1 A. Well, you are conducting this in such a ridiculous
2 fashion that anything I say is just -- is the
3 translation of little tattle into something that I don't
4 think probably merits that description. I am -- sorry, the
5 status of semi-fact.
6 It was, I would say, common gossip that
7 Jimmy Saville liked, you know, young -- it was always
8 assumed to be girls. I don't know whether it was girls
9 or boys. But I had no evidence of it, and I never saw
10 anything that made me take it more seriously than it
11 being common gossip. You know, I am very happy to put
12 it into what my views of the state of Radio One and the
13 rest of them were, but I saw -- if you are looking for
14 evidence, no. I had no evidence. But it was common
15 gossip, I think.
16 Q. And this common gossip has been prevalent throughout
17 your time at the BBC, or are you able to put a date on
18 it at all?
19 A. No, I can't. I mean, I just think it is part of the
20 baggage that -- that attaches to Saville's name.
21 I wouldn't put a specific date on it, no.
22 Q. Right. It has been suggested to us by somebody who has
23 made conduct with the review that Newsnight, and
24 I quote:
25 "... must be led at all times with panache,"

Merrill Corporation
(+44) 207 404 1400
8th Floor 165 Fleet Street
London EC4A 2DY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reed Smith Meetings</th>
<th>Page 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. This is a situation that is relatively recent in origin. I don’t want to put a precise figure on it, because I don’t — I mean, it is something that one has been aware of, on an open door basis, over a period of, I would say, probably three or four years. But the resources are extremely stretched and that doesn’t make it a satisfactory environment in which people are making difficult editorial judgments about the longer term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Q. Right at the beginning of this discussion, you mentioned two things. You talked about economic changes and you just fleshed that out in the last few minutes. You also used the words “institutional changes”. Can you just describe what you had in mind by “institutional changes”?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A. It’s difficult — I have got this thing on a speaker phone, so I am just going to see if I can switch it off. I hope you don’t disappear. If you do, I will call you back, okay? Because you are not very loud. Right, let’s see what happens. Are you still there?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Q. Yes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A. Excellent. Good, good. Much easier to hear you. Okay, institutional changes. Well, what happened, I would say, was that post-Hutton, there has been a general drawing in of horns, I would argue. I would say that there was a cultural change within the organisation which came about after that. I don’t say it is necessarily provably a consequence, but it certainly is noticeable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In the particular context of Newsnight, which, as I think I might have hinted earlier, has rather prided itself upon being slightly at one remove from the daily news churn, this has given us particular problems. The news division is — it has essentially been taken over by radio. The — so it is, you know, led by Helen Boaden, a radio person. Her second-in-command is Steve Mitchell, a radio person. Peter Rippon was a radio person. These people belong to a different kind of culture. They belong — you must form your own judgment about what the characteristics of that culture are, but it is a different sort of discipline and it tends to attract different sorts of people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. So what happened, when Peter Barron, the last editor of Newsnight, let left to go and work at Google — Barron was in the long tradition of people who were pretty free-thinking, creative, radical-ish — I don’t mean politically radical, but people who had a fresh way of looking at things. When he left to go to Google, the question of his replacement came up and it was given to a man whose previous experience in — was almost entirely in radio, thereby completing the — as I saw</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. People in radio tend to have a different set of priorities, I think, and they tend to be different sorts of people. I am not saying that people don't change; of course they do change, and most people who work in television have, at some point, worked in radio posts. I don't know. Many people --

2. MR POLLARD: Jeremy, it's Nick here. Can you just try and define that a bit more for us, the difference between, if you like, the --

3. A. Well, this is where we come across the difficulties of your protocol. You know, I would be very happy to discuss that with you off the record, because we both know -- would understand immediately what we are talking about. But in cold black and white, it is going to look rather disparaging and I don't want to do that particularly. But --

4. MR POLLARD: I understand that, and if it is possible to do that without reference to names and individuals, it will be helpful.

5. A. Right. I would say that there was a greater institutional -- preoccupation with the institution in radio than there is in television. There tends, I think, in television to be a greater loyalty to the programme, a greater sense that because one is in an extremely competitive environment, you want -- you have to create something that arrests the eyeballs, and -- but that tends to make people very committed to their programme. In radio, I think there is a much more institutional loyalty, where people tend -- I -- I would say they were more visible and I -- I mean, I don't want to damage or tar everybody with the same brush. It is not fair. I don't know. But it seems to me that that is the case and you certainly hear of -- people last a very long time. In television, it tends to be a younger person's game. There are -- with fewer older people in it and fewer people, I would say, preoccupied with their pensions.

