



Neutral Citation Number: [2025] EWHC 389 (KB)

Case No: KB 2024 002122

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE**  
**KING'S BENCH DIVISION**

Royal Courts of Justice  
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 25/02/2025

**Before :**

**THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE JENNIFER EADY DBE**

-----  
**Between :**

**JOHN WARE**

**Claimant**

**- and -**

**1. ROGER WATERS**

**First Defendant**

**2. AL JAZEERA MEDIA NETWORK**

**Second Defendant**

-----  
-----

**William Bennett KC** (instructed by **Patron Law LLP**) for the **Claimant**  
**Adam Wolanski KC** and **Kate Wilson** (instructed by **Russells (a firm)**) for the **First Defendant**  
**Jane Phillips** (instructed by **Carter-Ruck**) for the **Second Defendant**

Hearing date: 10 February 2025

-----  
**Approved Judgment**

This judgment was handed down remotely at 10.30am on 25 February 2025 by circulation to the parties or their representatives by e-mail and by release to the National Archives (see eg <https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2022/1169.html>).

.....

**Mrs Justice Eady:**

**Introduction**

1. The claimant brings a claim for libel in relation to statements made in the course of an interview with the first defendant, which was broadcast by the second defendant as a programme under the title ‘*Roger Waters on Gaza, Resistance and Doing the Right Thing*’ (“the programme”). The programme was broadcast in two editions - “version 1” and “version 2” – both of which are in issue in this claim.

2. By order of 18 October 2024, this matter was set down for a trial of the following preliminary issues: (1) the natural and ordinary meaning of each of the statements in issue; (2) whether the statements, or any of them, are defamatory of the claimant at common law; (3) whether the statements, or any of them, are or contain statements of fact or opinion; (4) insofar as the statements, or any of them, are or contain expressions of opinion, whether the programme indicated in general or specific terms the basis of the opinion. As the defendants accept that the statements are defamatory at common law, whether given the meaning they or the claimant contend, I do not need to determine issue (2).

3. In accordance with approved practice (Tinkler v Ferguson [2019] EWCA Civ 819, paragraph 9), I watched the programme, forming (and making a note of) my initial impressions before knowing what any of the parties sought to say. As the order of 18 October 2024 envisaged that the questions would need to be considered in respect of both editions of the programme, with, and without, captions, I watched each of the video files sent to me albeit, after watching version 1 (with captions), I was mindful of the fact that, thereafter, I was not in the same position as the hypothetical viewer (who would be unlikely to have watched more than one version of the programme). Acknowledging the inevitable difficulty arising from having to form an initial impression in respect of each viewing, I allowed a time gap between them and did my best to approach each with as fresh an eye as possible. Having undertaken this exercise, I then read the various documents setting out the parties’ respective positions and heard oral argument, reserving judgment as to how far I might adjust my initial views.

**The background and the statements in issue**

4. The claimant is a journalist and documentary maker. In 2023, he made and presented a documentary about the first defendant, called ‘*The Dark Side of Roger Waters*’ (“the documentary”); the documentary was made for an organisation known as the Campaign Against Antisemitism (“CAA”). The CAA broadcast the documentary on its YouTube channel.

5. The first defendant is a musician and performer; he was a founding member of the music group, Pink Floyd and performs as a solo artist. The second defendant is a broadcaster, which operates the television channel ‘*Al Jazeera English*’ and has a YouTube channel with the same name; one of the second defendant’s programmes is a discussion programme called ‘*The Stream*’, which is presented by Ms Anelise Borges.

6. In early February 2024, the first defendant was interviewed by Ms Borges for an edition of *The Stream*. The resulting programme was subsequently broadcast with two different edits. Version 1 was broadcast on the second defendant’s television channel three times: at 8.30pm on 15 February 2024, and at 2.30am and 2.30pm on 16 February 2024; version 2 was broadcast on the channel once on 17 February 2024 and was uploaded to the second defendant’s YouTube channel on 17 February 2024 at 8.30am, where it remained, and was available to be viewed on demand, until 9.53am on 1 May 2024. In addition to the oral interaction between the first defendant and Ms Borges, both versions of the programme included captions, appearing at the bottom of the screen, conveying further

information regarding the first defendant and the topics discussed. At annex A to this judgment, a complete transcript of the programme is provided, including captions. Where passages were edited out in version 2, these are shown as ~~struck through~~; where passages were added to version 2, these are underlined.

7. The programme opens with scenes from a concert performance featuring the first defendant, the footage being taken from his ‘*This is Not a Drill*’ tour. The first defendant is shown on stage, with footage of the audience, and there are large screens visible displaying the following messages: “*ROGER WATERS*”, “*THIS IS NOT A DRILL RESIST WAR*”, “*STOP THE GENOCIDE*”, “*GOOD*”, “*EVIL*”, “*RESIST WAR*”, “*EQUAL RIGHTS*”. The performance then breaks to a voiceover (still part of the concert) which states:

“Ladies and gentlemen, the show is about to begin. Before it does, if you’re one of those “I love Pink Floyd but I can’t stand Roger’s politics” people, you might do well to (bleep) off to the bar right now. Thank you.”

The words following “*Before it does*” are also shown in writing, on the screens.

8. The programme then cuts to a studio where Ms Borges is sitting. Ms Borges introduces the interview by picking up on the voiceover remarks from the concert, saying:

“And if you are one of those who can’t stand Roger Waters’ politics, now might indeed be a good time to go grab a drink, because the founding member of the iconic band Pink Floyd and one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, joins me now for a conversation about activism, Israel’s war in Gaza, rock and resistance. Good to have you with us, Roger.”

9. The first defendant appears on a large screen on the wall behind the sofa on which Ms Borges is sitting. The image of the first defendant is essentially of his head and shoulders, although throughout the interview he often gestures using his hands, which serves to emphasise particular points.

10. Continuing to refer to the voiceover remarks, Ms Borges’ first question is put as follows:

“We just saw there that spectacular opening of your latest ‘This Is Not a Drill’ tour. Quite a statement. What’s behind that message telling people to bugger off to the bar if they don’t like your politics.”

Eliciting the following response:

“Well it’s a piece of theatre and it was very effective piece of theatre because obviously it’s humorous, it’s tongue in cheek. I’m not actually seriously telling people to eff off to the bar. And so it was a it’s a very good way to open the show, and particularly towards the, the end of the tour, the latter shows where everybody knew that the spoken message was coming. And so they’re ready for it, and enjoyed it because they enjoy telling the opposition to eff off along with me.”

11. As the first defendant answers Ms Borges, captions appear at the bottom of the screen, explaining about his past work as a musician and co-founder of Pink Floyd.

12. Observing that there was “*quite a lot of politics*” in the first defendant’s show, Ms Borges continues:

“And obviously towards the end of the tour, Israel’s war on Gaza started and all that messaging gained a whole new and more urgent meaning perhaps. Can you tell us about that?”

13. In responding, the first defendant makes clear his view that this was an issue that had a far longer history, saying:

“... the Zionist war on the indigenous people of Palestine started in the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, ...”

and going on to describe more recent events in the following way:

“... What we’re seeing now beggars belief in every way. It’s obviously inconscionable [*sic*]. And every morning we all wake up flabbergasted and disgusted by the Zionist entity committing this, genocide. None of us, including you, are quite sure what to do, because the scale, the enormity of the crime that Israel is committing is so great that it’s hard for us to wrap our minds around it and to figure out how to respond to it.”

14. During the course of this exchange, captions again appear at the bottom of the screen. As well as reminding the viewer of the first defendant’s work as a musician, these explain:

“Since the 1990s Roger has toured extensively as a solo act incorporating political themes into his shows”

“Roger calls himself an anti-war & human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world”

“Roger’s activism focuses on issues including racism and the imprisonment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange”

“Roger has faced backlash over some of his political views including his comments the wars in Ukraine and Syria”

“As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”

15. Coming to the parts of the interview that form the basis of the claimant’s complaint in these proceedings, at paragraph 13 of the Amended Particulars of Claim (“APOC”), the relevant part of the transcript is set out as follows (I take this citation from the APOC, which sets out extracts from version 1 of the programme, with [square brackets] appearing around the passages edited out in version 2):

**“BORGES**

You have been an outspoken voice for Palestine for years now, how did you come to know about, what opened your eyes to the injustices endured by Palestinians?

**WATERS**

*(RW outlines why he became concerned about the Palestinians and why the issue pre-dated 7 October 2023.)*

**CAPTION SHOWN ON SCREEN**

For the past two decades, Roger has been critical of Israel’s occupation and oppression of Palestinians. In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including “stop the genocide” and “resist war”.

**BORGES**

You're obviously right about this war not having started on October 7, but we are definitely seeing much more pushback now for people like you who advocate for Palestinians. An organisation in the UK even produced a documentary on Roger's activism. Take a look:

**Extract from *The Dark Side of Roger Waters played***

**JOHN WARE**

I'm John Ware working with the charity Campaign Against Antisemitism. And I'm going to examine the evidence for the charge that Roger Waters is an antisemite. I talk to people who've worked closely with him, and who are speaking publicly for the first time.

**BOB EZRIN**

He does things that he says things that Jewish people take as an attack against us as a group.

**NORBERT STACHEL**

This dish comes, Roger kind of pushes it with his arm, he goes: "That's it. This is Jew food. What's with the Jew food?"

**BORGES**

I mean, we're not trying to validate those points. I actually wanted to get your reaction. I mean, this seems to be an old strategy, isn't it to kind of - I dunno - link whoever criticises Israel's government to some kind of behaviour to Jews.

**CAPTION**

For the past two decades, Roger has been critical of Israel's occupation and the oppression of Palestinians.

**WATERS** (*at the same time as Borges is speaking*)

....John Ware....

**CAPTIONS**

Roger Waters, Musician and co-founder of Pink Floyd.

In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including "Stop the genocide" and "Resist war."

Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of antisemitism.

Roger has faced numerous boycott campaigns and record label BMG severed ties with the musician over his views.

Roger calls the antisemitism allegations "despicable" and says they are part of a smear campaign to denounce him.

...

Roger calls himself an anti-war and human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world.

...

