

LAWSG144: Principles of Media Regulation: Eric Barendt

[View Online](#)

1.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

2.

Hitchens, L.: Broadcasting pluralism and diversity: a comparative study of policy and regulation. Hart Publishing, Oxford (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. 75, 1-42.

4.

US Supreme Court: Reno v ACLU (1997) 521 US 844. (1997).

5.

High Court of Australia: Dow Jones & Co Inc v Gutnick 1 LRC 368. (2002).

6.

Jacob Rowbottom: Media Freedom and Political Debate in the Digital Era. The Modern Law Review. 69, 489-513.

7.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

8.

Stewart, P.: Or of the press. Hastings Law Journal. 26, 631-637.

9.

Barendt, E.M.: Freedom of speech. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2007).

10.

Thomas Gibbons: Freedom of the press: ownership and editorial values. Public Law. 279-299 (1992).

11.

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

12.

European Convention on Human Rights & fundamental freedoms,
http://www.echr.coe.int/Pages/home.aspx?p=basictexts&c=#n1359128122487_pointer,
(1950).

13.

Observer and Guardian v United Kingdom (Application 13585/88) 14 EHRR 153. Court:
European Court of Human Rights (1991).

14.

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

15.

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

16.

Anderson, D.A.: Freedom of the Press. Texas Law Review. 80, 429-530 (2002).

17.

Association Ekin v France (Application No 39288/98) 35 EHRR 1207. (2002).

18.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

19.

Robertson, G., Nicol, A.G.L.: Media law. Penguin, London (2008).

20.

Queen's Bench Division (Administrative Court): R on the application of Anna Ford v PCC EMLR 95 [2002] EMLR 5. (2002).

21.

Leveson, L.J.: The Leveson Report, Executive Summary HC 779,
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/about/the-report/>, (2012).

22.

Barendt, E.: Statutory Underpinning: A Threat to Press Freedom Media Law after Leveson. *Journal of Media Law*. 5, (2013).

23.

Leveson, L.J.: The Leveson Report, Executive Summary,
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/about/the-report/>, (2012).

24.

Leveson Report: Cross Party Royal Charter,
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/leveson-report-cross-party-royal-charter>.

25.

The Independent Press Standards Organization (IPSO),
<https://www.ipso.co.uk/IPSO/whoweare.html>.

26.

IPSO Editors' Code of Practice, <https://www.ipso.co.uk/IPSO/cop.html>.

27.

Press Complaints Commission Editors' Code of Practice,
<http://www.pcc.org.uk/cop/practice.html>.

28.

Leveson, L.J.: The Leveson Report,
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/about/the-report/>, (2012).

29.

Leveson, L.J.: The Leveson Report,
<http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140122145147/http://www.levesoninquiry.org.uk/about/the-report/>, (2012).

30.

Leveson Report: Cross Party Royal Charter,
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/leveson-report-cross-party-royal-charter>.

31.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

32.

Robertson, G., Nicol, A.G.L.: Media law. Penguin, London (2008).

33.

British Board of Film Classification guidelines, <http://www.bbfc.co.uk/>.

34.

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

35.

UK Government: Video Recordings Act 1984,
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1984/39/contents>.

36.

European Court of Human Rights: Wingrove v UK (17419/90), 24 EHRR 1. (1997).

37.

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

38.

British Board of Film Classification: Report on effects of sexual and sadistic violence in films, <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. (1994).

40.

R v Video Appeals Committee of the BBFC, ex parte the BBFC, EMLR 850. (2000).

41.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

42.

A public service for all: the BBC in the digital age (Cm 6763, 2006), <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/a-public-service-for-all-the-bbc-in-the-digital-age>, (2006).

43.

House of Lords Select Committee on BBC Charter Review: The Review of the BBC's Royal Charter (2005, HL Paper 50-1), <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. HMSO, London (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. TSO, London (2006).

46.

Communications Act 2003, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/21/contents>.

47.

BBC: BBC Annual Report 2012/13 - Overview,
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*. 64, 657–687.

49.

Vick, D.W.: Regulatory convergence? *Legal Studies*. 26, 26–64.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-121X.2006.00005.x>.

50.

Queen's Bench Division: *R v BBC, ex parte Referendum Party*, EMLR 605. (1997).

51.

Dept of Culture, Media and Sport: Details of Culture, Media and Sport select committee inquiry - The Future of the BBC,
<http://www.parliament.uk/business/committees/committees-a-z/commons-select/culture-m>

edia-and-sport-committee/news/131022-future-of-the-bbc-tor/.

52.

Culture, Media & Sport Committee: BBC Licence Fee Settlement and Annual Report - Fourth Report,
<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201012/cmselect/cmcumeds/454/45402.htm>,
(2011).

53.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

54.

Robertson, G., Nicol, A.G.L.: Media law. Penguin, London (2008).

55.

Communications Act 2003, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/21/contents>.

56.

OFCOM: OFCOM Broadcasting Code,
<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/broadcast-codes/broadcast-code/>.

57.

OFCOM: OFCOM dismissal of complaints against Jerry Springer - the Opera,
<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). (2004).

59.

Court of Appeal (Civil Division): Gaunt v OFCOM, EWCA Civ 692, 1 WLR 2355. (2011).

60.

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

61.

OFCOM: OFCOM Broadcasting Code,
<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/broadcast-codes/broadcast-code/>.

62.

BBC Trust: From Seesaw to Wagon Wheel: safeguarding impartiality in the 21st century,
http://www.bbc.co.uk/bbctrust/our_work/editorial_standards/impartiality/safeguarding_impartiality.html, (2007).

63.