6. MR MACLEAN: Can I ask you, Jeremy -- it has been suggested to us, not by a central player in the particular drama, that Mr Rippon was, and I quote, "a good man", who had an excellent reputation as an editor on BBC radio.

7. A. Now, I -- I have a real problem in the way that the BBC has tried to lay all this on one person, I don't think it emerges well from it. But I would have said that was the case.
1 They potentially bring them expensive libel suits, and
2 they bring them trouble with, you know, powerful vested
3 interests.
4 So the editor's job is, it seems to me, to keep the
5 anxious bosses off the back of the investigator, and in
6 exchange, the investigator has to be completely
7 trustworthy. You cannot begin to doubt what the
8 investigator tells you he or she has found out, and the
9 two of you then collaborate on where you will take the
10 inquiry next.
11 But they are an obsessive, unusual people.
12
13 MR MACLEAN: What he says -- and we obviously will discuss
14 this with Peter Rippon in due course, but what he says
15 is, in a particular e-mail:
16 "Since [he is talking about Meirion Jones now] he
17 made me
18 nervous about his story."
19
20 Can we --
21 A. This is the Saville story?
22 Q. Because of, as it were, that made Rippon
23
24 nervous about Jones' Saville story.
25 Now, can we just break that down?
2
3 A. No, I don't. What are they referring to?
4 MR POLLARD: Jeremy, I am only guessing, I might be
5 completely wrong, but it is
6 A. Well, you know, you are the editor. I am just the gob
7 on the stick. But I think you absolutely have to have
8 total trust, (1), and (2), they have to be encouraged to
9 have their heads, but you have to manage them just to
10 the extent of knowing that they are complying with good
11 practice and the law and generally, you know, ethical
12 behaviour.
13 So it wants a light touch relationship, it seems to
14 me, but it needs to be a relationship that is founded on
15 trust. You have to be able to believe that you both
16 have the same objective. The investigative reporter or
17 producer expects and is, I think, entitled to expect
18 that his editor will cover his -- or her editor will
19 cover his or her back from a management which very often
20 feels that these sorts of people bring them nothing but
21 trouble. They bring them lots of work for the lawyers.
22
23
24
25
Q. Right, okay. That is very clear, thank you.

Q. I am going to come to those deputies in a moment. We have seen that you had a high opinion of Shaminder Nahal. Really, I think that is fair.

A. Yes.

Q. I assume you have read Peter Rippon's blog in the last few weeks, like the rest --

A. I haven't read it recently. I did see it, yes.

Q. You may or may not recall that one of the points that he makes in it is that some members of the, as it were, the team had supported his decision not to run their story and others had disagreed with him.

A. Mm-hm.

Q. And we have seen from your e-mails -- and we will come to this -- that you think that it was the wrong decision. Do you know what Liz Gibbons' view was about running the story, either then or now?

A. Well, why don't you ask her?

Q. I am asking you whether you were --

A. At the time, no. At the time, such was the -- you know, I knew Meirion was working on a Saville investigation, but lots of things, you know, get started upon which don't fly, in the end. And such is, you know, the nature of the treadmill, that you tend to say, "What are you doing? How is it going?" And then something else comes along which you have to deal with for that night's programme.

So I was -- I was aware that he had started on it. I was aware that it didn't go out. But I was not really terribly aware of either his own feelings about that judgment or the feelings of other people in the editorial hierarchy.

I do happen to know that at the time when the thing was commissioned, Liz Gibbons felt that it was not the sort of thing that Newsnight did yet. You know, it was not our conventional territory.