**WATERS**

Sorry, I interrupted you, John Ware the supposed journalist who you saw at the beginning of that clip, is a well-known, lying, conniving Zionist mouthpiece. [Apparently, there's a new programme coming out very soon. And I'm trying for the life of me to remember what it is. John Ware is an old adversary, and he will be standing up now cheerleading the genocide of the Palestinian people like almost more than anyone else on earth, that is who John Ware is.] I have nothing but utter contempt for him. [And as for those absurd lot of people – Bob Ezrin and Norbert Stachel – erm, well, they should be in a loony bin somewhere, bless them, poor little soldiers. I watched,] I sat through the whole of that quote documentary and it's a complete joke. It's made by something called the campaign about antisemitism. Well, the antisemitism argument is now blown out of the water.

**BORGES**

Mmm

**WATERS**

The genocide going on in Gaza now has absolutely proved beyond all doubt that those of us who've been standing up for Palestinian rights for the last 20 years are not only not – are not antisemitic; our motivations are not against the Jewish religion or the Jewish people. We are motivated (*sic*) by the cruel thugs who are running the Zionist entity in Israel who are all northern Europeans. They had nothing to do with the holy land. And they're trying to use the Jewish people and the Jewish religion, which I admire both of those groups - Jewish people and the Jewish religion which is a humane religion.

**BORGES**

Huh uh

**WATERS**

They don't care about. The difference between me and John Ware, and the difference between all of us on our side of the argument and all of the pro-Zionist, pro-genociders, is that we believe in Paris 1948 Declaration of Human Rights; we believe that all our brothers and sisters all over the world should be equal under universal law.

**BORGES**

Mmm

**[WATERS**

That's what the Paris Declaration 1948 December 10th said, OK? They don't – John Ware doesn't, Binyamin Netanyahu doesn't – none of them believe in human rights. That is why they call me an antisemite and the others who stand up for the Palestinian people, because we believe in human rights. They don't. That is the only question mark.

**BORGES**

Mmm

**WATERS**

And it's a question that's being answered: do the people invading and bombing the Palestinian people, women and children mercilessly, 24 hours a day in Rafah, believe in human rights? Really? No, of course they don't. They are the scum of the earth. And they are scoundrels and thugs. And we, the people who do believe in human rights have to continue to stand shoulder to shoulder until we are rid of them and their kind.]

**BORGES**

I imagine that sitting through that documentary was quite an unpleasant situation for you. But obviously there's much more concrete backlash than this.

**WATERS**

Yes

**BORGES**

A member of our online community on social media has a question for Roger about the risks of speaking up for Palestine. Let's take a look.

**KHALED ZURIKAT**

Hey Roger, this is Khaled from Jordan, what advice do you give people who dares to say something against the crimes and oppression that Israel is committing but then only get attacked, threatened and eventually silenced.

**BORGES**

What advice do you have, Roger?

**CAPTIONS**

Roger Waters, Musician and co-founder of Pink Floyd. In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including "Stop the genocide" and "Resist war." Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of antisemitism. Roger has faced numerous boycott campaigns and record label BMG severed ties with the musician over his

views. Roger calls the antisemitism allegations “despicable” and says they are part of a smear campaign to denounce him. . . . Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of antisemitism.

. . .

**WATERS**

They are murdering an entire people. The Israelis are murdering every man, woman and child in Palestine.”

16. This citation sets out the statements relied on by the claimant in his claim; for the most part, these occur between 00:04:13 and 00:09:16 on the recording (taking the times from the composite transcript at annex A), although the final statement made by the first defendant that is included in the citation appears some time later, at 00:22:29.

17. Between Ms Borges asking the first defendant “*What advice do you have ...?*” and the final statement relied on, the first defendant explains the advice given to him by his mother, “*You do the right thing*” (a phrase which presumably informed the choice of title for the programme) and goes on to make certain observations regarding various political leaders (the comments in this regard being more extensive in the version 2 edit). Within this part of the interview, further questions are posed by individuals who, like Mr Zurikat, are described by Ms Borges as members of “*our online community*”. One such question, from a Sandrine Correia, asks:

“I would like to ask you, what do you think of critics saying that artists should not have opinion on politics? Thank you.”

To which the first defendant responds (with some words edited out in the second version, as indicated by the [square brackets]):

“[Well bull- Obviously its complete bull-shit]  
What? What? Why shouldn't artists have political opinions. It's a...  
...It's like saying a coal miner shouldn't have an opinion or a doctor.”

18. The further question, from a Nicholas Vella (introduced as “*a fan and fellow musician*”), relates back to the first defendant's work with Pink Floyd, which ultimately leads Ms Borges to ask about the first defendant's thoughts on his “*legacy*”:

“What do you want to be remembered by your music or your activism or doing the right thing?”

It is the first defendant's answer to this question that includes the final statement relied on by the claimant. I set that out fully here to provide the context:

“Doing the right thing. You know, I think about this every day because all of all of those of us who care for our brothers and sisters and who have love in our hearts, we spend every day wondering how to get through the next moment in face of this calumny.

They are murdering an entire people. The Israelis are murdering every man, woman and child in Palestine. Nothing else matters at the moment. Once we can stop them doing that, and we can only do that by persuading Biden to say no, he could say no tomorrow. They all they have to do is stop sending the money. And it's over. Over. All those children can live. They can start feeding their children again. We can send in medicines and we could start to redevelop Gaza. But you're living, they are living, unfortunately, next to, an entity that has been so thoroughly brainwashed in its callous inhumanity that they are going to be very, very difficult to stop. But certainly we have to turn off the tap. So Macron, Sunak, all you Europeans, all... that idiot woman

who keeps spout [*sic*] shooting her mouth off, Van Der Leyden [*sic*], or whatever her name is, in the European Union.

No listen to the people. The people are right and you are wrong. It's really, really simple. Read. Go and read. All of you. All of you morons who seem to think there's something okay about this. You know the world cannot be ruled. That's something else that I've learned. And that, I say, as I've done, the world has to be loved and respected and above all, shared. Share. We have an absolute responsibility to share the world with all our brothers and sisters. This is a lesson for the Americans mainly. You cannot steal the whole thing. You cannot eat the whole cake. You have to share it with the rest of the world.”

### **The parties' positions in summary**

19. It is the claimant's case (see paragraph 17 of the APOC) that the natural and ordinary meaning of the statements in issue in each version of the programme is that:

(1) The Claimant made a documentary which attacked [D1] by deliberately telling the lie that he was antisemitic.

(2) The Claimant's reason for inventing the false allegation of antisemitism against [D1] was to punish him for his advocacy of the Palestinian cause and his criticism of the Israeli government in regard to its treatment of the Palestinian people, including its commission of genocide against them, and to undermine such advocacy and criticism.

(3) The Claimant personally and wholeheartedly supports and wishes for the genocide of the Palestinian people by the Israeli government, that is the murder of an entire people, every Palestinian man, woman and child.

It is said that the captions reinforce rather than alter the message thus conveyed.

20. The claimant further submits that these are statements of fact; alternatively, to the extent that the court determines that the statements (or any of them) are expressions of opinion, he says they are expressions of bare opinion, failing to indicate in general or specific terms the basis of the opinion.

21. For the defendants, it is contended that the statements should be given the following meanings (depending on whether version 1 or version 2 of the programme is being considered):

**Version 1:** the Claimant is a lying, conniving Zionist mouthpiece who, by opposing the First Defendant's politics on Palestine, cheerleads for the genocide of the Palestinian people.

**Version 2:** the Claimant is a lying, conniving Zionist mouthpiece.

It is said that the captions add nothing to the determination of meaning, although they do serve to emphasise the point that the first defendant's statements are expressions of opinion.

22. Accepting that, on either case, the statements are defamatory at common law, the defendants say that the statements (both version 1 and version 2) are clearly expressed and identifiable as expressions of the first defendant's opinion of the claimant, having regard to what is said about the first defendant by the claimant in the documentary, the programme indicating in general or specific terms the basis of the first defendant's opinion.



## The legal framework

### *Approach*

23. Reflecting the separate questions identified in the 18 October 2024 order, I set out below the relevant legal principles under sub-headings which correspond to each of the preliminary issues I am required to determine. I bear in mind, however, the risk of adopting an overly linear or compartmentalised approach; see per Warby J (as he then was) at paragraphs 16-17 **Triplark Ltd v Northwood Hall** [2019] EWHC 3494 (QB); Warby LJ at paragraph 23 **Blake v Fox** [2023] EWCA Civ 1000; [2024] EMLR 2; and Collins Rice J at paragraph 17 **Bridgen v Hancock** [2024] EWHC (KB) 1603. I accept that the questions identified at issues (1), (3) and (4) are inter-related and have approached my task accordingly.

### *Meaning*

24. The principles governing the determination of meaning are well-established. Acknowledging a degree of artificiality in the process - given that different people may interpret what they hear or read in different ways - the court's task is "*to determine the single natural and ordinary meaning of the words complained of, which is the meaning that the hypothetical reasonable reader would understand the words bear*"; per Nicklin J, **Koutsogiannis v Random House Group Ltd** [2019] EWHC 48 (QB), [2020] 4 WLR 25, paragraph 11. The relevant principles are summarised by Nicklin J at paragraph 12 **Koutsogiannis**; I have kept these in mind in reaching my determination.

25. As for the approach to be adopted when the statement/s in issue are broadcast as part of a television programme, in **Bond v BBC** [2009] EWHC 539 (QB), it was explained:

"9. It is important to acknowledge that assessing the meaning(s) of an hour long television programme is to a large extent a matter of impression. . . . one must not be over-analytical, in the sense of subjecting the text to a leisurely or legalistic breakdown: ordinary viewers will not have had that opportunity. The overall flavour of a programme may contribute to an interpretation which would not necessarily be found when subjecting the text to piecemeal analysis. There is a risk that such an exercise will focus on the trees and miss the wood."

### *Fact or opinion*

26. By section 3 **Defamation Act 2013** ("the 2013 Act") it is provided that a defence of honest opinion will be established where three conditions are met; the first of those conditions engages the question identified by issue (3), namely: "(2) ... *that the statement complained of was a statement of opinion.*"

27. In **Millett v Corbyn** [2021] EWCA Civ 567, [2021] EMLR 19, the defence of honest opinion was described as:

"16. ... a bulwark of free speech. It must not be whittled away by artificially treating comments as if they were statements of fact. On the other hand, if a person could use this defence as a means of escaping liability for a false defamatory allegation of fact, the law would fail to give due protection to

reputation. That is why the statutory defence only applies to a statement which is one of opinion.”