UK Government: Broadcasting Act 1990,
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1990/42/contents>.

64.

Hare, I.: Insulting Politicians on the Radio? Journal of Media Law. 4, 29–34.
<https://doi.org/10.5235/175776312802483899>.

65.

House of Lords Communications Committee: Media Convergence - Second Report,
<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. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, Oxford (2011).

67.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

68.

Queen's Bench Division: R v ASA, ex parte Charles Robertson, EMLR 463. (2000).

69.

Committee of Advertising Practice: UK Code of Non-Broadcasting Advertising, Sales Promotion and Direct Marketing,
<http://www.cap.org.uk/Advertising-Codes/Non-Broadcast.aspx>.

70.

OFCOM: Code on the Scheduling of Television Advertising,
<http://stakeholders.ofcom.org.uk/broadcasting/broadcast-codes/advert-code/>.

71.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

72.

VGT Verein gegen Tierfabriken v Switzerland, 34 EHRR 4. (2002).

73.

R (On the Application of ADI) v Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, 1 AC 1312. (2008).

74.

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

75.

Robertson, G., Nicol, A.G.L.: Media law. Penguin, London (2008).

76.

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

77.

Chancery Division: DGFT v Tobyward, 2 All ER 266 - [1989] 1 W.L.R. 517. (1989).

78.

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

79.

Colin R. Munro: Self-regulation in the media. Public Law. 6-17.

80.

Committee of Advertising Practice: BCAP Television Advertising Code,
<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. (2009).

82.

Andrew Scott: 'A Monstrous and Unjustifiable Infringement?': Political Expression and the Broadcasting Ban on Advocacy Advertising. *The Modern Law Review*. 66, 224–244.

83.

Rowbottom, J.: Animal Defenders International: Speech, Spending, and a Change of Direction in Strasbourg. *Journal of Media Law*. 5, 1–13.
<https://doi.org/10.5235/17577632.5.1.1>.

84.

Barendt, E.M., et al: *Media law: text, cases and materials*. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

85.

Communications Act 2003, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2003/21/contents>.

86.

House of Lords Communications Committee: *The Ownership of News*,
<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. (2010).

88.

Smith, R.C., Tambini, D.: Measuring Media Plurality in the United Kingdom: Policy Choices and Regulatory Challenges. *Journal of Media Law*. 4, 35–63.
<https://doi.org/10.5235/175776312802483862>.

89.

House of Lords Communications Committee: Media Plurality,
<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. Hart Publishing, Oxford (2006).

91.

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

92.

Craufurd Smith, R.: Reviewing Media Ownership Rules in the UK and Europe: Competing or Complementary Investigations? *Journal of Media Law*. 5, 332–344.
<https://doi.org/10.5235/17577632.5.2.332>.

93.

Arnott, C.: Media Mergers and the Meaning of Sufficient Plurality: A Tale of Two Acts. *Journal of Media Law*. 2, 245–275. <https://doi.org/10.5235/175776310794389373>.

94.

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

95.

Dept for Culture, Media & Sport: Media ownership and plurality,
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/media-ownership-and-plurality>.

96.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

97.

Barendt, E.M.: Freedom of speech. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2007).

98.

Murray, A.: Information technology law: the law and society. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2010).

99.

US Supreme Court: Reno v ACLU (1997) 521 US 844. (1997).

100.

Divisional Court: Chambers v DPP, EWHC 2157 (QB). (2012).

101.

Communications Act 2003, <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. 69, 489–513.

103.

Internet Watch Foundation, <http://www.iwf.org.uk/services/blocking>.

104.

House of Lords Communications Committee: Media Convergence - Second Report, <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. Hart Publishing, Oxford (2006).

106.

Price, M.E.: The Newness of New Technology. Cardozo Law Review. 22, 1885–1913.

107.

Edwards, L., Waelde, C.: Law and the Internet. Hart, Oxford (2009).

108.

Jack L. Goldsmith: Against Cyberanarchy. The University of Chicago Law Review. 65, 1199–1250.

109.

The Authority for Television on Demand: Authority for Television on Demand (ATVOD) Rules, <http://www.atvod.co.uk/rules-and-guidance>.

110.

Barendt, E.M., et al: Media law: text, cases and materials. Pearson, Harlow (2014).

111.

Barendt, E.M.: Freedom of speech. Oxford University Press, Oxford (2007).

112.

High Court of Australia: Dow Jones & Co Inc v Gutnick 1 LRC 368. (2002).

113.

Queen's Bench Division: *Bunt v Tilley*, 3 All ER 336. (2006).

114.

Queen's Bench Division: *Metropolitan International Schools v Designtecnica* EWHC 1765 (QB), EMLR 27. (2009).

115.

Court of Appeal (Civil Division): *Tamiz v Google Inc*, EWCA Civ 308, EMLR 14. (2013).

116.

Defamation Act 2013, <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2013/26/contents/enacted>.

117.

R v Perrin, EWCA Crim 747, All ER (D) 359 (Mar). (2002).

118.

R v Bowden, 2 All ER 418. (2000).

119.

Birnhack, M.D., Rowbottom, J.H.: *Shielding Children: The European Way Symposium: Do Children Have the Same First Amendment Rights as Adults*. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*. 79, 175-227 (2004).

120.

BBC News: *Google and Microsoft agree steps to block abuse images*, <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. 24, 673-696.

122.

Godfrey v Demon Internet Ltd, QB 201. (2001).

123.

Divisional Court: Atkins, Goodland v DPP, 2 All ER 425. (2000).

124.

R v Porter, EWCA Crim 560, 2 All ER 625. (2006).