might mean and then leave it to
- 11 a regulator to give flesh to those factors in individual
- 12 cases, or would you say it's desirable for the existing
- 13 or a new press regulator to seek to tabulate all
- 14 relevant public interest considerations, perhaps
- 15 depending on the context, as Mr Heawood as said, so that
- 16 we have almost a code book which can then be applied in
- 17 individual cases? How do you see it, Mr Heawood?
- MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure that I've come to a final position 18
- 19 on that. It's a debate that's going on at the moment.
- 20 English PEN, Index, the Media Standards Trust and others
- 21 are very interested in exactly that question.
- 22 I think I tend towards the second route that you
- 23 outlined. I'm not sure that as a single piece of
- 24 statute would do enough. I think it potentially could
 - cause further confusion because, as I said, the nature

Page 32

1 of public interest in different areas of publication is 1 stifling a significant amount of investigative 2 2 so different. So I think a code book that perhaps at iournalism. 3 least gathered together the different areas and the 3 Could I seek to put the point in this way, perhaps: 4 4 that particularly in privacy cases, genie out of the different requirements that might be relevant would be 5 of more value. 5 bottle argument, the harm is done, one could say prior 6 Q. What do you think, Mr Kampfner? 6 notification should be the general rule, but that would 7 7 always leave open the possibility for exceptions. One MR KAMPFNER: I would be strongly worried about the first 8 such exemption might be precisely the sort of case proposition. After all, it is the same Parliament that 8 9 9 you're addressing at the bottom of 54668, where there's keeled over at the first sign of trouble when it came to 10 10 concern that an injunction would be improperly gained on the superinjunction and Trafigura. Parliament's 11 11 commitment to -- and the same Parliament that tried to imperfect information, causing lasting harm. Would you 12 get -- to change freedom of information to prevent the 12 agree with that formulation? 13 exposure of MPs' expenses -- the default position, while 13 MR KAMPFNER: Yes, I would. I would also point you back to 14 there are many, many honourable exceptions who we work 14 Ian Hislop's testimony of a week or two ago, where he 15 with and who we respect, and while we completely 15 talked about injunctions simply being used to stop 16 understand the competing pressures, the record of 16 coverage in perpetuity of issues. 17 17 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's a slightly different point, Parliament in navigating a course towards better 18 accountability and better transparency is very poor 18 though, isn't it, because that goes to the speed and 19 efficacy of a remedy, which I've been trying to address 19 indeed. 20 Q. Fair enough. The next theme is privacy, 54667. At 20 with a number of people, as I'm sure you're aware. What 21 21 I think we're focusing on at the moment is the 54669 -- well, let me go over the points you make, 22 Mr Kampfner, at 54667 first. 22 substantive position. How you then solve a problem and 23 The first point you make is that you feel that 23 how you cope with trying to resolve the issue between 24 24 the two competing parties and the speed that you can do Article 8 of the Convention has been overinterpreted, is 25 25 that right, to yield a chilling effect? that is a slightly separate point, but there is Page 33 Page 35 a fundamental issue, isn't there, namely whether it is MR KAMPFNER: It has been, from time to time, a bit like 1 1 2 Churchill and democracy. I can't think of a better way ever right to permit a story to be published without 3 3 of dealing with the issue than leaving it to the giving a right of reply -- and I understand your answer 4 discretion of judges, and as with any judgment, one can 4 to that, or prior notification -- and if it isn't, then 5 always argue the toss and agree or disagree with those 5 how you couch the way in which you put the requirement 6 final decisions. 6 to ensure that sensible decisions are made in individual 7 We do -- I think the -- some of the main problems 7 cases which are then testable quickly. But the 8 arose from the Fontaniva(?) case, where it was --8 "quickly" bit is a slightly separate point, isn't it? 9 9 broadly, the continental view of privacy, which is MR KAMPFNER: Point absolutely taken, sir. I mean, what I 10 pretty much everything is private unless we seek to make 10 would say -- two things. One is a practical, one is a 11 it otherwise, began to seep in from that judgment, which 11 broad one. There is already, correct me if I'm wrong, 12 we regarded as wrong and dangerous. 12 an assumption of a requirement in good journalism to 13 13 However, subsequently, in any of the many cases test your story or test your supposition against the 14 involving footballers or others in the public eye, these 14 person about whom you are writing in any Reynolds 15 are difficult issues and there does need to be a public 15 defence, which is broader than simply in cases of libel. 16 16 It is obviously good journalism, if I'm writing about interest -- a strong public interest defence. One could 17 17 literally go case by case through them and say: yes, no, someone, to get their point of view before you write it. 18 18 But there may well be cases when, for absolutely yes, no or possibly. 19 19 We would very much assume a public interest unless legitimate journalistic reasons, you cannot and should 20 20 not do that. If you're exposing corruption and you know there is a convincing argument that there isn't, and 21 certainly the public realm is a public place. 21 they are going to slap a story -- I mean, what sometimes 22 22 Q. Yes. Thank you. That moves to the next point, happened in politics -- and again, it may not happen 23 Mr Kampfner. Prior notification, bottom of 54668. You 23 now, I'm not qualified to judge -- was you go back to 24 address Mr Mosley's evidence and make the point that in 24 a spin doctor or a minister and say, "I understand this 25 your view prior notification could lead to injunctions 25 and this and this is happening", and they'll just go and

Page 34

1 give the story to a rival just to spike your gun. So 1 issue about these various speech laws in general, 2 there were often non-legal but editorial reasons for not 2 whether it's libel or privacy, that we seem to treat the 3 3 doing that. harm that is done so much more seriously than we do the 4 4 harm of someone losing a limb. Personal injury cases, But on prior notification, we just took, as did the 5 British government, an absolutely strong view in 5 the redress that's available to someone who may b 6 Strasbourg that prior notification is deeply as 6 permanently incapacitated is often rather less than the 7 7 enshrined in statute -- and thankfully the European redress that we seem to be thinking should be available 8 8 Court agreed with us. And they didn't just agree with to people whose --9 us; they agreed with us vehemently. Their judgment was 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I don't think the privacy awards have 10 10 unequivocal on that. matched the type of sums that we've been reading about 11 in the press recently agreed. Those agreements might be 11 You just need to read, as we have written, 12 12 a number -- those countries that currently require prior for all sorts of reasons. If you want to debate the 13 13 notification in statute: Albania, Azerbaijan, Latvia, size of awards in personal injury cases, that's 14 Lithiania, Moldova, Poland, Russia and Ukraine. These 14 something which I'm very happy to talk about, but I'm 15 are not paragons of free expression. 15 not sure how helpful it is, because there are different 16 MR JAY: Yes, but is that a fair argument? There may be 16 features that come into play. 17 other problems with their press regulation systems --17 MR HEAWOOD: I take the point, but I think taken as a whole, 18 MR KAMPFNER: Many indeed, yes. No, but I think by way of 18 the cost of defending a libel or defending an 19 19 injunction -- an application for an injunction is so example, at least in part --20 Q. You say the United Kingdom shouldn't be added to that 20 great that it does have a potentially chilling effect, 21 21 which we make talk about when we talk about costs. 22 Mr Heawood, do you have a separate angle on prior 22 MR JAY: Before I deal with the issue --LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Part of it, then -- both of you, it's 23 notification or do you endorse what we've just heard? 23 24 24 MR HEAWOOD: Yeah, I completely endorse those points. not so much the substantive law that you challenge, 25 I think, just to add a sentence to the point about 25 although in some regards you do; it's the ability to get Page 37 Page 39 accuracy. I think in a libel case the wrong is that the a remedy and the cost of sorting it out? 1 1 2 2 MR HEAWOOD: In part, but I think also to clarify, in libel information is false and damaging. In a privacy case, 3 3 prior notification isn't an absolute requirement. It we're simply talking about an unjustified intrusion into 4 someone's private, virtual or physical space. In libel, 4 may be a requirement as part of a series of hurdles in 5 if you're talking fundamentally about accuracy, then 5 the Reynolds defence on a public interest issue, where 6 there may be a greater responsibility on the journalist 6 a libel -- a publication may be largely accurate but 7 to check out the accuracy of the story and therefore the 7 there is some inaccuracy in the mix. I think what 8 Reynolds steps, as they currently exist, do require 8 Max Mosley and others have called for is an absolute 9 9 journalist to notify the subject of the story in requirement for privacy, which I think is problematic. 10 advance. 10 MR JAY: We understand a possible room for a more nuanced 11 I think in privacy, if for some reason it's 11 position, that there's a general rule with exception to 12 absolutely clear that the information is accurate, 12 that rule. 13 13 I think it is worrying to then impose this prior MR HEAWOOD: Potentially, and that may be slightly more 14 notification requirement because you are essentially 14 desirable if it was written into code rather than into 15 asking the subject to snap an injunction on publication. 15 statute. 16 Q. Isn't that slightly anomalous, though, that in libel the 16 MR KAMPFNER: And again, it would come into the points I'd 17 17 wrong, if there is a wrong, can be corrected by a public like to make at the appropriate time on editor 18 announcement of the court and a payment of damages and 18 management and corporate governance. 19 19 the public understands that a wrong has been righted, MR JAY: We're soon going to come to those points, but just 20 but in privacy, the complaint, of course, can be 20 an insight, Mr Kampfner, that the two international 21 21 100 per cent accurate, but the damage, the intrusion of European examples you provide us with, 54672, the French 22 privacy, is permanent, which is an argument, of course, 22 privacy example and then the Hungarian experience -- can 23 in favour of prior notification. Is that not a possible 23 we try and summarise the position thus in relation to 24 analysis? 24 France, because you're the first witness, I think, who's MR HEAWOOD: It is, but it seems to bring up a rather odd 25 given us an insight into this. Under article 9 of the

Page 38

1 Civil Code, which was introduced by amendment in 1970, 1 and other courts are being similarly deprived of their 2 there is a general right to privacy. That's just one 2 independence -- some of the -- many of the provisions in 3 sentence in the code and the courts have interpreted 3 the media law are seemingly innocuous and mainstream. 4 4 that, particularly the higher courts in France, quite Co-regulation, licensing, fining, et cetera. If you 5 restrictively. You require a good and solid 5 looked at them on a piece of paper, a lot of these laws, 6 justification to breach that right and you give us an 6 you would say, "What's the problem with that?" Several 7 7 witnesses have come to this Inquiry and advocated example of the Meteron(?) secret diaries case; is that 8 8 correct? similar such measures, and of course the British 9 MR KAMPFNER: Correct, sir. It is within the same --9 heritage and British jurisdiction is different, but it 10 10 originally, citing Article 8, in other words the same is a case of "be careful what you wish for" because this 11 11 has led to owners -- because they are part of this body of law that operates now in the British 12 jurisdiction. However, the codification into the French 12 internal coregulation under statute provision, they're 13 constitution as a constitutional right gives it further 13 frightened stiff of any form of journalism that would 14 strength. It is a very -- which partly goes to the 14 lead the new adjudicator to deem them not to be fit and 15 15 proper, and we have cases -- and we can bring you more, French approach to privacy and the private life, but it 16 is a broader one about the ownership of the public space 16 as any other organisation in this field can -- of 17 and the ownership of image. 17 self-censorship and of outright censorship, even in the 18 Here is an example: a French TV crew wanting to do 18 12 months that this law has been in existence. 19 a GV, a generally view shot of a beach, talking about 19 Q. Thank you. I'm going to move on now to the issue of 20 exceptional weather at a particular time, cannot 20 regulation, which subdivides internal and then external 21 21 regulation. Mr Heawood first. This is 53772, internal identify a single person on the beach because each 22 person lying on the beach owns their only image and 22 regulation. 23 could sue, and so therefore pictures are blurred. It is 23 The basic themes may be these: the need for clear 24 24 an absolute view. It is sort of the Hanover decision on lines of responsibility, the need for audit trails and the need for sound governance. Mr Heawood, in your own 25 25 speed. It is absolutely a view that the public realm is Page 41 Page 43 private unless any individual wishes their movement in words, how would you develop those issues? What are you 1 1 2 2 the public realm to be identified and commented upon. looking for, please? 3 It's, in our view, an unhappy place to be. 3 MR HEAWOOD: I think those are points that are taken from 4 Q. Conceptually? 4 the Index on Censorship submission. I'm happy to expand 5 MR KAMPFNER: Yes. In many cases, French beaches are very 5 on those. I think one of the greatest innovations that 6 happy places to be. 6 we currently have in the press is the internal 7 Q. The Hungarian example -- can we deal with this shortly 7 ombudsman, the readers' editor, which the Guardian and 8 because we won't, with respect to Hungary, necessarily 8 the Observer have blazed a trail in appointing, but it's 9 be looking for detailed lessons from Hungary, but the 9 an internationally recognised model, and I would 10 10 problem, as you see it, Mr Kampfner? certainly be interested in a regulator which obliged 11 MR KAMPFNER: I would also, Mr Jay, say that Hungary isn't 11 members of that regulator to have an internal ombudsman 12 a far flung place about which we know little and care 12 as a first port of call. I think the vast majority of 13 even less. It is now an integral member of the European 13 complaints can be resolved very quickly and effectively 14 Union, the European Commission and the European 14 if there is someone inside the newspaper who is able to 15 Parliament. The European Parliament, along with the 15 resolve complaints but is editorially and commercially 16 White House, the OSCE and pretty much every 16 independent, and I think that independence is something 17 UN commission under human rights -- pretty much everyone 17 to be cherished. It's unusual at the Guardian and the 18 condemned or criticised the media law both in its 18 Observer because of the nature of their ownership by the 19 substance and its tone, and the European Commission was 19 Scott Trust, but I certainly see no reason why other 20 -- got one or two minor changes but was pretty powerless 20 newspapers couldn't be obliged to have a similar 21 21 function in-house. 22 The points where I think it is salient for this 22 Q. Thank you. Mr Kampfner? 23 Inquiry to remember is that while the prime minister of 23 MR KAMPFNER: I completely endorse that point. 24 Hungary, Viktor Orban, seems to have some difficulties 24 More broadly, we see a strong independent framework 25

with democracy at the moment -- the constitutional court

Page 42

25

of self-regulation where the regulator does the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 complaint mediation work that it does now, that it 2 strongly facilitates ADR in -- alternative dispute 3 resolution in its many manifestations -- and I think 4 that's a very important carrot to membership, that where 5 you are a member, you will have the facilities and the 6 means -- it's not the only means, but very good means --7 to seek resolution where resolution is required. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The regulator should have a very strong standards arm to it, where it should be seen to be at one arm removed but at the same time consistently to be looking at the standards of newspaper behaviour, twice yearly meetings with editors and others important in that media organisation.

So we see a strong regulator -- the code needs some tweaking, but it's fundamentally a good code. We think there should be far stronger lines between the funding arm of the regulator and its operations. We -- it's my view that serving editors -- even if they recuse themselves from individual decisions, I just think it diminishes from the sense of transparency and of disinterest in outcomes, and so serving editors should not be part of that, but --LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: It undermines the trust of those who 23 might complain.

25 MR KAMPFNER: Correct. You do, however, because of the Page 45

back, get stronger information, come back."

So the story -- fast-forward. The story is strong, the news editor is prepared to back it. The news editor talks to the editor with the reporter present, really cross-questions the reporter. "Are you sure about it", et cetera. So you get to a point where the editor is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt. He or she is going to take a risk on this story, a reputational risk on this story.

That editor should then go to the managing editor, or their publisher if it's a magazine, and say, "I'm not going to give you the details because it's my responsibility but I'm going to sanction an operation, to coin a phrase, in which we're going to use potentially the following methods to get a story which we're strongly of the view is in the public interest."

Another conversation: "Are you sure, are you sure", et cetera. You have that conversation, and the managing editor says, "Fine, it's your call, completely support what you're doing. Go ahead with that."

The story may come to nothing. The story may be a fabulous story, and so the concerns fall away because of the public interest test, or it may go badly wrong and there are then problems then ensue.

The quarterly board meetings of the news Page 47

fast-changing nature of the media, particularly now in 1 2 the digital age, you do need -- I think if you're 3 a former editor 20 years ago, you're probably not in 4 touch with the immediacy and the changes that are 5 happening exponentially in the news media and 6 particularly the challenges of the Internet newspapers. 7 If we think it's bad now, newspapers used to wait until 8 the following morning to put something out. Now they 9 put it out at 4 o'clock in the afternoon or whenever 10 they get it, so the challenges are greater than they

> One area I would like to stress -- and I hope this is the right place to do so -- is editorial management, corporate responsibility, corporate governance. Just imagine the following scenario: a reporter on the news desk has got wind of a very good story, talks to the news editor about it. It will involve, perhaps, any of the areas we highlight: phone hacking, paying sources for information, stealing documents, forging documents, impersonation, blagging, secret recording, secret filming, et cetera. It could potentially involve any of those. So in other words, we're in difficult terrain. The news editor has a private conversation, thinks:

were. "Well, actually this is pretty flaky. Who is your source? This may just be somebody with a grievance. Gol 25 Page 46

organisation could and should have an agenda item on standards and practices: "So, in the last quarter, how many potentially underhand operations did you do?" "Well, we did eight." "Okay, don't tell us the details. We don't need to join those two sets of dots. How did they go? Were you satisfied with the process?"

to discuss -- again, without joining the dots, without compromising sources -- and you have a robust internal mechanism that ultimately comes down to the directors of that news organisation. There is a massive self-interest for them, as News International and News Corporation directors are now finding to their cost. Where you don't apply procedure editorial standards -the "I was in Tuscany" excuse, "I didn't know about it, I didn't know who the bloke in the dirty mac in the corner was", is just no excuse.

And then you add into that a role for the regulator

The buck does stop with the editor and not knowing is not an excuse and it's an issue of corporate self-interest to make sure that procedures are good. But where done properly, this will not in any way chill free speech. I think it will be great for newspapers to say, "We did 37 investigations last year. They involved the following methods, and we're proud of each and every one of them."

1	I think that will be greatly enhancing for a news	1	problem of some publishers who choose not to opt in, but
2	organisation.	2	are still subject to the law of the land this is why
3	Q. Mr Heawood, I imagine you endorse all of that?	3	I reiterate that it's crucial to get the law of the land
4	MR HEAWOOD: Yes, nothing to add to that.	4	right and to facillitate access to justice. I think
5	Q. Just picking up a number of themes from Mr Kampfner's	5	ultimately that's preferable and then to be a member and
6	submission on external regulation. First, you say that	6	subscriber to that code becomes a badge of honour for
7	the regulator should be an authority on the big issues	7	the publications which are involved and you may wish to
8	of the day. What do you mean by that?	8	incentivise membership in various ways and compliance
9	MR KAMPFNER: Where there we're constantly, in the media,	9	with the code may, as now, be recognised by the courts
10	in the broader sense of media, coming up against all	10	as one of the incentives for membership and compliance.
11	these dilemmas of data, of the other sense of privacy,	11	I may have missed something but I haven't yet seen
12	which is corporations and search engines and others, and	12	a model which somehow charts a magical course between
13	ISPs holding information about individuals, the	13	those routes and somehow manages to get the best of
14	Wikileaks case. All kinds of issues flying around. The	14	both. I'm not sure that it exists.
15	regulator/ombudsman should be somebody who has a voice	15	MR BARR: Before I suggest such a model, Mr Kampfner, are
16	and who helps who contributes to the public discourse	16	you broadly in agreement with what you've just heard?
17	on really thorny issues.	17	MR KAMPFNER: We see no need in a robust environment for any
18	Q. May I move to a related matter, the issue of statutory	18	statutory element to regulation, where there is, as I've
19	regulation, which I know, Mr Kampfner, you oppose, and	19	outlined, I hope, strong editorial practice, where there
20	is this right, Mr Heawood, you adopt a similar position	20	is a good code and there is robust self-regulation as
21	on? Or position to?	21	set out in this form or in variance of that. We believe
22	MR HEAWOOD: Yes, yes, very clear position. Clearly opposed	22	that that will suffice in improving standards.
23	to statutory regulation.	23	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it hasn't to date. One can look
24	I think also thank you this holy grail has	24	at history, as you probably heard me say over the years,
25	appeared of co-regulation, this term which is now used	25	over the weeks
	Page 49		Page 51
1	as if it's a kind of magical third way between the rock	1	MR KAMPENER: It probably feels like years
1 2	as if it's a kind of magical third way between the rock	1 2	MR KAMPFNER: It probably feels like years. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something
2	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and	2	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something
2 3	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far	2 3	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report,
2 3 4	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation,	2 3 4	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We
2 3 4 5	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the	2 3 4 5	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then,
2 3 4 5 6	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert	2 3 4 5 6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do
2 3 4 5 6 7	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of	2 3 4 5 6 7	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why I mean it's a rock and a hard place. I don't think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to regulation around the world. I hope I have pointed out
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why I mean it's a rock and a hard place. I don't think there's a magical way between them. You may ultimately	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to regulation around the world. I hope I have pointed out that we don't lack for laws where it comes to dealing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why I mean it's a rock and a hard place. I don't think there's a magical way between them. You may ultimately have to choose the rock or the hard place, and if the rock is statutory, where you do have that capacity for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to regulation around the world. I hope I have pointed out that we don't lack for laws where it comes to dealing with areas of wrongful behaviour. We have a reasonable
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why I mean it's a rock and a hard place. I don't think there's a magical way between them. You may ultimately have to choose the rock or the hard place, and if the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to regulation around the world. I hope I have pointed out that we don't lack for laws where it comes to dealing with areas of wrongful behaviour. We have a reasonable code. Nobody in their right mind would argue that the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why I mean it's a rock and a hard place. I don't think there's a magical way between them. You may ultimately have to choose the rock or the hard place, and if the rock is statutory, where you do have that capacity for political oversight, and the hard place is self, where	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to regulation around the world. I hope I have pointed out that we don't lack for laws where it comes to dealing with areas of wrongful behaviour. We have a reasonable code. Nobody in their right mind would argue that the PCC, whatever the reasons for that, has not nobody
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why I mean it's a rock and a hard place. I don't think there's a magical way between them. You may ultimately have to choose the rock or the hard place, and if the rock is statutory, where you do have that capacity for political oversight, and the hard place is self, where it is independent but there are flaws with that, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to regulation around the world. I hope I have pointed out that we don't lack for laws where it comes to dealing with areas of wrongful behaviour. We have a reasonable code. Nobody in their right mind would argue that the PCC, whatever the reasons for that, has not nobody could remotely sympathise or even seek to explain its
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why I mean it's a rock and a hard place. I don't think there's a magical way between them. You may ultimately have to choose the rock or the hard place, and if the rock is statutory, where you do have that capacity for political oversight, and the hard place is self, where it is independent but there are flaws with that, I think one would prefer to go down the self-regulatory route,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to regulation around the world. I hope I have pointed out that we don't lack for laws where it comes to dealing with areas of wrongful behaviour. We have a reasonable code. Nobody in their right mind would argue that the PCC, whatever the reasons for that, has not nobody could remotely sympathise or even seek to explain its actions in the early part of the Milly Dowler case, in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and the hard place of statutory or self-regulation, and every example of co-regulation that I've seen so far seems to be a veiled form of statutory regulation, insofar as it usually provides that somewhere in the process an elected politician has the capacity to exert some influence over the decisions or the composition of a press council or a press commission. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But it's not difficult to remove the scope of politicians. It's really a more fundamental question than that which I'd be grateful for your assistance on, which concerns the way in which you ensure that common standards are commonly applied across everyone. MR HEAWOOD: I'm not sure who that "everyone" is. I think this is one of the problems I think this is why I mean it's a rock and a hard place. I don't think there's a magical way between them. You may ultimately have to choose the rock or the hard place, and if the rock is statutory, where you do have that capacity for political oversight, and the hard place is self, where it is independent but there are flaws with that, I think one would prefer to go down the self-regulatory route, where it's essentially an opt-in, contractual model	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There is some calamity, something must be done, there's a commission or a report, recommendations are made. Your predecessors said, "We must be self-regulated and that's the route" and then, two years on, there's something else. Now we must do something no, one last chance, whatever you want to call it, and over the last 20 years there have been examples. I'm very sympathetic to a great deal of what you say, but when you assert, as you say, that that will suffice in improving standards, I'm not sure of your evidence base for that assertion. MR KAMPFNER: I'm not sure I accept what you say, sir, in that it's a prediction more than anything else. The dangers I hope I have given a reasonable fist of drawing upon the dangers of statutory elements to regulation around the world. I hope I have pointed out that we don't lack for laws where it comes to dealing with areas of wrongful behaviour. We have a reasonable code. Nobody in their right mind would argue that the PCC, whatever the reasons for that, has not nobody could remotely sympathise or even seek to explain its actions in the early part of the Milly Dowler case, in the McCanns' case. I was just as touched and horrified

1 first three or four weeks of evidence. 2 But I would simply argue that yes, there have been

many last-chance saloons before, but with the right

4 robust and considerable changes -- I've outlined some

- 5 and you've had many other witnesses who better than me
- 6 have outlined others -- a strong system of
- 7 self-regulation -- you could have the ombudsman or the
- 8 chair of the new regulator reporting to the DCMS Select
- 9 Committee on the -- not on the individual judgments but
- 10 on the general performance mechanisms of the regulator
- 11 once a year. You can have all kinds of areas where, at
- 12 every level, the behaviour, the standards and the
- 13 compliance is rigorously monitored. I just -- and
- 14 I think advocates of freedom of expression, mindful of
- 15 foreign precedents and mindful of the weaknesses of the
- 16 media, would just resist strongly and urge you not to go
- 17 down the statutory route.
- 18 MR JAY: ADR, please, finally. 53722, Mr Heawood. 54675,
- 19 Mr Kampfner.