Now, if you want to know what she thinks beyond that, you really should ask her, but I know, because she said as much to me -- but this is subsequent, of course, it is not at the time -- that she had felt that -- and
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<tr>
<td>1 I think all of them feel that -- they wish that they had kept a closer eye on it at the time. But then, it was Rippon's personal judgment.</td>
<td>1 12 October, which should be towards the back of that clip of e-mails that we have sent back to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Q. Right. We obviously will explore that.</td>
<td>3 A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 A. Yes.</td>
<td>4 Q. Is it --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Q. You say that you were aware, in general terms, that Mr Jones was working on this story.</td>
<td>5 A. Yes, I have got it. Yes, yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 A. Yes.</td>
<td>6 Q. In our bundle -- this won't mean anything to you but just for the transcript, so that we can find it later, it is A/12, page 112.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Q. Obviously one knows, as a viewer of Newsnight, that you generally have a film piece and then there is a discussion led by the presenter with a range of people.</td>
<td>7 You make a number of points in this e-mail which are of great interest to us. One of the points that you make is that the decision not to run the story was, in your words, certainly wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 A. Mm-hm, mm-hm.</td>
<td>8 A. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Q. So presumably, if this story had run, there would have been a film piece with the people being interviewed by Liz MacKean?</td>
<td>9 Q. When did you form that view?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 A. I would have said that was a false presumption.</td>
<td>10 A. I will be perfectly frank. I formed it when the shit hit the fan. I mean -- sorry. I formed it when the -- some time around the time that the ITV thing aired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sometimes -- there are many films which are run that actually are not followed by a discussion, and there are films which, when you see what they are like, you then feel: well, we'd better have a discussion after that, or it naturally leads to a discussion or the editor of the day is so paralysed by the yawning chasm ahead of him that he decides we are going to have to have one. But it isn't -- the things are not automatically commissioned on that basis. In fact, most tape pieces, I would say, that are commissioned longer term, are not intended -- this is a ridiculous generalisation, but they are not intended as the premise for a discussion. They are exercises in their own right.</td>
<td>11 I found the whole -- I found the subject matter really unpleasant and distasteful, and then I thought: why am I so bothered about this? And I concluded that the reason I was very unhappy -- and I am talking here about recent events. I am not talking about last year, at the time that the decision was made, because I didn't know exactly where they were with it, and nor did most of us on the programme. As I say, we were all [indistinct].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Q. Right. So it follows from that that it wouldn't be particularly surprising if arrangements hadn't been made to identify what the topic of any post-film discussion might be, or who might participate in it, because there might not be one at all?</td>
<td>12 Q. If you look down the page, you --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 A. I think that is a real red herring. I wouldn't -- it is just sufficient unto itself, I think.</td>
<td>13 A. Yes, yes. These people prey upon children in vulnerable situations, and when the children complain, they are not believed, because if you ever get them in court, it is well known that clever lawyers can discredit them because of their chaotic lives, the problems they have had with the police, and so on. And I thought that we had behaved just like many other authorities, and I didn't like it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Q. In your view --</td>
<td>14 Q. So it follows from that, I think, that you certainly wouldn't take the view that this story -- forget for the moment about the events that took place on BBC premises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 A. I mean ...</td>
<td>15 Leave all that, for the moment, to one side. But just the story about Jimmy Saville, dead TV star -- dead BBC TV star -- being a paedophile. You wouldn't agree that that was not a Newsnight story, potentially?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 (The audio cut out)</td>
<td>16 A. Well, I think it would have been -- I think it would have been not a Newsnight story in some respects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 A. ... even suggested, &quot;Oh let's have a discussion about it&quot;. I do think that there is -- I mean, the broader editorial justification for it is that it does shine a light into the way in which -- or onto the way in which -- attitudes have changed. That is the broader context of it. But I don't -- I wouldn't have expected that such a film would have been followed necessarily by discussion.</td>
<td>17 Q. But I concluded, when ITV aired that thing, which was -- well, I don't know, I think it was not that different to what we had -- it was a long time after these events -- that the judgment that we had made was the judgment that authority figures always make when dealing with these children, and my -- do I go into it in this e-mail? Yeah, I do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Q. Right. Can I just pick up that point you have just made, which I think we can see in your e-mail of</td>
<td>18 Q. If you look down the page, you --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I mean, I don't find it surprising that some people said, "Look, this isn't really for us." It is not our normal sort of territory. I mean, you say you have watched the programme. Thank you very much. I am glad you enjoy it. But you know, you don't see this sort of stuff very much on -- or indeed at all on Newsnight. I think at that level, one can understand why people would say, "It is not our sort of thing." It is not.

Q. Now, what did you expect -- if you are still looking at that e-mail to Peter Rippon.

A. Yes, yes.

Q. What did you expect Peter Rippon to do with that e-mail when he received it, apart from read it?

A. This e-mail that I have sent him?

Q. Yes.

A. Well, I think I have explained -- yes. I didn't expect him to do anything. I wanted to explain to him why I felt differently about it to the decision that he had made.

Q. Would you have expected him to send an e-mail to Mr Mitchell?

A. I specifically said to him, somewhere or other -- no, I wouldn't have expected him to. But I did at some point say to him: "I should like my views on this to be made known to the inquiry."
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Q. Yes. You asked him for permission to send them to Helen Boaden and he said to you --

A. I don't think -- I didn't -- well, did I? Yes, I said I should like to send it to Helen. And he replied: "I have CCed her."

Q. Yes, but he didn't tell you that the e-mail that we have just been looking at had been sent by him to Mr Mitchell ten minutes after you had sent it to him.

A. No, I didn't, and I am ashamed to say I haven't read it sufficiently closely to realise that that had happened.

Mitchell and Rippon are close, and I don't --

I mean, you know, if he sent it on with some disparaging remark about me, well, you know, that wouldn't surprise me either. I don't know.

Q. Were you aware that before he published a blog, Peter Rippon wrote something called "The chain of events" which was sent to Helen Boaden and Steve Mitchell?