28. As the statute makes clear, it is not the meaning of the statement that is in issue, but the words used, albeit the answer to the question thus posed will depend on how those words would be understood by the ordinary reasonable viewer (or listener or reader). In **Butt v Secretary of State for the Home Department** [2019] EWCA Civ 933; [2019] EMLR 23, Sharp LJ, noting that section 3 of the **2013 Act** was intended to broadly reflect the common law principles applicable to the former defence of fair comment while simplifying and clarifying certain elements (see **The Explanatory Notes** to the **2013 Act**, paragraph 19), referred to the classic dictum of Cussen J in **Clarke v Norton** [2010] VLR 494, at 499, that:

“[Comment is] to be taken as meaning something which is or can reasonably be inferred to be a deduction, inference, conclusion, criticism, judgment, remark or observation” (see Sharp LJ at paragraph 34 **Butt v SSHD**)

going on to state that the ultimate determinant will be:

“39. ... how the statement would strike the ordinary reasonable reader: ... that is, whether the statement is discernibly comment (to such a reader) in the sense described above. In that regard, the subject matter, the nature of the allegation and the context of the relevant words may well be important. ...”

29. The principles drawn from the case-law that will inform the court’s approach to determining whether a statement is one of fact or opinion were summarised by Nicklin J at paragraph 16 **Koutsogiannis**, as follows:

- “i) The statement must be recognisable as comment, as distinct from an imputation of fact.
- ii) Opinion is something which is or can reasonably be inferred to be a deduction, inference, conclusion, criticism, remark, observation, etc.
- iii) The ultimate question is how the word would strike the ordinary reasonable reader. The subject matter and context of the words may be an important indicator of whether they are fact or opinion.
- iv) Some statements which are, by their nature and appearance opinion, are nevertheless treated as statements of fact where, for instance, the opinion implies that a claimant has done something but does not indicate what that something is, i.e. the statement is a bare comment.
- v) Whether an allegation that someone has acted “dishonestly” or “criminally” is an allegation of fact or expression of opinion will very much depend upon context. There is no fixed rule that a statement that someone has been dishonest must be treated as an allegation of fact.”

30. In carrying out its task, the court is engaged in a highly fact-sensitive process (see Warby LJ at paragraph 24 **Blake v Fox**), and subject matter and immediate context can be especially important (see Collins Rice J at paragraph 16 **Brigden v Hancock**). In **Greenstein v Campaign Against Antisemitism** [2019] EWHC 281 (QB), Nicklin J emphasised that, in that case, the determination of the question whether a statement is one of fact or opinion was highly context-specific (see his observations at paragraphs 29-31). More generally, it has been recognised that a court should be “*alert to the importance of giving free rein to comment and wary of interpreting a statement as factual in nature, especially where ... it is made in the context of political issues. ...*” (Warby J at paragraph 97 **Yeo v Times Newspapers Ltd** [2014] EWHC 2853 (QB)), albeit, in **Millett v Corbyn**, Warby LJ went on to warn:

“19. This is a highly fact-sensitive process that focuses on the particular statement at issue. It is obvious that the court cannot be bound or guided by findings made in other cases, about different words; ... Nor can the political role and status of Mr Corbyn, or the political nature of the Programme and its subject-matter, alter the approach required as a matter of law, still less dictate the answer to the question of whether the Statement was one of fact or opinion. These are all important features of the context to which the court should be alive when deciding how Mr Corbyn’s words would have struck the ordinary viewer. But they are no more than that.”

31. Part of the relevant context in the present case is provided by the fact that the statements were made in a broadcast interview. Although it would be possible for a viewer to pause and replay the programme (in particular where accessing it through an online platform), I accept that the hypothetical reasonable viewer would be unlikely to do so (see the observations of Nicklin J at paragraph 18 **Zarb-Cousin v Association of British Bookmakers and ors** [2018] EWHC 2240 (QB)). The approach the court should adopt in this regard was made clear in **Millett v Corbyn**:

“18. ... this is not a matter of studying the transcript, which cannot tell you how words are spoken, in what tone, or with what emphasis. It means watching and listening to the interview as a whole, bearing in mind that the ordinary viewer will do so only once. The court should avoid over-elaborate analysis and give weight to its own impression. ...”

32. At paragraph 16 iv) **Koutsogiannis**, Nicklin J acknowledged that some statements will have the nature and appearance of expressions of opinion but are nevertheless treated as statements of fact, such that the honest opinion defence will not be available. Characterised as “*bare comment*”, such cases underline the importance for the court in approaching this issue as a matter of substance not linguistics; as Warby LJ emphasised in **Millet v Corbyn**, having referred to the “*ultimate determinant*” identified in **Butt v SSHD**:

“24. ... The cases on “bare comment” do not lay down a rigid rule of law that requires a court to depart from this key principle, and artificially treat a statement of opinion as if it was a statement of fact. On the contrary. The authorities show that “bare comment” is a pointer, or guideline, or rule of thumb that *reflects* the key principle. The question is, would the words used strike the ordinary viewer as a statement of fact or opinion? The answer does not turn on whether any given word is an adjective, noun, or verb, or some other part of speech. This is a matter of substance, not a formal, analytical matter of grammar or linguistics. In practice, when someone uses a descriptive word without giving any detail of what he is describing, that will tend to come across as an allegation of fact. That is what the cases on “bare comment” say. ....”

#### *Indication of basis*

33. Issue (4) arises from the second of the three conditions necessary for the defence of honest opinion provided by section 3 of the **2013 Act**, which requires: “(3) ... *that the statement complained of indicated, whether in general or specific terms, the basis of the opinion.*” There is a degree of overlap between this condition and the question whether a statement is one of opinion; as Warby J observed in **Triplark**:

“17. There is also something of an overlap between the question of whether a statement is one of opinion, and the second requirement of the statutory defence under s 3 of the Act.... Although an inference may amount to a

statement of opinion, the bare statement of an inference, without reference to the facts on which it is based, may well appear as a statement of fact: see *Kemsley v Foot* [1952] AC 345. As Sharp LJ, DBE, pointed out in *Butt* at [37], not every inference counts as an opinion; context is all. Put simply, the more clearly a statement indicates that it is based on some extraneous material, the more likely it is to strike the reader as an expression of opinion.”

34. As paragraph 22 of **The Explanatory Notes** to the **2013 Act** makes clear, section 3(3) reflects the test approved by the Supreme Court in **Joseph v Spiller** [2010] UKSC 53, [2011] AC 852, that the comment must explicitly or implicitly indicate, at least in general terms, the facts on which it is based; as Lord Phillips explained in that case:

“102. It is a requirement of the defence that it should be based on facts that are true. This requirement is better enforced if the comment has to identify, at least in general terms, the matters on which it is based. The same is true of the requirement that the defendant’s comment should be honestly founded on facts that are true.

103. More fundamentally, even if it is not practicable to require that those reading criticism should be able to evaluate the criticism, it may be thought desirable that the commentator should be required to identify at least the general nature of the facts that have led him to make the criticism. ...

104. .... I do not consider that Lord Nicholls [in **Cheng v Tse Wai Chun Paul** [2000] HKCFA 35; [2001] EMLR 31] was correct to require that the comment must identify the matters on which it is based with sufficient particularity to enable the reader to judge for himself whether it was well founded. The comment must, however, identify at least in general terms what it is that has led the commentator to make the comment, so that the reader can understand what the comment is about and the commentator can, if challenged, explain by giving particulars of the subject matter of his comment why he expressed the views that he did. A fair balance must be struck between allowing a critic the freedom to express himself as he will and requiring him to identify to his readers why it is that he is making the criticism.”

35. As for what will suffice for the comment to identify the matters on which it is based, that will inevitably be fact and context specific. In some cases, a passing reference will be sufficient for the basis to be apparent (see the observation of Lord Walker at paragraph 131 **Joseph v Spiller**); in others, rather more will be required. As the statute makes clear, the question is simply whether the statement complained of indicated – whether that is in general or specific terms - the basis of the opinion which it contains (and see the guidance provided by Warby LJ at paragraph 44 **Riley v Murray** [2022] EWCA Civ 1146, [2023] EMLR 3).

### **Argument, analysis and conclusions**

36. Although the claimant’s claim is focused on a particular section of the broadcast, all parties emphasise the impression given by the programme as a whole, albeit they draw different conclusions from that. It is also common ground that the captions add little in this regard, although the claimant says they reinforce what is said by the first defendant, while the defendants say they serve to emphasise that the first defendant holds, and voices, strong opinions.

37. For the claimant it is said the programme's leitmotif is clear: because the first defendant has publicly advocated in favour of the Palestinians he has received "*push-back*" or "*backlash*"; the claimant's documentary was part of that - part of the "*old strategy*", linking "*whoever speaks up against the genocide and/or criticises Israel's government to some kind of behaviour to Jews*". This accusation as to the claimant's motive was reinforced by the statement that he is a "*lying, conniving, Zionist mouthpiece*"; the meaning was plain: (1) the claimant created a documentary that deliberately tells the lie that the first defendant is antisemitic, and (2) he did so as a political or propaganda weapon in order to punish and undermine the first defendant's advocacy for the Palestinians and his criticism of the Israeli government. The reference to "*genocide*" was no mere rhetorical flourish but a clear assertion of what Israel is seeking to do ("*the murder of an entire people. The Israelis are murdering every man, woman and child in Palestine*"); by referring to the claimant "*cheerleading the genocide of the Palestinian people*", it was being stated that (3) the claimant personally and wholeheartedly supports and wishes for the genocide of the Palestinian people by the Israeli government (and the editing of version 2 does not materially change this position, given that this still included the statement that the claimant was one of "*the pro-Zionist, pro-genociders*"). The statements are plainly statements of fact, but, to the extent they are seen as expressions of opinion, they are expressions of bare opinion, with no indication, in general or specific terms, of the basis of the opinion. To the extent the defendants argue that the first defendant's response to the documentary provides such basis, that cannot meet the requirements of the defence: contrary to the guidance provided in Joseph v Spiller, there was nothing to indicate to the viewer what it was about the documentary to elicit such opinions.