3

- 20 Mr Heawood, first of all, identify the key features
- 21 of the ADR scheme you have in mind, please.
- 22 MR HEAWOOD: So we're talking about alternative dispute
- 23 resolution. Again, it returns to my central point that
- 24 the underlying law has to be right and it has to be
- 25 accessible. So when you look at libel -- and many of Page 53
 - the cases -- many of the more egregious cases that have
- 2 come up in the course of the Inquiry are actually libel
- 3 cases, although it's not within the terms of reference
- 4 of the Inquiry as such -- what we are very concerned
- 5 about is that libel doesn't currently work for either
- 6 party. It doesn't seem to prevent some of those really
- 7 grotesque attacks on individuals' reputation, but at the
- 8 same time, it is being used very effectively to silence
- 9 all kind of publishers, NGOs, scientists, researchers,
- 10
- academics, book publishers, authors, historians
- 11 et cetera, who don't have the resource to fight those
- 12 13

14

15

16

17

21

24

25

1

So in order to get resolution for both parties we have found, in our research, that mediation is actually phenomenally surprisingly successful in more than 90 per cent of cases where it's been used. Early neutral evaluation has been used less but it does -- in

18 the cases where it has been used, it has been

19 equivalently successful. 20

So what we are recommending through our alternative libel project is that those options should be made not

22 mandatory -- because there are some problems attached to 23

making forms of ADR mandatory and in some cases it may

be inappropriate. The rights and wrongs may be so black

and white that actually it's a waste of people's time to Page 54

- 1 try to find some sort of settlement, but in most cases
- 2 there should be a heavy incentive to go down those
- 3 routes, which would be recognised by the courts in the
- 4 costs awards --
- 5 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Of course there's a snag there that
 - we discussed with Mr Barber, that those of very great
- 7 wealth might be perfectly prepared to use the very
- 8 expensive court route itself to effectively squash the
- 9 expression that you wish to preserve, and if it's
- 10 voluntary, then nothing can be done to stop that.
- 11 MR HEAWOOD: You mean they will refuse to mediate and will
- 12 say, "See you why court"? Well, quite, and this is
- 13 a problem that we have wrestled with considerably, but
- 14 problems have been put to us around Article 6 rights of
- 15 access to justice. If you're suggesting that some
- 16 private body which offers mediation or arbitration
- 17 services could replace the courts --
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, you can't, because of Article 6 18
- MR HEAWOOD: Quite.
- 20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's right. Therefore, if there is
- 21 such a mechanism, it has to be provided by law. Now, it
- 22 might not work and the victims might not like that, but
- 23 it's just the other side of the coin.
- 24 MR HEAWOOD: If I can just make one final point there. To
- 25 that extent, we have then looked down the Tribunal

Page 55

- route. Many people are talking about: can you not have 1
- 2 a libel tribunal, perhaps a broader press tribunal that
- 3 sat within the courts and tribunals service? I think
- 4 unless that tribunal came with quite severe cost capping
- 5 and other ways of limiting the ability for size of
- 6 chequebook to determine the amount of time spent, I'm
- 7 not sure it offers significant advantages, really, over
- 8 the High Court.
- 9 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I understand.
- 10 MR KAMPFNER: We would like, sir, to jointly submit in due
- 11 course the full report that we're doing jointly on
- 12 alternative dispute resolution and currently we expect
- 13 it to be published in March, and we've done a draft of
- 14 it, which I trust you received. We have an advisory
- 15 committee involving a number of lawyers chaired by
- 16 Sir Stephen Sedley, and we hope it will be a valuable
- 17 contribution.
- 18 It's our view that judges could take cognisance of
- 19 the willingness or otherwise of parties to engage in any
- 20 of the several potential fora for -- or mechanisms for
- 21 dispute, but they're not obliged to.
- 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I'll be very interested to see what
- 23 Sir Stephen, who has a great deal of experience in this
- 24 area, and his team have to suggest finally, and of
- 25 course there will be an opportunity for that to be

1 presented and discussed. But once one seeks to permit 2 judges to take account of this feature or that future, 3 there has to be some jurisdictional basis for them so to 4 do. There has to be something that says, "You can take 5 this into account", otherwise judges are acting outwith 6 the law, and whatever we do and however well we do it or 7 we don't do it, we try to do it consistently with our 8 obligations to respect the law, whether it be a statute 9 or common law. 10 MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not 11 already a de facto recognition of some element of 12 prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of 13 meaning? 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's 15 a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen 16 in this particular case. Anyway. 17 MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, 18 Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't 19 covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 20 now to draw to our attentions? 11 sensible libel reform and we are very keen to see that completed. 2 completed. 3 Just one very small point about the chilling effect. 4 Sometimes people talk about the "chilling effect" of law or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary there should be a deterrent. Now, obviously law serves a deterrent purpose but the chilling effect is something quite different. The chilling effect of a bad law or a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The won't commission books or biographies about them bet they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially just to say thank you ve
3 there has to be some jurisdictional basis for them so to 4 do. There has to be something that says, "You can take 5 this into account", otherwise judges are acting outwith 6 the law, and whatever we do and however well we do it or 7 we don't do it, we try to do it consistently with our 8 obligations to respect the law, whether it be a statute 9 or common law. 10 MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not 11 already a de facto recognition of some element of 12 prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of 13 Just one very small point about the chilling effect. 4 Sometimes people talk about the "chilling effect" of law or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary 6 there should be a deterrent. Now, obviously law server, 7 a deterrent purpose but the chilling effect is something 9 quite different. The chilling effect of a bad law or 9 a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that 10 certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel 11 already a de facto recognition of some element of 12 publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The 13 meaning? 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's 14 they're so litigious that they know they might be 15 a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen 16 in this particular case. Anyway. 17 MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, 18 Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't 19 covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 19 or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
do. There has to be something that says, "You can take this into account", otherwise judges are acting outwith the law, and whatever we do and however well we do it or we don't do it, we try to do it consistently with our we don't do it, we try to do it consistently with our and or common law. MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not already a de facto recognition of some element of prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of the course of the decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish in the properties of the something or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary or regulation
this into account", otherwise judges are acting outwith the law, and whatever we do and however well we do it or we don't do it, we try to do it consistently with our or common law. MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not already a de facto recognition of some element of prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of meaning? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't or regulation as if it's desirable, as if it's necessary there should be a deterrent. Now, obviously law servers there should be a deterrent. Now, obviously law servers a deterrent purpose but the chilling effect of a bad law or a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The won't commission books or biographies about them bed they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect of a bad law or a deterrent purpose but the chilling effect of a bad law or a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect on to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
there should be a deterrent. Now, obviously law serves a deterrent purpose but the chilling effect is something obligations to respect the law, whether it be a statute or common law. MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not already a de facto recognition of some element of prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of meaning? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish is a deterrent purpose but the chilling effect is something a deterrent. Now, obviously law serves a deterrent purpose but the chilling effect is something quite different. The chilling effect of a bad law or a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The won't commission books or biographies about them become they so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
we don't do it, we try to do it consistently with our obligations to respect the law, whether it be a statute or common law. MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not already a de facto recognition of some element of prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of meaning? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, MR Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish a deterrent purpose but the chilling effect is something quite different. The chilling effect of a bad law or a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The won't commission books or biographies about them bee they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
8 obligations to respect the law, whether it be a statute 9 or common law. 9 a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that 10 MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not 11 already a de facto recognition of some element of 12 prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of 13 meaning? 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's 15 a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen 16 in this particular case. Anyway. 17 MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, 18 Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't 19 covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 10 quite different. The chilling effect of a bad law or 9 a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that 10 certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel 11 we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of 12 publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The 13 won't commission books or biographies about them become they're so litigious that they know they might be 15 financially destroyed if they did so. 16 So I think we need to very careful about the nature 17 of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is 18 right, that it's accessible either through a regulator 19 or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
or common law. 10 MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not 11 already a de facto recognition of some element of 12 prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of 13 meaning? 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's 15 a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen 16 in this particular case. Anyway. 17 MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, 18 Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't 19 covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 10 a law which is badly applied or inaccessible is that 10 certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel 11 we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of 12 publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The publishers will now not touch certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel 12 publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The publishers will now not touch certain subjects simply go unreported.
MR KAMPFNER: It's your area and not ours, but is there not already a de facto recognition of some element of prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of meaning? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, MR JAY: I have about there any points you feel we haven't covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 10 certain subjects simply go unreported. So in libel we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The won't commission books or biographies about them been they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
already a de facto recognition of some element of prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of meaning? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, MR Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish meaning? 11 we've had evidence from publishers that a majority of publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The won't commission books or biographies about them bee they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
prejudicial activity in terms of early determination of meaning? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, MR Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish publishers will now not touch certain individuals. The won't commission books or biographies about them been they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
meaning? LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, MR Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish won't commission books or biographies about them because there's they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, yes, but that's because there's a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. 16 In this particular case. Anyway. 16 In this particular case. Anyway. 17 MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, 18 Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't 19 covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 19 they're so litigious that they know they might be financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
a decision that that's what's been ordered should happen in this particular case. Anyway. MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish financially destroyed if they did so. So I think we need to very careful about the nature of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
in this particular case. Anyway. 16 So I think we need to very careful about the nature 17 MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, 18 Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't 19 covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 10 So I think we need to very careful about the nature 11 of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is 12 right, that it's accessible either through a regulator 13 or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
17 MR JAY: I have about three minutes left. Mr Kampfner, 18 Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't 19 covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 10 of the chilling effect and to make sure that the law is 11 right, that it's accessible either through a regulator 12 or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
Mr Heawood, are there any points you feel we haven't right, that it's accessible either through a regulator or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
covered or you haven't covered adequately which you wish 19 or through the courts in the best form. But essentially
20 now to draw to our attentions? 20 just to say thank you very much for being here, for
21 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Your statements, of course, are part 21 letting us come.
of the record and I've read them both carefully, but I'm 22 MR JAY: Thank you both very much.
very keen that you do have the chance to say any extra 23 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you.
24 if you want to. 24 I would be grateful, if you can spare the time, if
25 MR KAMPFNER: I would like to conclude on a very specific 25 you would stay and listen to some of the other interest
Page 57 Page 59
point that is absolutely, in our view, fundamental to 1 groups that are coming to give evidence today, which
freedom of expression in the UK, and I said it 2 have different concerns, which it seems to me may impa
3 I alluded it to it in my seminar presentation but I want 3 on some of the nuanced discussion surrounding the very
4 very much and I said it this morning in the Times 4 big issues that you've spoken about.
5 to exhort you and the Inquiry to make it clear, where 5 MR HEAWOOD: I agree, and I've read their submissions
6 clarity is required, because the decisions are being 6 great interest. As far as possible, we'll stay for part
7 taken in coming weeks, that libel substantive reform 7 of the day.
8 of libel through the final defamation bill should not be 8 MR KAMPFNER: I was wondering, sir, whether you wer
9 held up pending resolution of all the many issues that 9 possibly on the point of saying something about libel
you are wrestling with. You will be reporting in the 10 and then you didn't. Did we stop you in your prime?
autumn. Where there are measures that need to follow, 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No. It's quite difficult to do
that will take another many months, and if libel, which 12 with me. What I decided to do and I will tell you
is there it's pretty much there. Pretty much 13 exactly what I've decided to do is to look rather
consensus has been reached through the joint committee 14 carefully at what has been happening. I have not
of the Lords in Commons on the substantive issue. It's studied the legislative pre-scrutiny. I don't know
ready on the stocks. It's a fast bill. We've had 16 precisely what the provisions proposed are. I've not
prelegislative scrutiny and I think it would be 17 seen precisely how they fit in to my terms of reference.
a tragedy if inadvertently, of course, this the 18 But what I will do is I will do that, particularly if
ongoing work of this Inquiry delayed the insertion of 19 you have any material that will help me do it, and
20 libel into the Queen's speech in May. 20 I will then make the position clear.
So anything you might wish to say or do now or at an 21 I would be very surprised if anything that I was
22 appropriate point, we would be very grateful on that 22 doing should prevent legislation being proposed and
23 score. 23 advanced because libel is not specifically within the
24 MR HEAWOOD: I'd obviously completely endorse that. We 24 terms of my reference, but I felt it wrong to shoot from
spent several years of our lives trying to achieve 25 the hip, as it were, in response to your submission,
Page 58 Page 60

1	which I've seen before. I would rather make	1	MS VAN HEESWIJK: My name is Annie van Heeswijk and I'm the
2	a considered response. You've seen that during the	2	campaign manager for human rights organisation Object,
3	course of this Inquiry, periodically I say things at an	3	which campaigns against the sexual objectification of
4	unexpected time in an unexpected way. I have very much	4	women in the media and popular culture.
5	your request in mind. I will consider it, but I hope	5	Q. Thank you. Finally please, Ms Harvey?
6	you will not consider it discourteous if I take just	6	MS HARVEY: My name is Heather Harvey and I'm currently the
7	some moments to think about what I should say and how	7	(inaudible) research and development manager at Eaves.
8	I should say it.	8	Eaves is a charity that works on all forms of violence
9	MR KAMPFNER: Thank you.	9	against women. We have front line support which deals
10	MR HEAWOOD: Thank you.	10	with cases of violence against women and across all
11	MR JAY: Thank you. Sir, may we take our break until	11	forms of violence against them and we have a research
12	quarter to 12?	12	and development function, which is the team I'm based
13	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Certainly.	13	in.
14	(11.33 am)	14	Q. Thank you.
15	(A short break)	15	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I can see where it says "inaudible"
16	(11.44 am)	16	that even now it's all going too quickly. I appreciate
17	MS HEATHER HARVEY (affirmed)	17	there's a lot to be said, but I'm very keen to make sure
18	MS ANNA VAN HEESWIJK (affirmed)	18	that I have a full record of what you're all saying.
19	MS JACQUI HUNT (affirmed)	19	Before Mr Jay starts, can I thank each one of you
20	MS MARAI LARASI (affirmed)	20	for the submissions you've received, which I've read and
21	Questions by MR JAY	21	which will form part of the record of this Inquiry. I'm
22	MR JAY: I am going to ask each of you respectively, please,	22	very grateful to you all for the trouble you've
23	to say who you are and who you represent. First of all,	23	obviously gone to to put these together.
24	please, Ms Larasi.	24	MR JAY: I'll just identify the submissions and then ask you
25	MS LARASI: My name is Marai Larasi. I represent the End	25	each to confirm that this is your evidence to the
	Page 61		Page 63
1	Violence Against Women coalition. It's a UK-wide	1	Inquiry. First of all, Ms Larasi, it's a submission
2	coalition of more than 40 organisations which campaigns	2	dated January of this year, is that right, and this is
3	to the government at every level in the UK. We have	3	your formal evidence to the Inquiry?
4	part of our work that is focused on preventing violence	4	MS LARASI: Yes.
5	against women as well as addressing it and members	5	Q. Ms Hunt, 22 December last year and likewise your formal
6	include organisations such as Women's Aid and Refuge.	6	submission to the Inquiry?
7	I've worked in the violence against women field for over	7	MS HUNT: Yes, it is.
8	17 years, I'm co-chair of this coalition and director of	8	Q. Ms Van Heeswijk, you put in a witness statement
9	a national organisation called Imkaan, which works	9	yesterday?
10	against violence around black and minority ethnic women	10	MS VAN HEESWIJK: Yes.
11	and girls.	11	Q. You have updated the submission, so it notionally bears
12	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Before we start, could I ask, to help	12	yesterday's date, and you've also provided us with
13	the lady who is trying to record all this and	13	a bundle of 20 exhibits which are in a yellow file; is
14	I failed to assist her sufficiently with the last group	14	that right?
15	of witnesses if you'd all speak rather more slowly.	15	MS VAN HEESWIJK: That is correct.
16	Right.	16	Q. Again, that is your formal submission to the Inquiry.
17	MR JAY: Thank you. Ms Hunt, please.	17	Finally, Ms Harvey, your submission, 22 December of last
18	MS HUNT: My name is Jacqui Hunt. I'm director of the	18	year?
19	London Office of Equality Now, which is an international	19	MS HARVEY: Yes.
20	human rights charity working to protect and promote the	20	Q. I'm going to ask each of you, please, to explain
21	rights of women around the world. We mobilise	21	succinctly at this stage why it is that you have sought
22	grass-roots action and action of our membership, which	22	to come to this Inquiry and assist the Inquiry with
23	is in now 160 countries, to support the efforts of local	23	submissions and evidence. First of all, please,
		24	Ms Larasi.
24	and national groups to promote women's rights.	2.	
24 25	Q. Thank you.	25	MS LARASI: So from an evil perspective, the media creates,

- Day 30 AM 1 reflects and enforces attitudes. Those who work in the 1 2 media should be conscious of this and should actively 2 3 seek not to reproduce attitudes which condone violence 3 4 against women and girls. Too often this is done through 4 5 inaccurate reporting -- for example, on the law on 5 6 rape -- intrusive reporting on victims and their 6 7 7 families and misrepresentation. Example of criminal 8 8 trials, for example, reporting only the defence 9 9 perspective. 10 10 Sensationalist selection of violence against women 11 stories -- for example, the Facebook murder -- and the 11 12 language used can somehow imply that the victim provoked 12 13 her assault. Supporting experts and court reports 13 14 reported might, for example, say that a particular crime 14 15 is cultural or religious and therefore is less serious 15 16 or somehow inevitable. 16 17 Q. Thank you very much. Now, Ms Hunt, as an encapsulation, 17 18 please, what is it that prompted you to wish to assist 18 19 this Inquiry? 19 20 MS HUNT: Just very briefly, international human rights 20 21 standards require elimination of discrimination against 21 22 women, including standards that the UK has signed up to, 22 23 and sexist stereotypes in the media are a form of 23 24 24 discrimination against women. 25 25 Q. Thank you. Ms Van Heeswijk, please? Page 65 MS VAN HEESWIJK: Firstly, it's clearly widespread concern 1 1 2 2 about the ever-increasing sexualisation and 3 3 objectification of women, as highlighted and outlined in 4 the recent government commissioned reviews, the Bailey 4 5
- that freedom of expression for the press doesn't always tackle exactly what the high ideals of journalism are, as I understand it, about, which is, as others have well put this morning, holding our states to account, holding decision-makers to account, challenging the status quo and the norms of our society, imparting information in a way that is not misrepresenting, in a way that is not misleading, in a way that is accurate, and what we are concerned about is our -- as others have said, our press not only reflects our society but can also create and shape and reinforce standards in our society, and if we do not take into account the existing power and balances that are in our society at the moment, then you can simply replicate discrimination, sexism or a misleading interpretation of what is occurring, and for us, we feel the press has a really vital important role to actually challenge the status quo and the sexism and discrimination in our society and can do that in a way that doesn't actually conflict with the principles of freedom of expression but it requires maybe some tweaking, amendments, some better guidance. So we will be calling for things like better guidelines, some greater involvement of independent parties, greater Page 67 liaison with groups who deal with equalities-type issues

strongly support the principle of freedom of expression

for the press, but I suppose where we have concerns is

review and before that, the review into the

6 sexualisation of young people.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

It is clear that the Page 3 tabloids contribute to a culture in which women are perceived as existing for the sole purpose of providing these sex objects or being sex objects, essentially. What is particularly harmful about this is that these images exist within mainstream newspapers, which are not age-restricted and are openly displayed at child's eye level, despite the fact that such material would be prohibited from the workplace -because of equality legislation it would be considered a form of sexual harassment -- and despite the fact that such sexually objectifying and degrading images would be restricted on broadcast media before the 9 pm watershed.

So essentially what we are proposing is that there are very simple solutions to tackle the sexualisation and objectification of women in the mainstream Page 3 tabloid press.

23 Q. Yes, and Ms Harvey, please?

24 MS HARVEY: We're very grateful to have the opportunity to 25 contribute. We feel, as others to this Inquiry, that we

Page 66

and we think that we can go a long way to actually

delivering what the high ideals of journalism are about

in a way that is not so harmful as it, we believe,

5 currently can be to women, such as deterring women from

6 bringing forward complaints about rape being just one

7 example which I can talk more to in my submission.

8 Q. Before I ask each of you to develop those points, I'm

9 going to look at individual examples which are referred

10 to in your various submissions. I think I'm going to

11 start with Object, Ms Van Heeswijk. This, to make it

12 clear, is a joint submission --

13 MS VAN HEESWIJK: It is.

Q. -- by your self and Turn Your Back On Page 3. The 14

15 specific examples start at, on the internal numbering,

16 page 6. I'm just going to check whether we've provided

17 updated URN numbers. I'm not sure we have.

18 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Page 6 of the internal?

19 MR JAY: Internal numbering under your tab 3A.

20 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes? Internal page 6, the evidence

21 from the Sun.

22 MR JAY: That's right. Because what you've done, is this

right, is to start off by taking a week in the life, if

24 that's the right way of putting it, of three tabloid

25 papers and you've looked at a week in mid-November of Page 68

1 our tab 6. Is that right? 1 last year; is that right? 2 2 MS VAN HEESWIJK: That's correct. MS VAN HEESWIJK: Yes. Q. First of all, please, in relation to the Sun, you make 3 Q. Thank you. Sorry, please continue. 4 MS VAN HEESWIJK: So we have the front page of the Sun. We 4 four general points. The Page 3 girl. Can I ask you, 5 please, about the Dear Deirdre column and explain the 5 have here -- I think it's quite difficult to read but it 6 6 says "Bodyguards for battered Towie sisters". issue in relation to that? 7 7 Essentially the story is about acts of violence that MS VAN HEESWIJK: Essentially what we're trying to 8 8 were inflicted upon the Towie sisters and the photograph illustrate here is the extent to which women are 9 9 persistently and relentlessly portrayed as a sum of used to accompany that is clearly a sexualised image of 10 10 sexualised body parts within the Page 3 tabloid press. one of them in her underwear, which we would say 11 11 I think you will find that there is a sort of gradient completely trivialises the acts of violence thats she 12 12 of extremity running from the Sun to the Daily Star to was subjected to and sends out a broader message 13 13 the Sport, which I know I have given copies to essentially of not taking these kinds of violent acts 14 everybody, but what runs -- the common theme throughout 14 seriously. 15 this is the Page 3 feature, which is of a topless or 15 Q. I think you wanted to talk about exhibit 10 as well; is 16 sometimes fully nude young woman, who is sexualised and 16 that right? Another Sun front page? MS VAN HEESWIJK: Exhibit 10 is extremely relevant because 17 17 objectified. It isn't actually restricted only to the 18 third page. In the Sport it's on every page, including 18 inside the Sun, one of the issues of course is that 19 19 the front page. The same would be the case for the these are mainstream newspapers. They're not 20 Star. 20 age-restricted. They're not sold and -- they're not 21 21 displayed on the top shelf. They're readily available In the Sun, we have the Page 3 girl. We have the 22 Dear Deirdre, which is essentially a daily agony aunt 22 and completely mainstream, and so within the Sun we have 23 and is another staple of the Sun but provides another 23 also adverts for the porn and sex industry. 24 example of always being accompanied by a woman in her 24 We have the Page 3 staple and we have, on the front 25 underwear, essentially, who is sexualised in this way. 25 page here, the Sun offering free toy Lego, which is Page 69 Page 71 It's one of the many examples within the Sun of the way 1 clearly going to be directed at children, parents buying 1 2 2 this for children, again despite the fact that the in which women are portrayed. 3 3 images within the Sun would be prohibited from being Q. Thank you. So if we look through the Sun examples --4 I'm not going to look at all of them but they're all 4 displayed within a workplace, because they would be 5 5 illustrative really of a theme. The first one, Kelly considered a form of sexual harassment for adults. The 6 6 images within the Sun would not be shown before the Brook, her breasts are described as "Mitchell brothers" 7 7 watershed on television and yet they're commonplace and we can see the photograph, and your analysis is 8 she's essentially reduced to a pair of breasts. 8 within an unrestricted newspaper which describes itself 9 9 as a family newspaper. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I would just like to refer you to the 10 Q. Thank you. Any further exhibits? I'm going to deal exhibits that we have printed, only because I think 10 11 there are some stronger examples within them, because 11 with exhibit 11 separately, because that raises 12 we're not going to be able to go through every single 12 a slightly different point, but any of the other 13 13 exhibits in relation to the Sun before we go back to exhibit in this original submission. 14 14 Q. I'm in your hands. If you feel in relation to the Sun your submission? 15 there are stronger examples in our yellow file, please 15 MS VAN HEESWIJK: The other thing I would say about the Sur 16 identify those and we will look at them. is because it has such a huge readership, there's a very 16 17 MS VAN HEESWIJK: Okay. Let's find -- so we have -- for 17 big issue in relation to even parents and teachers trying to regulate this kind of material. So, for 18 example, one of the issues that we have raised is not 18 19 19 example, through our work, through Object's work with only the way that women are persistently sexualised and 20 objectified, but the trivialisation and even sometimes 20 teachers in schools, teachers have often told us about 21 21 sort of eroticisation of the reporting of violence their difficulties in relation to this issue because 22 22 against women. clearly they are wanting to encourage their children and 23 23 In the Sun, we have, in exhibit 6, an example of the young people to read the newspapers, to engage with the 24 24 news, to know what's going on in the world. They have front page --

Q. Just while we find it, it's exhibit 6A, which is under

Page 70

25

periods where children are supposed to bring in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

left-hand side.

1 newspapers, and invariably they bring in the Sun and the 2 Daily Star. 3 The reading age of these newspapers are low. 4 They're very easy to read, essentially, and they are 5 going to be attractive to young people to buy, and so 6 teachers find themselves in a situation where they're 7 having to confiscate newspapers from children which the 8 children were free to buy at their local corner shop, at 9 the local supermarket -- of course, a point that the 10 children don't fail to make -- because of the sexualised 11 and degrading images that exist within these newspapers.

I could refer you to another example of the Sun, which is under Exhibit 15. This is a whole story on one of the Page 3 idols. Interestingly enough, the term "idol" there. Again, what story is this telling to young girls about what they should aspire to, about the stereotypes of femininity that are portrayed to young girls?

19 And in particular, I'd like to refer you to the 20 photographs of her again in a bikini at -- as 21 a 14-year-old.

- 22 Q. This is page 4 of 10 at the bottom right.
- MS VAN HEESWIJK: Yes. 23

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1

24 Q. You give other examples in relation to the Sun in your 25 submission. In example 4, page 7, is a fictitious Page 73

23 Q. Thank you. We've read some of the other examples, but

in an activity, in a sport, skiing, she is still

24 unless you wish to alight on any specifically, can we

25 move on to the Sport and then the Sunday Sport. Is this Page 75

the Daily Star, since it might be said these are all

extremely relevant because, as I've said, these

under exhibit 1. One of them is the Daily Star.

look at example 2, at the bottom of page 11.

Q. The use of language and the associated image.

MS VAN HEESWIJK: Mm-hm.

ass going up a fake ski slope."

reader. So they say:

newspapers are displayed at child's eye level in the

mainstream. There are some examples of front covers

Q. 1B is the Daily Star. We can see the photograph on the

In terms of the examples you give, you might like to

MS VAN HEESWIJK: I think another point to make here is the

assumptions that they make about the presumed male

"We assume you're not even reading this because

you're still getting a massive pervy eyeful of that pert

sexualised and reduced to a body part in this example.

So even when the image itself is of a woman engaging

MS VAN HEESWIJK: I think the imagery on the front pages is

thematic; in other words, very similar?

- scenario involving Prince Harry and Pippa Middleton,
- 2 which is self-explanatory, which, as you say, eroticises
- 3 sexual harassment and portrays Ms Middleton only in
- 4 relation to her bottom.
- 5 And then example 9 -- I'm only alighting on these
- 6 randomly -- "How to stop your man having affairs":
- 7 "Cook dinner in just your lingerie once a week."
- 8 Could I move on from the Sun to the Daily Star,
- 9 please, which is page 10 of your submission. There are
- 10 also examples in the yellow file.
- MS VAN HEESWIJK: Sorry, what is actually up on the screen 11
- 12 at the moment is from the Sun, but it is actually
- 13 another example of trivialising violence against women.
- 14 It's example 15.
- 15 Q. Thank you. If we go to the Daily Star in the
- 16 submission -- it's page 11 on the internal numbering.
- 17 You say at the top of page 11:
- 18 "In relation to the covers, hyper-sexualised imagery 19 of semi-naked women is commonplace on the front covers
- 20 of the newspaper. Page 3 'glamour models' extend over
- 21 several pages."
- 22 There is a Daily Star forum, which you explain, and
- 23 then there are various pornographic advertisements.
- 24 Which of the examples, please, Ms Van Heeswijk,
- 25 would you like us to look at particularly in relation to

Page 74

- 22
 - women in schools, who are often subjected to this form
 - 23 of sexual bullying and harassment, especially now with
 - 24 the widespread use of camera phones, and this is a front
 - 25

- right: there's a mid-week edition of the Sport --1
- 2 MS VAN HEESWIJK: And a Sunday.
- 3 Q. -- and a Sunday edition. In terms of the front pages,
- we have the example of a mid-week front page at exhibit
- 5 1A in the yellow file; is that correct?
- MS VAN HEESWIJK: That is correct. 6
- 7 Q. A Sunday example, exhibit 3 under our tab 3 in the
- 8 yellow file?
- 9 MS VAN HEESWIJK: Is that going to be up on the screen? Are
- 10 we waiting for that to go up?
- 11 O. I think we should see exhibit 3, please.
- 12 MS VAN HEESWIJK: Yes, I think so too. So I mean, as you
- 13 can see, in this exhibit the women are completely
- 14 nameless, headless. It's only focusing on one part of
- 15 their body, which is extremely objectifying and
- 16 sexualised, and it's also -- it's very worrying because
- 17 they're here clearly in a sort of vulnerable position
- 18 and it's normalising the up-skirt photographs. It's
- 19 normalising this sort of voyeurism and form of sexual
- 20 harassment and bullying which we know are of great
- 21 concern, particularly actually to young girls, young

- page photograph.

- Q. You provided us with a copy of the Sunday Sport last 1
- 2
- 3 MS VAN HEESWIJK: Yeah, this is the most recent.
- 4 Q. We can --

- 5 MS VAN HEESWIJK: If you care to look through it, you'll see
- that sort of every page is just photograph upon 6
- 7 photograph of more or less all white women who have
- 8 been -- and these women are completely sexualised and
 - objectified, degraded, portrayed as sex objects.
- 10 We really have to ask ourselves what kind of a story
- 11 this tells, especially, I think, to young children, to
- 12 boys and girls, when they see in mainstream newspapers
- 13 men in suits, men in sports attire, men as active
- 14 participants, as subjects, and women as sexualised
- 15 objects who essentially are naked or nearly naked on, in
- 16 the case of the Sport, every single page. But it is
- a common theme throughout the other newspapers as well. 17
- 18 Q. The last exhibit I'd like you to look at, just to
- 19 identify it, is exhibit 4. It's a picture of
- 20 Charlotte Church when I think she was 15. Where is this
- 21 from, do you know?
- 22 MS VAN HEESWIJK: This is in the Star. I mean, there are
- 23 many things you could say about this, but essentially
- 24 it's Charlotte Church at 15. The commentary is
- 25 important here:

1 2

Page 77

- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Regulating in that regard, you simply meanwhile where the newsagents are required to display
- 2
- 3 them?
- 4 MS VAN HEESWIJK: Sir, if they're classified pornography,
- 5 then there are age restrictions. There's an issue with
- lad's mags, which there's only a voluntary code as to 6
- 7 the sale and display of.
- 8 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: That's voluntary, is it?
- 9 MS VAN HEESWIJK: It's completely voluntary, and some
- 10 supermarkets respect this code and they do -- with lads'
- 11 mags, they do display them on the top shelf and they
- 12 cover them, but many don't.
- 13 The issue with these newspapers is they're never
- 14 displayed on the top shelf. They are completely
- 15 mainstream and freely available to anybody, and the fact
- 16 that they exist within a newspaper, I think, lends them
- 17 a sort of legitimacy and makes this type of portrayal of
- 18 women seem unquestionable, seem sort of normal and
- 19 acceptable, essentially.
 - Again, this type of material wouldn't pass a test
- 21 for pre-watershed broadcast media, so again I think that
- 22 there is an issue there of why it is seen as acceptable
- 23 for them to exist within print-based media.
- 24 MR JAY: The issue of regulation is one I'm going to come to
- 25 at the end.

20

Page 79

- "She's a big girl now. Child singing sensation showed just how quickly she's grown up after she turned
- 3 up at a Hollywood bash looking chest swell."
- 4 Clearly sort of an emphasis on a 15-year-old young
- 5 woman's breasts, and interestingly enough, that's
- 6 juxtaposed with this article, which is sort of outrage
- 7 against a spoof sort of satire around paedophilia. The
- 8 hypocrisy within these sort of newspapers is often quite
- 9
- 10 Q. Can I ask you this general question, if I can seek to
- 11 put it in these terms. If one were to rename these
- 12 papers Penthouse, Mayfair or whatever, what is the
- 13 difference, if any, between a publication which is, if
- 14 I can put it in these terms, expressively pornographic
- 15 and the material we've just been looking at? Is there
- 16 a differences, and if so, what is it?
- 17 MS VAN HEESWIJK: I think you'll find that there isn't
- 18 a marked difference between the content which exists
- 19 within these classified pornographic materials and the
- 20 contents within some of these mainstream Page 3
- 21 tabloids, so the difference therefore is how they are
- 22 regulated. One could say that it is actually more
- 23 harmful to have these images within mainstream
- 24 newspapers because of the normalising effect that it
- 25 therefore has and the legitimising effect that it has.
 - Page 78

- MS VAN HEESWIJK: May I make one other point about the 1
- 2 exhibits?
- 3 Q. Please.
- 4 MS VAN HEESWIJK: Only because I think it's extremely
- 5 interesting that when we were sent the submissions --
- 6 when the submissions were sent to all of those of us who
- 7 are giving evidence, the images within our submission
- 8 were actually censored, and that I find interesting
- 9 because they were censored for adults within this
- 10 hearing when in fact they are freely available in
- 11 mainstream newspapers which are not age-restricted.
- 12 Q. Yes. Thank you.
- 13 May I move to the submission, please, of End
- 14 Violence Against Women. You give us ten individual
 - cases. There may not be time to address all of them,
- 16 but I think you did certainly want to speak to the
- 17 Facebook murder, which is our page 54610. If you could
- 18 encapsulate the issue there and your concern?
- 19 MS LARASI: So what we have is -- this is a Daily Telegraph
- 20 story and the way it was reported was "Man murdered wife
- 21 after she changed Facebook status to single" and the
- 22 whole tone of the story focuses on she changed her
- 23 status to simultaneous, you know, their relationship was 24 breaking down, and then he killed her. He was getting
- 25 more and more depressed, et cetera. From a violence

Page 80

- 1 against women and girls perspective, he killed her 2 because he was abusive. He killed her and he killed
- 3 her. He didn't kill her because she changed her status 4 on Facebook.