A. No, I wasn't, but then why should I?

Q. There is no reason why you should be, but you might have been.

A. No, I wasn't. No, it is a fair enough question, of course, sorry.

No, I wasn't aware of that; but then, you know, in the -- in the context of these things, you have to understand -- sorry, you, of course, will have realised this already. But people like me are below the salt in an institution like the BBC. It is not -- it is, I believe, appreciably different to some other media organisations.

Producers -- particularly producers who get to a position of editorial eminence -- do not like their presenters interfering in what they consider to be the business of what I would call the bureaucracy and they would doubtless call the editorial superstructure or hierarchy or something. It is a cultural thing. They don't like us. So of course we wouldn't be -- we wouldn't -- I wouldn't be shown such a thing, nor would I expect to see it. And -- yes, I...

Q. I am not making a big point about this. I am just asking you if you had seen it, and you've said you haven't. One of the points that he makes in it is that the story was put on something called the "MPRL". Are you familiar with that term?

A. MPRL? I have never heard of it.

Q. Managed programme risk list.

A. That is very interesting. I only know about this at second or third hand. Second hand, I think. I was unaware that this thing existed until this incident blew up. These are programmes referred to the top of the
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organisation as potential areas of embarrassment or interest.

Q. Yes, yes.

A. I was -- I didn't know it was on that.

Q. Well, it wasn't, in fact, on it, but -- well, I am coming to that.

A. Oh, it wasn't? Oh! Well, it clearly should have been.

Q. Well, can we just take it in stages? He says in this document that the story, the Jimmy Saville story, had been put on the MPRL; okay? Let's just take that as a premise, for the moment, of the discussion.

A. Mm-hm.

Q. Now, as I understand it, the managed programmes risk list is intended to be a mechanism for communications between different parts of the BBC; for example, between the vision and --

A. Mm-hm.

Q. Somebody who works in the vision side of things has made the point that one of the purposes of this structure is that it shouldn't be necessary to have ten second conversations between directors of news and directors of vision, because this mechanism exists to put potential problems onto other people's radar.

A. Mm-hm.

Q. We have seen examples of this MPRL, and there is, as you
MR POLLARD: Alan, can I just jump in with a question? Slightly to re wind to a point from a little earlier. It was about the story itself, Jeremy. You will have seen, probably, that there was a thread throughout the discussions that were taking place in November between Meirion and Liz and Peter Rippon about the progress of the story, and that there was a sort of recurring theme of: where is the letter which purportedly explained the dropping of the case by Surrey police? And you might have seen that idea that Peter's view was that this, if you like, institutional failure -- in other words, the failure either of the police or the CPS to proceed with this -- was a fundamental part of the story. And I think it is fair to characterise it as something that perhaps in his mind would make it more of a Newsnight story. Bearing in mind what you were saying about some people had thought perhaps it wasn't, that it was just the story of a dead celebrity abusing people long ago, that that was a valid direction to take -- do you understand that? Do you sort of get that or support it, that that institutional failure might have been the difference between it being a Newsnight story and not? Sorry, that was a long question.
A. No, the institutional failure by the Surrey police, do you mean?
Q. Yes, that or, failing that, the CPS.
A. You know, you are asking me an opinion. Do I -- I can understand why some people might say that. I must say, I think on the only conversation that I had with Meirion about this at the time, he did not say: "We are looking into why the Surrey police failed to act." He said, "I am looking into Jimmy Saville." And I think I probably said something like: "Oh well, I don't think I need to ask you any further what that's about!"
MR POLLARD: Okay, fair enough, yes.
A. I mean, I can see why, you know, some people might take that view. But it is a counsel of -- it is a counsel of extreme -- I don't know. I was going to say "extreme caution," but I really don't know. It is just an opinion.
MR POLLARD: Yes, thanks.
MR MACLEAN: Just to go back to this managed programmes risk list, when I said that it wasn't on the list, in fact, as we understand it at the moment, it was provided by Liz Gibbons on the list she sent to somebody called Sara Beck. I don't know if she was on your radar screen or not?
A. No, I'm afraid she is definitely off it.
Q. But when it went beyond her, to Mr Mitchell's office, it
Q. What do you think of the notion of using an editor's blog as such a means of communication? Is that a sensible thing --
A. I mean, who reads editors' blogs? I don't know.
Q. Yes, quite, quite.
A. I mean, I don't know. But to be fair, it was -- I think there was -- you know, there were e-mails flying about all over the place from people. You will have to check this, but as far as I recall, from Helen and others, saying: Peter Rippon has done a blog explaining all of this, explaining why he took the decision he took. So I don't think it was quite as obscure as the editor's blog may -- suggests.
Q. Now, you mentioned a little earlier, when we were discussing Mr Rippon, about his attitude to the stories that were being worked on. Would you expect the editor to view the rushes -- I think that's the term you use -- of interviews that had been conducted before taking a final decision to pull the story?
A. No.
Q. Why not?
A. Well, that's why you have producers. I mean, the rushes are the -- everything that occurs. You know, the tape comes back. It is edited together by the producer. At that point, clearly the editor needs to see it.

