

Contents

Introduction	1
<i>General background</i>	2
<i>Chapter summaries</i>	4
 1 Defamation and freedom of speech	 6
<i>Freedom of speech</i>	6
<i>Reputation</i>	9
<i>Other threats to free speech</i>	11
<i>The balancing exercise</i>	13
<i>England and Wales</i>	15
<i>The United States of America</i>	17
<i>Germany</i>	20
<i>The European Court of Human Rights</i>	22
<i>Conclusion</i>	23
 2 Common law of defamation in England and Wales prior to the Defamation Act 2013	 25
<i>Introduction</i>	25
<i>The common law tort of defamation</i>	26
<i>Defamatory statement</i>	26
<i>'Single meaning' rule</i>	29
<i>Peculiar characteristics of the tort of defamation which may have led to the imbalance vis-à-vis free speech</i>	31
<i>Strict liability</i>	31
<i>Presumption of harm: actionable per se</i>	33
<i>Presumption of falsity</i>	34
<i>Free speech rationale for defamation reform</i>	37
<i>The chilling effect</i>	37
<i>Costs</i>	38
<i>Libel tourism</i>	39
<i>Conclusion</i>	42

3	Defamation law in England and Wales after the 2013 reforms	45
	<i>Introduction</i>	45
	<i>The Defamation Act 2013: the claimant</i>	47
	<i>Defamatory meaning</i>	48
	<i>Serious harm to reputation</i>	51
	<i>Jury trials ‘abolished’</i>	63
	<i>Libel tourism</i>	64
	<i>The Defamation Act 2013: defences</i>	64
	<i>Truth</i>	65
	<i>Honest opinion</i>	66
	<i>Privilege</i>	67
	<i>Publication on matter of public interest: successor to the Reynolds defence</i>	69
	<i>Claims against persons who are not the primary publisher of the defamatory statement</i>	79
	<i>Analysis</i>	82
	<i>The Depp cases</i>	82
	<i>Miscellaneous</i>	85
	<i>Cost and complexity</i>	85
	<i>Strict liability and the reverse burden of proof retained</i>	89
	<i>The presumption of falsity retained</i>	90
	<i>Summary</i>	91
4	Defamation in the United States of America	93
	<i>Introduction</i>	93
	<i>Constitutional protection of freedom of speech</i>	94
	<i>Permissible limitation of freedom of expression in the United States</i>	97
	<i>Clear and present danger (of imminent lawless action)</i>	97
	<i>Prohibition against prior constraint</i>	97
	<i>Compelling reason necessary for restriction of freedom of expression</i>	98
	<i>Contemporary US defamation law</i>	100
	<i>New York Times v Sullivan</i>	100
	<i>From public officials to public figures</i>	102
	<i>Purely private figures: Gertz</i>	102
	<i>Comparison to UK defamation law</i>	103
	<i>Analysis</i>	107
	<i>Conclusion</i>	109

5	Defamation in Germany	110
	<i>Introduction</i>	110
	<i>Some caveats for the common law scholar</i>	111
	<i>Constitutional protection of the right to freedom of expression</i>	116
	<i>Protection of reputation as a subcategory of personality rights</i>	117
	<i>Defamation law in Germany</i>	118
	<i>Case study: the Jan Böhmermann affair</i>	122
	<i>Guidelines from the German Federal Constitutional Court</i>	124
	<i>Balancing exercise</i>	125
	<i>Public discourse, context, and the right to reply</i>	129
	<i>Status of the libel complainant</i>	130
	<i>Opinions as opposed to abusive criticism</i>	130
	<i>Analysis</i>	134
6	Defamation in the European Court of Human Rights	138
	<i>Introduction</i>	138
	<i>The ECtHR: balancing competing rights</i>	139
	<i>Recognition of the chilling effect</i>	140
	<i>Developments in the ECtHR</i>	142
	<i>Freedom of expression</i>	142
	<i>How the right to privacy being conflated with reputational rights led to a devaluation of the status of article 10</i>	143
	<i>Balancing articles 10 and 8</i>	148
	<i>Application in the ECtHR: a case study of Delfi v Estonia and Høiness v Norway</i>	155
	<i>Analysis</i>	161
	<i>Balancing speech with reputation</i>	162
	<i>The proportionality test</i>	162
	<i>Margin of appreciation: types of speech</i>	163
7	Analysis and conclusions	164
	<i>The value of a comparative analysis</i>	165
	<i>Reputation, speech, and the events that led to the Defamation Act 2013</i>	165
	<i>The Defamation Act 2013</i>	169
	<i>United States</i>	174
	<i>Germany</i>	175
	<i>European Court of Human Rights</i>	176
	<i>Conclusion</i>	178
	<i>Index</i>	180