For us, the concern is the focus on her actions, the focus on Facebook trivialises the murder of this woman, and also moves the focus away from this man's violent

8 actions, and so for us it's particularly concerning. 9

Responsible journalism for us would look like, you know: "This is how often women are killed, women are murdered twice a week by a current or former partner, over 50 women are killed every week", et cetera, and

- 13 would contextualise it within a wider violence against
- 14 women and girls framework, not focus on she changed her 14
- 15 Facebook status, and the fact that it became known a
- 16 Facebook murder is in itself symbolic. It wasn't
- 17 a Facebook murder. It was a murder of a real woman by
- 18 her partner.

5

6

7

10

11

12

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 19 Q. It's the singling out, you say, of one adventitious
- 20 feature without any proper understanding of the overall
- 21 context; is that right?
- 22 MS LARASI: Absolutely, absolutely.
- 23 Q. The revealing rape victims' identity case, although
- 24 a serious error, I'm going to pass over because it
- 25 speaks for itself.

Page 81

- 1 We don't know the true circumstances in terms of the
- 2 conversations that were had, et cetera, but what we do
 - know is there is a context, which is that young women
- 4 are vulnerable, and what responsible reporting could do
- 5 is focus on the vulnerability of young women and
- 6 contextualise it, rather than using terms like "orgy",
- 7 "Lolita", et cetera, and putting that in the public
- 8 domain with no regard to the impact this reporting might
- 9 have on those young women or might have on other young
- 10 women in a similar situation.
- 11 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But even if you're going to put the
- 12 defence perspective, is there not a further argument
- 13 that what is critical is also to put the perspective
- that you've just identified?
- MS LARASI: I'm not quite sure I --15
- 16 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Well, your complaint is that this
- 17 story provides a slant and an unbalanced slant.
- 18 MS LARASI: Yes.
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You're not suggesting it should be 19
- 20 a slant the other way?
- 21 MS LARASI: No.
- 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You're merely requiring it to be
- 23 balanced --
- 24 MS LARASI: Absolutely.
- LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- and contextualised?

Page 83

- Item 3, please, gang rape of young girls, an "orgy", 1
- 2 5462. Your concern there?

of the young men.

- 3 MS LARASI: This was the Daily Mail and is particularly
- 4 upsetting. The first thing is you put the term "orgy"
- 5 in something and what you immediately do is you grab
- 6 people's attention. It becomes titillating. But also
- 7 we have a situation where two young girls were raped.
 - We're talking about unlawful sex. They were incapable
 - under British law of giving consent.

What then happens in the story is it completely focuses on their behaviour, their attitudes, what they did, et cetera. So it wasn't just the headline itself; the whole tone of the story really focuses on what those young women did and didn't do, and even went so the far as to focus on their parents as opposed to the behaviour

And what we also find is this almost sympathetic approach to these young men. They added that the careers of the promising young footballers had been ruined by the biggest mistakes of their lives. Now, that, yes, is reporting what happened in a court situation but the ways of reporting it so that what you're not doing is actually trivialising or exoticising

what happened to -- young women are particularly vulnerable to sexual exploitation and sexual violence. Page 82

- 1 MS LARASI: The way you would in a broadcast context. I'm
- 2 not saying that you can't have a position where you say,
- 3 you know: "In court, there was scrutiny of the young
- 4 girls' behaviour", et cetera. I'm not saying that you
- 5 couldn't do that, and say that's what happened in court,
- but I would expect that some scrutiny of the young men's 6
- 7 behaviour -- and I would expect it would be reported in
- 8 a way that was a lot more responsible, that suggested
- 9 actually young women are vulnerable. So you
- 10 contextualise the young women's behaviour within the
- 11 context of young women being vulnerable to sexual
 - exploitation.

12

13

14

15

23

The idea of that -- for example:

"The other girl was more reluctant and was raped by just one player."

16 I mean, that tone in itself actually indicates that

17 you're not focusing on the young woman's vulnerability

18 and you're not also thinking about -- you know, "just

19 one player"? A rape is a rape, therefore, for that

20 young woman, there's likely to be a whole -- you know,

21 a degree of trauma associated with that experience.

- 22 MR JAY: Your position is not censorship of comment; it is
 - responsible reporting, which requires balanced comment.
- 24 Is that right?
- 25 MS LARASI: Absolutely, and also seeking out of expertise, Page 84

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

- 1 of professionals who are able to speak to the issues
- 2 that are being reported. So, for example, dialogue with
- 3 Rape Crisis as an organisation, you know, could look at
- 4 what's the situation around young women. Who's
- 5 reporting to you? Are there particular vulnerabilities?
- 6 Et cetera. That would be been a much more responsible
- 7 way of approaching it.
- 8 Q. Item 4, please, 54614. This is racism and misogyny
- 9 wrapped up into one. It is a traveller family with 12
- 10 children and a particular report in the Sun in February
- 11 of last year. What, in essence, in the issue here?
- 12 MS LARASI: This is one of those stories where, apart from
- 13 promoting racist stereotypes, I'm not actually quite
- 14 sure -- and misogynistic position, what interest -- what
- 15 this particular story was hoping to do except feed
- 16 particular stereotypes.
- 17
- 18 accommodation by Harringay local authority during the
- 19 broadcast of a really popular Channel 4 showing of My 20 Big Fat Gypsy Wedding. The woman concerned complained
- 21 of being harassed, there were children, her children
- 22 were photographed. You know, in my mind, the whole tone
- 23 of this is completely irresponsible and I think that's
- 24 it. It's completely irresponsible. I'm concerned about
- 25 the racism, I'm concerned about the misogyny in the
 - Page 85

- 16 practitioner who may actually have one position, which The family concerned were placed in temporary 17 is: this it is associated with fundamentalism.
 - 18 Q. Thank you. The last example I'm going to ask you
 - 19 specifically to comment on -- of course, the Inquiry has
 - 20 read the others -- is item 8 at page 54625, which is the
 - 21 piece based on an unpublished and unfinished MSc
 - 22. dissertation. This is a Daily Telegraph article,

girls rather than on the idea of culture.

One of the things I've noted -- and we haven't given

an example here -- is the frequency with which the focus

From our perspective as experts working around violence

happening across a range of communities, and we know

that where culture and religion can be used as vehicles,

is on a Muslim father. You know, a Muslim father did

this, this happened within Muslim families, et cetera.

against women and girls, we know that this is not

primarily an Islamic issue, we know that this is

ultimately the causes are the same. It's violence

speaking to a range of experts as opposed to one

against women and girls. It's patriarchy. Those are

the issues we would ask reporters to focus on and we

would want people to provide a broad perspective, so

- 23 I think.
- 24 MS LARASI: Yes. What's disturbing about this particular
- 25 piece is the original press release said "Promiscuous

Page 87

- 1 reporting.
- 2 Q. Understood. Then I think you cover the issue of
- 3 honour-based violence in at least two examples. It's
- 4 not so much the examples necessarily as the point you
- 5 want to make.
- 6 MS LARASI: Yes.
- 7 Q. Can you encapsulate, please, for us the essence of that
- 8 point?

15

18

- 9 MS LARASI: So very often practices such as honour-based
- 10 violence or forced marriage are reported in the popular
- 11 press in gratuitous detail. The language, for example,
- 12 is inaccurate, so forced marriage is often referred to
- 13 as "arranged marriage", sending the wrong message about
- 14 what the issue is.

There's the idea that particular practices are

- 16 reported primarily as cultural or as religious rather 17
 - than as violence against women and girls, and therefore are not linked to other forms of violence against women
- 19 and girls, which actually serves to exoticise the
- 20 violence that particular women are experiencing.
- 21 A responsible approach would be to say, "Violence
- 22 against women is happening in a range of contexts.
- 23 Forced marriage is one element of violence against
- 24 women. So is honour-based violence." That way you focus
- 25 on the idea of the violence against the women and the
 - Page 86

- men are more likely to rape". The Telegraph reported 1 2 the piece as "Women who dress provocatively more likely
- 3 to be raped".

6

- 4 My immediate concern is: why would you twist the
- 5 piece in that way? What agenda is being served? Rather
 - than focusing on the actual -- you know, the information
- 7 that was in the press release. And so I'd be really
- 8 concerned about the reporter's intent, or the editorial
- 9 intent around this particular piece, because it's
- 10 misrepresenting the information and it's also presenting
- 11 an unpublished piece almost as science, as research,
- 12 et cetera, that is valid and it's completely twisted and
- 13 distorted the original piece, anyway.
- 14 Q. I put this point to you only as an idea. Would fair,
- 15 responsible and comprehensive reporting about violence
- 16 in women seek to bring in a number of strands. The
- 17
- first strand, not in any particular order, may be human 18
- nature, some men are violent. Another strand may be
- 19 cultural, economic, social, religious. Another strand
- 20 may be more subtle, the influence of what we read, 21
- press, socio-economic forces. Maybe those are in the 22
- second strand. And what we need is a picture which
- 23 embraces all those strands rather than a picture which 24
 - seeks to alight on any one of the strands? Is that
- 25 right or not?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS LARASI: Absolutely, but there is also -- because the 1 2 other side of it is a context where men who commit 3 violence are excessively demonised in the press and 4 portrayed as beasts or demons or monsters, and actually 5 men who commit violence are our fathers or brothers or 6 sons. They're the men around us, and when you demonise 7 those particular men in that particular way, what you do 8 is you actually take it out of the context of normal 9 society. 10 When you're talking about one in three women 11

experiencing violence in her life, we're talking about huge statistics there. So what we want is for people to understand that violence against women and girls too often is very normal. So if you sensationalise it, what you are likely to do is have people disconnect from it, have people "other" that violence, and therefore not see it as something that's related to them. The impact then on women reporting, if you have this whole exotic or "other" thing happening, for us is a concern, because if things are reported badly, then actually how women see that is, you know: "This isn't me", or: "It's not necessarily safe for me to report", or: "I might not be believed", or: "But he wasn't a demon; he was somebody that was my loving husband and he happened to be really really violent."

Page 89

So you know, there's something about actually

providing a balanced perspective that for us will be much more useful and what we don't want are reports that actually damage individual women and we don't want reports that excessively demonise violent men. Q. Thank you very much. May I move on, please, to Ms Harvey and your submission. You provide us case studies, examples and analysis. May I start, please, with 54246, which is under our tab 4. MS HARVEY: Yes.

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11 Q. In the middle of the page, failing to ask appropriate 12 challenging questions. This is the difference between 13 reporting of last summer riots and then reporting of 14 cases of male violence against women. In your own 15 words, please, what do you see the key differences to

16 17 MS HARVEY: Well, taking -- that's just one example. The 17 18 riots over the summer or gang violence or a whole range 19 of other features that get covered in the news will 20 often be covered in what I would say is quite 21 a responsible way, where it is situated in a context

22 where they look at: are there any wider patterns here? 23 Are there any trends here? What's the research here? 24 What's the statistics here? How does this particular

25 incident fit with the wider context that we're working Page 90

in?

It will usually involve asking particular commentators and maybe politicians, lawyers, academics, experts, frontline NGO services to come and actually comment on maybe what happened, why did it happen, is there anything that we should know more about that might enable us to prevent this happening in future or take measures that could minimise the possible likelihood of

What I'm concerned about -- and I only reference two cases here, but actually if you take just recently -over the Christmas period, for instance, I think probably most of us were struck by the fact that there were about four instances of a man murdering his wife and children. I'm not saying they're necessarily linked, I'm not saying it's necessarily the same thing, but what I am saying is I would expect responsible journalism to actually look at those things as: what is going on here? What is happening? Why is it happening? Is there anything -- is there a common factor or isn't there? There may not be, but those are valid questions to ask. Is there any research on this issue or isn't there? If there isn't, should there be? If there is, what does it say about it?

I think in actual fact from the work that we do we Page 91

know that there is research that looks into those kinds of factors. So what we're concerned about is these cases get treated as a one-off example of a few bad apples, and it's a tragedy, a one-off thing. There's nothing anyone could do about it. You could never predict it could happen. There's nothing particularly you could do to prevent it.

Whereas the position we're coming from, which reflects the position in CEDAW and other international conventions is that violence against women is linked directly to the public policy sphere. It's linked to our society and our economy and our choices. It's not inevitable and it's a reflection -- a cause and a consequence of inequality.

So what we would expect in terms of responsible reporting is that some of those questions get asked, some people are called upon to actually say: well, what are -- "You are our politicians. You are our decision-makers. What do you think about this? What are your steps to deal with it? What are you doing about?"

And they're very, very rarely, if ever, treated in that way. It's simply a one-off tragic case. How awful, how dreadful, what a shame, nothing we can do about it. So it's just a lack of contextual ignorance Page 92

1 and failing to ask the right questions, but I think 2 where that becomes a problem for us is that that again 3 causes us to sit back and think there isn't anything we 4 can or should be doing about and it can have 5 quite a damaging effect as well in terms of what is your 6 priority and your focus and your public responsibility 7 and your accountability, whereas, as I said before, in -- a free press which it is actually meeting its own 8 9 aims of holding people to account, could and should, 10 I think, be asking those kind of more challenging 11 questions about our society and the status quo. 12 Q. Thank you. A related issue, but it flows on from the 13 general issue you just adumbrated, at the bottom of 14 page 54247, invisibility of the victim and identifying 15 with the perpetrator. 16 MS HARVEY: Yes. 17 Q. Do you want to say something about that? 18 MS HARVEY: Yes. We actually also referenced the Facebook 19 murder as an example of this and again, some of those 20 family killings over the Christmas period. What we feel 21 is that a lot of the coverage of cases of violence 22 against women, whether that's sexual violence or other 23 forms of violence against women, have a considerable 24 focus on the perpetrator in often quite a sympathetic 25 way. So he was depressed, he was losing his job, he Page 93 1 feared that his wife was going to leave him, he was

It's not that those things are not valid to be said.

1 the reader could go away with is the impression that 2 there is a validation or a justification or 3 an explanation of why that man would commit that 4 violence, and these things do have an implication for 5 whether a woman will report a case or not. Will she 6 blame herself? That's particularly the case in rape 7 instances that we deal with. I think we're going to 8 come to that later. 9 Q. Yes, in the context of rape -- this is 54249 -- you 10 point out that the stranger rape scenario is quite rare, 11 and the more statistically familiar example is 12 acquaintance or date or even marital rape. Can I invite you, please, to develop that theme? 13 14 MS HARVEY: Yes. If I'm really honest, this is where it 15 becomes quite difficult because understandably the media 16 are reporting the cases that go to court and they're 17 reporting the cases that are, in their view, or what 18 they perceive to be their readers' views, the most 19 interesting, the most different, or unusual, or in many 20 cases, the ones that most fit with what their readers' 21 own views are or how they view society. 22 So I can see how this happens, but it's kind of

which comes first. These two things feed off each

Page 95

or attacks a woman sleeping in her bed at night. That

other. Something like only 8 per cent of rapes are the

kind of stranger who leaps out of a bush on a dark night

provoked. She said something that triggered him in some 2 3 way. And often it's amazing how little you find out about the woman who is actually the victim. Whilst --4 again, I think the point that was made by my colleagues. 5 6 They are. There will be all sorts of reasons that may 7 cause a man to be violent, but the point is ultimately 8 9 he has been violent, he has chosen to be violent and there is a context for that and there is another half to 10 that story, which is what's been happening in the lives 11

23

24

25

1

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of that woman and of women more generally. And again, putting it in context of the statistics, when you look at two women a week being killed by their partners or ex-partners, there is a kind of a context there which needs to be addressed, and the tendency to kind of obscure the victim so you find out virtually nothing about her, or worse, in many cases, to scrutinise her very intensely and actually look at what was her behaviour and what was her lifestyle like. Was she a difficult person? Did she say unpleasant things? Was she having an affair? She may have been, and all those things might be reprehensible or dislikeable or may make the situation more difficult, but the way it's portrayed all too often is -- the implication and what Page 94

is about 8 per cent of rapes. The rest are acquaintance rapes, date rapes, market tall rapes. You would never know that from reading the papers, but that feeds a discourse around what is a "real" rape, who is a "real" victim, who is a "real" rapist, and where that becomes particularly harmful for us is we will find examples of women saying that they will blame themselves, that they shouldn't come forward because they were drinking or wearing certain clothes or they'd known this person, it was a friend of theirs, or even, in some cases, they'd had sex with them in the past, and what they have read in the papers or heard in the discourses is that in some way they are responsible for that, that that's not "real" rape. So where it's harmful is it actually can deter women

from reporting rape. This is similar with false allegations. Again, there is a very significant intense interest in reporting so-called false allegations of rape. Again, there's very little contextualisation around how common is a false allegation of rape compared to a false allegation of other crimes. What goes on that causes a false allegation? What is recorded or reported as a false allegation? It could be no crime. It could actually -- there's a whole series of things Page 96

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that actually could get reported as a false allegation where actually it may just have been that there was no conviction. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I've not thought about this in quite the context that I am now, but of course there are all sorts of entirely sensible laws relating to reporting, and of course, because of the entirely correct approach not to identify victims, do you think that there is less interest in reporting the marital example because the newspaper report then loses all context? Because if it's a marital rape and you can't identify the victim, then you can't identify the defendant either, because the whole thing has to then move into language which is much more non-specific, so that there is no risk to the identification issue. Is that a problem? I've never ever thought of it that way, but it's just arising out	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS HARVEY: I think it's more about the stereotype and perception of what is a real rape. So that is both what gets reported and also what then gets reported by the media, that is, and also reported to the police for action to be taken. I don't think that's so much about the identification as it's about the stereotype that a real rape is a stranger leaping out of a bush. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Jumping out of the bushes. I understand that point. MS HARVEY: I may be missing your point, I'm sorry. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Very well. I'm also conscious tha much is made about the low conviction rate for rape without any understanding of the enormous problems there are when one is analysing the behaviour of two human beings who don't actually agree about what happened in an incident that is not witnessed by anybody else.
17	of what you've been saying.	17	That's one of the problems of which I'm sure you're
18	MS HARVEY: I think what we're trying to focus on here is	18	aware.
19	there was recently a Mumsnet survey and it was very	19	MS HARVEY: Yes.
20	unscientific, informal, but it was a huge number of	20	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: But that's not quite the purpose of
21	women who responded around sexual violence and they said	21	this exercise, and I'm sorry to take you down that
22 23	that there was a very high proportion of them had experienced some form of rape, whether that was date	22	track.
24	rape or marital rape, whatever. They said they would	23 24	MS HARVEY: No, sorry. MR JAY: Finally, Ms Harvey, in relation to your examples or
25	not report it when they were asked: "Would you report	25	your themes, could I ask you please to address the new
	Page 97		Page 99
	-		
1	it? Did you report it?" they said no, they wouldn't,	1	media theme, 54249 and following page, and your concern
2	because they were in fear of being blamed or of being	2	there.
3	accused of false allegations. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: You don't have to persuade me around	3	MS HARVEY: Yes. I only briefly mentioned it here but obviously there's increasingly and rightly debate in the
5	that. Anybody who's spent 40 years in the criminal	5	general media and general public and comment, blog and,
6	justice system, as I have, knows only too well about the	6	as others have said, almost all of us have become
7	underreporting, the issues that stand in the way of	7	publishers in a way.
8	accessing justice. I hope we're better now than we	8	I think the point that I reference here some of
9	were.	9	you will have seen the New Statesman article which
10	MS HARVEY: Indeed.	10	actually asked women about their experiences of
11	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: We've certainly put some effort into	11	blogging, commenting and what kind of responses they
12	it.	12	got, and what was quite shocking about it, even for me,
13	MS HARVEY: Yes.	13	was the level of abuse that people get, and there was
14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: So to get the whole picture	14	a recognition even amongst some of the male commenters
15	I understand, although I'm very happy that you make it	15	as well that the abuse that women get when they comment
16	clear so that everybody else does. I am just	16	on issues of public policy generally, but particularly
17 18	interested, for the purposes of this, in whether the anonymity rules mean that the larger proportion of	17	on issues relating to women's rights or feminism or
19	reported rapes that go to court are not reported because	18 19	anything of that nature, is very sexist and gendered abuse. It's not purely: "You're talking rubbish and you
20	they are not as interesting. Do you see the question	20	don't know what you're talking about", or: "Shut up",
21	I'm asking?	21	or: "I disagree about you", which is a normal feature in
22	MS HARVEY: I do. I'm not sure that I would focus on the	22	debate; there is language quite violent and vitriolic
23	anonymity rules as the issue here, really.	23	language like, "You should have" I mean, some of it
24	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: No, I'm not focusing on them. I'm	24	I couldn't even repeat here, but: "You should have your
25	just asking the question.	25	tongue ripped out. You should be raped backwards with
1	Page 98		Page 100

2

3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 a bush." It's ridiculous, but that is the kind of 2 language that is used, that you should be gang raped, 3 you should be raped in every orifice with an implement. 4 These are genuine things that have been said, as well as 5 a focus on your looks, you're ugly, or an assumption 6 that you must be a lesbian, as though that was a very 7 bad thing, you're unattractive to men, you're not 8 interested in men and you're man-haters. Assumptions 9 about your sexuality, assumptions about your looks and 10 quite -- as I say, very violent and obscene abuse which, 11 as I say, I can't even repeat here in some cases.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Now, the women themselves and a lot of even the men 12 who were also involved in the whole comment thread around that recognised that that was actually about preventing or resenting women's rights to comment on public matters. If she's talking about cupcakes and children, it might be okay, but if she's talking about public policy, if she's talking about women's rights, about equality, about the economy, there is a challenge to her right to have and express an opinion, and a lot of the women who actually blog themselves feel that this is actually about intimidating women into knowing their place, and that's -- for me, the nub of this matter, really, is women's voices and women's issues are actually being silenced, to some extent intimidated, not Page 101

properly covered, not adequately or covered in a partial way, in a stereotyped way that can be misleading, misrepresentive, inaccurate and is not a true representation of how women experience life.

I think the point I noticed this morning with PEN's submission -- I very much liked what they used as their definition around public interest, that that might be something that looks at how it can enhance the public's ability to engage in public debate.

As I've said before, we support freedom of speech. With that in mind, that it should enable people to equally participate in shaping, deciding, commenting on our society and holding our society to account, and our view is that the way that media covers women at the moment -- the portrayal of women in media, the roles that are focused on, the stereotypes that are there -it curtails and limits women's freedom of expression and 17 women's ability to engage in that public debate, and we think actually the press can be a crucial and helpful partner in actually challenging some of those norms and enabling that freedom of speech and expression for everybody with just a little bit of tweaking these and there. Thanks.

Q. Finally, please, on individual examples -- I know you

Page 102

haven't given any, Ms Hunt, but are there any themes or

specific examples you would draw to our attention which we could consider in the context of your general

submission?

4 MS HUNT: I think to reinforce what my colleagues have been

5 saying, over the years this has been a huge issue for

6 the international community and decades of work on

7 looking into this, and to really focus on the harms of

8 this sexist stereotyping in media and it being a barrier

9 to achieving the equal participation of women -- we

10 don't have, for example, very diverse images of women in

11 the media. BME women, older women, women with disabilities are virtually absent from the media.

> Women in decision-making roles, they have very negative stereotypes. Blair's babes, Dave's dolls. Even when the content of the article is about an interesting issue and may be a very interesting debate, the headlines there signal immediately trivialisation of women, infantilisation of women, demeaning of women, so that women, again, to pick up what Heather was saying, having an opinion is really seen, in a broader sphere, as something negative and it reinforces the way society maybe thinks about those issues and legitimises that.

> And the other part, in terms of the freedoms we're mentioning, is the legitimisation and normalisation of sexualism in society by the broader community, which may Page 103

1 also legitimate violence against women, and that in turn 2 might have a legitimate -- a consequence on access to 3 justice for women.

So if you're looking at all these particular -- any example of women given a sexist stereotype, it's actually limiting women's participation in society or having justice or being able to combat violence So I think any of the examples we give, they come back to those fundamentals.

Freedom of the press: fine, yes, important, really critical, and we use it to expose what governments are doing. It's really really key, but we have to find a way to make sure that women are not sidelined and objectified and taken out of political and human and society participation.

Q. May I turn now to the issue of recommendations, please. In framing that issue, may I just draw attention to two or three matters? The first is that under the existing code, clause 1, there's an obligation to the press to be accurate. If I paraphrase, there's considerable latitude to comment. Under clause 12, there's an anti-discrimination provision, if I can put it generally and crudely, and that must include gender discrimination. There's a free speech issue, which each you recognise, and there is also the possibility of Page 104

1 MS LARASI: Yes. So if I can contact the Advertising amending the code if the code doesn't adequately address 2 the concerns each of you raise. But I wonder if I might 2 Standards Agency if I drive past something and I think 3 ask each of you in turn, first of all perhaps starting 3 that the image isn't appropriate, and I've done that, 4 4 with Ms Lewis, to tell us your blueprint for I want to be able to comment, as an individual member of 5 recommendations for change. 5 the public or as an organisation, on something that 6 6 I actually think is inappropriate in terms of press MS LARASI: So the first point for us is, I suppose, 7 7 a softer recommendation, which is one around training, behaviour. 8 8 and we know that that throws up challenges in terms of I think that's it. 9 achieving that, but having journalists receiving manager 9 MR JAY: So in terms of complaining, one could have perhaps 10 10 training on the law of reporting violence against women the sort of sufficient interest test, which we 11 11 understand in public law, which would allow groups to so you don't have the "I didn't know, I shouldn't have 12 12 disclosed, you know, her identity", including the complain as well. 13 absolute and clear rule that victims of alleged rape 13 MS LARASI: Yes. 14 14 Q. I think that's a point each of you wishes to make have anonymity, but also looking at violence against 15 15 individually, but it's come from Ms Lewis. Ms Hunt, any women and girls within a UK context and a broader 16 context, so there's understanding of what the genuine 16 recommendations you would wish to advance today? 17 17 MS HUNT: In addition to that, I think we want women's issues are, and some myth-busting, so that what you have 18 18 groups or equality organisations to be involved in is you have journalists that are themselves empowered 19 because actually what they have is accurate information. 19 setting the standards within a new, say, Press 20 For us, there's also something around sanctions for 20 Complaints Commission, because we know now there are 21 21 those headlines of discrimination and inaccurate journalists who break the law, and at the moment it's 22 22 reporting, and there's also a carve-out for so-called almost as if free press feels as if it somehow grants 23 23 good taste or tone, and I think if you don't understand some degree of immunity. We want accountability. We 24 the context and you don't understand the gender equality want a free press, but we want an accountable press. 24 25 25 arguments, you might be persuaded in thinking this is We also want to see editors be more willing to Page 105 Page 107 remove editorial material which blames victims. 1 about tone rather than actually about the substance of 1 2 2 discrimination, so we would like that. Victim-blaming is very different from providing 3 3 a critical perspective around violence against women and And in terms -- I wasn't quite sure what 4 girls, and we need to make that really clear. So 4 Lord Leveson was saying in terms of the group. I think 5 5 looking at the circumstances, looking at the wider we don't want just a group who's supporting an 6 6 individual to be able to make that complaint. We would issues is not the same as having a tone which suggests 7 "she called this down on herself". 7 like more along the lines, say, of the CEDAW optional 8 We also really urgently need some kind of public 8 protocol where you're making complaints, both an 9 discussion about the way -- and I think actually what 9 individual who is directly affected and either grave or 10 I'll do is leave that to Anna, because that's a bit more 10 systemic, a pattern of abuse that we can then go to the around the pornography side of things, but our members 11 media and say, "This is systemic, this is a pattern of 11 12 have also stated that they want to see a regulatory 12 abuse that constantly feeds into the sexualisation" --13 system which has teeth. At the moment we're concerned 13 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The idea, what I was suggesting and 14 14 that the current system doesn't have adequate -- doesn't I think what Mr Jay has also spoken about, is anybody 15 provide an adequate framework for seeking redress. 15 can complain who has a sufficient interest, so it could 16 We also know that very often women who have been 16 be the victim, it could be groups such as yours had 17 wronged do not feel able to take on carrying out 17 a legitimate right to raise issues with the relevant 18 a complaint. If we have a mechanism that would allow 18 authority, whether it's a commission, a regulator, 19 19 groups to take up complaints and to support individual whatever, to have them adjudicated upon, which would 20 women in taking out complaints, then we believe that 20 have the benefit not merely of providing a potential 21 21 that would be useful -sanction, but also an encouragement to education to 22 22 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Or you could do it by having the change the way in which issues are discussed without 23 23 ability for a group to make the complaint -itself, as it were, using a big club to prevent free 24 MS LARASI: Absolutely. 24 speech. 25 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: -- rather than the individual victim 25 MS HUNT: Just an additional point, if I may. Sexism Page 106 Page 108

6

- 1 doesn't start in the newsrooms. It's in our society.
- 2 So we're also asking -- and maybe this isn't appropriate
- 3 for this forum -- the government to really take a lead
- 4 on education campaigns both in schools and generally in
- 5 the public about stopping discrimination and promoting
- 6 sex equality.

15

16

17

18

19

24

25

9

10

- 7 MR JAY: Ms van Heeswijk.
- 8 MS VAN HEESWIJK: So essentially our summary of
- 9 recommendations would be, one, the regulation of printed
- 10 material should be consistent with the regulation of
- 11 other forms of media, so essentially that would mean
- 12 that material that would not pass the test for
- 13 pre-watershed television should not be allowed to be
- 14 printed within unrestricted newspapers.
 - Secondly, that any form of regulation or printed materials should be guided by equality legislation that already exists, so in this case I'm referring to the Sex Discrimination Act, the Equality Act and making the point that any messages and images which would not be considered suitable for the workplace under those pieces
- 20 21 of legislation again should not be printed and readily
- 22 accessible within unrestricted newspapers. 23
 - I would reiterate the point about groups being able to make complaints on the basis of how groups are persistently stereotyped and misrepresented.