But I have to tell you -- and it wouldn't be applicable in this sort of case, but frequently things are now so stretched that they can't be viewed by editors before transmission because there are simply -- there is simply nobody there. No-one has the time to do it. Now, that would not be the case in this sort of story, which is prepared over a longer timeframe. But I -- in answer to your original question, I would not expect the editor to view the rushes, no.

Q. Right.
A. The editor might, at some point, in the context of viewing a cut piece, say, "Did he or she say anything more on that?" Or: "Have you got anything more on that particular angle?" Or: "Did you ask about this? Because it is not in here." That sort of thing. At which point -- which invites a return to the rushes, but I wouldn't expect an editor to view rushes because they would have no time to do anything else.
MR POLLARD: Just for clarification, you would expect, when a decision was being taken, would you, for the editor to see the proposed clips?
A. It depends what form the thing is. But if it is a proper -- yes, of course. If it is a piece, the editor should see it before transmission. But to use that phrase that you just used, "the proposed clips",

you are saying -- you are effectively saying he is seeing something between rushes and final product.
I wouldn't expect that, no.
MR POLLARD: No. I think what I am saying -- and I think I am right about the stage that this had reached. There hadn't been a rough cut of this, as I understand it.
A. As I understand it too, yes.
MR POLLARD: There had been at least four, possibly five, versions of a script which had got indications in them, as you would expect, of interview clips from various people.
A. Yes, yes.
MR POLLARD: And it had reached the point where the producers quite clearly were pushing this story very hard and saying they believed in it, and the editor was clearly, as it turned out, on the brink of saying, "No, I don't want to go ahead with it."
So the question is: would you have expected the editor who was acting as executive producer of that piece to see the clips of interview or just to read them on the page?
A. Well, it is an unusual situation. Had it been transcribed?
MR POLLARD: Well, I think the clips of interviews within the scripts have a pretty strong description of what is in each clip.
A. Yes, yes.
MR POLLARD: But of course, what you don't --
A. That will be the reporter or producer paraphrasing it, probably.
MR POLLARD: Exactly.
A. But sometimes, you know, if you have got particularly legally contentious things or very, very heavily invested in pieces, sometimes proper transcripts are done of the whole of the interview before it is edited.
But I -- that is obviously not what we are at here.
MR POLLARD: No. I think you obviously -- you don't see the tone of voice.
A. Yes, that's correct.
MR POLLARD: This is obviously something we will ask Peter Rippon about, but I just wanted to know about your --
A. No, I can't -- I don't think I can help you there, sorry.
MR POLLARD: Okay, thanks.
MR MACLEAN: Now Jeremy, on 2 October, you were keen to Newnight itself to cover this story, weren't you? If you look in your e-mail --
A. What day of the week is that?
Q. I think it is a --
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<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A. I recall -- I recall -- my vague recollection is that the ITV thing transmits on a Wednesday. It is all over the papers on Saturday/Sunday previous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Q. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A. Is that correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Q. That is --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A. My recollection is -- I mean, I can look at my calendar while I am talking to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Q. I think the 2nd is a Tuesday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A. Tuesday?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Q. The 2 October.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. A. I am surprised. My recollection was that having -- when it was clear that ITV were going to run something on the Wednesday, my recollection is that on the Monday, I took it up --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Q. If you --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. MR PULLARD: Monday the 3rd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. A. Monday is the 3rd?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. MR PULLARD: Yes. The 2nd is a Sunday. Oh sorry, I am --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. A. I don't think so. I think Monday is a --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. A. Monday is the 1st, Tuesday the 2nd. Wednesday the 3rd is the date of the ITV transmission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. MR PULLARD: Yes, exactly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. A. My recollection is that on the Sunday, I said to the --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. no, actually, did I say it on the ... Well no, 2. I concluded on the Sunday that we had to do the story on the Monday. On the Monday, I raised it with the person who was editor of the day that day, and I think with Peter Rippon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. MR MACLEAN: It will help you to look at the e-mail, 4. I think, Jeremy, the first one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A. Yes, I have got that. That is the 2nd, yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Q. Yes. I haven't got anything from you before that, but it may be that this is something --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A. I am not sure that this is -- no, I raised in conversation, you know. I think I called Peter. I am not sure. I think I called Peter. I called whoever the editor of the day was that day, on the Monday, and said that we should -- we really should do this. I didn't get anywhere. I then had a conversation -- oh, wait, 8. I did, actually. No, on the Monday or the Tuesday -- 9. I don't recall which one it was -- I raised it face-to-face, then, with Peter Rippon. And -- 10. Q. Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. A. He said -- and this was the really striking thing, 12. I recall now. In conversation, he said -- when I said, &quot;We have got to do this&quot;, for the sort of reasons I mentioned in the e-mail on 2 October 2012, the one dated -- timed 17.56 -- and again, I hasten to say, this</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. particular conversation I am going to refer to now, 2. I can't recall whether it was on the Monday or the Tuesday. But what struck me about it was his reply when I mentioned the reasons. He said, &quot;I am sorry, I just can't do this.&quot; And I thought that was a very, very unusual word to use, &quot;can't&quot;, because the normal judgment -- I mean: we are not going to do it, because we have got -- we haven't got time or we are doing politics or we are doing too many social stories tonight anyway. &quot;Can't&quot; was a very, very unusual word to use, and I didn't say, &quot;What do you mean 'can't'?&quot; Someone has told you that you can't, or you physically can't face it?&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Now, I think -- my suspicion is that there may well have been an element of both. There certainly was an element of the second, as you will see in one of these e-mails somewhere in here. He says -- he is suggesting that I do -- I can't remember. It was a conversation with Neil Breakwell, I think. He is suggesting he does -- he does an interview with me and he clearly, from the tone of the interview, was not keen to do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MR PULLARD: I think the 5 October is --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A. Is it the 5 October? I will have a hunt around here and find it. Anyway. There was a feeling --</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. MR PULLARD: With Nick Breakwell --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. A. Yes. I told him: &quot;Interviewing you is not a good idea.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Yes, yes, good. That is a reference on the -- maybe it is a reference. I was looking at a copy on the 8th, but maybe it is a previous copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. MR PULLARD:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A. Yes. I told him: &quot;Interviewing you is not a good idea.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Yes, yes, good. That is a reference on the -- maybe it is a reference. I was looking at a copy on the 8th, but maybe it is a previous copy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>15.</td>
</tr>
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<td>16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
</tr>
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<td>20.</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
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MR MACLEAN: Just pausing at the 2 October.

