

LAWSG144: Principles of Media Regulation: Eric Barendt

View Online



1.

Barendt EM, et al. Media law: text, cases and materials. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

2.

Hitchens L. Broadcasting pluralism and diversity: a comparative study of policy and regulation. Oxford: Hart Publishing; 2006.

3.

Lee C. Bollinger, Jr. Freedom of the Press and Public Access: Toward a Theory of Partial Regulation of the Mass Media. Michigan Law Review [Internet]. The Michigan Law Review Association; 75(1):1-42. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1287849>

4.

US Supreme Court. Reno v ACLU (1997) 521 US 844 [Internet]. 1997. Available from: <http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=5BGK-W1K1-DYBP-W2KF&csi=274794&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

5.

High Court of Australia. Dow Jones & Co Inc v Gutnick 1 LRC 368 [Internet]. 2002. Available from: <http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=531V-T6P1-DYJ0-8137&csi=280207&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

6.

Jacob Rowbottom. Media Freedom and Political Debate in the Digital Era. *The Modern Law Review* [Internet]. Wiley; 69(4):489–513. Available from:
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3877224>

7.

Barendt EM, et al. *Media law: text, cases and materials*. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

8.

Stewart P. Or of the press. *Hastings Law Journal* [Internet]. University of California Hastings College of Law; 26(3):631–637. Available from:
<http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Index?index=journals%2Fhastlj&collection=journals>

9.

Barendt EM. *Freedom of speech* [Internet]. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199225811.001.0001>

10.

Thomas Gibbons. *Freedom of the press: ownership and editorial values*. Public Law. 100 Avenue Road Swiss Cottage London NW3 3PF: Sweet & Maxwell; 1992;279–299.

11.

House of Lords Communications Committee. *The Ownership of the News - First Report of 2007-8*, HL 122 [Internet]. 2008. Available from:
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200708/ldselect/ldcomuni/ldcomuni.htm>

12.

European Convention on Human Rights & fundamental freedoms [Internet]. European Court of Human Rights; 1950. Available from:
http://www.echr.coe.int/Pages/home.aspx?p=basictexts&c=#n1359128122487_pointer

13.

Observer and Guardian v United Kingdom (Application 13585/88) 14 EHRR 153 [Internet]. Observer and Guardian v UK. Court: European Court of Human Rights; 1991. Available from:
<http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=4FXM-YJM0-TWW4-21NF&csi=279841&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

14.

McGregor OR, Great Britain. Royal Commission on the Press - Final Report. London: H.M.S.O.; 1977.

15.

Lichtenberg J. Democracy and the mass media: a collection of essays. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1990.

16.

Anderson DA. Freedom of the Press. Texas Law Review [Internet]. 2002;80(3):429-530. Available from:
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=ip,shib&db=bth&AN=6306076&site=ehost-live&scope=site>

17.

Association Ekin v France (Application No 39288/98) 35 EHRR 1207 [Internet]. Court: European Court of Human Rights. 2002. Available from:
<http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=7XP6-W3W0-Y9D2-B0M5&csi=279841&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

18.

Barendt EM, et al. Media law: text, cases and materials. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

19.

Robertson G, Nicol AGL. Media law. 5th ed. London: Penguin; 2008.

20.

Queen's Bench Division (Administrative Court). R on the application of Anna Ford v PCC EMLR 95 [2002] EMLR 5 [Internet]. 2002. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I79468360E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

21.

Leveson LJ. The Leveson Report, Executive Summary HC 779 [Internet]. National Archives; 2012. Available from:
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/about/the-report/>

22.

Barendt E. Statutory Underpinning: A Threat to Press Freedom Media Law after Leveson. Journal of Media Law [Internet]. Hart Publishing; 2013;5(2). Available from:
<http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Index?index=journals%2Fjoomaw&collection=journals>

23.

Leveson LJ. The Leveson Report, Executive Summary [Internet]. National Archives; 2012. Available from:
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/about/the-report/>

24.

Leveson Report: Cross Party Royal Charter [Internet]. UK Government; 2013. Available from:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/leveson-report-cross-party-royal-charter>

25.