Page 109

some form of stronger sanction.

- 2 But really it's the main thing again would be this
- 3 point about having some means of bringing a complaint as
- 4 a member of a group or a community, because I think
- 5 that's the only way you can bring in line the
 - possibility of some of the perhaps less tangible but
- 7 nonetheless real harms that could arise in a system that
- 8 is -- persists as being unequal and discriminatory.
- 9 Q. Thank you. Finally may I deal with a discrete issue
- 10 which comes out of our yellow file. Tab 11. It bears
- 11 really on our third module. This is Ms Van Heeswijk's
- 12 evidence in relation to what the Sun were doing. I'm
- 13 not sure about the date. Could you help us?
- 14 LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think it's 2004.
- MS VAN HEESWIJK: Yes. 15
- 16 MR JAY: This is an attempt to ban Page 3 and then use
- 17 pressure to try and thwart there. Could you talk us
- 18 through this one, please?
- 19 MS VAN HEESWIJK: Of course. I guess firstly I would say
- 20 that it's a shame that the editors of these newspapers
- 21 were not questioned on these issues when they were in
- 22 front of you, but I think it is very crucial that this
- 23 issue is re-addressed in module 3, and this is one of
- 24 the reasons why, because essentially these newspapers
- 25 credit created a culture of fear which silences groups,

Page 111

- Then just additionally the issue of gender equality 1
- 2 being the sort of baseline of any form of regulating
- 3 this type of material, so that it is considered in
- 4 relation to the impact that it has on women, the impact
- 5 that it has on shaping the attitudes of children and
- 6 young people about women, about young girls, rather than
- 7 in relation to more subjective notions of obscenity, for
- 8 example.
 - My key point would be that this really -- we're not proposing any form of radical -- any radical overhaul of
- 11 media regulation; we're just calling for consistency,
- 12 essentially, of how other areas of the media are
- 13 regulated to be -- and for the print media to be brought
- 14 in line it that.
- 15 O. Thank you. Ms Harvey?
- MS HARVEY: I think my colleagues can -- Ms Larasi has 16
- 17 covered most of what I want to say. For us it's about
- 18 improved guidance in training, it's about representation
- 19 and input and expertise from a wider and more
- 20 independent group. We would definitely like quick and
- 21 affordable access to remedies. We would like
- 22 a proactive power to whatever this new body would be to
- 23 undertake research or investigations when they
- 24 themselves identify or receive lots of complaints around
- 25 patterns or trends or clusters of issue. We would like Page 110

- 1 politicians, anybody much from speaking out against 2
 - their persistent portrayal of women as sex objects
- 3 against Page 3, and one of the ways that they most sort
- 4 of famously did that is through the real vilification
 - and targeting of Clare Short, who instigated a campaign
 - against Page 3 in the 1980s.
- 7 What we see a an example from the Sun newspaper that
- 8 actually perhaps the second example, which is 11B is
- 9 more illustrative, because it is a photograph of the
- 10 page within the Sun. What we have here is Clare Short's
- 11 face was superimposed onto a Page 3 model and the 12
 - headline is:

5

6

13

- "Fat, jealous Clare brands Page 3 porn."
- 14 They likened Clare Short to the "back of a bus" and
- 15 they told jokes about that -- well, jokes in inverted
- 16 commas, that making her into a Page 3 girl would be
- 17 a "mission impossible". Clearly, the sort of -- the --
- 18 if it wasn't the purpose, the effect has been to
- 19
- essentially close down free speech in relation to groups 20 and individuals feeling free to speak out and make
- 21 a critique against these newspapers.
- 22 As my colleague spoke about the often abusive 23 comments that bloggers receive when they speak about
 - issues relating to women's equality, which is clearly part of this wider culture that needs challenging, and

Page 112

24

1	these individual bloggers, here we're speaking about	1	appreciate that that absolutely is changing the law.
2	a national newspaper making similar comments about	2	There's no question of trying to find a soft way of
3	a politician, a democratically elected politician who	3	doing this. That's rock-solid legislation.
4	took this campaign on because of the concerns of her	4	MS VAN HEESWIJK: Which is why, I guess, it should be posed
5	constituents. I think this is very, very concerning,	5	to the politicians.
6	alarming. It's something that continues, so Harriet	6	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Yes, all right.
7	Harman, for example, has been vilified for the position	7	MS VAN HEESWIJK: Only because the other part of it, of
8	that she has taken on Page 3, and then more recently	8	course, is that the politicians are under international
9	Dr Even Harris, who actually put forward a motion at the	9	obligations, as my colleague has pointed out, to tackle
10	Liberal Democrat conference, which was accepted, which	10	the portrayal of women in this way, and therefore, if
11	essentially is supportive of the recommendations within	11	this is one of their obligations, their international
12	this submission, again was deemed villain of the week	12	obligations, legal obligations, it should be something
13	within the Sun.	13	that they are questioned about in relation to the media.
14	So this is clearly a sort of bullying tactic and	14	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: I think that's very interesting and
15	I think considering the fact that the editors themselves	15	I'm sure that we have noted that for when we get to the
16	were not questioned on these issues, I think it's really	16	next stage, and if anything arises that you want to
17	essential that politicians have an opportunity to speak	17	suggest should be put to the witnesses who are coming,
18	about the experiences that they've had when they have	18	then I have no doubt you know how to get in touch with
19	spoken up against the Page 3 phenomenon.	19	us and to suggest it.
20	MR JAY: Thank you very much.	20	MS VAN HEESWIJK: We do. Thank you very much.
21	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: There's a limit to what the context	21	LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: Thank you very much indeed for
22	of this Inquiry can achieve, but listening to your	22	coming, and I repeat my thanks for the effort that you
23	arguments as they've developed and with the graphic	23	put into these submissions.
24	illustrations that you've provided, the start would	24	We'll say 2.05 pm.
25	certainly be, it seems to me from what you say, to	25	(1.05 pm)
	Page 113		Page 115
1 1	permit bodies such as yours to be able to take up issues	1	(The luncheon adjournment)
1 2	permit bodies such as yours to be able to take up issues of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for	1	(The luncheon adjournment)
2	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for	2	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair?	2 3	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start.	2 3 4	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start.	2 3 4 5	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have	2 3 4 5 6	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but	2 3 4 5 6 7	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this type of policy and regulation is completely it's sort	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this type of policy and regulation is completely it's sort of universally accepted and receives widespread support	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this type of policy and regulation is completely it's sort of universally accepted and receives widespread support in relation to broadcast media, and therefore we would	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this type of policy and regulation is completely it's sort of universally accepted and receives widespread support in relation to broadcast media, and therefore we would not see it as a real sort of drastic ask or proposal or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this type of policy and regulation is completely it's sort of universally accepted and receives widespread support in relation to broadcast media, and therefore we would not see it as a real sort of drastic ask or proposal or recommendation to recommend that this already generally	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this type of policy and regulation is completely it's sort of universally accepted and receives widespread support in relation to broadcast media, and therefore we would not see it as a real sort of drastic ask or proposal or	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this type of policy and regulation is completely it's sort of universally accepted and receives widespread support in relation to broadcast media, and therefore we would not see it as a real sort of drastic ask or proposal or recommendation to recommend that this already generally accepted policy would then be applied to print-based	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	(The luncheon adjournment)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	of press standards with whomsoever is responsible for regulating it. Would that be fair? MS LARASI: It would be a good start. MS VAN HEESWIJK: It would certainly be a start. LORD JUSTICE LEVESON: The point being I appreciate you have all sorts of other anxieties and I understand them, but I'm sure you understand also the length and the breadth of what I can do within the context of this Inquiry. I agree that there are elements that come into module 3 here, but how much further one can go without raising all sorts of other issues which could take me another year to think about is not entirely straightforward. So I'm not discouraging you, but I'm merely asking whether I've understood the absolute priorities. I understand you have a whole range of priorities. MS VAN HEESWIJK: I guess one issue would be is that this type of policy and regulation is completely it's sort of universally accepted and receives widespread support in relation to broadcast media, and therefore we would not see it as a real sort of drastic ask or proposal or recommendation to recommend that this already generally accepted policy would then be applied to print-based media.	2 3 4 5 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	(The luncheon adjournment) Page 116

I	ī	i	ı	i	Ī	Ī
A	accused 98:3	Advertising	American 5:9	110:12	aunt 69:22	111:10
ability 16:6,8	achieve 22:21	107:1	amount 4:23	argue 34:5 52:20	authoress 24:15	beast 12:14
27:25 39:25	58:25 113:22	adverts 71:23	10:1 13:22	53:2	authority 49:7	beasts 12:17
56:5 102:9,18	achieving 103:9	advisory 56:14	35:1 56:6	argued 24:20	85:18 108:18	14:10 15:22
106:23	105:9	advocate 11:8	analysing 99:14	argument 6:16	authors 54:10	89:4
able 16:4 17:5	acquaintance	advocated 43:7	analysis 38:24	18:10 19:5	autumn 58:11	becoming 24:24
44:14 70:12	95:12 96:2	advocates 53:14	70:7 90:8	34:20 35:5	available 39:5,7	bed 96:1
85:1 104:7	act 8:3 28:19,20	affair 94:22	and/or 8:22	37:16 38:22	71:21 79:15	began 34:11
106:17 107:4	42:21 109:18	affairs 74:6	angle 29:19	83:12	80:10	behaviour 11:9
108:6 109:23	109:18	affirmed 61:17	37:22	arguments 29:13	average 17:25	16:13 21:16,19
114:1	acted 28:14 29:3	61:18,19,20 affordable	Anna 61:18 106:10	107:25 113:23 arises 115:16	18:1 aversion 20:3	26:15,20 45:11 52:19 53:12
absence 31:4	acting 57:5 action 24:3 62:22	110:21	Annie 63:1	arising 97:16	awards 39:9,13	82:11,15 84:4
absent 103:12	62:22 99:5	afternoon 46:9	anniversary 2:13	arm 45:9,9,17	55:4	84:7,10 94:20
absolute 27:16	actionable 26:24	age 2:21 46:2	announcement	arose 11:7 34:8	aware 17:7	99:14 107:7
30:18 40:3,8	actions 11:6	73:3 79:5	38:18	arranged 86:13	35:20 99:18	beings 99:15
41:24 105:13	52:23 81:5,8	Agency 107:2	anomalous 38:16	article 5:11 8:7	awful 92:24	belief 5:9
114:15 absolutely 6:1	active 77:13	agenda 48:1 88:5	anonymity 98:18	9:8 19:13 22:7	Azerbaijan	believe 51:21
19:19 36:9,18	actively 65:2	age-restricted	98:23 105:14	25:12,16,19	37:13	68:4 106:20
37:5 38:12	activity 27:7	66:12 71:20	answer 20:13	26:2,6 33:24		believed 89:23
41:25 58:1	57:12 75:21	80:11	23:10 25:16	40:25 41:10	В	benefit 108:20
81:22,22 83:24	actors 15:23	ago 8:13 19:13	29:21,24 36:3	55:14,18 78:6	b 39:5	Berlin 3:15
84:25 89:1	acts 10:6 71:7,11	35:14 46:3	answers 24:13	87:22 100:9	babes 103:14	best 51:13 59:19
106:24 115:1	71:13	agony 69:22	anti-discrimin	103:15	back 15:2 17:3	better 11:9 20:16
abstract 9:9	actual 88:6 91:25	agree 16:15	104:22	articles 22:21	19:10,14 35:13	21:7 33:17,18
abuse 3:1 100:13	add 21:20 37:25	30:17 34:5	anxieties 114:7	articulate 7:2,3	36:23 47:1,1,3	34:2 53:5
100:15,19	48:7 49:4	35:12 37:8	anybody 13:14	22:6	68:14 72:13	67:23,24 98:8
101:10 108:10	added 37:20	60:5 99:15	79:15 98:5	Artistic 10:8	93:3 104:8	beyond 47:7
108:12	82:18	114:10	99:16 108:14	asked 13:4 24:12	112:14	big 15:22 49:7
abusive 81:2	addition 2:23 107:17	agreed 37:8,9 39:11	112:1	27:14 92:16 97:25 100:10	backwards	60:4 72:17 78:1 85:20
112:22	additional	agreement 21:21	anyway 57:16 88:13	asking 24:4	100:25	108:23
academia 4:14	108:25	51:16	apart 85:12	38:15 91:2	bacon 31:21 bad 21:16 46:7	bigger 19:25
academics 9:25	additionally	agreements	apparent 14:15	93:10 98:21,25	59:8 92:3	biggest 15:13
10:5 54:10	110:1	39:11	appeared 49:25	109:2 114:14	101:7	82:20
91:3	address 32:5	ahead 47:20	apples 92:4	aspire 73:16	badge 51:6	bikini 73:20
accept 52:13						
- cocontoble (():1()	34:24 35:19	aid 4:4 62:6	application	ass 75:19	l hadly 47:23 59:9	bill 30:7,8,9 58:8
acceptable 79:19	34:24 35:19 80:15 99:25	aid 4:4 62:6 aims 93:9	application 39:19	ass /5:19 assault 65:13	badly 47:23 59:9 89:20	bill 30:7,8,9 58:8 58:16
79:22	34:24 35:19 80:15 99:25 105:1				89:20	58:16
79:22 accepted 113:10	80:15 99:25	aims 93:9	39:19	assault 65:13	89:20 bag 25:9	
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23	80:15 99:25 105:1	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23	assault 65:13 assert 52:10	89:20	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19	58:16 biographies 59:13
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23 accountable	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10 107:16	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20 56:12	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10 areas 2:15 3:4	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20 attire 77:13	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23 basis 29:6 57:3	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21 bloggers 7:17
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23 accountable 105:24	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10 107:16 advanced 60:23	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20 56:12 amazing 94:3	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10 areas 2:15 3:4 6:2 7:25 11:16	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20 attire 77:13 attitude 21:23	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23 basis 29:6 57:3 109:24 battered 71:6 battle 15:5	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21 bloggers 7:17 112:23 113:1 blogging 100:11 bloke 48:16
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23 accountable	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10 107:16 advanced 60:23 advantages 56:7	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20 56:12 amazing 94:3 amending 105:1	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10 areas 2:15 3:4 6:2 7:25 11:16 11:16 18:22,25	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20 attire 77:13 attitude 21:23 attitudes 65:1,3	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23 basis 29:6 57:3 109:24 battered 71:6 battle 15:5 BBC 3:18	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21 bloggers 7:17 112:23 113:1 blogging 100:11 bloke 48:16 blueprint 105:4
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23 accountable 105:24 accuracy 38:1,5	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10 107:16 advanced 60:23 advantages 56:7 adventitious	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20 56:12 amazing 94:3 amending 105:1 amendment 5:10	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10 areas 2:15 3:4 6:2 7:25 11:16 11:16 18:22,25 25:24 27:21	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20 attire 77:13 attitude 21:23 attitudes 65:1,3 82:11 110:5	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23 basic 29:6 57:3 109:24 battered 71:6 battle 15:5 BBC 3:18 beach 41:19,21	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21 bloggers 7:17 112:23 113:1 blogging 100:11 bloke 48:16 blueprint 105:4 blurred 41:23
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23 accountable 105:24 accuracy 38:1,5 38:7	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10 107:16 advanced 60:23 advantages 56:7 adventitious 81:19	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20 56:12 amazing 94:3 amending 105:1 amendment 5:10 41:1	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10 areas 2:15 3:4 6:2 7:25 11:16 11:16 18:22,25 25:24 27:21 28:25 32:1	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20 attire 77:13 attitude 21:23 attitudes 65:1,3 82:11 110:5 attractive 73:5	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23 basic 29:6 57:3 109:24 battered 71:6 battle 15:5 BBC 3:18 beach 41:19,21 41:22	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21 bloggers 7:17 112:23 113:1 blogging 100:11 bloke 48:16 blueprint 105:4 blurred 41:23 BME 103:11
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23 accountable 105:24 accuracy 38:1,5 38:7 accurate 38:12 38:21 40:6 67:10 104:20	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10 107:16 advanced 60:23 advantages 56:7 adventitious 81:19 advertisements	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20 56:12 amazing 94:3 amending 105:1 amendment 5:10 41:1 amendments	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10 areas 2:15 3:4 6:2 7:25 11:16 11:16 18:22,25 25:24 27:21 28:25 32:1 33:1,3 46:18	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20 attire 77:13 attitude 21:23 attitudes 65:1,3 82:11 110:5 attractive 73:5 audit 43:24	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23 basic 29:6 57:3 109:24 battered 71:6 battle 15:5 BBC 3:18 beach 41:19,21 41:22 beaches 42:5	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21 bloggers 7:17 112:23 113:1 blogging 100:11 bloke 48:16 blueprint 105:4 blurred 41:23 BME 103:11 board 47:25
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23 accountable 105:24 accuracy 38:1,5 38:7 accurate 38:12 38:21 40:6	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10 107:16 advanced 60:23 advantages 56:7 adventitious 81:19	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20 56:12 amazing 94:3 amending 105:1 amendment 5:10 41:1	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10 areas 2:15 3:4 6:2 7:25 11:16 11:16 18:22,25 25:24 27:21 28:25 32:1	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20 attire 77:13 attitude 21:23 attitudes 65:1,3 82:11 110:5 attractive 73:5	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23 basic 29:6 57:3 109:24 battered 71:6 battle 15:5 BBC 3:18 beach 41:19,21 41:22	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21 bloggers 7:17 112:23 113:1 blogging 100:11 bloke 48:16 blueprint 105:4 blurred 41:23 BME 103:11
79:22 accepted 113:10 114:19,23 access 9:11 18:4 51:4 55:15 104:2 110:21 accessible 53:25 59:18 109:22 accessing 98:8 accommodation 85:18 accompanied 69:24 accompany 71:9 account 11:14 16:11 17:22,24 57:2,5 67:6,7 67:14 93:9 102:13 accountability 21:11 33:18 93:7 105:23 accountable 105:24 accuracy 38:1,5 38:7 accurate 38:12 38:21 40:6 67:10 104:20	80:15 99:25 105:1 addressed 94:16 addressing 35:9 62:5 adequate 29:23 106:14,15 adequately 57:19 102:1 105:1 adjournment 116:1 adjudicated 108:19 adjudicator 43:14 adopt 49:20 ADR 45:2 53:18 53:21 54:23 adults 72:5 80:9 adumbrated 93:13 advance 38:10 107:16 advanced 60:23 advantages 56:7 adventitious 81:19 advertisements	aims 93:9 alacrity 2:21 alarming 113:6 Albania 37:13 alight 75:24 88:24 alighting 74:5 allegation 96:21 96:22,23,24 97:1 allegations 96:18 96:19 98:3 alleged 105:13 allow 2:4 106:18 107:11 allowed 109:13 allows 8:12 alluded 6:9 18:24 58:3 already-existing 21:7 alternative 45:2 53:22 54:20 56:12 amazing 94:3 amending 105:1 amendment 5:10 41:1 amendments	39:19 applied 32:16 50:13 59:9 114:23 apply 1:20 48:14 appointing 44:8 appreciate 63:16 114:6 115:1 approach 29:19 41:15 82:18 86:21 97:7 approaching 85:7 appropriate 26:15 40:17 58:22 90:11 107:3 109:2 arbitration 55:16 area 5:14 6:1 19:9 21:9 46:12 56:24 57:10 areas 2:15 3:4 6:2 7:25 11:16 11:16 18:22,25 25:24 27:21 28:25 32:1 33:1,3 46:18	assault 65:13 assert 52:10 assertion 52:12 assist 62:14 64:22 65:18 assistance 50:12 associated 13:25 75:13 84:21 87:17 association 4:1 assume 34:19 75:17 assumption 36:12 101:5 assumptions 75:15 101:8,9 attached 54:22 attacks 54:7 96:1 attempt 111:16 attention 29:16 82:6 103:1 104:17 attentions 57:20 attire 77:13 attitude 21:23 attitudes 65:1,3 82:11 110:5 attractive 73:5 audit 43:24	89:20 bag 25:9 Bailey 31:19 66:4 balance 23:14,16 balanced 83:23 84:23 90:2 balances 67:14 balancing 29:13 ban 111:16 banks 19:17 Barber 55:6 BARR 51:15 barrier 103:8 barriers 4:9,9 base 52:12 based 63:12 87:21 baseline 110:2 bash 78:3 basic 43:23 basic 29:6 57:3 109:24 battered 71:6 battle 15:5 BBC 3:18 beach 41:19,21 41:22 beaches 42:5	58:16 biographies 59:13 bit 21:9 34:1 36:8 102:22 106:10 black 2:25 54:24 62:10 BlackBerry 6:13 blagging 46:20 Blair 13:2 14:8 Blair's 103:14 blame 95:6 96:8 blamed 98:2 blames 106:1 blanket 27:22 blazed 44:8 blocks 21:12 29:14 blog 100:5 101:21 bloggers 7:17 112:23 113:1 blogging 100:11 bloke 48:16 blueprint 105:4 blurred 41:23 BME 103:11 board 47:25

1						- 1.81 - 1.8
1 1 41 11 55 16	1, 1,40,10	50.00.04.57.16	00.12.02.10	104 10 21	l , .	1 4 150 2
body 41:11 55:16	buck 48:18	52:23,24 57:16	90:12 93:10 102:20 112:25	clause 104:19,21	commentaries	completed 59:2
69:10 75:22 76:15 110:22	build 8:12 building 21:12	69:19 77:16 81:23 90:7	chance 52:7	clear 5:7 9:13 13:21 38:12	19:11 commentary	completely 30:17 33:15 37:24
Bodyguards	built 31:7	92:23 95:5,6	57:23	43:23 49:22	5:22 77:24	44:23 47:19
71:6	bully 17:13	109:17	change 9:5 33:12	58:5 60:20	commentators	58:24 71:11,22
bolted 9:18	bullying 8:2	cases 2:25 20:19	105:5 108:22	66:7 68:12	91:3	76:13 77:8
Bonn 3:13	76:20,23	21:8,16 23:15	changed 2:20 9:4	98:16 105:13	commented 42:2	79:9,14 82:10
book 32:16 33:2	113:14	28:13 30:13	80:21,22 81:3	106:4	commenters	85:23,24 88:12
54:10	bundle 64:13	32:12,17 34:13	81:14	clearer 2:17	100:14	114:18
books 4:14 24:16	burden 23:25	35:4 36:7,15	changes 8:25	clearly 16:15	commenting	compliance
59:13	bureau 3:14	36:18 39:4,13	42:20 46:4	49:22 66:1	100:11 102:12	13:17 51:8,10
born 11:10 bottle 35:5	bus 112:14	42:5 43:15	53:4	71:9 72:1,22 76:17 78:4	comments 20:14 112:23 113:2	53:13
bottom 5:20	bush 95:25 99:7 101:1	54:1,1,3,12,16 54:18,23 55:1	changing 8:7 115:1	112:17,24	commercially	complimentary 23:7
34:23 35:9	bushes 99:8	63:10 80:15	Channel 85:19	113:14	44:15	composition
73:22 74:4	business 11:17	90:14 91:11	charity 62:20	close 112:19	commission	50:7
75:11 93:13	12:24,25	92:3 93:21	63:8	clothes 96:10	42:14,17,19	comprehensive
boundaries 5:3	businesses 16:11	94:18 95:16,17	Charlotte 77:20	club 108:23	50:8 52:3	88:15
boys 77:12	buy 73:5,8	95:20 96:12	77:24	clusters 110:25	59:13 107:20	compromising
brands 112:13	buying 72:1	101:11	charts 51:12	coalition 62:1,2	108:18	48:9
breach 28:18,20		cause 32:25	check 38:7 68:16	62:8	commissioned	conceivably 24:6
41:6 breadth 114:8		92:13 94:8	checking 16:9 chequebook 56:6	code 28:3 32:16 33:2 40:14	66:4	concept 7:9
break 27:14	cabinet 31:22 calamity 52:2	causes 87:11 93:3 96:23	cherished 44:17	41:1,3 45:14	commit 89:2,5 95:3	Conceptually 42:4
61:11,15	call 3:4,22 10:24	causing 35:11	chest 78:3	45:15 51:6,9	commitment	concern 35:10
105:21	20:8 44:12	CEDAW 92:9	chief 3:14,16	51:20 52:20	33:11	66:1 76:21
breaking 80:24	47:19 52:8	108:7	Child 78:1	79:6,10 104:19	committee 53:9	80:18 81:5
breasts 70:6,8	called 29:1 40:8	celebrate 15:21	children 72:1,2	105:1,1	56:15 58:14	82:2 88:4
78:5	62:9 92:17	celebrates 2:12	72:22,25 73:7	codification	committee's 30:8	89:19 100:1
brief 5:13	106:7	celebrity 11:17	73:8,10 77:11	41:12	common 50:13	concerned 4:4
briefly 11:15	calling 67:24	censored 80:8,9	85:10,21,21	cognisance 56:18	57:9 69:14	54:4 67:11
65:20 100:3	110:11	censorship 2:12 2:16,25 10:8	91:15 101:17 110:5	coin 47:14 55:23 coining 14:9	77:17 91:20 96:21	85:17,20,24,25 88:8 91:10
bring 15:18 38:25 43:15	camera 76:24 campaign 5:16	43:17 44:4	child's 66:13	collateral 20:12	commonly 50:13	92:2 106:13
72:25 73:1	10:2 15:11	84:22	75:5	20:21 21:22	commonplace	concerning 81:8
88:16 111:5	24:2 63:2	cent 16:22 38:21	chill 21:17 48:21	colleague 112:22	72:7 74:19	113:5
bringing 68:6	112:5 113:4	54:16 95:24	chilled 10:5	115:9	Commons 58:15	concerns 47:22
111:3	campaigner	96:2	chilling 19:2	colleagues 94:5	communications	50:12 60:2
brings 3:7	14:25 15:17	central 53:23	33:25 39:20	103:4 110:16	27:9	67:2 105:2
British 37:5	17:5,17	centre 3:25	59:3,4,7,8,17	collectively 18:9	communities	113:4
41:11 43:8,9	campaigners	centres 4:2	China 5:23 choices 92:12	column 69:5	87:9	conclude 57:25 condemn 11:6
82:9 broad 30:6 32:9	14:22	century 15:13 16:23	choose 17:7	combat 104:7 come 5:15 12:11	community 103:6,25 111:4	condemned
36:11 87:14	campaigning 2:22	CEO 11:20	31:17 50:19	18:5,19 20:14	companies 18:14	42:18
broadcast 66:18	campaigns 62:2	certain 10:16	51:17	24:19 26:5,15	company 11:21	condone 65:3
79:21 84:1	63:3 109:4	14:22 59:10,12	chosen 25:2 94:9	28:22,24 32:18	compare 14:23	conduit 7:14,24
85:19 114:20	candle 19:21	96:10	Christmas 27:14	39:16 40:16,19	15:7	conference
broadcasters	capability 9:7	certainly 2:1	91:12 93:20	43:7 47:1,21	compared 96:21	113:10
7:11,21 19:7	capacity 9:6 50:6	23:10 34:21	Church 77:20,24	54:2 59:21	competing 3:5	conferences 10:4
broader 4:25 7:9 36:15 41:16	50:20	44:10,19 61:13 80:16 98:11	Churchill 34:2 circulations 7:20	64:22 79:24 91:4 95:8 96:9	5:12 26:2,5 33:16 35:24	confident 17:5 confidentiality
49:10 56:2	capping 56:4 card 27:17,17	113:25 114:5	circulations 7:20	104:8 107:15	complain 45:24	3:6
71:12 103:20	card 27:17,17 care 3:11 6:13	cetera 8:3 43:4	83:1 106:5	114:10	107:12 108:15	confirm 63:25
103:25 105:15	42:12 77:5	46:21 47:6,18	citing 41:10	comes 3:5 17:3	complained	confiscate 73:7
broadly 8:4	careers 82:19	54:11 80:25	citizen 7:17	48:10 52:18	85:20	conflict 23:5
21:21 34:9	careful 8:24	81:12 82:12	civil 23:21 31:4	95:23 111:10	complaining	67:21
44:24 51:16	43:10 59:16	83:2,7 84:4	41:1	coming 14:21	23:19 107:9	confrontation
Brook 70:6	carefully 57:22	85:6 87:5	claimant 23:22	49:10 58:7	complaint 38:20	14:15
Brooke 14:24	60:14	88:12 CEO 11:21	24:1,5	60:1 92:8	45:1 83:16	confused 24:24
15:8 18:21 Brooke's 15:11	carrot 45:4 carrying 106:17	CFO 11:21 chair 53:8	claimants 8:22 claims 15:1	115:17,22 commas 112:16	106:18,23 108:6 111:3	confusion 32:25 connection 25:1
Brooks 16:5	carrying 106:17	chaired 56:15	Clare 112:5,10	comment 7:15	complaints	connotations 7:6
brothers 70:6	case 24:5,11	challenge 39:24	112:13,14	20:5,9 84:22	44:13,15 68:6	conscious 65:2
89:5	31:14,20 34:8	67:19 101:19	clarify 40:2	84:23 87:19	106:19,20	99:11
brought 3:7 8:20	34:17,17 35:8	challenges 46:6	clarity 58:6	91:5 100:5,15	107:20 108:8	consensus 30:7
23:21 24:4	38:1,2 41:7	46:10 105:8	classified 78:19	101:13,15	109:24 110:24	58:14
110:13	43:10 49:14	challenging 67:7	79:4	104:21 107:4	complete 27:14	consent 82:9
	ı	1	I	I	1	