A. Yes.

Q. The 17.56 e-mail.

A. Yes.

Q. When you sent that e-mail, you had already had this face-to-face discussion with him that you have referred to?

A. I think I must have done, because 17.56 is pretty late in the afternoon. I think I was probably just reiterating, you know, the arguments and -- probably in a last attempt -- because that was the day before the ITV thing goes out. Or maybe I thought we could do it on the same -- at the same time or on the same day as the ITV thing. I can't recall what time of day it aired, but...

Q. The e-mail ends by saying:

"Can I ask you to reconsider ..."

Which rather suggests that you had a conversation with him already?

A. I'd certainly had conversations on, I think, both the Monday and the Tuesday.

Q. And did Mr Rippon ever indicate -- well, let me ask you a different way. What was his attitude to the idea that Newsnight should do this story? I am not asking you now about his being interviewed on the programme, but simply about his being interviewed on the programme.

Newsnight doing the story which you wanted to do. We can see that on the 2nd --

A. This is not the Saville story itself, but the fact that ITV was about to broadcast, or pegged the ITV being about to broadcast.

Q. Yes. That's right.

A. I would have said it was a blanket refusal to entertain the idea.

Q. Did he ever indicate to you that he thought that your suggestion was one that was worth considering?

A. Never.

Q. So you would be surprised, would you, if he had sent a text message to Steve Mitchell on 2 October at 16.38, saying:

"JP [which I assume is you] still pushing to do it tonight. I think we should consider it."

That is news to you, is it?

A. That is news to me. Yes, it certainly is. I had got no indication from him that he would entertain the idea.

Q. Well, we will obviously explore these --

A. I am sure you will. But -- I mean, I think that it is very, very interesting and a very revealing piece of information, because it indicates that they had had previous conversations, and that what sounds to me to be a policy judgment had been made, that it wasn't -- the subject wasn't going to be tackled.

Q. Well, as you say -- as I say, we will obviously explore that with others.

A. Yes.

Q. Now, he actually replied to your e-mail -- Mr Rippon replied within half an hour, if you go over the page, at 18.22.

A. Uh-huh.

Q. And he replies by asking you a question, and the question was what allegations had he failed to address, in your view, in his blog. Then you answer that at the top of the page within ten minutes. Do you see? At 18.32?