38. For the defendants it is said that the programme makes clear from the outset that the first defendant is someone who expresses very strong political opinions, representative of his "*us and them*" world view, which is how his references to "*genocide*" are framed. The statements relating to the claimant are elicited in response to the documentary, then placed into the first defendant's "*us and them*" world view. That the first defendant was commenting on the claimant's motives served to underline that these are statements of opinion. A viewer would understand these to be (trenchant) expressions of opinion, in the same way as later comments about various world leaders; this was further emphasised by the answers given to Ms Correia. The meanings advanced by the defendants are true to the statements made, and it was notable that the claimant's letter before action initially adopted a similar approach. Moreover, these expressions of opinion make clear the relevant bases: in both versions, the reference to the claimant being a "*lying, conniving Zionist mouthpiece*" was plainly a response to the documentary; in version 1, the reference to the claimant's cheerleading "*the genocide of the Palestinian people*", also a response to the suggestion of antisemitism in the documentary, was based on the first defendant's clearly stated world view, in which the claimant is characterised as an "*old adversary*".

39. I agree with the parties that it is right to see the statements complained of in the context of the relevant programme (whether version 1 or version 2) taken as a whole; it is a reasonably short programme (around 25 minutes long), which I accept would generally be watched as a whole, in one go. My initial impression of the programme also accords with a description used by Ms Phillips in oral submissions: the title, the dramatic footage taken from the concert, and the initial signs and voiceover from that concert, all serve to make clear that this is going to be all about the first defendant; it is going to be political and it is going to be partisan – if that is not what the viewer wants to hear, then there is an early warning that they might wish to stop watching. I can accept that the captions may serve to emphasise these points but that observation is made with hindsight rather than being reflective of the impression I gained on my initial viewing of the programme: although I picked up on the fact that the early captions told me something of the first defendant's past career (about which I would assume most viewers would already be aware), I found that I did not pay attention to them after that. That this interview is going to be all about the first defendant's politics is, however, made clear regardless of the captions. That, I accept, is relevant context in answering the questions posed at this stage of the proceedings.

40. The scene is further set by the way the interview is then conducted by Ms Borges. This is not a hostile interview, it is, rather, very much a conversation that invites the first defendant to state his views about events in Gaza. Again, I can agree with the defendants that, from the outset, the viewer will be aware that the first defendant sees the world divided into two camps: “*us and them*”. That is apparent from the “*GOOD*” and “*EVIL*” signs at the concert; it is reinforced by Ms Borges’ opening remarks (picking up on the suggestion that those who do not like the first defendant’s views might wish to leave); it is made clear by the first defendant’s early answers, which assume he is speaking to those who agree with him (“*us*”); it is further emphasised during the course of the interview. All of these points made an impression on me on my first viewing of the programme, and I accept that this provides relevant context.

41. Turning then to the statements in issue, - which are those made by the first defendant after viewing the extract from the claimant’s documentary (set in the context of the questions posed by Ms Borges before and after the relevant clip) - I have reminded myself of my initial impression of what the first defendant was saying, and have then reflected on that after reading, and hearing, the submissions of the parties. My conclusions on the preliminary issues follow; because it accords with how I interpreted the statements in issue, I have explained my reasoning in two parts, before setting out my final decision.

42. The initial part of the first defendant’s answer states that the claimant “*is a well-known, lying conniving, Zionist mouthpiece*”. On my initial viewing of the interview, it seemed clear to me that this was a description which related to the claimant’s making of the documentary, which was (in turn) stated to be an investigation of the “*evidence for the charge*” that the first defendant “*is an antisemite*”. My understanding of what the first defendant was saying was that the claimant had made a documentary that contained lies about the first defendant and that he had done that as a response to the first defendant’s public support for the Palestinian cause because he (the claimant) was acting as a Zionist mouthpiece and wanted to undermine what the first defendant was saying.

43. Reflecting on why I gained the impression I did, I consider this was in part informed by what Mr Bennett KC characterised as the leitmotif of this part of the interview, that is to say, that there is “*push back*” for those, such as the first defendant, who advocate for the Palestinian cause. That links in not only with Ms Borges’ characterisation of the subject matter of the documentary as “*an old strategy ... to ... link whoever criticises Israel’s government to some kind of behaviour .... anti-Jews*”, but also with the first defendant’s subsequent forceful rejection of the charge of antisemitism (“*Well, the anti-Semitism argument is now blown out of the water. ... our motivations are not against the Jewish religion or the Jewish people ...*”), and with his description of the claimant as “*the supposed journalist*” and of the “*quote documentary*” as “*a complete joke*”. Providing this explanation should not, however, be seen as reflecting a line-by-line analysis on my part; my interpretation was, and is, based on my initial viewing of the programme. Reflecting on the parties’ submissions, I consider that, at least in this respect, my interpretation of meaning was (and is) closer (albeit not the same) to the first two propositions urged by the claimant.

44. Equally, however, my initial impression of what the first defendant was saying in this regard was that he was expressing his opinion about the documentary (that it contained lies about the first defendant) and about the claimant’s motivations in making it (it was a response to the first defendant’s public support for the Palestinian cause/criticism of the Israeli government because the claimant was acting as a Zionist mouthpiece and wanted to undermine what the first defendant was saying). Although the short clip from the documentary shown as part of the programme did not enable me to decide whether the first defendant’s comments were fair, I had noted the first defendant saying he had watched the whole documentary, and I understood him to be saying that the charges of antisemitism it contained were false and that a programme containing these false allegations had been made because he had criticised Israel’s policy towards Palestine. Expressing my impressions in the straightforward terms of the question posed by section 3(3) of the **2013 Act**, I find that, at least in

respect of these statements, the claimant's documentary was indicated to be the basis for the first defendant's opinion.

45. The first defendant's observations relating to the claimant did not, however stop there. In version 1, he went on to describe the claimant as "*an old adversary*", saying "*he will be standing up now, cheerleading the genocide of the Palestinian people like, almost more than anyone else on Earth. That is who John Ware is.*" The first defendant later came back to this theme, linking the claimant to the "*pro-genociders*" – a statement that remained in the edit in version 2. Returning to my initial impressions on watching version 1 of the programme, I interpreted these statements as meaning that the claimant positively supports the genocide of the Palestinian people by Israeli forces. In using the term "*genocide*", I understood the first defendant to be referring to the wholesale destruction of the Palestinian people. That, I thought, would be how most viewers would interpret the use of the word "*genocide*" but it also seemed to me to be apparent from how the first defendant was using the term in the programme; my impression was that the first defendant had already made clear he considered Israel's actions in Gaza to amount to a genocide of the Palestinian people and he was describing the claimant as one of those who supported that genocide.

46. I should make clear that, in watching version 2, unlike the ordinary viewer (who would be unlikely to have already seen version 1), I was aware that the programme no longer included the "*cheerleading*" comment. For present purposes, however, I do not consider this materially impacts upon my determination of the issues. In my initial viewing of version 1, I had already formed a view as to the meaning and nature of the first defendant's reference to "*pro-genociders*"; doing my best to approach my viewing of version 2 afresh, the impression I gained from the first defendant's use of that term did not change.

47. In hearing the descriptions of the claimant as "*cheerleading the genocide of the Palestinian people*" and as a "*pro-genocider*", I did not understand that the first defendant was linking these remarks to the documentary. In contrast to the impression I had from his earlier comments, these statements came across to me as factual statements about the claimant. That is not to say that I lost sight of the obviously political nature of the interview and the subject matter of the discussion, or of the context set by the programme. I have further reminded myself that the essence of the defence of honest opinion is "*the protection it affords for the honest expression of opinion of those with strong views and prejudices*" (per Sharp LJ paragraph 26 **Butt v SSHD**), and I bear in mind that I am not deciding whether what was said was correct, or even fair: the defence of honest opinion must extend to one-sided opinions, otherwise it would be no defence at all. In my judgement, however, the statements in issue were bald statements of fact: by saying that the claimant was "*cheerleading the genocide of the Palestinian people*", or that he was a "*pro-genocider*", the first defendant was saying that the claimant did, as a matter of fact, positively support the genocide of the Palestinians.

48. For the defendants it is contended that these statements express opinions that are clearly indicated to be based on the first defendant's response to the documentary and/or on his "*us and them*" world view. The short answer to these points is that this is simply not the impression the first defendant's words had on me when watching the programme. I have already explained how, on my initial viewing of the programme, the statements linking the claimant to support for genocide struck me as being distinct from the first defendant's responses regarding the documentary. And, although I can see that a separate argument might be constructed, whereby these statements are ultimately linked back to the first defendant's "*us and them*" characterisation of the debate relating to the actions of the Israeli government towards the Palestinian people, that seems to me to (i) require precisely the overly-elaborate analysis warned against and (ii) still fails to address the absence of any link between the information provided relating to the claimant and the bald statement that he supports the genocide of the Palestinian people. Thus, although I would accept that the first defendant's reference to a "*genocide*" expressed his opinion as to what was happening as a result of the actions of Israeli forces in Gaza (to which he had already referred), in stating that the claimant positively supported that "*genocide*", I find he was making a statement of fact.

49. My conclusions on the preliminary issues are therefore as follows:

- (1) Whether considering version 1 or version 2 (and with or without captions), the natural and ordinary meaning of each of the statements is as follows:

*Statement 1*

**The claimant had made a documentary that contained lies about the first defendant, and he had done that as a response to the first defendant’s public support for the Palestinian cause because he (the claimant) was acting as a Zionist mouthpiece and wanted to undermine what the first defendant was saying.**

*Statement 2*

**The claimant positively supported the genocide of the Palestinian people by Israeli forces (whereby “genocide” means the wholesale destruction of the Palestinian people).**

- (2) As is accepted, the statements are defamatory of the claimant at common law.
- (3) To the extent that the statements contained statements of fact, this is indicated by the underlining in the meanings set out in relation to issue (1).
- (4) Insofar as the statements are or contain expressions of opinion (those parts of the meanings that are not underlined):

Statement 1: the basis of the opinion was indicated to be the claimant’s documentary.