consequence	continues 14:18	33:17 38:20,22	111:25 112:25	64:17	90:5	106:2
92:14 104:2	113:6	43:8 51:12	cupcakes 101:16	decided 15:9,12	demonised 89:3	difficult 32:2
	contractual	54:2 55:5	curb 8:3	60:12,13	demons 89:4	34:15 46:22
consequences 15:15	50:24	56:11,25 57:21	curbing 22:8	deciding 102:12	denons 89.4 departing 22:12	50:9 60:11
consequent 25:4	contradict 13:6	58:18 61:3	current 12:6	decision 28:23	departing 22.12 depending 32:15	71:5 94:21,24
consequential	contribute 28:7	71:18 73:9	30:3 81:11	41:24 57:15	depressed 80:25	95:15
29:13	66:7,25	87:19 97:5,7	106:14	decisions 6:8	93:25	difficulties 42:24
consider 11:3	contributes	111:19 115:8	currently 37:12	34:6 36:6	deprived 43:1	72:21
61:5,6 103:2	49:16	court 15:3,3,4	38:8 44:6 54:5	45:19 50:7	depth 17:12	digital 2:21 8:12
considerable	contribution	16:12 22:17	56:12 63:6	58:6	derived 10:24	8:23 46:2
53:4 93:23	56:17	23:5,16,21	68:5	decision-makers	describe 24:19	dignity 22:22
104:20	Convention 22:7	28:22 29:1	curtail 20:18	67:7 92:19	described 70:6	23:2
considerably	33:24	37:8 38:18	curtailing 22:8	decision-making	described 70.0 describes 72:8	dilemmas 49:11
2:20,22 55:13	conventions	42:25 55:8,12	curtailment 5:6	103:13	designed 2:14	diligent 6:15
considerations	92:10	56:8 65:13	curtails 102:17	decline 7:21	designed 2.14 desirable 18:16	diminished 7:16
32:14	convergence	82:21 84:3,5	customers 18:16	deem 43:14	32:12 40:14	diminishes 45:20
considered 61:2	4:23	95:16 98:19	customers 16.10	deemed 19:7	59:5	diminishing 5:12
66:15 72:5	conversation	courts 8:20	D	113:12	desk 4:14 46:16	7:13
109:20 110:3	46:23 47:17,18	23:13,16 30:15	daily 3:14 69:12	deeper 17:16	Desmond 50:25	dinner 74:7
considering	conversations	41:3,4 43:1	69:22 73:2	deeply 31:5 37:6	desperation	direct 8:17
113:15	83:2	51:9 55:3,17	74:8,15,22	defamation 58:8	13:24	directed 72:1
consistency	conviction 29:3	56:3 59:19	75:1,7,8 80:19	default 33:13	despite 66:13,16	directly 9:11
110:11	97:3 99:12	cover 2:24 79:12	82:3 87:22	defence 27:6,10	72:2	92:11 108:9
consistent 17:1	convinced 15:16	86:2	damage 20:12,21	27:15,16,20	destroyed 59:15	director 4:11
109:10	27:21 28:4	coverage 16:21	21:22 38:21	29:6 30:2,5,10	destruction	62:8.18
consistently 15:1	convincing 6:15	35:16 93:21	90:4	30:11,11,14,18	19:17	directors 48:10
45:10 57:7	34:20	covered 3:18	damaged 7:11	30:18,23,24	detail 86:11	48:13
constantly 7:16	Cook 74:7	26:18 57:19,19	damages 38:18	34:16 36:15	detailed 42:9	dirty 48:16
49:9 108:12	cope 35:23	90:19,20 102:1	damaging 38:2	40:5 65:8	details 15:1 21:6	disabilities
constituents	copies 69:13	102:1 110:17	93:5	83:12	47:12 48:4	103:12
113:5	copious 21:7	covers 74:18,19	dangerous 34:12	defences 26:1	deter 96:16	disagree 34:5
constitution	copy 77:1	75:6 102:14	dangers 52:15,16	defend 9:24	determination	100:21
41:13	coregulation	co-chair 62:8	dark 95:25	defendant 24:11	31:8 57:12	disclosed 105:12
constitutional	43:12	co-regulation	data 3:6 49:11	97:12	determine 56:6	disconnect 89:15
32:7 41:13	corner 48:17	43:4 49:25	date 15:16 51:23	defendants 8:22	determined 26:3	discouraging
42:25	73:8	50:3	64:12 95:12	defending 39:18	26:4	114:14
consumers 9:5	corporate 8:2,2	crazy 13:16	96:3 97:23	39:18	deterrent 59:6,7	discourse 49:16
contact 107:1	21:11 40:18	create 20:11 23:1	111:13	define 28:11	deterring 68:5	96:5
contend 20:16	46:14,14 48:19	67:12	dated 1:14 64:2	defined 8:4	develop 14:14	discourses 96:14
contended 30:5	Corporation	created 30:1	daughter's 25:8	definitely 110:20	27:7 44:1 68:8	discourteous
content 9:6,7	48:13	111:25	25:9	definition 2:17	95:13	61:6
78:18 103:15	corporations	creates 64:25	Dave's 103:14	28:5 29:5	developed 18:25	discrete 111:9
contention 26:14	49:12	credit 111:25	day 12:21 16:24	102:7	23:4,24 113:23	discretion 34:4
contents 78:20	correct 26:10	crew 41:18	16:25 31:19	definitions 29:16	developing 4:20	discrimination
context 4:19 8:6	36:11 41:8,9	crime 65:14	49:8 60:7	degraded 77:9	development	65:21,24 67:16
27:11 32:6,15	45:25 64:15	96:24	days 2:16	degrading 66:17	63:7,12	67:20 104:24
81:21 83:3	69:2 76:5,6	crimes 96:22	DČMS 53:8	73:11	dialogue 85:2	107:21 108:2
84:1,11 89:2,8	97:7	criminal 65:7	de 57:11	degree 12:7,8	diaries 41:7	109:5,18
90:21,25 94:10	corrected 38:17	98:5	deal 14:14 27:3	84:21 105:23	dictating 13:1	discriminatory
94:13,15 95:9	correspondent	Crisis 85:3	32:5 39:22	Deirdre 69:5,22	dictatorship	111:8
97:5,10 103:2	3:17 12:9	critical 83:13	42:7 52:9	delayed 58:19	2:14	discuss 48:8
105:15,16	corruption 36:20	104:11 106:3	56:23 68:1	deleterious 6:6	dictatorships	discussed 9:23
107:24 113:21	cost 17:25 18:1	criticised 42:18	72:10 92:20	deliberate 10:6	2:17	21:6 55:6 57:1
114:9	39:18 40:1	critique 112:21	95:7 111:9	delivering 68:3	difference 4:22	108:22
contexts 5:3	48:13 56:4	cross-questions	dealable 26:22	demeaning	7:4 78:13,18	discussion 60:3
86:22	costs 17:21 19:1	47:5	dealing 6:25	103:18	78:21 90:12	106:9
contextual 92:25	39:21 55:4	crowd 7:17	30:25 34:3	democracy 2:17	differences 4:23	disinterest 45:21
contextualisati	couch 36:5	crowded 25:23	52:18	25:20 34:2	78:16 90:15	disk 15:9,10,11
96:20	council 50:8	crucial 19:19	deals 63:9	42:25	different 7:5 8:8	dislikeable 94:23
contextualise	countries 3:9 4:3	51:3 102:19	Dear 69:5,22	Democrat	10:15 22:14	display 79:2,7,11
81:13 83:6	6:4 8:16 37:12	111:22	debate 3:9 15:20	113:10	25:11 27:20,21	displayed 66:13
84:10	62:23	crudely 104:23	32:19 39:12	democratic	28:3,17,25	71:21 72:4
contextualised	country 16:19	cultural 65:15	100:4,22 102:9	16:20	29:20 33:1,2,3	75:5 79:14
83:25	30:22 31:5	86:16 88:19	102:18 103:16	democratically	33:4 35:17	dispute 45:2
continental 34:9	couple 13:4	culture 12:11,13	decade 19:15	113:3	39:15 43:9	53:22 56:12,21
continue 9:5	18:19	13:17,23 63:4	decades 103:6	demon 89:23	59:8 60:2	dissertation
71:3	course 11:18	66:8 87:1,10	December 64:5	demonise 89:6	72:12 95:19	87:22
<u> </u>	•		1	•		

31.414.14.1	06 16 17 27 2	26.10	04.4.05.6.07.5	40 15 17 10	2.15	C-11 47 00
distinct 14:1	26:16,17 37:2	26:19	84:4 85:6 87:5	48:15,17,19	expression 2:15	fall 47:22
distinguishing	46:13 48:14	enforces 65:1	88:12	exemplary 8:14	3:5 4:19,24,25	fallen 16:21
6:22 9:21	51:19 88:8	engage 20:8	ethnic 62:10	exemption 27:22	5:5,7 6:23 7:4	false 38:2 96:17
distorted 88:13	106:1	56:19 72:23	EU 18:2	35:8	7:8,8,10,24 8:4	96:19,21,22,23
disturbing 87:24	editorially 44:15	102:9,18	European 5:10	exercise 99:21	9:21,23,24	96:24 97:1
diverse 103:10	editors 45:12,18	engaging 75:20	6:4 37:7 40:21	exercised 16:19	10:8 19:3	98:3
docility 13:17	45:21 105:25	engines 49:12	42:13,14,14,15	exert 50:6	23:17 25:18	familiar 14:20
doctor 11:21	111:20 113:15	English 3:25	42:19	exhibit 70:13,23	37:15 53:14	95:11
12:20 36:24	education	4:11 8:24 10:7	evaluation 54:17	70:25 71:15,17	55:9 58:2 67:1	families 65:7
doctors 9:25	108:21 109:4	32:20	event 29:25	72:11 73:13	67:3,22 102:17	87:5
12:14	effect 6:6 8:14,17	enhance 102:8	events 3:15	75:7 76:4,7,11	102:21	family 24:17
documents 4:17	33:25 39:20	enhances 27:25	everybody 69:14	76:13 77:18,19	expressively	72:9 85:9,17
46:19,19	59:3,4,7,8,17	enhancing 49:1	98:16 102:22	exhibits 64:13	78:14	93:20
doing 31:25 37:3	78:24,25 93:5	enjoy 9:11 23:2,8	ever-increasing	70:10 72:10,13	extend 74:20	famously 112:4
47:20 56:11	112:18	enjoyed 15:23	66:2	80:2	extent 7:19 23:7	far 11:4 19:25
60:22 82:23	effectively 44:13	enormous 15:15	evidence 1:15	exhort 58:5	24:8 55:25	42:12 45:16
92:20 93:4	54:8 55:8	19:1 99:13	24:14 34:24	exist 9:17 30:16	69:8 101:25	50:3 60:6
104:12 111:12	efficacy 35:19	enshrined 37:7	52:12 53:1	38:8 66:11	external 43:20	82:14
115:3	effort 98:11	ensue 47:24	59:11 60:1	73:11 79:16,23	49:6	farewell 14:9
dolls 103:14	115:22	ensure 11:9 36:6	63:25 64:3,23	existence 43:18	extra 57:23	fast 58:16
domain 31:9	efforts 62:23	50:13	68:20 80:7	existing 26:19	extraordinarily	fast-changing
83:8	egregious 2:25	entertainment	111:12	29:23 32:12	12:3	46:1
door 9:18 28:6	54:1	11:16	evident 78:9	66:8 67:14	extremely 6:6	fast-forward
doorstepped	eight 48:4	entirely 97:6,7	evil 64:25	104:18	32:1 71:17	47:2
24:18	either 10:6 54:5	114:13	evoke 26:12	exists 30:4 51:14	75:4 76:15	Fat 85:20 112:13
doorstepping	59:18 97:12	environment	evolved 2:18 4:6	78:18 109:17	80:4	father 87:4,4
25:10	108:9	4:20 8:7 51:17	exactly 32:21	exotic 89:18	extremity 69:12	fathers 89:5
dots 48:5,8	eke 12:10	equal 23:2 103:9	60:13 67:4	exoticise 86:19	ex-partners	fault 6:14
doubt 47:7	elaborate 9:20	equalities-type	exaggerate 7:19	exoticising 82:23	94:15	faulty 28:21
115:18	elected 50:6	68:1	exaggerating 6:7	expand 44:4	eye 34:14 66:13	favour 38:23
Dowler 52:23	113:3	equality 22:22	example 5:23	expect 24:1	75:5	fear 98:2 111:25
Dr 113:9	element 51:18	62:19 66:15	18:20 24:13	56:12 84:6,7	eyeful 75:18	feared 94:1
draft 21:15 30:7	57:11 86:23	101:19 107:18	27:8 31:10	91:17 92:15		feature 57:2
30:8 56:13	elements 52:16	107:24 109:6	37:19 40:22	expense 15:1	F	69:15 81:20
drastic 114:21	114:10	109:16,18	41:7,18 42:7	expenses 18:21	fabulous 47:22	100:21
draw 8:10 29:15	elimination	110:1 112:24	50:3 65:5,7,8	33:13	face 112:11	features 39:16
57:20 103:1	65:21	equally 102:12	65:11,14 68:7	expensive 20:6	Facebook 65:11	53:20 90:19
104:17	embrace 2:21,24	equivalent 5:10	69:24 70:18,23	55:8	80:17,21 81:4	February 85:10
drawing 52:16	embraces 88:23	15:17 22:22	72:19 73:12,25	experience 11:10	81:6,15,16,17	fed 12:19
dreadful 92:24	emphasis 78:4	equivalently	74:5,13,14	11:25 40:22	93:18	feed 12:17,18
dress 88:2	emphasise 19:14	54:19	75:11,22 76:4	56:23 84:21	faced 32:2	85:15 95:23
drinking 96:10	emphatic 25:17	era 12:5,6	76:7 84:13	102:4	facilitates 45:2	feeding 12:13,14
drive 107:2	empowered	eroticisation	85:2 86:11	experienced	facilities 45:5	feeds 96:4
driven 13:23	105:18	70:21	87:3,18 90:17	97:23	facillitate 51:4	108:12
drop 16:8	empowerment	eroticises 74:2	92:3 93:19	experiences	fact 9:2 30:19	feel 33:23 57:18
due 56:10	18:6	error 21:15	95:11 97:9	100:10 113:18	66:13,16 72:2	66:25 67:17
E	emulate 8:16	31:24 81:24	103:10 104:5	experiencing	79:15 80:10	70:14 93:20
	enable 91:7	especially 76:23	110:8 112:7,8	86:20 89:11	81:15 91:13,25	101:21 106:17
earlier 32:1	102:11 enables 23:2	77:11	113:7	expertise 84:25	113:15	feeling 112:20 feels 52:1 105:22
early 3:16 52:23	enabling 102:21	essence 85:11 86:7	examples 40:21 52:9,25 68:9	110:19 experts 65:13	facto 57:11	felt 60:24
54:16 57:12	enabling 102:21 encapsulate 4:21	essential 113:17	68:15 70:1,3	87:6,15 91:4	factor 91:20	femininity 73:17
East 3:15	80:18 86:7	essentially 38:14	70:11,15 73:24	87:0,15 91:4 explain 52:22	factors 32:11	femininty /3:1/ feminism 100:17
easy 73:4	encapsulation	50:24 59:19	70:11,15 73:24 74:10,24 75:6	64:20 69:5	92:2 facts 26:10	feral 14:9,10
Eaves 63:7,8	65:17	66:10,19 69:7	74:10,24 75:6	74:22	facts 26:10	fictitious 73:25
economic 4:10	encounter 50:25	69:22,25 70:8	86:4 90:8 96:8	explained 29:9	fail 15:21 73:10	field 43:16 62:7
88:19		71:7,13 73:4	99:24 102:24	explanation 95:3	failed 62:14	fight 54:11
economy 92:12 101:19	encourage 72:22 encouragement	77:15,23 79:19	103:1 104:8	explanation 93:3	failing 17:1	file 64:13 70:15
	108:21	109:8,11	exception 22:13	82:25 84:12	90:11 93:1	74:10 76:5,8
editing 31:10	endangering	110:12 111:24	40:11	exponentially	failings 19:17	111:10
edition 76:1,3	30:25	110:12 111:24	exceptional	46:5	failure 29:22	filming 46:21
editor 3:19,20	endear 13:24	established 4:3	41:20	expose 104:11	fair 2:4 12:21	final 30:9 32:18
40:17 44:7	endear 13:24 endorse 37:23,24	24:10	exceptions 12:12	expose 104:11 exposing 36:20	29:15 33:20	34:6 55:24
46:3,17,23	44:23 49:3	et 8:3 43:4 46:21	33:14 35:7	exposing 30:20 exposure 33:13	37:16 88:14	58:8
47:3,3,4,6,10	58:24	47:6,18 54:11	excessively 89:3	express 5:2	114:3	finally 15:8 19:9
47:10,19 48:18	enforce 29:23	80:25 81:12	90:5	20:19 23:9	faith 28:13,21,21	53:18 56:24
editorial 2:23 19:5 21:10	enforced 21:8	82:12 83:2,7	excuse 28:15	101:20	faithfully 14:3 fake 75:19	63:5 64:17
17.3 41.10	cinorecu 21.0	02.12 03.2,1	CACUSE 20.13	101.20	14NC / J.17	03.3 04.17
	•	•	•	•	•	•

00 24 102 24	92.10	22 2 102 22	105.16	49.20.51.20	04.10	107.01
99:24 102:24	82:19	23:3 103:23	105:16	48:20 51:20	94:10	107:21
111:9	fora 56:20	freelancers	getting 75:18	107:23 114:4	hammering	heard 7:2 25:7
financial 3:17 12:22 18:14	forced 86:10,12 86:23	26:18 freely 5:2 10:11	80:24 get-out-of-jail	governance 8:2 21:11 40:18	26:11 hand 10:17	37:23 51:16,24 96:13
financially 59:15	forces 88:21	79:15 80:10	27:16	43:25 46:14	14:15 23:17,18	hearing 80:10
find 19:19 20:25	forefront 3:8	French 40:21	girl 69:4,21 78:1	government 5:23	25:6	Heather 14:24
22:8,11 32:3	foreign 12:9	41:12,15,18	84:14 112:16	12:23 17:14	hands 15:12	15:8,11 18:21
55:1 69:11	31:12 53:15	42:5	girls 62:11 65:4	37:5 62:3 66:4	70:14	61:17 63:6
70:17,25 73:6	forging 46:19	frequency 87:3	73:16,18 76:21	109:3	Hanover 41:24	103:19
78:17 80:8	form 25:13,14	friend 96:11	77:12 81:1,14	governments	happen 13:5	heavily 3:3
82:17 94:3,17	43:13 50:4	friends 11:20	82:1,7 84:4	104:11	36:22 57:15	heavy 55:2
96:7 104:12	51:21 59:19	frightened 43:13	86:17,19 87:1	grab 82:5	91:5 92:6	Heawood 1:5,6
115:2	63:21 65:23	frightening 19:2	87:7,12 89:13	gradient 69:11	happened 13:3,3	1:12,12,20,22
finding 48:13	66:16 72:5	front 5:18 16:13	105:15 106:4	graduate 3:13	14:24 15:7,8	2:8 3:24,25
fine 47:19 104:10	76:19,22 97:23	63:9 69:19	110:6	grail 49:24	36:22 82:21,24	6:18,21 8:6,11
fining 43:4	109:15 110:2	70:24 71:4,16	give 11:22 13:12	grants 105:22	84:5 87:5	10:14 14:12,17
fire 25:23	110:10 111:1	71:24 74:19	13:19 24:13	graphic 113:23	89:24 91:5	16:3,15 18:5
first 1:4,9,17,23	formal 1:15 64:3	75:3,6 76:3,4	25:2 32:11	grass-roots	99:15	18:12 21:20,21
2:11 4:15 5:9	64:5,16	76:24 111:22	37:1 41:6	62:22	happening 21:13	22:15,16 23:20
10:19,21 21:14	former 46:3	frontline 91:4	47:12 60:1	grateful 50:11	36:25 46:5	24:23 27:3,12
22:15 26:21	81:11	fulfil 17:1	73:24 75:10	58:22 59:24	60:14 86:22	29:14,15,18
27:4 29:22	forms 54:23 63:8 63:11 86:18	full 1:9 56:11 63:18	80:14 104:8	63:22 66:24 gratuitous 86:11	87:9 89:19	32:15,17,18 37:22,24 38:25
31:19 33:7,9 33:22,23 40:24	93:23 109:11	63:18 fully 69:16	given 31:11 40:25 52:15	gratuitous 86:11 grave 108:9	91:7,19,19 94:11	37:22,24 38:25 39:17 40:2,13
43:21 44:12	formulation	function 44:21	69:13 87:2	great 39:20	happens 82:10	43:21,25 44:3
49:6 53:1,20	35:12	63:12	102:25 104:5	48:22 52:9	95:22	49:3,4,20,22
61:23 64:1,23	forthcoming	fundamental	gives 41:13	55:6 56:23	happy 2:7 39:14	50:15 53:18,20
69:3 70:5 82:4	17:10	11:12,18 25:20	giving 12:25 36:3	60:6 76:20	42:6 44:4	53:22 55:11,19
88:17 95:23	forum 74:22	36:1 50:10	80:7 82:9	greater 8:8 18:1	98:15	55:24 57:18
104:18 105:3,6	109:3	58:1	glamour 74:20	38:6 46:10	harassed 85:21	58:24 60:5
firstly 66:1	forward 68:6	fundamentalism	global 5:21	67:25,25	harassment	61:10
111:19	96:9 113:9	87:17	go 11:15 13:12	greatest 44:5	26:20,25 66:16	Heeswijk 61:18
fist 52:15	fought 15:4	fundamentally	21:19 31:18	greatly 49:1	72:5 74:3	63:1,1 64:8,10
fit 43:14 60:17	23:15	5:5 19:23 38:5	33:21 34:17	grey 3:4	76:20,23	64:15 65:25
90:25 95:20	found 54:14	45:15	36:23,25 46:25	grievance 46:25	hard 23:8 24:2	66:1 68:11,13
flaky 46:24	founded 2:13	fundamentals	47:10,20,23	grotesque 54:7	50:2,17,19,21	69:2,7 70:9,17
flattering 26:13	founding 3:25	104:9	48:6 50:23	group 4:4 15:18	harm 23:22,23	71:2,4,17
flaws 50:22	four 53:1 69:4	funding 45:16	53:16 55:2	62:14 106:23	24:1,3,6,10,20	72:15 73:23
flesh 32:11	91:14	furnished 4:17	59:10 68:2	108:4,5 110:20	24:20,24 25:4	74:11,24 75:3
floor 2:8 13:18 13:19	framework	further 9:20	70:12 72:13 74:15 76:10	111:4	29:7,10 35:5	75:12,14 76:2
flourishing	22:20 44:24 81:14 106:15	32:25 41:13 72:10 83:12	95:1,16 98:19	groups 10:11 14:1 60:1	35:11 39:3,4 91:9	76:6,9,12 77:3 77:5,22 78:17
22:22	framing 104:17	114:11	108:10 114:11	62:24 68:1	Harman 113:7	79:4,9 80:1,4
flows 93:12	France 6:5 40:24	future 13:9 14:5	goes 35:18 41:14	106:19 107:11	harmful 66:10	109:7,8 111:15
flung 42:12	41:4	57:2 91:7	96:22	107:18 108:16	68:4 78:23	111:19 114:5
flying 49:14	free 2:14 3:4 4:6	37.2 71.7	going 12:18	109:23,24	96:7,16	114:17 115:4,7
focus 21:9 81:5.6	4:19 5:5,7 7:10	G	13:20 14:4	111:25 112:19	harms 103:7	115:20
81:7,14 82:15	7:10 8:3 9:21	gained 35:10	18:5 19:20	grown 78:2	111:7	Heeswijk's
83:5 86:24	9:22,23,24	gang 82:1 90:18	23:13 27:3	grubby 20:9	Harriet 113:6	111:11
87:3,13 93:6	10:5 19:3	101:2	30:22 32:19	Guardian 16:24	Harringay 85:18	held 14:20 15:22
93:24 97:18	21:17 22:6,12	gathered 33:3	36:21 40:19	44:7,17	Harris 113:9	16:19 58:9
98:22 101:5	24:9 37:15	gender 104:23	43:19 47:7,12	guess 24:4	Harry 74:1	help 60:19 62:12
103:7	48:22 71:25	107:24 110:1	47:13,14 61:22	111:19 114:17	Harvey 61:17	111:13
focused 62:4	73:8 93:8	gendered 100:18	63:16 64:20	115:4	63:5,6,6 64:17	helpful 39:15
102:16	104:24 105:22	general 11:12	68:9,10,16	guidance 67:23	64:19 66:23,24	102:19
focuses 80:22	105:24 108:23	35:6 39:1	70:4,12 72:1	110:18	90:7,10,17	helps 49:16
82:11,13	112:19,20 freedom 4:7 8 10	40:11 41:2	72:10,24 73:5	guided 109:16	93:16,18 95:14	heritage 43:9
focusing 35:21 76:14 84:17	freedom 4:7,8,19 4:24,24,25	53:10 69:4	75:19 76:9 79:24 81:24	guidelines 67:24 gun 37:1	97:18 98:10,13 98:22 99:1,10	high 8:20 56:8 67:4 68:3
88:6 98:24	6:23,23 7:4,5,7	78:10 93:13	83:11 87:18	gun 37:1 guy 13:11	98:22 99:1,10	97:22
follow 15:25	7:8,8,24 20:8	100:5,5 103:2 generally 41:19	91:19 94:1	GV 41:19	100:3 110:15	higher 41:4
17:15 58:11	23:16 25:18	94:12 100:16	95:7	Gypsy 85:20	110:16	highlight 2:15,24
following 46:8	33:12 53:14	104:22 109:4	good 1:3 5:17	Jp5, 03.20	head 31:2	46:18
46:15 47:15	58:2 67:1,3,22	114:22	11:19 13:15	<u> </u>	headless 76:14	highlighted 66:3
48:24 100:1	102:10,17,21	generated 25:1	16:25 28:13,20	hacking 11:7	headline 82:12	highlighting
Fontaniva 34:8	104:10	genie 35:4	36:12,16 41:5	46:18	112:12	12:5
footballers 34:14	freedoms 4:9	genuine 101:4	45:6,15 46:16	half 4:12 16:22	headlines 103:17	hip 60:25
	l	l	I	l	l	l