A. "What allegations have I failed ..."

Q. Yes.

A. Yes.

Q. And you answer at the top of the page that --

A. Yes.

Q. The notable(?) one. You say:

"Surely we need details [this is your e-mail, second line]. Were there any conversations? If so, with whom?"

A. Yes.

Q. "What evidence of those conversations?"

What you were presumably speculating about there, or asking about, were conversations with the news management, the Helen Boaden or Steven Mitchell?

A. Well, yes. Probably exactly what you are trying to get to the bottom of, yes. I mean, this is a public relations disaster because of resolute disclosure [sic] to address any of these questions.

Now, there were lots and lots of other questions, I suppose, but yes, I mean, it was -- it was 18.32. It was reasonably off the top of the head, yes.

Q. When you say "were there any conversations", obviously we need to explore whether there were, in fact, any conversations in this particular instance. But moving away from the specific to the general; how common would such conversations be between someone in the position of Helen Boaden and Steve Mitchell on the one hand, and the editor of Newsnight on the other?

A. How am I supposed to know that?

Q. Well --

A. Sorry, there is a dog barking. Go on. Off you go. My daughter has got a -- off you go. Sorry.

I mean, how can I possibly know that? The conversations take place, if they take place at all, between other people than myself.

Q. You are asking a question: were there any conversations?
1  A. Yes.
2  Q. My question comes from your e-mail. You say:
3      "Were there any conversations?"
4  If you had got the answer back: "Yes, there were six
5      conversations" --
6  A. Yes.
7  Q. -- would that have been something that would have struck
8      you as being perfectly routine and ordinary, or would
9      you have thought that that was extraordinary or what
10     would you --
11  A. I wouldn't have thought it was -- I would have thought
12     it was, you know, the boss class earning a living.
13  Q. Right.
14  A. They seemed to spend an awful lot of time having
15     meetings with one another. I don't quite understand why
16     a subject like this wouldn't have invited some sort of
17     discussion, but I don't know.
18  Q. Right.
19  A. Mm-hm.
20  Q. Which, in our bundles, is A/7, 343. He says he thought
21     that he had addressed the point that you had mentioned:
22      "It really would look like special treatment if
23     I came on to expand on it in such detail. It would
24     Page 45
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1  look ..."
2  A. Yes.
3  Q. "... desperate."
4  Then it is your e-mail at the top of the page that
5      I just want you to look at, please.
6  A. Yes.
7  Q. Now, this is the day that the blog has been published
8      but it is the day before ITV's broadcast had been -- so
9      we had all read about it in the Sunday papers.
10  A. Mm-hm.
11  Q. You say:
12      "I think it is very unfair, and frankly not at all
13      untypical, that the BBC has dumped all this on one
14      individual. I think the BBC's behaviour now is almost
15      as contemptible as it was then."
16  Q. And having seen the script of what Panorama had --
17  A. (Laughs) Exasperation, I should think. I -- I don't
18     know. I mean, this is -- you know. You know what the
19     e-mails are like. They just come and go very fast.
20     This is, what 19.25. 19.25, I would have been,
21     I should think, probably trying to write the menu and
22     worrying about what was going on that night.
23     I would guess this is a reference to the decision to
24     can the investigation, but that -- I mean, in the
25     context, that is the only thing I can think it refers
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1      to.
2  Q. So your attitude from these e-mails was -- if it
3      matters, which it might not -- you thought that
4      a clearly wrong decision had been made not to run this
5      story?
6  A. In my judgment, yes.
7  Q. But nonetheless, what was happening now was that Rippon
8      was being dumped on, or the BBC had dumped all this on
9      one individual. Did you mean that he was being given
10     a lot on his plate, or he was being, as it were,
11     identified as the fall guy?
12  A. I think what this refers to is the fact that he was
13     being used as the fall guy, and secondly, as you will
14     have -- well, as is explicit in the previous e-mails,
15     I profoundly disagree with the BBC's refusal to engage
16     with it and to justify or attempt to justify its
17     position. So I think -- you know, on the whole, I think
18     that the public -- you know, the public pay our wages.
19     The public are entitled to know what is being done with
20     them.
21  Q. Did you see the ITV programme when it went out on the
22     Thursday?
23  A. No, I didn't.
24  Q. Or shortly after?
25  A. No. It is not the sort of thing I find of any interest.
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1  I perhaps should have done. No actually, why should
2  I have done? It is -- you know, it is sleazy, sleazy
3  behaviour in a world I dislike.
4  Q. Have you now seen it or not?
5  A. No.
6  Q. No. Did you see the Panorama that went out a bit after
7      that, a couple of weeks ago?