Statement 2: the basis of the opinion (what genocide meant in this context) was indicated to be the conduct of Israeli forces in Gaza.



### Roger Waters Interview on The Stream- Composite Transcript with Captions

1. Time	Speaker	Words Spoken	Caption Time	Caption Version 2	Caption Version 1	Visual Version 2
1.  00:00:14	Roger Waters on stage 'This is Not a Drill' tour footage:	You, yes, you.	00:00:07  00:00:10  00:00:11	"ROGER WATERS"  "THIS IS NOT A DRILL"  "RESIST WAR"	00:00:07 ROGER WATERS  00:00:10 THIS IS NOT A DRILL  00:00:11 RESIST WAR	Footage from 'This is Not a Drill Tour' showing Roger Waters performing on stage, large screens displaying the messages outlined in the captions column and footage of his audience at this show.
00:00:27		When we grew up and went to school, there were certain teachers who would hurt the children anyway they	00:00:18  00:00:23  00:00:26  00:00:30	"STOP THE GENOCIDE"  "GOOD"  "EVIL"  "RESIST WAR"	00:00:18 STOP THE GENOCIDE  00:00:23 GOOD  00:00:26 EVIL  00:00:28 RESIST WAR	

			could.	<b>00:00:38</b>	"EQUAL RIGHTS"	<b>00:00:36</b> EQUAL RIGHTS	
2.	<b>00:00:40</b>	<b>Roger Waters Voiceover in tour footage:</b>	Ladies and gentlemen, the show is about to begin. Before it does, if you're one of those "I love Pink Floyd but I can't stand Roger's politics" people, you might do well to (bleep) off to the bar right now. Thank you.	<b>00:00:40</b>	"If you're one of those "I love Pink Floyd but I can't stand Roger's politics" people, you might do well to off to the bar right now. Thank you"	<b>00:00:49</b> if you're one of those "I love Pink Floyd but I can't stand Roger's politics" people you might do well to off to the bar right now. Thank you.	
3.	<b>00:01:05</b>	<b>Anelise Borges (AB):</b>	And if you are one of those who can't stand Roger Waters politics, now might indeed be a good time to go grab a drink, because the founding member of the iconic band Pink Floyd and one of the world's most outspoken	<b>00:01:08</b>	Anelise Borges @anneliseborges	<b>00:01:06</b> "Anelise Borges @anneliseborges"	

			musicians, joins me now for a conversation about activism, Israel's war in Gaza, rock and resistance. Good to have you with us, Roger.			
4.	00:01:26	Roger Waters (RW):	Very nice to be here. Thank you.			
5.	00:01:28	AB:	We just saw there that spectacular opening of your latest 'This Is Not a Drill' tour. Quite a statement. What's behind that message? Telling people to bugger off to the bar if they don't like your politics.			
6.	00:01:41	RW:	Well it's a piece of theatre and it was very effective piece of theatre because obviously it's humorous, it's tongue in cheek. I'm not actually seriously telling people to eff off to the bar. And so it was a it's a very good way to open the show, and particularly	00:01:45	"Roger Waters Musician & Co-founder Pink Floyd"	00:01:45 "Roger Waters, Musician & Co-founder Pink Floyd" "New York" "@AJStream"

			<p>towards the, the end of the tour, the latter shows where everybody knew that the spoken message was coming. And so they're ready for it, and enjoyed it because they enjoy telling the opposition to eff off along with me</p>	<p><b>00:02:01</b></p> <p><b>00:02:11</b></p>	<p>“Roger is a British Musician &amp; singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd”</p> <p>“For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd’s co-lead vocalist lyricist &amp; creative director until his departure in 1985”</p>	<p><b>00:02:00</b> Roger is a British musician &amp; singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd”</p> <p><b>00:02:13</b> “For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd’s co-lead vocalist lyricist &amp; creative director until his departure in 1985”</p>	
7.	<b>00:02:18</b>	<b>AB:</b>	<p>We appreciate you censoring the F- word there. It was a fair warning, though, because there's a quite a lot of politics in your show, your political statements, they're splashed on those gigantic screens. And obviously, towards the end of the tour, Israel's war on Gaza started and all that messaging gained a whole new and more urgent meaning, perhaps. Can you tell us about that?</p>	<p><b>00:02:34</b></p>	<p>“By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one of</p>	<p><b>00:02:24</b> “By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one the world’s most critically acclaimed &amp; commercially successful bands”</p>	

					the world’s most critically acclaimed & commercially successful bands”		
8.	<b>00:02:43</b>	<b>RW:</b>	Well, Israel’s war on Gaza didn’t start after the tour. Israel's war on Gaza was started in the middle of the 19th century. Well, not, yes, Israel's war, the Zionist war on the indigenous people of Palestine started in the middle of the 19th century, and it came to one of its primary heads in, on the 10th of May in 1948, when the Nakba started and that's 75 years ago. So nothing actually started, towards the end of my tour. And we know and we all know all of that. And this morning, particularly now that that they're invading Rafah and that they're bombarding the	<b>00:02:47</b>	“Roger Waters Musician & Co-founder Pink Floyd”	<b>00:02:47</b> “Roger Waters Musician & Co-founder Pink Floyd”	<u>From <b>00:02:49</b> onwards black and white footage plays of men with guns, tanks, people and donkeys behind a barbed wire fence, a woman holding a child and a woman with a suitcase walking in a street filled with sandbags.</u> <u>Footage ends at <b>00:03:10</b></u>
				<b>00:03:11</b>	“Since the 1990s, Roger has toured	<b>00:03:07</b> “Since the 1990s Roger has toured extensively as a solo act incorporating political themes into his shows”	

			<p>place in southern Gaza, that they told the Palestinians to go to because it was a safe area. What we're seeing now beggars belief in every way. It's obviously inconscionable [sic]. And every morning we all wake up flabbergasted disgusted by the Zionist entity that is committing this, genocide. None of us, including you, are quite sure what to do, because the scale, the enormity of the crime that Israel is committing is so great that it's hard for us to wrap our minds around it and to figure out how to respond to it.</p>	<p><b>00:03:21</b></p> <p>“Roger calls himself an anti-war &amp; human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world”</p> <p><b>00:03:35</b></p> <p>“Roger’s activism focuses on issues including racism and the imprisonment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange”</p>	<p>extensively as a solo act incorporating political themes into his shows”</p> <p><b>00:03:21</b> “Roger calls himself an anti-war &amp; human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world”</p> <p><b>00:03:35</b> “Roger’s activism focuses on issues including racism and the imprisonment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange”</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	---	--

				<b>00:03:57</b>	“Roger has faced backlash over some of his political views including his comments on the wars in Ukraine and Syria”	<b>00:03:58</b> “Roger has faced backlash over some of his political views including his comments the wars in Ukraine and Syria”	
				<b>00:04:12</b>	“As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005.”	<b>00:04:12</b> “As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”	
9.	<b>00:04:13</b>	<b>AB:</b>	You're absolutely right. None of us actually knows what to do. You have been an outspoken voice for Palestine for years now. How did you come to know about this? What opened your eyes to the injustices endured by Palestinians?				
10.	<b>00:04:32</b>	<b>RW:</b>	Well, I'm ashamed to say that I didn't become part of the movement until 2006 when, my agent booked a gig in Tel-Aviv in the middle of a European tour that I was doing. I think it was	<b>00:04:35</b>	“Roger Waters Musician & Co-founder Pink Floyd” @rogerwaters	<b>00:04:37</b> “Roger Waters, Musician & Co-founder Pink Floyd”	

		'The Dark Side of the Moon' tour but I'm not sure. And I immediately started to get email messages from everywhere, but particularly from North Africa and the Middle East. And one of them was from Omar Barghouti, who I'm sure you've heard of....	<b>00:04:52</b>	“As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”	<b>00:04:53</b> “As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”	
11.	<b>AB:</b>	Yes				
12.	<b>RW:</b>	...who was one of the prime movers in Palestinian civil society starting the BDS-Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement, which is simply, a non-violent human rights movement to try and budge the Zionist entity from its policies of occupation and, and	<b>00:05:15</b>	“Roger cites the backlash against a planned concert in Israel as the moment that opened his eyes to Palestine”	<b>00:05:15</b> “Roger cites the backlash against a planned concert in Israel as the moment that opened his eyes to Palestine”	From <b>00:05:13</b> footage plays of a younger Roger Water’s graffitiing a wall with the words ‘We Don’t Need No Thought Control’ And writing on the same wall with a pen. Footage ends at <b>00:05:32</b>



			what has now turned into overt open-air genocide.				
13.00: 05: 32	AB:	You're obviously right about this war not having started on October 7th, but we're definitely seeing much more push back now for people like you who advocate for Palestinians. An organisation in the UK, even produced a documentary on Roger's activism. Take a look.	00:05:36	“For the past two decades, Roger has been critical of Israel’s occupation & the oppression of Palestinians”	00:05:33 “For the past two decades, Roger has been critical of Israel’s occupation & the oppression of Palestinians”		
			00:05:47	“In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including ‘STOP THE GENOCIDE’ and ‘RESIST WAR’”	00:05:45 “In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including ‘STOP THE GENOCIDE’ and ‘RESIST WAR’”		
14.00: 05: 52	John Ware in ‘The Dark Side of Roger Waters’:	I'm John Ware working with the charity Campaign Against Anti-Semitism, and I'm going to examine the evidence for the charge that Roger Waters is an anti-Semite. I talked to people who've worked closely with him, and who are speaking publicly for the first time.	00:05:58	“CAMPAIGN AGAINST ANTISEMITISM”  “@AJStream”	00:05:52  “CAMPAIGN AGAINST ANTISEMITISM”  “@AJStream”	Footage plays from 00:05:53 from ‘The Dark Side of Roger Waters’ including footage of Ware on a phone at Bond Street Station and images of Speaker 1 and Speaker 2.	