Higlan's 25.14	77:19 97:8,11	:magazzmagy: 40.7	inflicted 71.0	20.4 16 20.2 2	involved 2:19 3:3	100.7 111.16
Hislop's 35:14		inaccuracy 40:7	inflicted 71:8	29:4,16 30:2,3		109:7 111:16
historians 54:10	97:12 110:24	inaccurate 65:5	influence 50:7	30:11,14,23	12:7 48:23	113:20
history 51:24	identifying 93:14	86:12 102:3	88:20	32:7,10,14	51:7 101:13	Jay's 24:13
hold 14:18 16:10	identity 81:23	107:21	informal 97:20	33:1 34:16,16	107:18	jealous 112:13
17:22,23 19:21	105:12	inadvertently	information 7:15	34:19 40:5	involvement	JK 24:14 25:2,8
holding 49:13	idol 73:15	58:18	7:24 11:22	47:16,23 59:25	67:25	26:7
67:6,6 93:9	idols 73:14	inappropriate	12:11 31:7,9	60:6 85:14	involving 8:21	job 93:25
102:13	ignorance 92:25	54:24 107:6	32:4 33:12	96:19 97:9	34:14 56:15	John 1:7,11 8:13
Hollywood 78:3	illegal 25:5	inaudible 63:7	35:11 38:2,12	102:7 107:10	74:1	9:1
holy 49:24	illegally 15:12	63:15	46:19 47:1	108:15	in-house 44:21	join 48:5
honest 95:14	illustrate 69:8	incapable 82:8	49:13 67:8	interested 24:21	Iran 5:23	joining 48:8
honour 51:6	illustrations	incapacitated	88:6,10 105:19	28:9 32:21	irresponsible	joint 30:8 58:14
honourable	113:24	39:6	infringement	44:10 56:22	85:23,24	68:12
33:14	illustrative 70:5	incentive 55:2	23:19	98:17 101:8	Islamic 87:8	jointly 56:10,11
honour-based	112:9	incentives 51:10	inherit 23:23	interesting 11:23	ISPs 49:13	jokes 112:15,15
86:3,9,24	image 41:17,22	incentivise 51:8	initiative 12:25	11:24 17:23	issue 20:3 34:3	Jonathan 1:6,12
hope 6:15 16:20	71:9 75:13,20	incident 90:25	injunction 35:10	31:16 80:5,8	35:23 36:1	18:24 26:7
46:12 51:19	107:3	99:16	38:15 39:19,19	95:19 98:20	39:1,22 40:5	30:17
52:15,17 56:16	imagery 74:18	include 62:6	injunctions	103:16,16	43:19 48:19	Jonathan's
61:5 98:8	75:3	104:23	34:25 35:15	115:14	49:18 58:15	18:20
hopefully 30:9	images 66:11,17	includes 26:17	injury 39:4,13	interestingly	69:6 72:17,21	journalism 7:17
hoping 85:15	72:3,6 73:11	includes 20.17	innocuous 43:3	31:15 73:14	79:5,13,22,24	10:13 11:17,17
horrified 52:24	78:23 80:7	69:18 105:12	innovations 44:5	78:5	80:18 85:11	11:18 14:6
horrilled 52:24		incorporate 2:5				16:17 20:6
	103:10 109:19 imagine 6:1		input 110:19	interests 5:18	86:2,14 87:8 91:22 93:12.13	
hours 30:20	20:14 46:15	incorporation 6:3	Inquiry 1:10,14 1:15 2:6 5:22	internal 4:17		21:14 30:12,15
House 42:16 huge 4:22 13:22	20:14 46:15 49:3	6:3 increase 19:24		6:19 8:19	97:15 98:23	35:2 36:12,16 43:13 67:4
0			11:4 16:16	43:12,20,21	103:5,16	
17:11 72:16	Imkaan 62:9	increasingly	17:22 19:19	44:6,11 48:9	104:16,17,24	68:3 81:9
89:12 97:20	immediacy 46:4	100:4	42:23 43:7	68:15,18,19,20	110:1,25 111:9	91:18
103:5	immediate 88:4	independence	52:25 54:2,4	74:16	111:23 114:17	journalist 3:11
human 21:15	immediately	43:2 44:16	58:5,19 61:3	international 4:1	issued 8:20	11:19 28:13
22:22,22 42:17	82:5 103:17	independent	63:21 64:1,3,6	4:2,5 13:25	issues 6:17 9:23	29:2 38:6,9
62:20 63:2	immunity	44:16,24 50:22	64:16,22,22	40:20 48:12	18:3 19:16	journalistic 3:22
65:20 88:17	105:23	67:25 110:20	65:19 66:25	62:19 65:20	26:16 31:16	36:19
99:14 104:14	impact 7:21 8:23	Index 2:12,20	87:19 113:22	92:9 103:6	34:15 35:16	journalists 3:1
humbly 11:2	9:1 60:2 83:8	5:13 11:5,11	114:9	115:8,11	44:1 49:7,14	10:4,25 12:10
Hungarian	89:17 110:4,4	32:20 44:4	insertion 58:19	internationally	49:17 58:9	12:16 17:22
40:22 42:7	imparting 67:8	indicates 84:16	inside 44:14	44:9	60:4 68:1	105:9,18,21
Hungary 6:5	impede 10:9	individual 11:4	71:18	Internet 9:11	70:18 71:18	judge 36:23
42:8,9,11,24	imperfect 35:11	14:22,24 17:5	insight 11:23	46:6	85:1 87:13	judges 16:12
hungry 17:18	impersonation	17:17 18:4,7	40:20,25	interpretation	98:7 100:16,17	26:3,4,4 34:4
Hunt 61:19	46:20	18:15,23 21:3	insofar 30:4 50:5	67:17	101:24 103:22	56:18 57:2,5
62:17,18,18	impinged 25:21	21:5 23:18	instance 17:11	interpreted 41:3	105:17 106:6	judgment 34:4
64:5,7 65:17	implement 101:3	31:18 32:11,17	24:5 28:3,17	intimidated 3:3	108:17,22	34:11 37:9
65:20 102:25	implication	36:6 42:1	28:18 91:12	101:25	111:21 112:24	judgments 53:9
103:4 107:15	94:25 95:4	45:19 53:9	instances 91:14	intimidating	113:16 114:1	Jumping 99:8
107:17 108:25	imply 65:12	68:9 80:14	95:7	101:22	114:12	jurisdiction 8:14
hurdles 40:4	importance 6:7	90:4 102:24	instigated 112:5	introduced 41:1	item 48:1 82:1	8:15,24 18:1
husband 89:24	15:19	106:19,25	instinct 6:12	introduction 8:8	85:8 87:20	41:12 43:9
hyper-sexualised	important 11:1	107:4 108:6,9	13:20 26:21	8:11		jurisdictional
74:18	17:4 22:25	113:1	instincts 3:22	intrusion 25:7,14	J	57:3
hypocrisy 28:5	23:11 45:4,12	individually	institutional 9:3	38:3,21	Jacqui 61:19	justice 1:3,25 2:4
78:8	67:18 77:25	107:15	15:6	intrusive 65:6	62:18	2:10 6:21,25
	104:10	individuals 5:1	insufficient	invade 30:22	January 1:1,14	16:1,5 18:4
I	impose 38:13	10:10 19:1,3	30:24	invading 25:8	64:2	23:13 24:12
Ian 35:14	impossible	22:10 49:13	integral 42:13	invariably 6:16	Jay 1:4,8,9,13,17	27:13 35:17
idea 14:8 84:13	112:17	54:7 59:12	intense 96:18	31:7 73:1	2:11 7:1 8:5	39:9,23 45:23
86:15,25 87:1	impression 95:1	112:20	intensely 94:19	inverted 112:15	18:5 26:24	50:9 51:4,23
88:14 108:13	imprimatur 19:8	industry 9:15	intent 88:8,9	investigate 20:18	37:16 39:22	52:2 55:5,15
ideals 67:4 68:3	improperly	17:24 71:23	interception	investigations	40:10,19 42:11	55:18,20 56:9
identification	35:10	inequality 92:14	27:9	48:23 110:23	53:18 57:17	56:22 57:14,21
97:15 99:6	improve 21:10	inevitable 65:16	interest 10:11	investigative	59:22 61:11,21	59:23 60:11
identified 42:2	improved 11:8	92:13	15:19 25:25	20:5 35:1	61:22 62:17	61:13 62:12
83:14	110:18	inevitably 23:13	27:2,6,10,17	invisibility 93:14	63:19,24 68:19	63:15 68:18,20
identify 4:8	improving 51:22	inexorably 7:21	27:20,22,24	invite 95:12	68:22 79:24	79:1,8 83:11
41:21 53:20	52:11	infantilisation	28:6,8,10,12	involve 46:17,21	84:22 99:24	83:16,19,22,25
63:24 70:16	inaccessible 59:9	103:18	28:14,16,18,24	91:2	107:9 108:14	97:4 98:4,6,8
			l			ĺ
<u> </u>						

00 11 14 24	(0.15 (0.12	107701715	02.10.22.25	1.11	1	
98:11,14,24	60:15 69:13	10:7,7,9 17:15	83:19,22,25	lobbying 2:22 local 62:23 73:8	luncheon 116:1	matter 49:18
99:8,11,20 104:3,7 106:22	72:24 76:20 77:21 80:23	20:17 21:7 26:1,19 29:23	97:4 98:4,11	73:9 85:18	lying 41:22	101:23
104:3,7 106:22	81:10 83:1,3	30:16 31:3	98:14,24 99:8	located 29:22	M	matters 8:10 20:9 101:16
111:14 113:21	84:3,18,20	32:2 39:1 43:5	99:11,20 106:22,25	locked 14:11	mac 48:16	104:18
111.14 113.21	85:3,22 87:4,7	52:18 97:6	108:4,13	Lolita 83:7		Max 40:8
115:14,21	87:8,9 88:6	lawyers 17:17,23	111:14 113:21	London 62:19	magazine 31:14 47:11	Mayfair 78:12
justification 22:8	89:21 90:1	56:15 91:3	114:6,25 115:6	lone 15:17	magical 50:1,18	McCanns 52:24
22:11 41:6	91:6 92:1 96:4	laziness 10:24	115:14,21	long 15:4 25:10	51:12	mean 8:14 14:16
95:2	100:20 102:24	lead 34:25 43:14	Lewis 105:4	68:2	mags 79:6,11	17:24 20:24
juxtaposed 78:6	105:8,11,12	109:3	107:15	longer 3:11	Mail 82:3	23:21 24:1
Juxtuposeu 70.0	106:16 107:20	leader 19:13	liaison 68:1	long-term 20:7	main 19:14 34:7	31:3 32:10
K	115:18	leading 5:16	libel 5:16 8:18	look 16:17 19:14	111:2	36:9,21 49:8
Kampfner 1:4,7	knowing 48:18	leaping 99:7	10:2,7 17:24	22:13,17 23:20	mainstream 7:12	50:17 55:11
1:11,11,13,16	101:22	leaps 95:25	17:25 18:25	25:14 28:12	16:22 19:6	76:12 77:22
2:3,7,11,12	known 4:1 81:15	leave 32:10 35:7	23:24 24:1,3	51:23 53:25	43:3 66:11,21	84:16 98:18
3:10,11 4:15	96:11	94:1 106:10	28:17,25 29:11	60:13 68:9	71:19,22 75:6	100:23 109:11
4:22 6:1,22,24	knows 98:6	leaving 2:19 34:3	30:2,4 31:17	70:3,4,16	77:12 78:20,23	meaning 57:13
7:7 9:20 10:12		led 11:6 14:9	36:15 38:1,4	74:25 75:11	79:15 80:11	means 23:1 45:6
10:19 11:1	L	43:11	38:16 39:2,18	77:5,18 81:9	majority 44:12	45:6,6 111:3
18:19 20:13,22	Labour 12:23	left 57:17	40:2,6 53:25	85:3 90:22	59:11	measures 43:8
25:16 27:1	lack 52:18 92:25	left-hand 75:9	54:2,5,21 56:2	91:18 94:14,19	making 4:21	58:11 91:8
29:19,24 30:3	lads 79:10	legal 4:10 17:9	58:7,8,12,20	looked 43:5	8:25 12:4	mechanism
33:6,7,22 34:1	lady 62:13	17:20,23 18:25	59:1,10 60:9	55:25 68:25	54:23 108:8	48:10 55:21
34:23 35:13	lad's 79:6	18:25 115:12	60:23	looking 21:18	109:18 112:16	106:18
36:9 37:18	land 17:15 51:2	legislation 60:22	libels 8:21	42:9 44:2	113:2	mechanisms
40:16,20 41:9	51:3	66:15 109:16	Liberal 113:10	45:10 78:3,15	male 75:15 90:14	53:10 56:20
42:5,10,11	language 65:12	109:21 115:3	liberties 31:4	103:7 104:4	100:14	media 5:19 7:12
44:22,23 45:25	75:13 86:11	legislative 60:15	licensing 43:4	105:14 106:5,5	man 74:6 80:20	9:6,7,24 10:11
49:9,19 51:15	97:13 100:22	legitimacy 79:17	life 12:10 21:4	looks 16:14 92:1	91:14 94:8	10:16 11:12,12
51:17 52:1,13	100:23 101:2	legitimate 32:3	28:1 30:25	101:5,9 102:8	95:3	12:2 14:1
53:19 56:10	Larasi 61:20,24	36:19 104:1,2	41:15 68:23	Lord 1:3,25 2:4	management	15:22 19:6,19
57:10,17,25	61:25,25 64:1	108:17	89:11 102:4	2:10 6:21,25	26:17 40:18	19:21,24 31:25
60:8 61:9	64:4,24,25	legitimately	lifestyle 94:20	16:1,5 23:13	46:13	32:2,20 42:18
Kampfner's 49:5	80:19 81:22	20:17	liked 102:6	24:12 27:13	manager 63:2,7	43:3 45:12
keeled 33:9	82:3 83:15,18	legitimisation	likelihood 91:8	35:17 39:9,23	105:9	46:1,5 49:9,10
keen 57:23 59:1	83:21,24 84:1	103:24	likened 112:14	45:23 50:9	manages 51:13	53:16 63:4
63:17	84:25 85:12	legitimises	likewise 2:9 64:5	51:23 52:2	managing 47:10	64:25 65:2,23
keep 31:8	86:6,9 87:24	103:22	limb 12:10 39:4	55:5,18,20	47:18	66:18 79:21,23
Kelly 70:5	89:1 105:6	legitimising	limelight 24:16	56:9,22 57:14	mandatory	95:15 99:4
kept 3:21	106:24 107:1	78:25	limit 19:25	57:21 59:23	54:22,23	100:1,5 102:14
key 53:20 90:15	107:13 110:16	Lego 71:25	113:21	60:11 61:13	manifestations	102:15 103:8
104:12 110:9	114:4	lends 79:16	limiting 56:5	62:12 63:15	45:3	103:11,12
kicking 13:19	large 15:18 23:6	length 114:8	104:6	68:18,20 79:1	manner 10:9	108:11 109:11
kill 81:3	largely 15:6	lenses 25:10	limits 102:17	79:8 83:11,16	man's 81:7	110:11,12,13
killed 3:2 80:24	17:15 40:6	lesbian 101:6	line 12:18 63:9	83:19,22,25	man-haters	114:20,24
81:1,2,2,10,12	larger 98:18	lesser 12:7	110:14 111:5	97:4 98:4,11	101:8	115:13
94:14	lasting 35:11	lessons 42:9	lines 21:10 27:24	98:14,24 99:8	Marai 61:20,25	mediate 55:11
killings 93:20	last-chance 53:3	letting 59:21 Let's 70:17	43:24 45:16 108:7	99:11,20 106:22,25	March 2:20	mediation 45:1 54:14 55:16
kind 21:22 26:12	late 3:15	level 6:12 53:12	lingerie 74:7	106:22,25	56:13	medium 6:14,17
26:20 30:25	latitude 104:21	62:3 66:13	linked 86:18	111:14 113:21	marital 95:12 97:9,11,24	meeting 93:8
50:1 54:9 72:18 77:10	Latvia 37:13 launched 10:2	75:5 100:13	91:16 92:10,11	111.14 113.21	97:9,11,24 marked 78:18	meetings 45:12
		Leveson 1:3,25	list 37:21	114.0,23 113.0	marked 78:18 market 96:3	47:25
93:10 94:15,17	law 5:3 9:14,19 15:2,16 17:4	2:4,10 6:21,25	listen 59:25	Lords 58:15	market 96:3 marriage 86:10	megaphone 16:1
95:22,25 100:11 101:1	18:24 22:23	16:1,5 23:13	listening 113:22	loses 97:10	86:12,13,23	16:4
106:8	23:4,24 25:14	24:12 27:13	literally 12:16	losing 39:4 93:25	mass 19:16	member 42:13
kinds 49:14	26:19 27:21	35:17 39:9,23	13:1 34:17	lost 20:20	mass 19.10 massive 48:11	45:5 51:5
53:11 71:13	28:25 39:24	45:23 50:9	Lithiania 37:14	lot 3:21 9:25	75:18	107:4 111:4
92:1	41:11 42:18	51:23 52:2	litigious 59:14	17:21 31:3	matched 39:10	members 44:11
Kingdom 37:20	43:3,18 51:2,3	55:5,18,20	little 19:20 25:12	43:5 63:17	material 60:19	62:5 106:11
know 13:2 15:14	53:24 55:21	56:9,22 57:14	42:12 94:3	84:8 93:21	66:14 72:18	membership
17:14,21 19:25	57:6,8,9 59:4,6	57:21 59:23	96:20 102:22	101:12,20	78:15 79:20	45:4 51:8,10
22:21 24:9	59:8,9,17 65:5	60:11 61:13	live 21:25	lots 110:24	106:1 109:10	62:22
30:20 36:20	82:9 105:10,21	62:12 63:15	lives 58:25 82:20	loving 89:24	109:12 110:3	men 77:13,13,13
42:12 48:15,16	107:11 115:1	68:18,20 79:1	94:11	low 73:3 99:12	materials 78:19	82:16,18 88:1
49:19 59:14	laws 6:4 8:15	79:8 83:11,16	lobby 3:16 11:25	lunch 13:14	109:16	88:18 89:2,5,6
1	l		I	I	l	l
P						

89:7 90:5	mistakes 82:20	21:14,15 27:19	78:24 79:13	objective 22:18	options 54:21	112:13,16
101:7,8,12	Mitchell 70:6	28:16,18 30:1	80:11 109:14	28:22	opt-in 50:24	112:13,16
mention 26:8	mix 40:7	32:25 44:18	109:22 111:20	objects 66:9,10	Orban 42:24	pages 74:21 75:3
mentioned 100:3	Mm-hm 6:24	46:1 59:16	111:24 112:21	77:9,15 112:2	order 11:22 14:2	76:3
mentioning	75:12	88:18 100:18	newsrooms	Object's 72:19	31:21 54:13	painful 15:5
103:24	mobilise 62:21	navigating 33:17	109:1	obligation	88:17	pair 70:8
men's 84:6	model 44:9 50:24	nearly 77:15	NGO 3:23 4:6	104:19	ordered 57:15	paparazzi 26:11
merely 9:5 16:6	51:12,15	necessarily	91:4	obligations 57:8	organisation	paper 43:5
83:22 108:20	112:11	18:12,16 25:22	NGOs 10:5	115:9,11,12,12	1:24 5:19 11:5	papers 68:25
114:14	models 74:20	42:8 86:4	14:22 54:9	obliged 44:10,20	18:23 19:7,22	78:12 96:4,13
message 71:12	module 111:11	89:22 91:15,16	night 95:25 96:1	56:21	25:18 43:16	paragons 37:15
86:13	111:23 114:10	necessary 14:17	noisy 22:1	obscene 101:10	45:13 48:1,11	paragraph 18:8
messages 109:19	Moldova 37:14	59:5	non-legal 37:2	obscenity 110:7	49:2 62:9 63:2	parameters 32:9
messenger 6:13	moment 8:13	need 6:17 18:11	non-specific	obscure 94:17	85:3 107:5	paraphrase
6:13 Meteron 41:7	32:19 35:21 42:25 67:15	20:7,15 22:7	97:14	Observer 4:13 44:8,18	organisations	104:20
methods 7:18	74:12 102:15	22:11 34:15 37:11 43:23,24	normal 79:18 89:8,14 100:21	observers 28:9	5:1,2 10:10,16 62:2,6 107:18	parents 72:1,17 82:15
11:9 47:15	105:21 106:13	43:25 46:2	normalisation	obviously 5:14	orgy 82:1,4 83:6	Parliament 15:4
48:24	moments 61:7	48:5 51:17	103:24	13:14,22 14:6	orifice 101:3	16:20 32:8
middle 29:17	monitored 53:13	58:11 59:16	normalising	18:20 36:16	original 9:20	33:8,11,17
90:11	monsters 89:4	88:22 106:4,8	76:18,19 78:24	58:24 59:6	17:3 70:13	42:15,15
Middleton 74:1	months 43:18	needs 5:6,7,7	norms 6:4 10:8	63:23 100:4	87:25 88:13	parliamentary
74:3	58:12	24:2 29:2	67:8 102:20	occasion 16:3	originally 41:10	16:17,21
mid-noughties	morally 25:3	45:14 94:16	notable 12:12	occasionally	originals 30:7	Parliament's
12:2	morning 1:3	112:25	note 25:9 29:17	14:10	OSCE 42:16	33:10
mid-November	46:8 58:4 67:6	negative 103:14	noted 9:1 87:2	occurring 67:17	ostensibly 12:2	part 11:1 18:4
68:25	102:5	103:21	115:15	October 19:10	outcome 28:8	20:13 28:1,1
mid-week 76:1,4 mid-1990s 12:1	Moscow 3:13,15 Mosley 40:8	negligence 21:23 negligent 21:24	noticed 102:5 notification	odd 38:25 offering 71:25	outcomes 45:21 outlined 32:23	30:22 37:19 39:23 40:2,4
militated 18:22	Mosley's 34:24	neither 21:23	34:23,25 35:6	offers 55:16 56:7	51:19 53:4,6	43:11 45:22
Miller 26:9	motion 113:9	neutral 54:17	36:4 37:4,6,13	Office 31:12	66:3	52:23 57:21
Milly 52:23	move 10:12	never 21:13	37:23 38:14,23	62:19	outrage 78:6	60:6 62:4
mind 28:15	43:19 49:18	79:13 92:5	40:3	official 25:24	outright 43:17	63:21 75:22
52:20 53:21	74:8 75:25	96:3 97:15	notify 38:9	28:19,20 31:13	outset 30:5	76:14 103:23
61:5 85:22	80:13 90:6	nevertheless	notionally 64:11	31:14,17	outwith 57:5	112:25 115:7
102:11	97:13	11:10	notions 110:7	Oh 21:2	overall 81:20	partial 27:6,15
mindful 53:14,15	moved 3:16,17	new 3:20,20 8:11	November 1:21	okay 18:18 48:4	overhaul 110:10	27:16 102:1
mindset 31:6	3:21,23	12:25 31:10	nuanced 40:10	70:17 101:17	overinterpreted	participants
minimise 91:8	movement 42:1	32:13 43:14	60:3	older 103:11	33:24	77:14
minister 6:11 31:22 36:24	moves 34:22 81:7	53:8 99:25 100:9 107:19	nub 101:23 nude 69:16	ombudsman 44:7,11 53:7	overly 22:2,2 overseas 8:22,22	participate 102:12
42:23	MPs 15:1,3	110:22	number 14:13	once 53:11 57:1	oversight 50:21	participation
ministers 13:15	18:21 33:13	news 5:1 7:15	27:5 35:20	74:7	owing 18:11	103:9 104:6,15
minor 42:20	MSc 87:21	13:25 18:23	37:12 49:5	ones 95:20	owners 43:11	particular 9:4
minority 62:10	Mumsnet 97:19	19:15 46:5,15	56:15 88:16	one-off 92:3,4,23	ownership 41:16	12:5 20:1
minutes 57:17	murder 65:11	46:17,23 47:3	97:20	ongoing 58:19	41:17 44:18	28:24 30:21,22
misery 21:4	80:17 81:6,16	47:3,25 48:11	numbering 4:18	open 22:1 28:6	owns 41:22	41:20 57:16
misguided 31:24	81:17,17 93:19	48:12,12 49:1	6:19 68:15,19	35:7	o'clock 46:9	65:14 73:19
misleading 67:10	murdered 80:20	72:24 90:19	74:16	openly 66:12		85:5,10,15,16
67:16 102:2	81:11	newsagents 79:2	numbers 4:16	open-textured	<u> </u>	86:15,20 87:24
misogynistic	murdering 91:14	Newsnight 3:19	68:17	30:1	paedophilia 78:7	88:9,17 89:7,7
85:14 misogyny 85:8	Muslim 87:4,4,5	newspaper 4:13 7:20 15:18	nurture 11:19	operates 41:11 operation 47:13	page 4:16,18	90:24 91:2 104:4
85:25	myth-busting 105:17	7:20 15:18 19:11 20:1	nurturing 14:7	operation 47:13 operations 25:24	6:19,20 8:6	particularly 3:9
misplaced 19:24	103.17	24:25 25:3	0	30:25 45:17	29:17 66:7,21 68:14,16,18,20	8:7 12:3,5 35:4
misrepresentat	N	44:14 45:11	Object 63:2	48:3	69:4,10,15,18	41:4 46:1,6
65:7	naked 77:15,15	72:8,9 74:20	68:11	opinion 16:12	69:18,19,21	60:18 66:10
misrepresented	name 12:21	79:16 97:10	objectification	101:20 103:20	70:24 71:4,16	74:25 76:21
109:25	61:25 62:18	112:7 113:2	63:3 66:3,21	opportunity	71:24,25 73:14	81:8 82:3,24
misrepresenting	63:1,6	newspapers 5:18	objectified 69:17	56:25 66:24	73:22,25 74:9	92:6 95:6 96:7
67:9 88:10	nameless 76:14	7:11,20 14:20	70:20 77:9	113:17	74:16,17,20	100:16
misrepresentive	names 1:9	17:18 44:20	104:14	oppose 49:19	75:11 76:4,25	parties 35:24
102:3	narrow 5:8	46:6,7 48:22	objectifying	opposed 49:22	77:6,16 78:20	54:13 56:19
missed 51:11	28:10 29:5	66:12 71:19	66:17 76:15	82:15 87:15	80:17 87:20	67:25
missing 99:10 mission 4:7	national 62:9,24	72:23 73:1,3,7 73:11 75:5	objection 17:16	oppression 10:6 opt 51:1	90:11 93:14	partly 41:14 partner 81:11,18
112:17	113:2 nature 8:19	77:12,17 78:8	objectionable 25:3	optional 108:7	100:1 111:16 112:3,6,10,11	102:20
112.17	nature 0.17	77.12,1770.0	23.3	optional 100.7	112.5,0,10,11	102.20
L						

