

I append my thoughts on your two questions.

Neville Cramer

#### Question 1

In my opinion, the new system for overseeing press regulation is a failure.

There are two strands to my view.

First, The Practical. It has failed in many cases, but I quote just one, The Emily Brothers case, in which the Sun cocked a snook at IPSO. IPSO found against the Sun and specified restitution. The Sun responded in such a way as to respond to the letter (arguably) of the IPSO ruling. But by using no large type headline, as would be found in any other newspaper article, the Sun was clearly cocking a snook at IPSO (not to mention Emily Brothers). There was no response from IPSO asking the Sun to respond properly. I do not know whether this was because IPSO did not have the power to do so or its courage failed in having face down a major financial supporter.

My second strand I call 'Theoretical' for want of a better word. A judge of considerable ability and experience, after a full inquiry, proposed a different method. It seems to me, therefore, that is likely to be the most successful approach in the long run. Particularly when the alternative has been set up by the very organisations whose behaviour for decades past has been to use their power to abuse the lowly and keep (some of) the mighty cowed.

#### Question 2

It seems to me that the publishers are the ones who need to be incentivised. From memory, I seem to recall that the judges proposal was that by joining a recognised regulator, the publisher will make available a system which is cheap for the complainant and most important protects itself (the publisher) from huge costs.

This seems to be an excellent way of proceeding, particularly, since it was approved by Parliament and the Government (or a Government) promised to implement it.

Over the decades, we have tried many other approaches which all failed. They had in common that they were all not regulated. Let's try the alternative!