

WHY EXAMINE WHAT IS WRITTEN?

A message, report, or decision may contain words such as “agrees”, “owes”, “dangerous”, or “guilty”. What is presented here first is the wording. Reading it as agreement, obligation, danger, or guilt introduces a particular reading. This study concerns the next step: how that reading enters a demand, report, or decision, and what consequence it is connected to.

Illustrative examples: a grade in a register is read as a description of a pupil; confirmation of an operation as agreement with an amount; an accounting figure as a loss of money. These are composed examples. Place the source formulation beside the next one: what was carried over, and what did the reading add?

HOW WAS THE WORDING READ? WHAT ENTERED THE NEXT RECORD?

The reader’s task is to locate a specific passage for discussion: where agreement was added to an account of selection, a condition was omitted, or a status under a rule was called a voluntary decision. The task for public discussion is to make that connection visible when examining a demand, refusal, or accusation. An objection then addresses particular wording, and a response may retain, qualify, or replace it.

The general principle is that a word does not become what it names. This applies to every explanation in this study: “analysis”, “assessment”, “text”, and “boundary” perform or certify nothing merely by being written. This does not imply that everything is false or non-binding. The following pages present document passages, proposed readings, and an example of revising the next record.

WHY HORIZON?

SOURCE SUMMARY AND PROPOSED READING

Post Office is the name of the British post office network; Horizon names a sales and accounting system in Hamilton, a judgment of the Court of Appeal of England and Wales dated 23 April 2021. The judgment describes branches' handling of recorded shortfalls and criminal cases involving Horizon data. This summarises the cited paragraphs. [7, paragraphs 9–24 and 123]

SOURCE SUMMARY AND PROPOSED READING

Paragraph 137 describes recorded shortfalls being treated as incontrovertible losses. The section on Seema Misra recounts convictions, while paragraph 209 states that they are quashed. This judicial account allows the connection between an accounting figure, a charge, and consequences to be examined. Their sequence in a summary does not itself establish causation. [7, paragraphs 137 and 198–209]

Horizon is selected because published documents allow a report's wording, accounting conditions, and subsequent judicial discussion to be compared. The following report item is examined in that context. Its use as a basis for Misra's conviction is not established here: a shared subject does not present that connection.

Post Office report, 2 August 2010 · p. 9

Acceptance of debt by the branch – branches do actively choose options in Horizon

SOURCE SUMMARY AND PROPOSED READING

The complete item comes from the debt-recovery section of Rod Ismay's report dated 2 August 2010, p. 9. Page 5 is summarised separately: closing an accounting period requires covering the amount with cash or passing it to central debt handling. The quotation and this summary remain separate, with their respective pages identified. [4, PDF pp. 5 and 9]

Sources

[4] POL00026572 · postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk

[7] [2021] EWCA Crim 577 · caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk

ONE ITEM. THREE POSSIBLE READINGS.

A dash separates the report item’s two parts. The proposal here is to read the second part as a reason for the first. That is a reading, not an additional part of the quotation. Three explanatory statements are composed below; they do not describe an individual subpostmaster’s actions.

Composed statement	Proposed reading
The subpostmaster selected a way to close the period.	An account of an operation.
The subpostmaster agreed that the amount was correct.	An assertion of agreement.
Under the specified rule, that selection counts as accepting the debt.	Attribution of a status under a rule.

The first statement names selection of an operation. The second adds agreement that the amount is correct. The third proposes attribution under a rule; supply the rule, its conditions, and a record of application separately. A status attributed under a rule is not renamed voluntary agreement. The proposed distinction is thus set out through the statements themselves.

SOURCE SUMMARY AND PROPOSED READING

Hamilton paragraphs 21–22 describe demands to cover shortfalls even when disputed. Comparing that account with the report item raises a specific question: which passage warrants reading selection of a prescribed way to close the period as agreement with the amount? The description of the operation and the assertion of agreement are proposed for separate examination. [7, paragraphs 21–22]

**PROPOSED NEXT RECORD:
selection of an operation is described; agreement with
the amount and status under a rule are examined
separately.**

The proposed amendment concerns the summary. It establishes neither a debt nor its absence. If a statement of agreement or a rule is added, reconsider the wording with that passage identified. An amendment is not mandatory: the original formulation may be retained and explained through the passages compared.

WHAT CHANGE IS PROPOSED?

The broader question extends beyond Horizon: how does a reading of one record enter the next, and on what basis is it applied to a person, amount, diagnosis, assessment, or decision? These are possible applications. The detailed examination here concerns selected Horizon material, not every instance of each use.

The intended public outcome is to discuss the specific point where agreement, loss, or status is added to an account. The next formulation should make visible what comes from the source, what the reading proposes, and under what condition. This is an aim for application, not a report of an achieved social effect.

Start with one sentence. Place the source passage, link, and proposed reading alongside it. State the question: was a condition omitted, were summary and quotation merged, or was agreement attributed where a status under a rule was described? Then record a proposed revision or explain why no amendment is proposed. The package includes a worked example and a blank form.

Supply the passages and context relevant to the selected question; every case volume need not be attached. Examine a new passage for what it changes in the reading. "That is text too" does not close a specific objection. Being written does not by itself establish that the circumstances described are absent, that a document has lost its legal effect, or that procedural requirements no longer apply.

A WORD DOES NOT BECOME WHAT IT NAMES. THE NEXT EXPLANATION IS NO EXCEPTION.

The proposed result is a further record with clear attribution to its source and its condition retained. It too remains a written explanation. Readers' agreement, a change in practice, or a particular judicial outcome is not promised.

The full study, sources, and application guide are included in this package.