parties 94:15 party 54:6 party 54							=
parts 69:10 parts 69:10 pass 621 79:20 pass 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 79:20 pass 621 79:20 pass 622	nartners 01:15	64.25 65.0	102:24 104:16	nornographic	proforable 51:5	nrincipled 5:5	nronor /3:15
party 54:66 pospec 527 75:18 portography 79 10:32 p							
pass 621 79-20 persuaded 98-84 piclinor 20:17 portiols 22:18 portion 108:11 portion 108:19 portion 20:17 portion 12:18 portion 20:18 portion 2	*				1 0		
Sal Port P							
patriarnelly 87:12 108:11 108:11 108:11 108:11 108:11 108:12 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:25 110:27 110:15:21:12 110:27 110:15:22:13 110:15:22:173	.					-	
patterns 90.22 patt							
Distances Perf 578 Percey 7578 Percey 7579 Percey 7578 Perce							
matterns 90:22 part phenomenally phenomenal	_						
Paul 17.11 Pay 21.3		•	•		-		
Paul 17.11							
pay 21:3 pokemen		•					
paydend 38.18 phone 117.13:2 point 5.22.81.3 psycholograph 107.7 psycholograph 1					_ <u>-</u>		
Posture Post		-					
PCC 283 52:21 pecking 14-1 per 92.5 pbhotograph 70-7 phones 76:24 per 92.5 photograph 70-7 Portree 16.12 per 92.5 per 9					-		
pecking 14:1 personality 14:2 personality 14:1 polity 25:1 place 22:57:8,23 place 12:57:8,23 place 12:57:8,23 place 12:57:8,23 place 13:34:22 place 13:34:24 place 13:34:34:34:34:34:34:34:34:34:34:34:34:34							
peer 925 PERS 325 4.2.3 718 75.8 75.8 75.20 718 75.8 4.11 5.15 3.20 718 75.8 4.11 5.15 3.20 718 75.8 75.20 718 75							
PEM 525 4:2.3		1					
4-11 5-15 76-25 77-6.7 36-8 9.17 22-4.14 25-17 25-18							
32.20	, . , . , . , . , . , . , . , .		, , ,	•			*
pending 58-9 Pottoros 78:12				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		′	
Penthouse 78:12 ponultimate 187 photographs 53:23 55:24 40:11,23 49:20 21:24 23:17 71:19 40:21 75:17 84:22 76:17 84:2.22 76:18 85:14 87:16 76:2.31.1.18 75:2.26 66:22 76:2.31.1.18 75:2.26 66:22 76:2.31.1.18 75:2.26 66:22 76:2.31.1.18 76:2.25 16:18 7						′	
Penultimate 18.7 Price P							
PENSI 102:5 Propople 7:19 10:3 Propople 7:19 10:10 Propople 7:19 Propople 7:19 Propople 7:19 Propopl							
	I			,		-	
35:20 39:8 physical 38:4 pick 16:718:6 picking 49:5 19:66 27:2 100:8 102:5 100:8 102:5 possibility 35:7 69:20 88:14 98:14 98:14 100:6 107:14 100:6 107:14 100:6 107:14 100:6 107:14 100:8 102:5 possibility 35:7 69:10 86:11 proactive 110:22 produbly 46:3 provides 50:5 40:20 38:17 picking 49:5				,			
35:20 398		•			,		
56:1 59:4 66:6 pick 167 18:6 79:210 99:9.10 104:25 111:6 69:10 86:11 87:25 887:21 87:25 887:21 87:25 887:21 87:25 887:21 97:0bably 46:3 provides 50:5 69:23 83:17 93:9 100:13 picking 49:5 109:23 1109:9 109:23 1109:9 109:23 1109:9 109:23 1109:9 109:23 1109:9 109:23 1109:9 113:24 109:23 1109:9 113:24 109:23 1109:9 113:24 109:23 1109:9 113:24 109:23 1109:9 113:24 109:23 1109:9 113:24 109:23 1109:9 113:24 109:23 1109:9 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109:23 109:24 109							
Provides 50:5 Provides 50:							
87:14 89:12,15 91:17 103:19 105:6 107:14 108:25 109:19 108:25 109:19 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 110:9 109:23 10:9 109:23 10:9 109:24,24 109:24,24 109:24,24 109:24,24 109:20 109:24,24 109:24,24 109:20 109:25 120 109:20 109:25 100:20 109:25 100:20 109:25 109:20 109:25 109:24,24 109:26 109:24,24 109:26 109:26 109:25 109:20 109:20 109:25 109:20 109:2		l =					
88:16.92:17 picking 49:5 108:25 109:19 38:23 40:10 102:19 104:10 104:10 105:22 probe 6:2 66:99:2 66:99:2 106:21 108:20 problem 17:20 106:21 106:21 105:24 problem 17:20				l =	,		
93:9 100:13 pick-wp 19:6 picture 26:13 111:3 114:6,25 possibly 34:18 105:24,24 problem 17:20 provision 43:12 106:2 108:20 provision 43:12 provision 43							
10:211 110:6							
people's 54:25 77:19 88:22,23 pointed 52:17 60:9 107:6,19 114:2 29:22 35:22 provision 43:12 82:6 98:14 98:14 98:16 points 4:21 6:18 115:9 potential 9:2 107:6,19 114:2 29:22 35:22 provision 43:12 percetive 95:18 pictures 41:23 pints 4:21 6:18 56:20 108:20 pressure 111:17 pressure 111:23 presure 14:24 presure 14:23							
82:6 perceive 95:18 perceived 66:8 perceive			· ·			-	
perceive 95:18 perceych 66:8 perceych 66:8 perceych 99:2 perfect 99:24 perfect 99:23 perfect 99:23 perfect 20:23,24 perfect 20:23,24 perfect 20:23,24 perfect 20:23,24 perfect 20:23,24 perfect 20:23.24 perfect 20:23.24 perfect 20:23.25 perfect 20:23.24 perfect 20:23.24 perfect 20:23.25 perfect 20:24 perfect 20:23.25 perfect 20:24 perfect 20:24.25 perfect 2							-
perceived 66:8 perception 99:2 perfect 20:23,24 sepreced 20:23,24 perfect 20:23,24 pieces 109:20 pipa 74:1 speriod 91:12 period 91:12 2:21:12 de:22 44:3 speriod 91:12 2:21:2 30:21 speriod 91:12 2:21:2 30:21 speriod 91:12 periodically 61:3 de:13 periodically 61:3 periodically 61:3 speriod 72:25 50:19,21 police 99:4 permanent 93:5 speriod 57:15 permanent permanent 93:5 speriod 57:15 permanent permanent 93:5 speriod 57:15 permanent 93:5 speriod 57:1 permanent 93:6 speriod 57:1 permanent 94:0 speriod 57:1 permanent 95:0 sp							
perception 99:2 perfect 20:23,24 perfect 20:23,22 spersect 20:23,22 perfect 20:23,22 spersect 30:20 spersect 30:21 spersect 30:20 spersect 30:21 spersect 30:20 spe							
perfect 20:23:24 perfectly 29:23 performance 88:5,9,11,13 pieces 109:20 20:4 27:4,5 deces 109:20 39:20 40:13 deces 109:20 deces 109:20 problems 17:11 provoked 65:12 provoke	•						
perfectly 29:23 pieces 109:20 29:20 33:21 37:24 40:16,19 preformance performance 53:10 23:23 24:6,7 point of 91:12 25:12 30:21 point of 91:12 25:12 30:21 point of 91:12 point of 91:14 point of 91:1							
Signal Pippa 74:1 Signal			,				
performance place 8:21 21:12 42:22 44:3 power 10:17,18 31:23 47:24 50:16 public 7:25 53:10 23:23 24:67 57:18 68:8 14:12,16,16,17 24:9 99:13,17 23:23 24:16 93:20 34:21 42:3,12 Poland 37:14 15:17,21,23 pretty 13:1 34:10 99:13,17 23:8 24:16 periodically 61:3 46:13 50:2,17 police 99:4 16:18,18 17:2 42:16,17,20 procedure 48:14 25:25 27:2,6 permanent 101:23 100:16 101:18 67:14 110:22 prevent 21:13 procedures 48:20 27:23,25 28:5 permanently 38:22 placed 85:17 114:18,23 powerful 18:9,15 powerful 18:9,15 processes 26:17 29:4,16 30:1,3 39:6 play 9:3 28:1 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 practice 8:1 processes 26:17 29:4,16 30:1,3 permit 36:2 57:1 player 84:15,19 50:2 1 104:14 processes 26:17 producers 9:7 30:1,1,423 perpetuity 35:16 14:14 27:2,8 50:6 113:3,3 politicians 13:29 50:6 113:3,3 processes 26:17							
53:10 23:23 24:6,7 period 91:12 57:18 68:8 designer of de		* *					
period 91:12 25:12 30:21 69:4 14:18,19 15:16 24:9 99:13,17 23:8 24:16 93:20 34:21 42:3,12 Poland 37:14 15:17,21,23 pretty 13:1 34:10 precedure 48:14 25:25 27:2,6 periods 72:25 50:19,21 police 99:4 16:18,18 17:2 42:16,17,20 procedures 27:10,17,20,22 permanent 101:23 100:16 101:18 67:14 110:22 prevent 21:13 process 9:16 28:8,9,11,14 38:22 placed 85:17 places 42:6 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 poserful 18:9,15 33:12 54:6 48:6 50:6 28:16,18,23 permates 31:5 permetates 31:5 player 84:15,19 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 practice 8:1 preventable professionals 31:9,22 32:6 perpetuty 35:16 14:14 27:2,8 politician 13:19 politician 13:19 practices 8:1 preventing 62:4 progeny 26:16 34:14,15,16,19 persistent 112:2 44:2 53:18,21 politician 3:19 politician 3:24 practiced 8:15 pre-escrutiny project 54:21 project 54:21 47:16,23 4	l =	•					-
93:20 34:21 42:3,12 periodically 61:3 Poland 37:14 police 99:4 police 99:4 police 99:4 police 99:4 policy 92:11 portiodically 61:3 as:22 permanent 38:22 placed 85:17 placed 85:15 permit 36:2 57:1 placed 85:17		,		, , ,			
periodically 61:3 periods 72:25 46:13 50:2,17 periods 72:25 police 99:4 policy 92:11 16:18,18 17:2 list,1,13 23:9 42:16,17,20 dic 46:24 58:13,13 list,1,1,13 23:9 procedures 42:6 permanently places 42:6 politely 13:10 powerless 42:20 permanently as:6 placed 85:17 places 42:6 politely 13:10 political 3:17,19 dic 4:10 12:4 14:6 player 84:15,19 players 15:23 please 1:5,9,23 spitcal 3:15,24 perpetrator 93:15,24 perpetuity 35:16 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persists 111:8 person 23:19 gistent 112:1 million and the persistent 112:2 persists 111:8 person 23:19 gistent 112:1 million and the persistent 112:2 person 23:19 gistent 22:2 poor 8:2 33:18 person 23:19 person 23:19 gistent 22:2 poor 8:2 33:18 person 23:19 person 23:19 person 23:19 gistent 22:2 poor 8:2 33:18 person 23:19 person 23:19 gistent 22:2 poor 8:2 33:18 person 23:19 person 23:19 gistent 22:2 poor 8:2 33:18 person 23:19 person 23:2 person 23:19 person 23:2 person 23:	•					′	
periods 72:25 50:19,21 policy 92:11 18:11,13 23:9 46:24 58:13,13 48:20 27:23,25 28:5 permanent 101:23 policy 92:11 18:11,13 23:9 46:24 58:13,13 48:20 27:23,25 28:5 permanent placed 85:17 114:18,23 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 powerless 42:20 powerless 42:20 60:22 91:7 processes 26:17 29:4,16 30:1,3 39:6 player 84:15,19 political 3:17,19 4:10 12:4 14:6 practical 32:5 92:7 108:23 producers 9:7 30:11,14,23 permetator players 15:23 please 1:5,9,23 50:6 113:3,3 politician 13:19 practices 48:2 preventing 62:4 progeny 26:16 34:14,15,16,19 93:15,24 perpetuity 35:16 14:14 27:2,8 16:11 50:10 practices 48:2 prescrutiny prospramme 3:19 probibited 66:14 38:19 40:5 persistent 11:2: 44:2 53:18,21 91:3 92:18 practiced 8:15 pre-evatershed project 54:21 Promiscuous 83:7 92:11 persists 111:8 65:18,25 66:23 politics 3:18 poor 8:2 33:18 p						-	
permanent 101:23 100:16 101:18 67:14 110:22 powerful 18:9,15 prevent 21:13 process 9:16 28:8,9,11,14 38:22 permanently places 42:6 play 9:3 28:1 politicyl 13:10 political 3:17,19 as 39:6 political 3:17,19 powerless 42:20 powerful 18:9,15 powerless 42:20 powerful 18:9,15 powerless 42:20 practical 3:17,19 producers 9:7 practical 3:17,19 producers 9:7				,	, ,	•	
38:22 placed 85:17 placed 85:17 placed 85:17 placed 42:6 politely 13:10 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 permeates 31:5 premit 36:2 57:1 player 84:15,19 players 15:23 political 3:19,22 32:6 premit 36:2 57:1 player 84:15,19 players 15:23 political 3:19 political 3:19 preptrator place 1:5,9,23 3:12 44:20 8:9 player 84:20 political 3:17,19 preptrator place 1:5,9,23 3:24 4:20 8:9 politician 13:19 preptentity 35:16 perpetuity 35:16 perpetuity 35:16 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persistent 118:8 person 23:19 69:3,5 70:15 36:124 94:21 96:11 personal 39:4,13 personal 39:4,13 personal 39:4,13 personally 19:22 point a sile state political 3:19 political 3:10 prediction 52:14 prediction 52:14 primary 22:5,10 primary 22:5,10 prompted 65:18 prompted	l =						
permanently places 42:6 play 9:3 28:1 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 as:10 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 as:10 political 3:17,19 political 3:17,19 players 4:15,19 players 15:23 please 1:5,9,23 as:24 4:20 8:9 prepetrator 93:15,24 perpetuity 35:16 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:3 person 23:19 as:10 political 3:18 person 23:19 as:11 sepson 23:19 as:11 sepson 23:19 as:18 person 23:19 as:13 sepson 23:19 as:18 person 23:19 as:18 person 23:19 as:18 person 23:19 as:18 person 23:19 p						•	
39:6 play 9:3 28:1 political 3:17,19 practical 32:5 92:7 108:23 producers 9:7 30:11,14,23 permeates 31:5 permit 36:2 57:1 player 84:15,19 50:21 104:14 practice 8:1 26:21 professionals 31:9,22 32:6 permit 36:2 57:1 players 15:23 politician 13:19 50:21 104:14 practices 8:1 26:21 progeny 26:16 32:10,14 33:1 perpetrator plase 1:5,9,23 50:6 113:3,3 politicians 13:24 practices 48:2 101:15 progeny 26:16 34:14,15,16,19 perpetuity 35:16 14:14 27:2,8 politicians 13:24 practices 48:2 pre-scrutiny 60:15 72:3 41:16,25 42:2 persistent 11:2: persistently 69:9 61:22,24 62:17 61:21 113:17 87:16 pre-watershed 79:21 109:13 Promiscuous 83:7 92:11 persists 111:8 65:18,25 66:23 politics 3:18 precisely 35:8 primarily 86:16 promising 82:19 promote 2:14 10:16,18 personal 39:4,13 42:1 96:11 76:11 80:3,13 poor 8:2 33:18 predecessors primary 22:5,10 pr		•	,				
permeates 31:5 39:16 4:10 12:4 14:6 36:10 preventable professionals 31:9,22 32:6 permit 36:2 57:1 player 84:15,19 50:21 104:14 practice 8:1 26:21 85:1 32:10,14 33:1 perpetrator please 1:5,9,23 50:6 113:3,3 practices 48:2 101:15 progeny 26:16 34:14,15,16,19 perpetuity 35:16 14:14 27:2,8 16:11 50:10 practised 8:15 pre-scrutiny prohibited 66:14 38:19 40:5 persistent 112:2 44:2 53:18,21 91:3 92:18 practitioner pre-watershed project 54:21 47:16,23 49:16 persistently 69:9 61:22,24 62:17 112:1 113:17 87:16 79:21 109:13 Promiscuous 83:7 92:11 persists 111:8 65:18,25 66:23 politics 3:18 precisely 35:8 primarily 86:16 promising 82:19 101:16,18 person 23:19 69:3,5 70:15 36:22 poor 8:2 33:18 60:16,17 87:8 primary 22:5,10 62:20,24 102:7,9,18 personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 60:10 <t< td=""><td></td><td>-</td><td>political 3:17,19</td><td>practical 32:5</td><td></td><td>•</td><td></td></t<>		-	political 3:17,19	practical 32:5		•	
permit 36:2 57:1 player 84:15,19 50:21 104:14 practice 8:1 26:21 85:1 32:10,14 33:1 114:1 players 15:23 politician 13:19 50:6 113:3,3 practices 48:2 101:15 progeny 26:16 34:14,15,16,19 perpetrator please 1:5,9,23 50:6 113:3,3 politicians 13:24 86:9,15 pre-scrutiny prohibited 66:14 38:19 40:5 perpetuity 35:16 14:14 27:2,8 16:11 50:10 practised 8:15 60:15 72:3 41:16,25 42:2 persistently 69:9 61:22,24 62:17 112:1 113:17 87:16 79:21 109:13 Promiscuous 83:7 92:11 persists 111:8 65:18,25 66:23 politics 3:18 precedents 53:15 primarily 86:16 promising 82:19 promising 82:19 101:16,18 person 23:19 69:3,5 70:15 36:22 60:16,17 87:8 promote 2:14 102:7,9,18 94:21 96:11 76:11 80:3,13 poular 63:4 52:4 primary 22:5,10 62:20,24 promoting 4:7 personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 60:10 <td>permeates 31:5</td> <td></td> <td>4:10 12:4 14:6</td> <td>36:10</td> <td>preventable</td> <td></td> <td>31:9,22 32:6</td>	permeates 31:5		4:10 12:4 14:6	36:10	preventable		31:9,22 32:6
114:1 players 15:23 politician 13:19 51:19 preventing 62:4 progeny 26:16 34:14,15,16,19 perpetrator please 1:5,9,23 50:6 113:3,3 practices 48:2 101:15 progeny 26:16 34:21,21 38:17 93:15,24 3:24 4:20 8:9 politicians 13:24 86:9,15 pre-scrutiny prohibited 66:14 38:19 40:5 perpetuity 35:16 14:14 27:2,8 16:11 50:10 practised 8:15 60:15 72:3 41:16,25 42:2 persistently 69:9 61:22,24 62:17 112:1 113:17 87:16 79:21 109:13 Promiscuous 83:7 92:11 70:19 109:25 63:5 64:20,23 politics 3:18 precedents 53:15 price 21:3 87:25 93:6 100:5,16 persists 111:8 65:18,25 66:23 politics 3:18 60:16,17 87:8 promote 2:14 102:7,9,18 36:14 41:21,22 71:3 74:9,24 70:11 80:3,13 poular 63:4 52:4 primary 22:5,10 62:20,24 promoting 4:7 109:5 personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 Prime 6:11 42:23 Prompted 65	_	player 84:15,19		practice 8:1		-	
perpetrator please 1:5,9,23 50:6 113:3,3 politicians 13:24 practices 48:2 101:15 pre-scrutiny programme 3:19 prohibited 66:14 34:21,21 38:17 93:15,24 perpetuity 35:16 persistent 112:2 persistent 112:2 persistently 69:9 persistently 69:9 a61:22,24 62:17 a7:19 109:25 persists 111:8 person 23:19 a6:14 41:21,22 a7:13 74:9,24 personal 39:4,13 personal 39:4,13 personally 19:22 50:6 113:3,3 politicians 13:24 politicians 13:24 a6:19 politicians 13:24 politicians 13:24 a6:19 politicians 13:24 a6:19 politicians 13:24 a6:19 politicians 13:24 a6:11 50:10 practised 8:15 practitioner pre-watershed project 54:21 precedents 53:15 precedents 53:15 precedents 53:15 price 21:3 price 21:4 price 21:4 price 32:4 price 32:4 price 41:41:41:41:41:41:41:41:41:41:41:41:41:4	114:1		politician 13:19	51:19	preventing 62:4	progeny 26:16	34:14,15,16,19
perpetuity 35:16 14:14 27:2,8 16:11 50:10 practised 8:15 60:15 72:3 41:16,25 42:2 persistent 112:2 44:2 53:18,21 91:3 92:18 practitioner pre-watershed project 54:21 47:16,23 49:16 persistently 69:9 61:22,24 62:17 112:1 113:17 87:16 79:21 109:13 Promiscuous 83:7 92:11 70:19 109:25 63:5 64:20,23 115:5,8 politics 3:18 precedents 53:15 price 21:3 87:25 93:6 100:5,16 person 23:19 69:3,5 70:15 36:22 60:16,17 87:8 promote 2:14 102:7,9,18 36:14 41:21,22 71:3 74:9,24 poor 8:2 33:18 predecessors primary 22:5,10 62:20,24 106:8 107:5,11 personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 60:10 85:13 109:5 publication 24:7 personally 19:22 90:6,8,15 porn 71:23 prediction 52:14 Prince 74:1 Prompted 65:18 24:24 27:24	perpetrator	please 1:5,9,23	50:6 113:3,3	practices 48:2	101:15	programme 3:19	34:21,21 38:17
persistent 112:2 persistently 44:2 53:18,21 61:22,24 62:17 91:3 92:18 112:1 113:17 113:17 practitioner 87:16 79:21 109:13 79:21 109:13 Promiscuous project 54:21 Promiscuous 47:16,23 49:16 83:7 92:11 113:17 Promiscuous 70:19 109:25 persists 111:8 person 23:19 36:14 41:21,22 94:21 96:11 personal 39:4,13 personally 19:22 69:3,5 70:15 36:22 poor 8:2 33:18 prome 8:2 33:18 prome 8:2 33:18 prome 6:11 42:23 prome 6:11 42:23 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 promoting 52:14 promoting 52:14 promoting 52:14 promoted 65:18 promote 24:24 27:24 personal 39:4,13 personally 19:22 90:6,8,15 91:3 92:18 practitioner 87:16 procedents 53:15 precedents 53:15 preced	93:15,24	3:24 4:20 8:9	politicians 13:24	86:9,15	pre-scrutiny	prohibited 66:14	38:19 40:5
persistently 69:9 61:22,24 62:17 112:1 113:17 87:16 79:21 109:13 Promiscuous 83:7 92:11 70:19 109:25 63:5 64:20,23 115:5,8 precedents 53:15 price 21:3 87:25 93:6 100:5,16 persists 111:8 65:18,25 66:23 politics 3:18 36:22 primarily 86:16 promising 82:19 101:16,18 person 23:19 69:3,5 70:15 36:22 60:16,17 87:8 promote 2:14 102:7,9,18 36:14 41:21,22 71:3 74:9,24 poor 8:2 33:18 predecessors primary 22:5,10 62:20,24 106:8 107:5,11 personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 60:10 85:13 109:5 publication 24:7 personally 19:22 90:6,8,15 porn 71:23 prediction 52:14 Prince 74:1 prompted 65:18 24:24 27:24	perpetuity 35:16	14:14 27:2,8	16:11 50:10	practised 8:15	60:15	72:3	41:16,25 42:2
persistently 69:9 61:22,24 62:17 112:1 113:17 87:16 79:21 109:13 Promiscuous 83:7 92:11 70:19 109:25 63:5 64:20,23 115:5,8 precedents 53:15 price 21:3 87:25 93:6 100:5,16 persists 111:8 65:18,25 66:23 politics 3:18 36:22 primarily 86:16 promising 82:19 101:16,18 person 23:19 69:3,5 70:15 36:22 60:16,17 87:8 promote 2:14 102:7,9,18 36:14 41:21,22 71:3 74:9,24 poor 8:2 33:18 predecessors primary 22:5,10 62:20,24 106:8 107:5,11 personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 60:10 85:13 109:5 publication 24:7 personally 19:22 90:6,8,15 porn 71:23 prediction 52:14 Prince 74:1 prompted 65:18 24:24 27:24			91:3 92:18		pre-watershed	project 54:21	
persists 111:8 65:18,25 66:23 person 23:19 politics 3:18 36:22 person 23:19 precisely 35:8 60:16,17 predecessors primarily 86:16 promising 82:19 promote 2:14 102:7,9,18 promote 2:14 promote 2:14 promote 2:14 promote 2:14 promote 2:14 promoting 4:7 predecessors primary 22:5,10 personal 39:4,13 personally 19:22 pose,8,15 porn 71:23 personally 19:22 pose,8,15 porn 71:23 prediction 52:14 prime 6:11 42:23 promoted 65:18 promot	persistently 69:9	61:22,24 62:17	112:1 113:17	87:16	79:21 109:13		83:7 92:11
person 23:19 69:3,5 70:15 36:22 60:16,17 87:8 promote 2:14 102:7,9,18 36:14 41:21,22 71:3 74:9,24 poor 8:2 33:18 predecessors primary 22:5,10 62:20,24 106:8 107:5,11 94:21 96:11 76:11 80:3,13 popular 63:4 52:4 prime 6:11 42:23 promoting 4:7 109:5 personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 60:10 85:13 109:5 publication 24:7 personally 19:22 90:6,8,15 porn 71:23 prediction 52:14 Prince 74:1 prompted 65:18 24:24 27:24		63:5 64:20,23	115:5,8	precedents 53:15			· ·
36:14 41:21,22 94:21 96:11 71:3 74:9,24 poor 8:2 33:18 popular 63:4 predecessors primary 22:5,10 prime 6:11 42:23 popular 6:11 42:23 popular 6:11 42:23 promoting 4:7 predict 92:6 prediction 52:14 prime 6:11 42:23 prompted 6:18 62:20,24 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 prediction 52:14 prime 6:11 42:23 promoted 6:10 states prompted 6:18 106:8 107:5,11 prime 6:11 42:23 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 promoting 4:7 states promoting 4:7 prime 6:11 42:23 promoting 4:7 prime 6:11 42:23 prime 6:11 42:2	_						
94:21 96:11 76:11 80:3,13 popular 63:4 52:4 prime 6:11 42:23 promoting 4:7 109:5 personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 60:10 85:13 109:5 publication 24:7 personally 19:22 90:6,8,15 porn 71:23 prediction 52:14 Prince 74:1 prompted 65:18 24:24 27:24				60:16,17			
personal 39:4,13 82:1 85:8 86:7 85:19 86:10 predict 92:6 60:10 85:13 109:5 publication 24:7 personally 19:22 90:6,8,15 porn 71:23 prediction 52:14 Prince 74:1 prompted 65:18 24:24 27:24				-			
personally 19:22 90:6,8,15 porn 71:23 prediction 52:14 Prince 74:1 prompted 65:18 24:24 27:24		,				_	
perspective 95:13 99:25 112:13 prefer 50:23 principle 67:1 proof 23:25 28:17 29:4			•	•			
	perspective	95:13 99:25	112:13	prefer 50:23	principle 67:1	proof 23:25	28:17 29:4
		I		I	I		

21 21 22 1		1 20 10	1.106.22			100.11
31:21 33:1	quite 2:20 12:15	reading 39:10	recorded 96:23	relating 97:6 100:17 112:24	reporting 53:8	100:11
38:15 40:6 78:13	27:15 29:14 41:4 55:12,19	73:3 75:17 96:4	recording 46:20 recuse 45:18	relation 1:20	58:10 65:5,6,8 70:21 82:21,22	responsibility 21:11 38:6
publications	56:4 59:8	ready 58:16	redress 17:9,10	27:9 40:23	83:4,8 84:23	43:24 46:14
8:19 19:4 28:7	60:11 71:5	real 17:20 18:3	39:5,7 106:15	69:3,6 70:14	85:5 86:1	47:13 93:6
51:7	78:8 83:15	23:23 24:6	reduced 70:8	72:13,17,21	88:15 89:18	responsible
publicly 7:3	85:13 90:20	25:4,6 29:7,7	75:22	73:24 74:4,18	90:13,13 92:16	30:12 81:9
public's 19:25	93:5,24 95:10	81:17 96:5,6,6	refer 70:9 73:12	74:25 99:24	95:16,17 96:17	83:4 84:8,23
102:8	95:15 97:4	96:15 99:2,7	73:19	110:4,7 111:12	96:19 97:6,9	85:6 86:21
publish 15:14	99:20 100:12	111:7 112:4	reference 54:3	112:19 114:20	105:10 107:22	88:15 90:21
published 30:9	100:22 101:10	114:21	60:17,24 91:10	115:13	reports 65:13	91:17 92:15
36:2 56:13	108:3	reality 18:17	100:8	relations 5:17	90:3,5	96:14 114:2
publisher 29:3	quo 67:7,19	really 13:10,12	referenced 93:18	relationship	reprehensible	rest 96:2
47:11	93:11	22:24 29:3	referred 68:9	80:23	26:14 94:23	restricted 22:2
publishers 9:2		47:4 49:17	86:12	release 87:25	represent 5:18	25:22 66:18
15:24 51:1	R	50:10 54:6	referring 11:15	88:7	61:23,25	69:17
54:9,10 59:11	racism 85:8,25	56:7 67:18	109:17	relentlessly 69:9	representation	restrictions
59:12 100:7	racist 85:13	70:5 77:10	reflection 92:13	relevant 32:14	102:4 110:18	19:24 32:3
purely 100:19	radical 110:10	82:13 85:19	reflects 65:1	33:4 71:17	representing	79:5
purpose 59:7	110:10	88:7 89:24,25	67:12 92:9	75:4 108:17	25:18	restrictively 41:5
66:9 99:20	raise 105:2	95:14 98:23 101:24 103:7	reform 5:16 10:2	religion 87:10	reproduce 65:3	result 15:10 24:7
112:18 purposes 98:17	108:17 raised 70:18	101:24 103:7	24:2 58:7 59:1 Refuge 62:6	religious 65:15 86:16 88:19	reputation 54:7 reputational	24:25 returns 20:6
pursue 17:6,7,8	raised 70:18	104:12,12	refuse 55:11	reluctant 84:14	47:8	53:23
pursuing 15:7	raising 114:11	104.12,12	regard 5:4 6:3	remain 7:12,14	request 61:5	Reuters 3:12
pushed 15:2	randomly 74:6	110:9 111:2,11	25:19 31:4	remains 7:22	require 37:12	reveal 14:25
put 16:13 21:1	range 86:22 87:9	113:16	79:1 83:8	remarking 16:16	38:8 41:5	revealed 30:19
35:3 36:5 46:8	87:15 90:18	realm 34:21	regarded 34:12	remarks 2:8	65:21	30:21
46:9 55:14	114:16	41:25 42:2	regards 26:23	remedies 110:21	required 23:22	revealing 81:23
63:23 64:8	rape 65:6 68:6	reason 8:24 9:12	39:25	remedy 35:19	45:7 58:6 79:2	revelation 28:4
67:6 78:11,14	81:23 82:1	15:20 22:8,11	regulate 9:15	40:1	requirement	28:24
82:4 83:11,13	84:19,19 85:3	22:20 38:11	18:11 72:18	remember 3:12	21:18 36:5,12	reverse 23:25
88:14 98:11	88:1 95:6,9,10	44:19	regulated 20:10	12:14,20 13:7	38:14 40:3,4,9	review 9:25 66:5
104:22 113:9	95:12 96:5,15	reasonable 5:4	22:3 78:22	42:23	requirements	66:5
115:17,23	96:17,20,21	47:7 52:15,19	110:13	remind 5:20	11:19 33:4	reviews 66:4
putting 25:9	97:11,23,24,24	reasons 18:13	regulating 9:17	remotely 30:10	requires 67:22	revolution 8:23
68:24 83:7	99:2,7,12	36:19 37:2 39:12 52:21	79:1 110:2 114:3	52:22	84:23	Reynolds 30:4
94:13	105:13	94:7 111:24	regulation 11:9	remove 4:8 50:9 106:1	requiring 83:22 research 6:15	30:10 36:14 38:8 40:5
Q	raped 82:7 84:14 88:3 100:25	receive 110:24	20:15,16,24	removed 45:10	17:24 54:14	re-addressed
qualified 12:6	101:2,3	112:23	21:5 37:17	rename 78:11	63:7,11 88:11	111:23
30:18 36:23	rapes 95:24 96:2	received 56:14	43:20,21,22	renders 14:2	90:23 91:22	ridiculous 101:1
quarter 48:2	96:3,3,3 98:19	63:20	49:6,19,23	repeat 31:25	92:1 110:23	right 1:25 4:25
61:12	rapist 96:6	receives 114:19	50:4 51:18	100:24 101:11	researchers 54:9	9:8,9,10,14,19
quarterly 47:25	rapprochement	receiving 105:9	52:17 59:5	115:22	resenting 101:15	10:3,10 12:17
Queen's 58:20	12:24	recognisable	79:24 109:9,10	repeatedly 8:20	resist 53:16	17:4 19:25
question 9:21	rare 95:10	9:17	109:15 110:11	repercussions	resolution 45:3,7	20:18,19 22:5
10:21,23 15:21	rarely 11:3	recognise 104:25	114:18	5:21	45:7 53:23	22:6,9,10,12
20:1,11,13	92:22	recognised 30:15	regulator 32:11	replace 55:17	54:13 56:12	22:16,19,24
23:11 24:12	rate 99:12	44:9 51:9 55:3	32:13 44:10,11	replicate 67:16	58:9	23:11,17 24:9
25:16 27:13	reach 8:23	101:14	44:25 45:8,14	reply 36:3	resolve 35:23	26:22 30:5
29:25 32:6,21	reached 58:14	recognition 57:11 100:14	45:17 48:7 49:7 53:8,10	report 52:3 56:11 85:10	44:15	33:25 36:2,3 41:2,6,13
50:11 78:10	reaction 26:12 read 4:8 7:19	recommend	59:18 108:18	89:22 95:5	resolved 44:13 resource 54:11	46:13 49:20
98:20,25 115:2 questioned	37:11 57:22	114:22	regulatory	97:10,25,25	resources 18:14	51:4 52:20
111:21 113:16	60:5 63:20	recommendati	106:12	98:1	respect 33:15	53:3,24 55:20
115:13	71:5 72:23	105:7 114:22	regulator/omb	reported 6:9,10	42:8 57:8	59:18 62:16
questions 1:8	73:4 75:23	recommendati	49:15	65:14 80:20	79:10	64:2,14 68:22
10:20 13:4	87:20 88:20	5:21 52:4	reinforce 67:13	84:7 85:2	respectively 1:9	68:23,24 69:1
29:21 61:21	96:13	104:16 105:5	103:4	86:10,16 88:1	1:23 61:22	71:1,16 73:22
90:12 91:21	reader 75:16	107:16 109:9	reinforces	89:20 96:24	respects 17:1	76:1 81:21
92:16 93:1,11	95:1	113:11	103:21	97:1 98:19,19	responded 97:21	84:24 88:25
quick 110:20	readers 18:9	recommending	reiterate 51:3	99:3,3,4	response 2:13	93:1 101:20
quickly 36:7,8	44:7 95:18,20	54:20	109:23	reporter 46:15	6:10 13:7	108:17 115:6
44:13 63:16	readership 72:16	record 2:5 31:22	related 10:15	47:4,5	27:12 30:8	righted 38:19
78:2	readily 71:21	33:16 57:22	49:18 89:17	reporters 87:13	60:25 61:2	rightly 20:5
quiet 22:2	109:21	62:13 63:18,21	93:12	reporter's 88:8	responses 5:24	100:4
	1	1	1	<u> </u>	1	1