The Independent Press Standards Organization (IPSO) [Internet]. IPSO; Available from:

<https://www.ipso.co.uk/IPSO/whoweare.html>

26.

IPSO Editors' Code of Practice [Internet]. IPSO; Available from:
<https://www.ipso.co.uk/IPSO/cop.html>

27.

Press Complaints Commission Editors' Code of Practice [Internet]. Press Complaints Commission; Available from: <http://www.pcc.org.uk/cop/practice.html>

28.

Leveson LJ. The Leveson Report [Internet]. National Archives; 2012. Available from:
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/about/the-report/>

29.

Leveson LJ. The Leveson Report [Internet]. National Archives; 2012. Available from:
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/about/the-report/>

30.

Leveson Report: Cross Party Royal Charter [Internet]. UK Government; 2013. Available from:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/leveson-report-cross-party-royal-charter>

31.

Barendt EM, et al. Media law: text, cases and materials. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

32.

Robertson G, Nicol AGL. Media law. 5th ed. London: Penguin; 2008.

33.

British Board of Film Classification guidelines [Internet]. Available from:
<http://www.bbfc.co.uk/>

34.

British Board of Film Classification. BBFC policy statement, sexual and sadistic violence [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.bbfc.co.uk/what-classification/research>

35.

UK Government. Video Recordings Act 1984 [Internet]. 1984. Available from:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/39/contents>

36.

European Court of Human Rights. *Wingrove v UK* (17419/90), 24 EHRR 1 [Internet]. 1997. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?docguid=I08BF5580E42911DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&crumb-action=reset&entityID=https%3A%2F%2Fshib-idp.ucl.ac.uk%2Fshibboleth>

37.

Williams B. Report of the Committee on obscenity and film censorship. London: H.M.S.O.; 1979.

38.

British Board of Film Classification. Report on effects of sexual and sadistic violence in films [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.bbfc.co.uk/what-classification/research>

39.

European Court of Human Rights. *Otto-Preminger Institute v Austria* (A/295-A), 19 EHRR 34 [Internet]. 1994. Available from:

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I14CC5090E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

40.

R v Video Appeals Committee of the BBFC, ex parte the BBFC, EMLR 850 [Internet]. 2000. Available from:
<http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=59MP-VFV1-DYBP-P1FV&csi=274662&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

41.

Barendt EM, et al. Media law: text, cases and materials. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

42.

A public service for all: the BBC in the digital age (Cm 6763, 2006) [Internet]. UK Government; 2006. Available from:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-public-service-for-all-the-bbc-in-the-digital-age>

43.

House of Lords Select Committee on BBC Charter Review. The Review of the BBC's Royal Charter (2005, HL Paper 50-1) [Internet]. 2005. Available from:
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200506/ldselect/ldbbsc/50/5002.htm>

44.

Dept of National Heritage, British Broadcasting Corporation. Broadcasting: copy of Royal Charter for the continuance of the British Broadcasting Corporation. London: HMSO; 1996.

45.

Dept for Culture, Media and Sport. Broadcasting: an agreement between Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport and the BBC. London: TSO; 2006.

46.

Communications Act 2003 [Internet]. 2003. Available from:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/21/contents>

47.

BBC. BBC Annual Report 2012/13 - Overview [Internet]. BBC Trust; 2013. Available from:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbctrust/news/press_releases/2013/annual_report.html

48.

Born G, Prosser T. Culture and Consumerism: Citizenship, Public Service Broadcasting and the BBC's Fair Trading Obligations. *The Modern Law Review* [Internet]. Wiley; 64(5):657-687. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1097275>

49.

Vick DW. Regulatory convergence? *Legal Studies*. 26(1):26-64.

50.

Queen's Bench Division. *R v BBC, ex parte Referendum Party*, EMLR 605 [Internet]. 1997. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I333CFA70E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

51.

Dept of Culture, Media and Sport. Details of Culture, Media and Sport select committee inquiry - The Future of the BBC [Internet]. Available from:
<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/culture-media-and-sport-committee/news/131022-future-of-the-bbc-tor/>

52.