15.00: 06: 10	<b>Speaker 1 in 'The Dark Side of Roger Waters':</b>	He does things and says things that Jewish people take as an attack against us as a group.		"THE DARK SIDE OF ROGER WATERS"		Footage of Bob Ezrin speaking the words transcribed.
16.00: 06: 24	<b>Speaker 2 in 'The Dark Side of Roger Waters':</b>	This dish comes and Roger kind of pushes it with his arm and he goes, "That's it. This is Jew food. What's with the Jew food?"	<b>00:06:29</b>		<b>00:06:29</b> "THE DARK SIDE OF ROGER WATERS"	Footage of Nortbert Stachel speaking the words transcribed.  Footage ends at <b>00:06:30</b>
17.00: 06: 31	<b>AB:</b>	I mean, we're not trying to validate those points. I actually want to get your reaction. I mean, this seems to be an old strategy, isn't it, to kind of, I don't know, link whoever criticises Israel's government to some kind of behaviour ...	<b>00:06:42</b>		<b>00:06:42</b> "For the past two decades, Roger has been critical of Israel's occupation & the oppression of Palestinians"	
18.	<b>RW:</b>	John Ware...				
19.	<b>AB:</b>	..anti-Jews...				

<p>20.00: 06: 50</p>	<p>RW:</p>	<p>Sorry I interrupted you, John Ware, the supposed journalist who you saw at the beginning of that clip is a well-known, lying, conniving Zionist mouthpiece. <del>Apparently there's a new programme coming out very soon, I'm trying for the life of me to remember what it is,</del> John Ware is an old adversary and he will be standing up now, cheerleading the genocide of the Palestinian people like, almost more than anyone else on Earth. That is who John Ware is. I have nothing but utter contempt for him. <del>And as for those absurd little people, Bob Ezrin and Norbert Stachel well they should be in a loony bin somewhere bless them poor little soldiers. I watched I sat through the whole of</del></p>	<p><b>00:06:56</b></p> <p><b>00:07:11</b></p> <p><b>00:07:29</b></p>	<p>“Roger Waters Musician &amp; Co-Founder Pink Floyd”</p> <p>“Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of anti-Semitism”</p> <p>“Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including</p>	<p><b>00:06:51</b> Roger Wates, Musician &amp; Co-founder of Pink Floyd”</p> <p><b>00:07:10</b> “In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including ‘STOP THE GENOCIDE’ and ‘RESIST WAR’”</p> <p><b>00:07:23</b> “Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of anti-Semitism”</p>	
------------------------------	------------	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>that quote documentary, and it's a complete joke. It's made by something called the Campaign About Anti-Semitism [sic]. Well, the anti-Semitism argument is now blown out of the water. The genocide going on in Gaza now has absolutely proved beyond all doubt that those of us who have been standing up for Palestinian rights for the last 20 years are not only not.. are not anti-Semitic, that our motivations are not against the Jewish religion or the Jewish people. We are motified [sic]by the crew of thugs who are running the Zionist entity in Israel, who are all northern Europeans. They had nothing to do with the Holy Land, and they're trying to use the Jewish people and the Jewish religion, which I admire,</p>	<p><b>00:07:42</b></p> <p><b>00:07:56</b></p> <p><b>00:08:07</b></p>	<p>allegations of anti-Semitism”</p> <p>“Roger has faced numerous boycott campaigns &amp; record label BMG severed ties with the musician over his views”</p> <p>“Roger calls the anti-Semitism allegations ‘despicable’ &amp; says they are part of a smear campaign to denounce him”</p> <p>“Roger is a British musician &amp; singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd”</p>	<p><b>00:08:03</b> “Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of anti-Semitism”</p> <p><b>00:08:18</b> “Roger has faced numerous boycott campaigns &amp; record label BMG severed ties with the musician over his views”</p> <p><b>00:08:31</b> “Roger calls the anti-Semitism allegations ‘despicable’ &amp; says they are part of a smear campaign to</p>	
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	--

		<p>both of those</p> <p>groups, Jewish people and the Jewish religion, which is a humane religion. They don't care about that. The</p> <p>difference between me and John Ware, and the difference between all of us on our side of the argument and all of the pro-Zionist, pro-genociders [sic], is that we believe in the Paris 1948 Declaration of Human Rights. We believe that all our brothers and sisters all over the world, are, should be equal under universal law.</p> <p><del>That's what the Paris Declaration 1948 December the 10th said. They don't. John Ware doesn't, Benjamin Netanyahu doesn't. None of them believe in human rights. That is</del></p>	<p><b>00:08:14</b></p> <p><b>00:08:32</b></p>	<p>"For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd's co-lead vocalist lyricist &amp; creative director until his departure in 1985"</p> <p>"By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one of the world's most critically acclaimed &amp; commercially successful bands"</p>	<p>denounce him"</p> <p><b>00:08:42</b> "Roger is a British musician &amp; singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd"</p> <p><b>00:08:48</b> "For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd's co-lead vocalist lyricist &amp; creative director until his departure in 1985"</p> <p><b>00:09:05</b> "By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one the world's most critically acclaimed and commercially successful bands"</p> <p><b>00:09:21</b> "Pink Floyd achieved international success with albums like the 'Dark Side of the Moon' &amp; 'Wish You Were Here'"</p>	
--	--	--	---	---	---	--

		<p><del>why they called me an anti-Semite and the others who stand up for the Palestinian people because we believe in human rights and they don't. That is the only question mark. And it's a question that's being answered. Do the people invading and bombing the Palestinian people women and children mercilessly 24 hours day in Rafah believe in human rights, really? No of course they don't! They are the scum of the earth and they are scoundrels and thugs. And we, the people who do believe in human rights, have to continue to stand shoulder to shoulder until we are rid of them and their kind. Because the world cannot survive...</del></p>			
21.00:	AB:	I imagine that sitting		<p>"Roger's activism focuses on issues including racism and the</p>	

	08: 41		through that documentary was quite an unpleasant situation for you, but obviously there's much more concrete backlash than this. A member of our online community on social media has a question for Roger about the risks of speaking up for Palestine. Let's take a look.	00:08:42	imprisonment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange”  KHALED ZURIKAT Amman, Jordan		
22.00:	09: 00	Khaled Zurikat (KZ):	Hey, Roger, this is Khaled from Jordan. What advice do you give people who dare to say something against the crimes and oppression that Israel is committing, but then only get attacked, threatened, and eventually silenced?	00:09:00	“Roger Waters, Musician & Co-Founder Pink Floyd”	00:10:36 KHALED ZURIKAT Amman, Jordan	From 00:09:00 to 00:09:15 pre-recorded message of KZ speaking the words transcribed alongside his location on a map.
23.00:	09: 16	AB:	What advice do you have, Roger?				
24.00:		RW:	My father died in Italy on	00:09:22			

<p>09: 19</p>		<p>February the 18th, 1944, fighting the Nazis. My mother, who survived him, took me aside one day when I was 13 years old, and I've told this story before, but it bears retelling. And she could see that I was trying to think something out. I've no idea what it was, but she said to me "Roger, sit down. I'm going to give you some advice. All through your life, you are going to be faced with difficult problems that you're going to have to think about. My advice when you are faced with something different", this would be a good time for people to start doing what my mother suggests. "Read, read, read. Read everything that you can find about it. If it's geographical or political in any way, read the history." So, read the</p>	<p>00:09:38</p> <p>00:09:50</p>	<p>"In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including 'STOP THE GENOCIDE' and 'RESIST WAR'"</p> <p>"Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of anti-Semitism"</p> <p>"Roger has faced numerous boycott campaigns &amp;</p>	<p>00:10:57 "Roger Waters, Musician and Co-founder Pink Floyd"</p> <p>00:11:13 "In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including 'STOP THE GENOCIDE' and 'RESIST WAR'</p> <p>00:11:25 "Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of anti-Semitism"</p>	
-------------------	--	---	---------------------------------	--	---	--



			<p>history, okay? Don't listen when people say October the 7th. Read all the history. My mother said to me, "when you've done that, read some more." And then she said, "when you've done that, you've done all the heavy lifting. The hard work is over. The next bit is easy." "Oh really Mum? What is the next bit then?" "You do the right thing." What a wonderful piece of advice to anybody. And my answer to the young man who was asking the question is, we have no alternative, my friend. We have to stand up and we have to do the right thing. And we are. And there are billions of us all over the world. We are a majority. Things have changed in the last ten, fifteen years.</p>	<p><b>00:10:06</b></p> <p><b>00:10:21</b></p> <p><b>00:10:36</b></p>	<p>record label BMG severed ties with the musician over his views"</p> <p>"Roger calls the anti-Semitism allegations 'despicable' &amp; says they are part of a smear campaign to denounce him"</p> <p>"Roger is a British musician &amp; singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd"</p> <p>"For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd's</p>	<p><b>00:11:41</b> "Roger has faced numerous boycott campaign &amp; record label BMG severed ties with the musician over his views"</p> <p><b>00:11:55</b> "Roger calls the anti-Semitism allegations 'despicable' &amp; says they are part of a smear campaign to denounce him"</p> <p><b>00:12:25</b> "For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd's co-lead vocalist lyricist &amp; creative director until his departure in 1985"</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

			And you can see it.	00:10:49	co-lead vocalist lyricist & creative director until his departure in 1985”		
				00:10:58	“By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one of the world’s most critically acclaimed & commercially successful bands”		
25.00: 11: 00	AB:	<u>Sorry to interrupt, precisely on that point, throughout the past few months, we’ve seen millions of people who share this view, who share this sentiment, attempt to, for example, take to the streets to express their views in places like the US or the UK or France, and places where the governments have instead stood by Israel.</u>		00:11:15	“Pink Floyd achieved international success with albums like ‘Dark side of the Moon’ & ‘Wish You Were Here’”		
		<u>Does that make you, I don’t know, question our</u>					

		<u>democratic systems here? Do you still have faith in Western democracies these days?</u>				
26.00: 11: 35	RW:	<u>No, of course, I don't, no. I haven't had faith in Western democracy since shortly after the Second World War. Anybody who has faith in Western democracy is obviously a bit thick. They haven't been watching what's going on. Well, now is the time, because the Western democracies have come out, openly, not just Joe Biden and Antony Blinken and Victoria Nuland and Jake Sullivan and the Americans, but also Rishi Sunak and Keir Starmer, the turncoat leader of the Labour Party in England, and</u>	<b>00:11:28</b>	<p>“Since the 1990s, Roger has toured extensively as a solo act incorporating political themes into his shows”</p> <p><u>“ROGER WATERS Musician &amp; Co-Founder”</u></p> <p><u>“Roger cites the backlash against a planned concert in Israel as the moment that opened his eyes to Palestine”</u></p>		

