ROPEAN MAN HTS

I w Review

OPINION

ERIC METCALFE

INEQUALITY OF ARMS: THE RIGHT TO A FAIR TRIAL IN GUANTANAMO BAY

ARTICLES

PHILIP HAVERS Q.C. AND ROSALIND ENGLISH

HUMAN RIGHTS: A REVIEW OF THE YEAR

PIETRO SARDARO

JUS NON DICERE FOR ALLEGATIONS OF SERIOUS VIOLATIONS

OF HUMAN RIGHTS: QUESTIONABLE TRENDS IN THE

RECENT CASE LAW OF THE STRASBOURG COURT

JEREMY HYAM

HATTON v UNITED KINGDOM IN THE GRAND CHAMBER:

ONE STEP FORWARD, TWO STEPS BACK?

RICHARD EKINS

A CRITIQUE OF RADICAL APPROACHES TO

RIGHTS-CONSISTENT STATUTORY INTERPRETATION

CASE ANALYSIS

ALISON MACDONALD


R. (ON THE APPLICATION OF PROLIFE ALLIANCE) v BRITISH BROADCASTING CORPORATION: POLITICAL

SPEECH AND THE STANDARD OF REVIEW

Issue 6 2003

Can

EUROPEAN HUMAN RIGHTS



w Review

Issue 6 2003

pages 573-682

EHRLR aims to promote better understanding of European human rights law, and to provide a forum for serious debate on the European Convention on Human Rights. Tailored to the needs of the practitioner and academic lawyers, it carries articles on all aspects of human rights law as well as providing authoritative commentaries on current developments in this field.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OPINION Inequality of Arms: the Right to a Fair Trial in Guantanamo Bay Eric Metcalfe 573 BULLETIN 585 **ARTICLES** Human Rights: A Review of the Year Philip Havers Q.C. and Rosalind English 587 Jus Non Dicere for Allegations of Serious Violations of Human Rights: Questionable Trends in the Recent Case Law of the Strasbourg Court Pietro Sardaro 601 Hatton v United Kingdom in the Grand Chamber: One Step Forward, Two Steps Back? *Jeremy Hyam* 631 A Critique of Radical Approaches to Rights-Consistent Statutory **Interpretation** Richard Ekins 641

CASE ANALYSIS	
R. (on the application of ProLife Alliance) v British Broadcasting Corporation:	
Political Speech and the Standard of Review	
Alison MacDonald65	1
CASES AND COMMENT	
Lyons v United Kingdom65	8
Perry v United Kingdom	1
Hatton v United Kingdom 66	3
Sahin v Germany 66	5
Sentges v Netherlands 66	9
Garaudy v France 67	2
Finucane v United Kingdom67	
Hirst v United Kingdom 67	8
BOOK REVIEW	1

This Review may be cited as: [2003] E.H.R.L.R.

© Sweet and Maxwell Limited, 100 Avenue Road, NW3 3PF (http://www.sweetandmaxwell.co.uk) and contributors 2003

All rights reserved. Crown copyright legislation is reproduced under the terms of Crown Copyright Policy Guidance issued by HMSO.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, or stored in any retrieval system of any nature without prior written permission, except for permitted fair dealing under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988, or in accordance with the terms of a licence issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency in respect of photocopying and/or reprographic reproduction.

Application for permission for other use of copyright material including permission to reproduce extracts in other published works shall be made to the publishers. Full acknowledgment of author, publisher and source must be given.

ISSN: 1361 1526