Culture, Media & Sport Committee. BBC Licence Fee Settlement and Annual Report - Fourth Report [Internet]. 2011. Available from:
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmcmums/454/45402.htm>

53.

Barendt EM, et al. Media law: text, cases and materials. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

54.

Robertson G, Nicol AGL. Media law. 5th ed. London: Penguin; 2008.

55.

Communications Act 2003 [Internet]. 2003. Available from:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/21/contents>

56.

OFCOM. OFCOM Broadcasting Code [Internet]. Available from:
<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/broadcast-codes/broadcast-code/>

57.

OFCOM. OFCOM dismissal of complaints against Jerry Springer - the Opera [Internet]. OFCOM Broadcasting Bulletin; 9AD. Available from:
<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/enforcement/broadcast-bulletins/pcb61/>

58.

House of Lords. R (On the Application of Pro-Life Alliance) v BBC, 1 AC 185 (Hoffmann, Scott) [Internet]. 2004. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I7ECA41A0E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

59.

Court of Appeal (Civil Division). *Gaunt v OFCOM*, EWCA Civ 692, 1 WLR 2355 [Internet]. 2011. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I5F0750B0993B11E0AD16BA3024D1BECD&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

60.

Hitchens L. *Broadcasting pluralism and diversity: a comparative study of policy and regulation*. Oxford: Hart Publishing; 2006.

61.

OFCOM. OFCOM Broadcasting Code [Internet]. Available from:
<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/broadcast-codes/broadcast-code/>

62.

BBC Trust. *From Seesaw to Wagon Wheel: safeguarding impartiality in the 21st century* [Internet]. 2007. Available from:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbctrust/our_work/editorial_standards/impartiality/safeguarding_impartiality.html

63.

UK Government. *Broadcasting Act 1990* [Internet]. 1990. Available from:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/42/contents>

64.

Hare I. *Insulting Politicians on the Radio?* *Journal of Media Law*. 4(1):29–34.

65.

House of Lords Communications Committee. *Media Convergence - Second Report* [Internet]. 2013. Available from:
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201213/ldselect/ldcomuni/154/15402.htm>

66.

Fielden L. Regulating for trust in journalism: standards regulation in the age of blended media [Internet]. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism; 2011. Available from:

<http://copac.ac.uk/search?title=Regulating%20for%20Trust%20in%20Journalism&rn=1>

67.

Barendt EM, et al. Media law: text, cases and materials. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

68.

Queen's Bench Division. R v ASA, ex parte Charles Robertson, EMLR 463 [Internet]. 2000. Available from:

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I2ED2E991E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

69.

Committee of Advertising Practice. UK Code of Non-Broadcasting Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing [Internet]. Available from:

<http://www.cap.org.uk/Advertising-Codes/Non-Broadcast.aspx>

70.

OFCOM. Code on the Scheduling of Television Advertising [Internet]. Available from:

<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/broadcast-codes/advert-code/>

71.

Barendt EM, et al. Media law: text, cases and materials. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

72.

VGT Verein gegen Tierfabriken v Switzerland, 34 EHRR 4 [Internet]. VGT Verein gegen Tierfabriken v Switzerland. 2002. Available from:

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?docguid=IE73CB0B0E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&crumb-action=reset&entityID=https%3A%2F%2Fshib-idp.ucl.ac.uk%2Fshibboleth>

73.

R (On the Application of ADI) v Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, 1 AC 1312 [Internet]. Official Transcript. 2008. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?docguid=IF99845A0F0C211DC810BBB39FEDB30E7&crumb-action=reset&entityID=https%3A%2F%2Fshib-idp.ucl.ac.uk%2Fshibboleth>

74.

European Court of Human Rights. Animal Defenders International v UK, European Court decision of 22 April 2013 [Internet]. 22AD. Available from:
<http://hudoc.echr.coe.int/sites/fra/pages/search.aspx?i=001-119244>

75.

Robertson G, Nicol AGL. Media law. 5th ed. London: Penguin; 2008.

76.

Hitchens L. Broadcasting pluralism and diversity: a comparative study of policy and regulation. Oxford: Hart Publishing; 2006.