		<p><u>Macron and all the leaders of the so-called democratic countries all over NATO, have all come out and say, here</u></p> <p><u>we are, we declare that we don't give a fig. For you, or for democracy or for human rights. All we care about is our narrow economic and hegemonic and political interests, and this is us demonstrating it to you. And if you elect any of us again, ever, so be it.</u></p>	<p><b>00:12:03</b></p> <p><b>00:12:13</b></p>	<p><u>“For the past two decades, Roger has been critical of Israel’s occupation &amp; the oppression of Palestinians”</u></p> <p><u>“Roger calls Israel’s war on Gaza a genocide and slams western countries for their unconditional support”</u></p> <p><u>“In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including ‘STOP THE</u></p>		
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

				<p><b>00:12:23</b></p> <p><u>GENOCIDE’ and ‘RESIST WAR’</u></p> <p>“Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of anti-Semitism”</p> <p><b>00:12:39</b></p>		
27.00:12:45	AB:	<p><u>You get more of that. Roger.</u> On that precise point, the British prime minister, Rishi Sunak, took it a step further Recently. He had this message for pro-Palestinian protesters. Take a listen.</p>		<p>“FACEBOOK/ RISHI SUNAK”</p>	<p><b>00:12:34</b> “Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of anti-Semitism”</p>	
28.00:12:59	Rishi Sunak on pre-recorded clip:	<p>Since the October 7th attacks in Israel, we've seen protests across our country almost every weekend. Many of these have been respectful, but they have also been far too many appalling examples of</p>	<p><b>00:12:59</b></p>			<p>Rishi Sunak in pre-recorded announcement talking to camera about protests, speaking the words transcribed from <b>00:12:59-00:13:23</b></p>

			anti-Semitism, violent intimidation and the glorification of terrorism. This must not stand. I've asked the police what powers they need to bring order to our streets.				
29.00: 13: 23	AB:	There's clearly an attempt to vilify protesters here, and I, if I may, I want to go straight into another question from our online community, and then I'll get your reaction on both, because another member of a social media community here had this question for Roger. Take a look.	00:13:29	“Roger is a British musician & singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd”			
30.00: 13: 42	Thanira Rates (TR):	Hi, I'm Thanira from London. What would you say to Prime Minister Sunak and other leaders that are quiet or supporting Israel?	00:13:42	“THANIRA RATES Data Scientist London, UK”			From 00:13:42 to 00:13:50 pre-recorded message of TR speaking the words transcribed alongside her location on a map.

31.00: 13: 51	AB:	So what is your message to Sunak, to other leaders Joe Biden, for example, who insist on standing by Israel? What is your message today?			00:13:35 “Roger is a British musician & singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd”	
32.00: 14: 00	RW:	Well, to Ricky Sunak [sic], I wouldn't waste my breath saying anything to that cretin. 'You know, maybe he and his billionaire wife should retire somewhere, but hopefully not to the Holy Land, because there are enough cretins in the Holy Land already destroying the place. But don't get me started on Ricky Sunak [sic], that young woman it was a sensible question. There's nothing that they can do. Thanira, you have been in the street.	00:14:05	“Roger Waters, Musician & Co-founder Pink Floyd”	00:13:52 “Roger Waters Musician & Co-Founder Pink Floyd”  00:14:05 “For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd’s co-lead vocalist lyricist & creative director until his departure in 1985”	
			00:14:18	“For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd’s co-lead vocalist lyricist & creative	00:14:15 “By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one of the world’s most critically acclaimed & commercially successful bands”  00:14:17 “Pink Floyd achieved international success with albums like ‘The Dark Side of the Moon’	

			<p>You were one of the 500,000 the week after, October 7<sup>th</sup>, in the streets of London, demonstrating on behalf of the Palestinian people. You are one of the half-million or so people who would not have the wool pulled over their eyes. You stood up to be counted, and you will do it again and again and again and again. And we have to, we have to keep going back to the streets. We the people are many. And they the Ricky Sunaks [sic] the awful, awful people who are destroying our beautiful planet for profit. Let's call a spade a spade.</p> <p>That's what they do. These and these, these,[sic] these are the</p>	<p><b>00:14:29</b></p> <p><b>00:14:34</b></p> <p><b>00:15:03</b></p>	<p>director until his departure in 1985”</p> <p>“By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one of the world’s most critically acclaimed &amp; commercially successful bands”</p> <p>“Pink Floyd achieved international success with albums like ‘The Dark Side of the Moon’ and ‘Wish You Were Here”</p> <p>“Since the 1990s, roger has toured extensively as a solo act incorporating political themes</p>	<p>&amp; ‘Wish You Were Here”</p> <p><b>00:14:39</b> “Since the 1990s, Roger toured extensively as a solo act incorporating political themes into his shows”</p> <p><b>00:14:56</b> “Roger calls himself an anti-war &amp; human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world</p> <p><b>00:15:15</b> “Roger’s activism focuses on issues including racism and the imprisonment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange”</p>	<p>From <b>00:14:43</b> footage plays of people in high visibility jackets protesting on the street with large posters and banners reading ‘Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament’ and ‘Palestine Solidarity Campaign’ and ‘Free Palestine’, close up footage</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--



			<p>generat...[sic] these are the descendants of the colonialist from the United Kingdom. And we have a huge we owe a huge debt to the people of the world because we went out there in the 16th, 17th, 18th and 19th centuries and effed the whole thing up. So we have an absolute responsibility to stand up for human rights, equal human rights under the law, for all our brothers and sisters everywhere. And I know you're doing it. I've seen you. And my heart beats stronger every time I see one of those glorious demonstration, whether it's in the streets of London or whether it's in the Yemen, where or whether it's in South Africa or whether it's in Chicago, and it... and we will win this fight because we are many</p>	<p><b>00:15:12</b></p> <p><b>00:15:27</b></p> <p><b>00:15:40</b></p> <p><b>00:15:54</b></p>	<p>into his shows”</p> <p>“Roger calls himself an anti-war &amp; human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world”</p> <p>“Roger’s activism focuses on issues including racism and the imprisonment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange”</p> <p>“Roger has faced backlash over some of his political views including his comments on the wars in Ukraine and Syria”</p>	<p><b>00:15:25</b> “Roger has faced backlash over some of his political views including his comments on the wars in Ukraine and Syria”</p> <p><b>00:15:40</b> “As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since</p>	<p>of a teenage girl with a megaphone. Footage ends at <b>00:15:02</b></p>
--	--	--	---	---	---	---	--

		and they are few. We are the people, and the people do not want this genocide. It's only our crazed lunatic leaders who want it. They believe in unipolar hegemonic behaviour. They do not believe in love. Well, I do, and so do you. We believe in love and we will win this fight. So thank you for standing...	<b>00:16:18</b>	<p>“As one of the World’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”</p> <p>“Roger cites the backlash against a planned concert in Israel as the moment that opened his eyes to Palestine”</p>	2005”	
<b>33.00:16:26</b>	<b>AB:</b>	Roger, with politicians pushing these narratives and a lot of biased, media coverage. We have a question now on the role the entertainment industry could play. Let's have a look.		<p>“Roger cites the backlash against a planned concert in Israel as the moment that opened his eyes to Palestine”</p> <p>“SANDRINE CORREIA Montry, France”</p>		
<b>34.00:16:41</b>	<b>Sandrine Correia (SC):</b>	Hi, my name is Sandrine. I'm from France and I would like to ask you, what do you think of critics saying that artists should not have opinion on	<b>00:16:41</b>		<b>00:16:26 SANDRINE CORREIA Montry, France</b>	From <b>00:16:41 to 00:16:51</b> pre-recorded message of SC speaking the words transcribed alongside her location on a map.

			politics? Thank you.			
35.00: 16: 52	AB:		So artists should not have an opinion on politics. You obviously are the exception to that rule if there is one. What do you say to that?			
36.	RW:		2. <del>Well bull- Obviously its complete bull-shit</del> What? What? Why shouldn't artists have political opinions. It's a...	00:17:04	"Roger Waters, Musician and Co-founder Pink Floyd"	00:16:52 "Roger Waters Musician & Co-Founder"
37.	AB:		And what do you think of the types...?	00:17:10		00:17:00 "Roger has faced backlash over some of his political views including his comments on the wars in Ukraine and Syria"
38.	RW:		...It's like saying a coal miner shouldn't have an opinion or a doctor.			
39.00: 17: 13	AB:		What do you think of the artists that are not expressing their opinion right now? What do you say to other artists who have remained quiet during this time?			"Roger has faced backlash over some of his political views including his comments on the
40.00:	RW:		Well, some, most have			00:17:20 Roger Waters

<p>17: 24</p>		<p>remained quiet, but some haven't. Anybody who knows Bono should go and pick him up by his ankles and shake him until he stops being a (beep) s-h-i-t. 'You know, we have to start speaking to these people and just saying "your opinion is so disgusting and degrading when you stand up for the Zionist entity". What he did in the Sphere in Las Vegas a couple of weeks ago, singing about the Stars of David was one of the most disgusting things I've ever seen in my life. So, and I've started to text about it occasionally, but not to get personal about these things, but I've spent so many years writing fruitless letters, just not all the, you know, not all, a number of people have answered my letters</p>	<p><b>00:17:28</b></p> <p><b>00:17:40</b></p> <p><b>00:17:55</b></p>	<p>wars in Ukraine and Syria"</p> <p>"Roger Waters Musician &amp; Co-Founder Pink Floyd"</p> <p>"Roger calls himself an anti-war &amp; human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world"</p> <p>"Roger's activism focuses on issues including racism and the imprisonment of WikiLeaks</p>	<p>Musician and Co-Founder</p> <p><b>00:17:32</b> "Roger calls himself an anti-war &amp; human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world"</p> <p><b>00:17:47</b> "Roger's activism focuses on issues including racism and the imprisonment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange"</p> <p><b>00:18:10</b> "Roger Waters @rogerwaters"</p>	
-------------------	--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>politely and whatever. And there are a group of us, I'm not going to start naming all the names now in the music industry who are standing up for human rights. But more and more, more people are discovering that the platform is indisputable. And the question is very direct. Do you believe in supporting human rights or not? You can't have it both ways. And that's true of a bass player, just as it's true of any worker in any industry. So to single out musicians and to suggest that they shouldn't stand up for them. But it's like saying you have no right to love, because this movement is based on our love for one another and our love for the planet that we all call home. Because</p>	<p><b>00:18:17</b></p> <p><b>00:18:27</b></p> <p><b>00:18:47</b></p>	<p>founder Julian Assange”</p> <p>“Roger Waters @rogerwaters”</p> <p>“As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”</p> <p>“Roger cites the backlash against a planned concert in Israel as the moment that opened his eyes to Palestine”</p>	<p><b>00:18:19</b> “As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”</p> <p><b>00:18:38</b> “Roger cites the backlash against a planned concert in Israel as the moment that opened his eyes to Palestine”</p> <p><b>00:18:59</b> “For the past two decades, Roger has been critical of Israel’s occupation &amp; the oppression of Palestinians”</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