	I	l <u> </u>	I	I	1	l
rights 3:5 5:12	91:16,17 96:8	selection 65:10	sexist 65:23	simple 66:20	solutions 32:5	speed 35:18,24
22:10,18,20,25	97:17 103:5,19	self 50:21 68:14	100:18 103:8	simply 17:13	66:20	41:25
23:6,7,18	108:4	self-censorship	104:5	19:14,18 22:19	solve 35:22	spent 14:25 56:6 58:25 98:5
25:13,19 26:2	says 24:16 47:19 57:4 63:15	43:17	sexual 63:3 66:16 72:5	27:17 28:4 29:2 35:15	somebody 13:12	sphere 23:8,8
26:2,5 42:17 54:24 55:14	71:6	self-explanatory 74:2	74:3 76:19,23	36:15 38:3	25:7 46:25 49:15 89:23	92:11 103:20
62:20,21,24	scandal 11:7	self-interest	82:25,25 84:11	53:2 59:10	someone's 38:4	spike 37:1
63:2 65:20	scenario 46:15	48:12,20	93:22 97:21	67:16 79:1	sons 89:6	spin 11:21 12:14
100:17 101:15	74:1 95:10	self-regulated	sexualisation	92:23	soon 30:9 40:19	12:20 36:24
101:18	scheme 53:21	52:5	66:2,6,20	simultaneous	soon-to-be-inc	spoke 2:2 112:22
right-minded	school 25:9	self-regulation	108:12	80:23	12:23	spoken 26:7 60:4
11:5	schools 72:20	44:25 50:2	sexualised 69:10	sinew 20:25	sorry 7:1 18:19	108:14 113:19
rigorously 53:13	76:22 109:4	51:20 53:7	69:16,25 70:19	singing 78:1	20:20 71:3	spoof 78:7
riots 5:24 6:11	science 88:11	self-regulatory	71:9 73:10	single 32:23	74:11 99:10,21	sport 69:13,18
90:13,18	scientists 10:5	50:23	75:22 76:16	41:21 70:12	99:23	75:21,25,25
RIPA 27:9	54:9	seminar 2:9	77:8,14	77:16 80:21	sort 13:20 35:8	76:1 77:1,16
ripped 100:25	scope 50:10	19:10 58:3	sexualism	singling 81:19	41:24 55:1	sports 11:17
rise 7:16	score 58:23	seminars 2:1	103:25	sir 11:2 20:25	69:11 70:21	77:13
risk 20:3,11,21	Scott 44:19	semi-naked	sexuality 101:9	36:9 41:9	76:17,19 77:6	squash 55:8
47:8,8 97:14	screen 74:11	74:19	sexually 66:17	52:13 56:10,16	78:4,6,7,8	stable 9:18
risked 12:10 rival 37:1	76:9 scrutinise 94:19	sending 86:13 sends 71:12	shades 3:4	56:23 60:8	79:17,18	stage 64:21 115:16
rival 37:1 robust 20:8 48:9	scrutinise 94:19 scrutiny 58:17	sends /1:12 sensation 78:1	shame 92:24 111:20	61:11 79:4 sisters 71:6,8	107:10 110:2 112:3,17	stand 98:7
51:17,20 53:4	84:3,6	sensation /8:1 sensationalise	shape 67:13	sit 93:3	112:3,17	stand 98:7 standards 21:19
rock 50:1,17,19	search 49:12	89:14	shaping 102:12	situated 90:21	113.14 114.16	32:20 45:8,11
50:20	seats 16:21	Sensationalist	110:5	situation 30:20	sorting 40:1	48:2,14 50:13
rock-solid 115:3	second 10:22	65:10	shareholders	73:6 82:7,22	sorts 17:1 39:12	51:22 52:11
role 9:4,4 17:2	16:22 29:25	sense 14:2 19:3	18:15	83:10 85:4	94:7 97:6	53:12 65:21,22
48:7 67:18	32:22 88:22	28:10 45:20	shelf 71:21 79:11	94:24	114:7,12	67:13 107:2,19
roles 102:15	112:8	49:10,11	79:14	six 4:11	sought 64:21	114:2
103:13	Secondly 109:15	sensible 36:6	shocking 100:12	size 39:13 56:5	sound 13:13	staple 69:23
room 40:10	secret 41:7 46:20	59:1 97:6	shoot 6:12 60:24	ski 75:19	43:25	71:24
route 32:22	46:20	sent 30:21 80:5,6	shop 73:8	skiing 75:21	source 14:21	Star 69:12,20
50:23 52:5	secretive 31:6	sentence 37:25	short 29:24	slant 83:17,17,20	46:25	73:2 74:8,15
53:17 55:8	secrets 25:24	41:3	61:15 112:5,14	slap 36:21	sources 11:20	74:22 75:1,7,8
56:1	28:19,20 31:13	separate 10:14	shortly 42:7	slapped 31:13	46:18 48:9	77:22
routes 51:13	31:14,17	35:25 36:8	Short's 112:10	sleeping 96:1	sourcing 7:18	start 22:12,14
55:3 Rowling 24:14	Sedley 56:16 see 4:7 7:3 23:5	37:22	shot 41:19	slightly 9:9 22:1	Soviet 2:14	26:5 62:12
25:2,8 26:7	32:17 42:10	separately 72:11 series 30:16 40:4	show 23:22 24:1	22:2 28:3 31:2 35:17,25 36:8	so-called 96:19 107:22	68:11,15,23 90:8 109:1
rubbish 100:19	44:19,24 45:14	96:25	24:5	38:16 40:13	space 25:9 38:4	113:24 114:4,5
rubric 10:13	51:17 55:12	serious 24:3,19	showed 78:2	72:12	41:16	started 3:12
ruined 82:20	56:22 59:1	29:9 65:15	showing 85:19	slope 75:19	spare 59:24	12:21
rule 35:6 40:11	63:15 70:7	81:24	shown 17:25	slowly 62:15	speak 10:11 23:9	starting 22:5
40:12 105:13	75:8 76:11,13	seriously 39:3	29:8 72:6	small 12:7 19:4	62:15 80:16	27:23 29:14
rules 98:18,23	77:5,12 89:16	71:14	Shut 13:7 100:20	59:3	85:1 112:20,23	105:3
run 16:7 19:6	89:20 90:15	served 3:13 88:5	side 55:23 75:9	snag 55:5	113:17	starts 63:19
running 69:12	95:22 98:20	serves 59:6 86:19	89:2 106:11	snap 26:13 38:15	speakers 10:4	stated 106:12
runs 69:14	105:25 106:12	service 56:3	sidelined 104:13	social 4:10 88:19	15:24	statement 19:10
Russia 37:14	112:7 114:21	services 14:2,7	Sienna 26:9	society 14:19	speaking 16:18	31:25 64:8
	seek 6:16 9:15	55:17 91:4	sign 33:9	17:9 22:1,3	17:2 87:15	statements 6:8,9
<u>S</u>	32:13 34:10	serving 45:18,21	signal 103:17	23:1 28:2,2	112:1 113:1	57:21
safe 89:22	35:3 45:7 52:22 65:3	set 4:19 11:8	signed 65:22	67:8,12,13,15	speaks 81:25	states 67:6
sale 79:7	52:22 65:3 78:10 88:16	27:13 32:9 51:21 52:25	significant 7:14 7:23 35:1 56:7	67:20 89:9 92:12 93:11	specific 20:14 25:24 27:15	Statesman 3:20 3:20 31:10
salient 42:22 saloons 53:3	seeking 17:22	sets 48:5	96:18	95:21 102:13	57:25 68:15	100:9
sanction 47:13	84:25 106:15	setting 107:19	silence 31:21	102:13 103:21	103:1	statistically
108:21 111:1	seeks 57:1 88:24	settlement 55:1	54:8	103:25 104:6	specifically	95:11
sanctions 105:20	seemingly 43:3	severe 56:4	silenced 101:25	104:15 109:1	60:23 75:24	statistics 89:12
sat 56:3	seen 5:16 8:17	severely 7:11	silences 111:25	socio-economic	87:19	90:24 94:13
satire 78:7	30:24 45:9	25:15	similar 6:18	88:21	speech 4:6 10:3,5	status 6:8 67:7
satisfied 47:7	50:3 51:11	sex 66:9,10 71:23	29:19 43:8	soft 115:2	14:9 21:17	67:19 80:21,23
48:6	60:17 61:1,2	77:9 82:8	44:20 49:20	softer 105:7	22:6,13 24:9	81:3,15 93:11
save 31:21	79:22 100:9	96:12 109:6,17	75:2 83:10	sold 71:20	39:1 48:22	statute 32:9,24
saying 21:2 27:8	103:20	112:2	96:17 113:2	sole 66:9	58:20 102:10	37:7,13 40:15
60:9 63:18	seep 34:11	sexism 67:16,19	similarly 17:18	solid 41:5	102:21 104:24	43:12 57:8
84:2,4 91:15	Select 53:8	108:25	43:1	solution 32:7,8	108:24 112:19	statutory 49:18
	I	I	I	I	I	I

40.22 50.2 4	70:11,15 111:1	23:11 55:15	granician 21.6	tank 4:12	thanks 102:23	90.4 16 95.22
49:23 50:2,4 50:20 51:18	strongly 11:8,13	83:19 108:13	suspicion 31:6 swathe 28:7	tank 4:12 targeting 112:5	115:22	80:4,16 85:23 86:2 87:23
52:16 53:17				targeting 112:3 taste 20:9 107:23	thats 71:11	
stay 59:25 60:6	33:7 45:2 47:16 53:16	suggests 21:22 106:6	swell 78:3 sworn 1:6,7	teachers 72:17	thats /1:11 theatre 25:23	91:12,25 92:19 93:1,3,10 94:5
stay 39.23 00.0 stealing 46:19	67:1	suitable 109:20	symbolic 81:16	72:20,20 73:6	theirs 96:11	95:7 97:8,18
Stephen 56:16	struck 91:13	suits 8:19 77:13	sympathetic	team 56:24 63:12	thems 90.11 thematic 75:2	99:1,5 100:8
56:23	studied 60:15	sum 18:9 69:9	52:9 82:17	technologies 8:8	thema 10:12 18:6	102:5,19 103:4
steps 38:8 92:20	studies 90:8	summarise 20:4	93:24	8:9	27:2 33:20	102.3,19 103.4
stereotype 99:1,6	subdivides 43:20	40:23	sympathise	technology 8:11	69:14 70:5	107:2,6,8,14
104:5	subject 7:2 38:9	summary 109:8	52:22	8:12	77:17 95:13	107:17,23
stereotyped	38:15 51:2	summer 5:24	sympathy 12:15	teeth 106:13	100:1	107.17,23
102:2 109:25	subjected 71:12	90:13.18	system 20:23	Telegraph 3:14	themes 43:23	110:16 111:4
stereotypes	76:22	sums 39:10	21:16 53:6	15:9,18 16:3	49:5 99:25	111:14,22
65:23 73:17	subjective 29:1	Sun 68:21 69:3	98:6 106:13,14	17:13,14,16	102:25	113:5,15,16
85:13,16	110:7	69:12,21,23	111:7	18:21 80:19	they'd 96:10,12	114:13 115:14
102:16 103:14	subjects 59:10	70:1,3,14,23	systemic 10:21	87:22 88:1	thing 9:13 20:23	thinking 31:24
stereotyping	77:14	71:4,16,18,22	10:22,23	Telegraph's	20:23 22:17	39:7 84:18
103:8	submission 1:13	71:25 72:3,6	108:10,11	15:12	31:1 72:15	107:25
stiff 43:13	1:17,18,21	72:13,15 73:1	systems 37:17	television 72:7	82:4 89:19	thinks 46:23
stifling 35:1	4:18 6:2,20	73:12,24 74:8		109:13	91:16 92:4	103:22
stocks 58:16	9:12 11:2,16	74:12 85:10	T	tell 1:23 48:4	97:13 101:7	third 50:1 69:18
stop 35:15 48:18	14:23 27:19	111:12 112:7	tab 68:19 71:1	60:12 105:4	111:2	111:11
55:10 60:10	30:16 44:4	112:10 113:13	76:7 90:9	telling 26:9	things 21:13	thorny 49:17
74:6	49:6 60:25	Sunday 75:25	111:10	73:15	24:23 36:10	thought 97:4,16
stopping 109:5	64:1,6,11,16	76:2,3,7 77:1,2	tabloid 66:22	tells 77:11	61:3 67:24	thread 20:20
stories 12:11	64:17 68:7,12	superimposed	68:24 69:10	temporary 85:17	77:23 87:2	101:13
14:4 15:13	70:13 72:14	112:11	tabloids 66:7	ten 9:16 80:14	89:20 91:18	three 2:18 53:1
19:15 26:16	73:25 74:9,16	superinjunction	78:21	tend 32:22	94:6,21,23	57:17 68:24
65:11 85:12	80:7,13 90:7	33:10	tabulate 32:13	tendency 94:16	95:4,23 96:25	89:10 104:18
story 11:24	102:6 103:3 113:12	supermarket 73:9	tackle 66:20 67:4	term 2:24 19:3 20:15 26:22	101:4 106:11 think 2:8 4:12	threshold 29:10 29:12
12:25 13:1,15 13:16 14:3,4	submissions 60:5	supermarkets	115:9 tackled 6:17	49:25 73:14	6:25 7:2 8:22	throw 31:2
15:7 16:7,8	63:20,24 64:23	79:10	tackied 6:17	82:4	9:8,12,13,14	thrown 31:18
17:6,7,8 19:6	68:10 80:5,6	support 47:19	take 5:4 13:8	terms 8:11 54:3	12:4,20 14:17	throws 105:8
24:25 25:2	115:23	62:23 63:9	18:20 19:15	57:12 60:17,24	14:17,18 15:6	thwart 111:17
27:18 28:8	submit 1:18	67:1 102:10	23:14 24:6	75:10 76:3	16:16,17,18,25	time 2:18 5:11
31:11 36:2,13	56:10	106:19 114:19	25:17 39:17	78:11,14 83:1	17:3,20,21	6:14 7:13 9:16
36:21 37:1	subscriber 51:6	supporting	47:8 56:18	83:6 92:15	18:3,12,18	9:17 12:1
38:7,9 46:16	subsection 7:7	65:13 108:5	57:2,4 58:12	93:5 103:23	19:18 20:11	13:23 14:11
47:2,2,8,9,15	subsequently	supportive	61:6,11 67:14	105:8 107:6,9	21:12,21,22,23	21:17 26:16
47:21,21,22	34:13	113:11	89:8 91:7,11	108:3,4	21:25 22:16,24	34:1,1 40:17
71:7 73:13,15	subset 10:22	suppose 24:8	99:21 106:17	terrain 46:22	23:4,6,20,23	41:20 45:10
77:10 80:20,22	substance 42:19	67:2 105:6	106:19 109:3	test 28:22 29:1,9	24:23 25:11,14	54:8,25 56:6
82:10,13 83:17	108:1	supposed 72:25	114:1,12	30:3 36:13,13	25:16 26:3	59:24 61:4
85:15 94:11	substantial 24:3	supposition	taken 8:21 11:13	47:23 79:20	27:12,19,22	80:15
straightforward	24:19 29:10	36:13	15:3 19:12	107:10 109:12	28:11,12,16,25	times 3:17 6:10
26:6 31:20 114:13	substantive	suppression 3:1	23:23 24:6	testable 36:7	29:5,20 30:6	12:22 16:24
straining 20:25	35:22 39:24 58:7,15	sure 8:1 11:5 26:21 32:18,23	31:12 36:9	testimony 26:9 35:14	30:10,23 32:8 32:22,24 33:2	18:1 19:13 31:18 58:4
strand 88:17,18	subtle 88:20	35:20 39:15	39:17 44:3 58:7 99:5	thank 2:10 3:10	33:6 34:2,7	titillating 82:6
88:19,22	success 24:22	47:5,17,17	104:14 113:8	3:24 4:15 5:20	35:21 37:18,25	today 1:4 3:18
strands 88:16,23	successful 24:15	48:20 50:15	talk 12:6 14:23	6:18 8:5 11:1	38:1,11,13	4:7 9:12 12:17
88:24	54:15,19	51:14 52:11,13	18:6 39:14,21	14:12 34:22	39:9,17 40:2,7	16:23 60:1
stranger 95:10	succinct 14:13	56:7 59:17	39:21 59:4	43:19 44:22	40:9,24 42:22	107:16
95:25 99:7	succinctly 64:21	63:17 68:17	68:7 71:15	49:24 59:20,22	44:3,5,12,16	told 72:20
Strasbourg 37:6	sue 41:23	83:15 85:14	111:17	59:23 61:9,10	45:3,15,19	112:15
strength 41:14	suffice 51:22	98:22 99:17	talked 7:5 35:15	61:11 62:17,25	46:2,7 48:22	tone 42:19 80:22
stress 46:12	52:11	104:13 108:3	talking 25:6	63:5,14,19	49:1,24 50:15	82:13 84:16
strong 5:8,8 7:22	sufficient 28:5	111:13 114:8	26:10 38:3,5	65:17,25 70:3	50:16,17,22	85:22 106:6
13:22 21:7	107:10 108:15	115:15	41:19 53:22	71:3 72:10	51:4 53:14	107:23 108:1
30:10,14 31:11	sufficiently	surmount 29:12	56:1 82:8	74:15 75:23	56:3 58:17	tongue 100:25
34:16 37:5	62:14	surprised 60:21	89:10,11	80:12 87:18	59:16 61:7	Tony 13:2 14:8
44:24 45:8,14	suggest 21:24	surprisingly	100:19,20	90:6 93:12	68:2,10 69:11	top 71:21 74:17
47:2 51:19 53:6	51:15 56:24 115:17,19	54:15 surrounding	101:16,17,18	110:15 111:9 113:20 115:20	70:10 71:5,15 75:3,14 76:11	79:11,14 topic 16:15
stronger 21:6	suggested 84:8	60:3	talks 46:16 47:4 tall 96:3	115:21	76:12 77:11,20	topic 16.13 topless 69:15
45:16 47:1	suggesting 15:20	survey 97:19	tan 90.3	thankfully 37:7	78:17 79:16,21	tort 23:21 26:24
			- Inigiote 111.0			
<u> </u>						

26:24 29:7	72:18 97:18	understandably	94:6	87:6,11 88:15	18:14 21:24	98:11
torts 30:13	115:2	95:15	validation 95:2	89:3,5,11,13	22:9,24 23:4	Whilst 94:4
toss 34:5	Tuesday 1:1	understanding	valuable 56:16	89:16 90:14,18	23:20 28:7	whistle-blower
total 22:21	turn 11:23 68:14	4:5 81:20	value 33:5	92:10 93:21,22	34:2 35:3 36:5	31:12,15
touch 20:3 46:4	104:1,16 105:3	99:13 105:16	van 61:18 63:1,1	93:23 95:4	37:18 48:21	white 2:25 42:16
59:12 115:18	turned 13:3,10	understands	64:8,10,15	97:21 104:1,7	50:1,12,18	54:25 77:7
touched 52:24	78:2	38:19	65:25 66:1	105:10,14	61:4 67:9,9,10	Whitehall 31:6
Towie 71:6,8	Tuscany 48:15	understood 86:2	68:11,13 69:2	105.10,14	67:20 68:2,4	whole-heartedly
toy 71:25	TV 41:18	114:15	69:7 70:9,17	violent 71:13	68:24 69:25	28:14
track 99:22	tweaking 45:15	undertake	71:2,4,17	81:7 88:18	70:1,19 80:20	whomsoever
traduced 21:4	67:23 102:22	110:23	72:15 73:23	89:25 90:5	83:20 84:1,8	114:2
Trafigura 33:10	twice 45:11	underwear	74:11,24 75:3	94:8,9,9	85:7 86:24	wider 81:13
tragedy 21:5	81:11	69:25 71:10	75:12,14 76:2	100:22 101:10	88:5 89:7	90:22,25 106:5
58:18 92:4	twist 88:4	unequal 111:8	76:6,9,12 77:3	virtual 38:4	90:21 92:23	110:19 112:25
tragic 92:23	twisted 88:12	unequivocal	77:5,22 78:17	virtually 94:17	93:25 94:3,24	widespread 66:1
trail 44:8	two 10:20 16:6	37:10	79:4,9 80:1,4	103:12	96:14 97:16	76:24 114:19
trails 43:24	18:22 23:14	unequivocally	109:7,8 111:11	vital 67:18	98:7 100:7	wife 80:20 91:14
trainee 3:13	24:23 29:21	11:6	111:15,19	vitriolic 100:22	102:2,2,14	94:1
training 105:7	30:20 35:14,24	unexpected 61:4	114:5.17 115:4	vivid 26:9	103:21 104:13	Wikileaks 49:14
105:10 110:18	36:10 40:20	61:4	115:7,20	voice 18:8 49:15	106:9 108:22	willing 105:25
transformation	42:20 48:5	unfinished 87:21	variance 51:21	voices 101:24	111:5 115:2,10	willingness
9:16	52:6 82:7 86:3	unhappy 17:8	various 19:11	voluntary 55:10	ways 16:6 51:8	56:19
transjurisdicti	91:10 94:14	42:3	31:3 39:1 51:8	79:6,8,9	56:5 82:22	wind 46:16
8:18	95:23 99:14	Union 6:4 42:14	68:10 74:23	voyeurism 76:19	112:3	wind 40.10 window 25:11
transparency	104:17	United 37:20	vast 10:1 44:12	vulnerabilities	weakness 10:17	windscreen
33:18 45:20	type 39:10 79:17	universally	vehemently 37:9	85:5	11:11 14:15	26:11
trauma 84:21	79:20 110:3	114:19	vehicle 7:23	vulnerability	19:9	wish 1:18 5:14
traveller 85:9	114:18	unjustified 38:3	vehicles 87:10	83:5 84:17	weaknesses	8:10 21:20
travesty 14:7		unlawful 27:7	veiled 50:4	vulnerable 76:17	10:13,19,20	22:6 43:10
treat 39:2	U	82:8	versa 23:10	82:25 83:4	11:12 53:15	51:7 55:9
treated 92:3,22	ugly 101:5	unmediated 7:17	version 5:9	84:9,11	wealth 55:7	57:19 58:21
trends 90:23	UK 3:9 6:8 10:9	unpleasant	vice 23:10		weapons 19:16	65:18 75:24
110:25	10:13 11:11	94:21	victim 65:12	W	wearing 96:10	107:16
trespass 25:13	25:19 58:2	unpublished	93:14 94:4,17	wait 46:7	weather 41:20	wishes 24:15
26:25	62:3 65:22	87:21 88:11	96:6 97:11	waiting 76:10	Wedding 85:20	42:1 107:14
trial 17:25	105:15	unquestionable	106:25 108:16	wall 32:2	week 13:5 19:13	witness 40:24
trials 65:8	Ukraine 37:14	79:18	victims 21:2	walls 31:8	35:14 68:23,25	64:8
tribunal 55:25	UK-wide 62:1	unredacted 15:9	55:22 65:6	want 8:16 9:13	74:7 81:11,12	witnessed 99:16
56:2,2,4	ultimate 22:18	unreported	81:23 97:8	13:8,12 17:4,6	94:14 113:12	witnesses 1:4
tribunals 56:3	ultimately 15:10	59:10	105:13 106:1	17:9 21:1	weeks 15:14	26:8 43:7 53:5
tried 33:11	22:16 48:10	unrestricted	Victim-blaming	22:17 23:10	51:25 53:1	62:15 115:17
triggered 94:2	50:18 51:5	72:8 109:14,22	106:2	24:10,17,17,18	58:7	woman 69:16,24
trivialisation	87:11 94:8	unscientific	view 5:5 11:3	28:22,22 39:12	went 82:14	75:20 81:6,17
70:20 103:17	UN 42:17	97:20	30:14 34:9,25	52:7 57:24	Western 3:9	84:20 85:20
trivialises 71:11	unattractive	unsupported	36:17 37:5	58:3 80:16	Westminster	94:4,12 95:5
81:6	101:7	15:5	41:19,24,25	86:5 87:14	11:25 12:12	96:1
trivialising 74:13	unbalanced 10:7	unusual 44:17	42:3 45:18	89:12 90:3,4	we'll 60:6 115:24	woman's 78:5
82:23	83:17	95:19	47:16 56:18	93:17 105:23	we're 9:5 14:20	84:17
troops 30:20	uncertainty	updated 64:11	58:1 95:17,21	105:24,24,25	18:5 19:21	women 62:1,5,7
trouble 33:9 63:22	29:25 32:6	68:17 upsetting 82:4	102:14	106:12 107:4	35:21 38:3	62:10,21 63:4
troubling 10:16	underhand 48:3	upsetting 82:4 up-skirt 76:18	views 95:18,21 vigorous 7:9	107:17 108:5	40:19 46:22 47:14,16 48:24	63:9,10 65:4 65:10,22,24
true 83:1 102:3	underlying 9:14	urge 53:16	20:7	110:17 115:16	49:9 53:22	66:3,8,21 68:5
truly 10:23	53:24	urgently 106:8	vigorously 7:10	wanted 18:19	56:11 66:24	68:5 69:8 70:2
trumping 22:19	undermines 45:23	URN 68:17	Viktor 42:24	71:15	69:7 70:12	70:19,22 74:13
trust 32:20 44:19	underreporting	use 2:24 3:1 10:6	vilification 112:4	wanting 41:18 72:22	82:8 89:11	74:19 76:13,22
45:23 56:14	98:7	19:2 47:14	vilified 113:7	war 30:19	90:25 92:2,8	77:7,8,14
truth 16:18 17:2	understand 1:18	55:7 75:13	villain 113:12	wasn't 81:16	95:7 97:18	79:18 80:14
23:9	16:5 28:2	76:24 104:11	violence 3:1 62:1	82:12 89:23	98:8 103:23	81:1,10,10,12
try 23:1 40:23	33:16 36:3,24	111:16	62:4,7,10 63:8	108:3 112:18	106:13 109:2	81:14 82:14,24
55:1 57:7	40:10 56:9	useful 7:1 90:3	63:10,11 65:3	waste 54:25	110:9,11 113:1	83:3,5,9,10
111:17	67:5 89:13	106:21	65:10 70:21	waste 54.25 watching 5:24	we've 5:17 8:17	84:9,11 85:4
trying 13:13	98:15 99:9	users 18:10	71:7,11 74:13	watershed 66:18	16:23 23:24	86:17,18,20,22
14:25 23:16	107:11,23,24	usually 50:5 91:2	80:14,25 81:13	72:7	37:23 39:10	86:24,25 87:7
26:12 31:20	114:7,8,16,25		82:25 86:3,10	wave 27:17	56:13 58:16	87:12 88:2,16
35:19,23 58:25	understandable	V	86:17,18,20,21	way 5:11 6:19	59:11 68:16	89:10,13,18,20
62:13 69:7	6:3,12	valid 88:12 91:21	86:23,24,25	8:12 17:8,13	75:23 78:15	90:4,14 92:10
	l	l	l	ĺ	l	l
I						

02 22 22 04 12	40.14	12 42 10 61 12	F4614.05.0		
93:22,23 94:12	40:14	12 43:18 61:12	54614 85:8		
94:14 96:8,16	wrong 10:7	85:9 104:21	5462 82:2		
97:21 100:10	25:11 26:10	13 1:14	54625 87:20		
100:15 101:12	34:12 36:11	14-year-old	54660 4:16 5:20		
101:21,22	38:1,17,17,19	73:21	54661 10:12		
102:4,14,15	47:23 60:24	140 18:1	54662 20:3		
103:9,10,11,11	86:13	15 73:13 74:14	54664 27:3 29:20		
103:11,13,18	wronged 106:17	77:20,24	54667 33:20,22		
103:18,18,19	wrongful 21:13	15-year-old 78:4	54668 34:23 35:9		
104:1,3,5,13	31:24 52:19	160 62:23 17 62:8	54669 33:21 54672 40:21		
105:10,15	wrongfully 21:4 wrongly 6:5	17 62:8 1970 41:1	54675 53:18		
106:3,16,20 110:4,6 112:2	wrongs 54:24	1970 41.1 1980s 112:6	34073 33.10		
115:10	wrongs 54.24	1980s 112.0 1991 4:3	6		
women's 62:6,24	Y	1991 4.3 1996 12:24			
84:10 100:17	Yeah 22:16	1990 12.24	6 55:14,18 68:16		
101:15,18,24	37:24 77:3	2	68:18,20 70:23 71:1		
101:24 102:17		2 6:20 75:11	6A 70:25		
102:18 104:6	year 1:14,21 2:13 48:23	2.05 115:24	UA 70.23		
107:17 112:24	53:11 64:2,5	20 3:12 46:3 52:8	7		
wonder 105:2	64:18 69:1	64:13	7 73:25		
wondering 60:8	85:11 114:13	20th 16:23	1 13.23		
words 8:9 16:24	yearly 45:11	2000 27:9	8		
21:22 41:10	years 2:18 3:8,12	2004 111:14	8 26:2 33:24		
44:1 46:22	4:6,12 9:16	2005 3:21	8 26:2 33:24 41:10 87:20		
75:2 90:15	11:11 14:25	2008 3:21	95:24 96:2		
work 2:23 5:8	23:24 46:3	2012 1:1	80s 3:15		
10:1 11:11	51:24 52:1,6,8	22 64:5,17	800 23:24		
33:14 45:1	58:25 62:8	24 1:1	000 23.21		
54:5 55:22	98:5 103:5		9		
58:19 62:4	yellow 64:13	3	9 40:25 66:18		
65:1 72:19,19	70:15 74:10	3 66:7,21 68:14	74:5		
91:25 103:6	76:5,8 111:10	69:4,10,15,21	90 54:16		
worked 4:12	yesterday 64:9	71:24 73:14	90s 3:16		
12:9 18:23	yesterday's	74:20 76:7,7	95 16:22		
62:7 working 4:16	64:12	76:11 78:20			
5:17 62:20	yield 33:25	82:1 111:16,23			
87:6 90:25	young 66:6 69:16 72:23 73:5,16	112:3,6,11,13			
workplace 66:14	73:17 76:21,21	112:16 113:8 113:19 114:10			
72:4 109:20	77:11 78:4	3A 68:19			
works 16:6 62:9	82:1,7,14,16	30 1:21 22:21			
63:8	82:18,19,24	37 48:23			
world 2:15,16,23	83:3,5,9,9 84:3	27 10.23			
3:2,23 4:3	84:6,9,10,11	4			
25:19 52:17	84:17,20 85:4	4 4:18 46:9 73:22			
62:21 72:24	110:6,6	73:25 77:19			
worried 33:7		85:8,19 90:9			
worries 19:23	1	40 62:2 98:5			
worrying 38:13	1 75:7 104:19	40th 2:12			
76:16	1A 76:5				
worse 94:18 worth 15:7 16:16	1B 75:8	5			
worth 15:/ 16:16 worthier 13:13	1.05 115:25	50 81:12			
worthler 13:13 wouldn't 79:20	10 5:11 8:7 9:8	500 16:25			
98:1	22:7 25:12,16	51717 8:6			
wrapped 85:9	25:19 26:6	53717 6:19			
wrestled 55:13	71:15,17 73:22	53718 10:14			
wrestling 58:10	74:9 10,000 16:23	14:13 18:8			
write 4:8 14:3,3	10,000 16:23 10.00 1:2	53719 27:3,4			
36:17	10.00 1:2 100 4:2 38:21	53720 29:17			
writers 4:1,4,5	100 4.2 38.21 11 72:11 74:16	53722 53:18 53772 43:21			
writes 24:16	74:17 75:11	53 77 2 43:21 54246 90:9			
writing 10:3	111:10	54246 90:9 54247 93:14			
36:14,16	11B 112:8	54247 95.14 54249 95:9 100:1			
written 30:15	11.33 61:14	54610 80:17			
31:3 37:11	11.44 61:16	/			
	<u> </u>		I		l