77.

Chancery Division. DGFT v Tobyward, 2 All ER 266 - [1989] 1 W.L.R. 517 [Internet]. 1989. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I9943DD31E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

78.

Queen's Bench Division (Administrative Court). R v ASA, ex parte Matthias Rath, EMLR 581 [Internet]. 2001. Available from:

<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I7A529C30E42811DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

79.

Colin R. Munro. Self-regulation in the media. Public Law. 100 Avenue Road Swiss Cottage London NW3 3PF: Sweet & Maxwell; (1):6-17.

80.

Committee of Advertising Practice. BCAP Television Advertising Code [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.cap.org.uk/Advertising-Codes/Broadcast.aspx>

81.

European Court of Human Rights. TV Vest and Pensioners Party v Norway, 48 EHRR 51 [Internet]. 2009. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I8DD21A00403311DEB8B88BCF555915D2&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

82.

Andrew Scott. 'A Monstrous and Unjustifiable Infringement': Political Expression and the Broadcasting Ban on Advocacy Advertising. The Modern Law Review [Internet]. Wiley; 66(2):224-244. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1097625>

83.

Rowbottom J. Animal Defenders International: Speech, Spending, and a Change of Direction in Strasbourg. Journal of Media Law. 5(1):1-13.

84.

Barendt EM, et al. Media law: text, cases and materials. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

85.

Communications Act 2003 [Internet]. 2003. Available from:
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/21/contents>

86.

House of Lords Communications Committee. The Ownership of News [Internet]. 2008. Available from:
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200708/ldselect/ldcomuni/122/12202.htm>

87.

Court of Appeal (Civil Division). BSkyB v Competition Commission, EWCA Civ 2 [Internet]. 2010. Available from:
<http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I7F645240070B11DFBAF4824E29209369&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

88.

Smith RC, Tambini D. Measuring Media Plurality in the United Kingdom: Policy Choices and Regulatory Challenges. *Journal of Media Law*. 4(1):35–63.

89.

House of Lords Communications Committee. Media Plurality [Internet]. 2014. Available from: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201314/ldselect/ldcomm/120/12002.htm>

90.

Hitchens L. Broadcasting pluralism and diversity: a comparative study of policy and regulation. Oxford: Hart Publishing; 2006.

91.

Rowbottom J. Democracy distorted: wealth, influence and democratic politics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2010.

92.

Craufurd Smith R. Reviewing Media Ownership Rules in the UK and Europe: Competing or Complementary Investigations? *Journal of Media Law*. 5(2):332–344.

93.

Arnott C. Media Mergers and the Meaning of Sufficient Plurality: A Tale of Two Acts. *Journal of Media Law*. 2(2):245–275.

94.

Dept for Culture, Media & Sport. OFCOM Report and other documents on News Corporation acquisition of BSkyB [Internet]. 2011. Available from: <http://www.culture.gov.uk/publications/7737.aspx>

95.

Dept for Culture, Media & Sport. Media ownership and plurality [Internet]. 2013. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/media-ownership-and-plurality>

96.

Barendt EM, et al. *Media law: text, cases and materials*. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

97.

Barendt EM. *Freedom of speech* [Internet]. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199225811.001.0001>

98.

Murray A. *Information technology law: the law and society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2010.

99.

US Supreme Court. *Reno v ACLU* (1997) 521 US 844 [Internet]. 1997. Available from: <http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=5BGK-W1K1-DYBP-W2KF&csi=274794&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

100.

Divisional Court. *Chambers v DPP*, EWHC 2157 (QB) [Internet]. 2012. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I96CC0DB1D86411E18BFAEAE7E8BE854C&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

101.

Communications Act 2003 [Internet]. 2003. Available from: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/21/contents>

102.

Jacob Rowbottom. Media Freedom and Political Debate in the Digital Era. *The Modern Law Review* [Internet]. Wiley; 69(4):489–513. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3877224>

103.

Internet Watch Foundation [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.iwf.org.uk/services/blocking>

104.