			<p>Macron and Sunak and Biden and Blinken and Netanyahu and all the others are destroying our home the home that we all live on.</p>	<p><b>00:19:07</b></p> <p><b>00:19:19</b></p> <p><b>00:19:26</b></p>	<p>“For the past two decades Roger has been critical of Israel’s occupation and the oppression of Palestine”</p> <p>“Roger calls Israel’s war on Gaza a genocide and slams western countries for their unconditional support”</p>	<p><b>00:19:11</b> “Roger calls Israel’s war on Gaza a genocide and slams western countries for their unconditional support”</p>	<p>From <b>00:19:12</b> footage of world leaders at Hiroshima Memorial Park including Justin Trudeau, Emmanuel Macron, Fumio Kishida, Joe Biden, Olaf Scholz and Rishi Sunak. Ends <b>00:19:26</b></p>
<p>41.00: 19: 26</p>	<p>AB:</p>		<p>We have... You've had an extraordinary career. Over 60 years on stages across the world, we have another question from a fan and a fellow musician in France.</p>		<p>“NICHOLAS VELLA Musician Paris, France”</p>		

<p>42.00: 19: 38</p>	<p><b>Nicholas Vella (NV):</b></p>	<p>Hi. Roger I'm Nicholas from Paris. I have a question for you about your work with Pink Floyd. At the time, about the composition and the production. Did you think about satisfying the musical industry or not? And did you know you were writing a page of history?</p>	<p><b>00:19:38</b></p>	<p>"In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including 'STOP THE GENOCIDE' and 'RESIST WAR'"</p>	<p><b>00:19:30</b> "NICHOLAS VELLA Musician Paris, France"</p>	<p>From <b>00:19:38 to 00:19:55</b> pre-recorded message of NV speaking the words transcribed alongside his location on a map.</p>
<p>43.00: 19: 55</p>	<p><b>AB:</b></p>	<p>So did you care about the music industry when you were actually coming up with your lyrics, with your compositions? And did you know what a big page of musical history you would be writing?</p>	<p><b>00:20:01</b></p>	<p>"Roger Waters Musician &amp; Co-Founder Pink Floyd"</p>	<p><b>00:19:51</b> "In his latest tour, Roger displayed messages on big screens including 'STOP THE GENOCIDE' and 'RESIST WAR'"</p>	
<p>44.00: 20: 11</p>	<p><b>RW:</b></p>	<p>Well, the first part of the question is, yeah, obviously I knew that the industry were going to be interested. There's a song I wrote on the album, 'Wish You Were Here', called 'Have a Cigar', which I wrote in</p>	<p><b>00:20:14</b></p>	<p>"Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of</p>	<p><b>00:20:08</b> "Roger Waters Musician &amp; Co-Founder Pink Floyd"</p>	

		<p>1974. Something like that. "Come in here to Dear Boy, have a cigar." And that was taken from a being in the studio with a bunch of executives from CBS coming in, and they thought one of us was called Pink. So it's a it's a sort of true story, but it shows how little grasp they had of what I was writing about.</p> <p>Did I know it was going to become of any historic value? No, of course not. Is it? Yes it is. That's why I've just remade 'The Dark Side of the Moon', which is about trying to bring home the message to people that, as far as we know, we only get one chance at life. And there's far more joy to be had in expressing our love for one another and our love for the</p>	<p><b>00:20:27</b></p> <p><b>00:20:38</b></p> <p><b>00:20:49</b></p>	<p>anti-Semitism"</p> <p>"Roger has faced numerous boycott campaigns &amp; record label BMG severed ties with the musician over his views"</p> <p>"Roger calls the anti-Semitism allegations 'despicable' &amp; says they are part of a smear campaign to denounce him"</p>	<p><b>00:20:17</b> "Roger has faced backlash over his vocal support of a free Palestine including allegations of anti-Semitism"</p> <p><b>00:20:38</b> "Roger calls the anti-Semitism allegations 'despicable' &amp; says they are part of a smear campaign to denounce him"</p>	
--	--	---	--	---	--	--



			<p>Mother Earth, than there is for expressing our hatred for one another and destroying planet Earth. So and so that's all that. When I wrote 'Dark Side of the Moon' I wasn't quite as clear as I am now about what it was about. That is what it's about. And that is the question that is facing us all every minute of every day right now. And all of us our hearts are in Rafah with our brothers and sisters in Gaza who are being slaughtered by the Zionist entity, whose time is over.</p>	<p><b>00:21:00</b></p> <p><b>00:21:13</b></p>	<p>"Roger is a British musician &amp; singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd"</p> <p>"For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd's co-lead vocalist lyricist &amp; creative director until his departure in 1985"</p> <p>"By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one of the world's most critically acclaimed &amp; commercially successful bands"</p>	<p><b>00:20:55</b> "Roger is a British musician &amp; singer-songwriter who in 1965 co-founded the rock band Pink Floyd"</p> <p><b>00:21:04</b> "For two decades, Roger was Pink Floyd's co-lead vocalist lyricist &amp; creative director until his departure in 1985"</p> <p><b>00:21:25</b> "By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one of the world's most critically acclaimed &amp; commercially successful bands"</p>	
<p>45.00: 21: 44</p>	<p><b>AB:</b></p>		<p>You said that this would be your first final tour. I wanted to ask you about this. Do you think about</p>	<p><b>00:21:50</b></p>	<p>"By 1980, Pink Floyd had become one of the world's most critically acclaimed &amp; commercially successful bands"</p>	<p><b>00:21:42</b> "Pink Floyd achieved international success with albums like</p>	

			the end? And do you think about your legacy? What do you want to be remembered by your music or your activism or doing the right thing?		“Pink Floyd achieved international success with albums like ‘The Dark Side of the Moon’ & ‘Wish You Were Here’”	‘The Dark Side of the Moon’ & ‘Wish You Were Here’”	
46.00: 22: 09	RW:	Doing the right thing. You know, I think about this every day because all of all of those of us who care for our brothers and sisters and who have love in our hearts, we spend every day wondering how to get through the next moment in face of this calumny. They are murdering an entire people. The Israelis are murdering every man, woman and child in Palestine. Nothing else matters at the moment. Once we can stop them doing that, and we can only do that by persuading Biden to say no, he could say no tomorrow. They all they have to do	00:22:14	“Roger Waters Musician and Co-Founder Pink Floyd”	00:22:05 “Roger Waters Musician & Co-Founder Pink Floyd”		
			00:22:29	“Since the 1990s, Roger has toured extensively as a solo act incorporating political themes into his shows”	00:22:19 “Since the 1990s, Roger has toured extensively as a solo act incorporating political themes into his shows”		

			<p>is stop sending the money. And it's over. Over. All those children can live. They can start feeding their children again. We can send in medicines and we could start to redevelop Gaza. But you're living, they are living, unfortunately, next to, an entity that has been so thoroughly brainwashed in its callous inhumanity that they are going to be very, very difficult to stop. But certainly we have to turn off the tap. So Macron, Sunak, all you Europeans, all... that idiot woman who keeps spout [sic] shooting her mouth off, Van Der Leyden [sic], or whatever her name is, in the European Union.</p> <p>No listen to the people. The people are right and you are wrong. It's really, really simple. Read. Go and read. All</p>	<p><b>00:22:49</b></p> <p><b>00:23:04</b></p> <p><b>00:23:23</b></p>	<p>“Roger calls himself an anti-war &amp; human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over the world”</p> <p>“Roger’s activism focuses on issues including racism and the imprisonment of WikiLeaks founder Julian Assange”</p> <p>“Roger has faced</p>	<p><b>00:22:41</b> “Roger calls himself an anti-war &amp; human rights activist who speaks out against injustices all over all the world”</p> <p><b>00:23:41</b> “Roger has faced backlash over some of his political views including his comments on the wars in Ukraine and Syria”</p> <p><b>00:23:30</b> “As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

		<p>of you. All of you morons who seem to think there's something okay about this. You know the world cannot be ruled. That's something else that I've learned. And that, I say, as I've done, the world has to be loved and respected and above all, shared. Share. We have an absolute responsibility to share the world with all our brothers and sisters. This is a lesson for the Americans mainly. You cannot steal the whole thing. You cannot eat the whole cake. You have to share it with the rest of the world.</p>	<p><b>00:23:39</b></p>	<p>backlash for some of his political views including his comments on the wars in Ukraine and Syria”</p> <p>“As one of the world’s most outspoken musicians, Roger has been a vocal supporter of a free Palestine since 2005”</p>		
<p><b>47.00:</b></p>	<p><b>AB:</b></p>	<p>I guess this is as close</p>				

	24: 29		as I'm going to get to you, talking about your own mortality and your own end of your career. But I appreciate nonetheless this is occupying your mind, obviously. Thank you so much, Roger, for joining us here on The Stream today.				
48.00:	24: 45	RW:	It's been a pleasure. Thank you very much for having me and giving this bit of a voice to my brothers and sisters in Palestine. Thank you.				
49.00:	24: 56	AB:	And thank you all for watching. Don't forget to keep in touch online. You can use the hashtag or the handle AJ Stream and send us your comments and suggestions. Take care and I'll see you next time.	00:25:02		AJStream	

Approved Judgment

WARE V WATERS & ANOR

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

“AJ Stream”