

Good morning.

On one Sunday some time ago on BBC 1. Appearing on the "The Big Question" a press editor ( I believe from the Sun ) stated that the fact they had chosen not to expose John Whittingdale's somewhat bazaar sexual arrangements was because they did not believe it was in the public interest and this showed how well the Press was regulating itself

This was about the same time that other members of the press were seeking cancellation of a high court judgement that forbade them from printing a story about some celebrity and a "Threesome."

I don't see any particular public interest in this later case.

However how can the public have any faith and is it not suspicious when the press choose not to publish an adverse story about someone who is responsible for regulating them. I believe one press e-mail described him as an asset.

While I believe there is no public interest in anyone's sex life It was absolutely in the public interest to know that John Whittingdale had an embarrassing secret and he knew that the press knew.

This smacks at the best hypocrisy and at the worst raises public suspicion of corruption.

It highlights the FACT that self regulation is not working. The public demand that Levison be implimented.

Best Wishes

Graham Lascelles