House of Lords Communications Committee. *Media Convergence - Second Report* [Internet]. 2013. Available from: <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201213/ldselect/ldcomuni/154/15402.htm>

105.

Hitchens L. *Broadcasting pluralism and diversity: a comparative study of policy and regulation*. Oxford: Hart Publishing; 2006.

106.

Price ME. The Newness of New Technology. *Cardozo Law Review* [Internet]. Yeshiva University Benjamin N. Cardozo School of Law; 22(5-6):1885-1913. Available from: <http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Index?index=journals%2Fcdozo&collection=journals>

107.

Edwards L, Waelde C. *Law and the Internet*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Hart; 2009.

108.

Jack L. Goldsmith. Against Cyberanarchy. *The University of Chicago Law Review* [Internet]. The University of Chicago Law Review; 65(4):1199-1250. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1600262>

109.

The Authority for Television on Demand. *Authority for Television on Demand (ATVOD) Rules* [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.atvod.co.uk/rules-and-guidance>

110.

Barendt EM, et al. *Media law: text, cases and materials*. Harlow: Pearson; 2014.

111.

Barendt EM. *Freedom of speech* [Internet]. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2007. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199225811.001.0001>

112.

High Court of Australia. *Dow Jones & Co Inc v Gutnick* 1 LRC 368 [Internet]. 2002. Available from: <http://www.lexisnexus.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=531V-T6P1-DYJ0-8137&csi=280207&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

113.

Queen's Bench Division. *Bunt v Tilley*, 3 All ER 336 [Internet]. 2006. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I7D5A7A71E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

114.

Queen's Bench Division. *Metropolitan International Schools v Designtecnica* EWHC 1765 (QB), EMLR 27 [Internet]. 2009. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I9AB8083075A111DE8908AB881D7C0247&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

115.

Court of Appeal (Civil Division). *Tamiz v Google Inc*, EWCA Civ 308, EMLR 14 [Internet]. 2013. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=IA400CDA0771911E2BDD5EE83071B65AA&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

116.

Defamation Act 2013 [Internet]. UK Government; 2013. Available from: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2013/26/contents/enacted>

117.

R v Perrin, EWCA Crim 747, All ER (D) 359 (Mar) [Internet]. Court: Court of Appeal. 2002. Available from: <http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=4FXP-Y980-TWW4-20VV&csi=279841&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

118.

R v Bowden, 2 All ER 418 [Internet]. 2000. Available from: <http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=4CSP-4J80-TWP1-6013&>

csi=274668&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t

119.

Birnhack MD, Rowbottom JH. Shielding Children: The European Way Symposium: Do Children Have the Same First Amendment Rights as Adults. *Chicago-Kent Law Review* [Internet]. Chicago-Kent College of Law; 2004;79(1):175–227. Available from: <http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Index?index=journals%2Fchknt&collection=journals>

120.

BBC News. Google and Microsoft agree steps to block abuse images [Internet]. BBC News; 18AD. Available from: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-24980765>

121.

Muir Watt H. Yahoo Cyber-Collision of Cultures: Who Regulates (Special Feature - Cyberage Conflicts Law). *Michigan Journal Of International Law* [Internet]. University of Michigan Law School; 24(3):673–696. Available from: <http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Index?index=journals%2Fmjil&collection=journals>

122.

Godfrey v Demon Internet Ltd, QB 201 [Internet]. 2001. Available from: <http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=4K3D-RRG0-TXD5-X0YC&csi=296982&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t>

123.

Divisional Court. *Atkins, Goodland v DPP*, 2 All ER 425 [Internet]. 2000. Available from: <http://login.westlaw.co.uk/maf/wluk/ext/app/document?crumb-action=reset&docguid=I687E0E01E42711DA8FC2A0F0355337E9&entityID=https://shib-idp.ucl.ac.uk/shibboleth>

124.

R v Porter, EWCA Crim 560, 2 All ER 625 [Internet]. Court: Court of Appeal. 2006. Available from: <http://www.lexisnexis.com/uk/legal/docview/getDocForCuiReq?Ini=4JHK-XM70-TWW4-20H5>

&csi=279841&oc=00240&perma=true&elb=t