8  A. No, I didn't see the Panorama, but I got hold of the
9      script of the Panorama and I called the editor. We were
10     doing Newsnight that night. It was a Monday, wasn't it?
11  We were doing Newsnight that night, and I got hold of
12     the script, and I called the editor of Panorama and
13     said, "What have you got?" because clearly it was going
14     to make life difficult for us, and I thought we might
15     be -- you know, one needed to know what was going to be
16     in the Panorama in order to deal with it.
17  Q. And having seen the script of what Panorama had --
18  A. Yes.
19  Q. -- did that shift your view in any way about any of the
20     topics that we have been discussing, and if so, how?
21  A. I wouldn't have said so, no.
22  Q. If you still have that e-mail at 19.25, the one about
23     "dumped all this on".
24  A. Yes.
25  Q. Mr Rippon got an e-mail from somebody else, about
an hour later --
1. A. Uh-huh.
2. Q. -- saying -- actually, from George Entwistle, at 20.52
3. that night --
4. A. Uh-huh.
5. Q. -- which was a reply to one from him in which he said he
6. was aware -- this is Peter Rippon:
7. "I am also aware that I am failing to stop JP
8. haranguing you about the bloody thing [I don't know what
9. that is a reference to, and it may not matter]."
10. And George Entwistle came back -- there was a brief
11. reference to you, then he says:
12. "Good blog. Lonely, at times, I know, but spot on
13. to take responsibility and fight it out if you have to.
14. I do know how it is. Helen and I totally supportive.
15. All the best, G."
16. A. Mm-hm.
17. Q. Now, it seems, from my reading of your e-mail of 19.25
18. but tell me if I am wrong, that you wouldn't share the
19. view that at least all management was totally supportive
20. of Mr Rippon. Is that fair?
21. A. I would -- yes, I think that is fair. I mean, I think,
22. bad they been totally supportive -- I mean, there is
23. a perfect logic to saying: "The policy is their
24. individual editorial decision and we support the editor"
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the right to make those decisions." Implicit in
that is "whether we agree or not".
But I did not get a sense that there was that sort
of endorsement.
5. Q. So your position, in a nutshell, was that Mr Rippon,
whose decision you personally clearly disagreed with,
was being hung out to dry?
6. A. Uh-huh, yes.
7. Q. Now, you were still pressing for Newsnight to run
a story, and we can see from one of your e-mails,
I think, that you were pressing Shambinder Nahal to run
the story. Can we then go to -- I think there is
an e-mail of 3 October.
8. A. Let me just see if I can find it, yes.
9. Q. It should be just over the page, I think, from where we
were. It starts at the top of the page. It talks
about:
10. "I agree it is corrosive."
11. Do you see that one?
12. A. Yes, got it.
13. Q. Now, it picks up, at the bottom of the page, from where we
have been. Then do you see Mr Rippon's e-mail to you
of the 3rd, at 9.36:
14. "Thank you for this. Telegraph suggesting ..."
15. [et cetera]. The leaking and briefing is what actually
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bothers me more. It is only the older lags who do it
and I have never worked anywhere where it is so
pervasive."
4. A. Mm-hm.
5. Q. Now, is that a description that you recognise, that
second sentence, that "It is only the older lags who do it
and I have never worked anywhere where it is so
pervasive"? Obviously he has worked places you haven't,
but "only the older lags who do it" and leaking and
briefing being "pervasive" -- are those descriptions you
recognise?
6. A. No. I would have said, actually -- I am not going to
start naming names. I think --
7. Q. I haven't asked you to name names.
8. A. In terms of the leaks and the briefings, if there were
any, I don't think it was at all -- was or is at all
pervasive. I think -- I can think of, in the course of
quite a long time there -- well, let's stick to the last
five years.
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I can think in this case, from reading the press on
Saville, I would have thought them -- you see, it looks
Page 52

to me as if there are probably two people who have
leaked on it. So I would not have said -- I mean, you
will be able to find out what the total number of staff
on Newsnight is. It must be in the order of 40 to 50,
including the graphics people and so on. I don't think
that is very high and I don't find it surprising that he
has not worked in places where it happens. That again,
I am afraid, is a reflection on radio culture, which
tends to be rather different.
4. Q. Yes, right.
5. A. So I don't find -- I don't find that -- I didn't believe
that, when I read it, and I don't believe it now, the
leaking and briefings.
6. I mean -- well, actually, what is he referring to?
7. "Pervasive" is a stupid word to use, but I am not
surprised that he uses it. He is a very embattled
person at this point. It only needs one person to give
the leaks, if the leaks are sufficiently numerous or --
or authoritative or damaging.
8. So I think he has misunderstood it. I don't believe
that there are a lot of older lags doing it. You know,
9. I could be proved wrong, but I don't think so.
10. Q. In your reply, it is right to point out that you said
11. that you agreed with him, that "it", whatever it is, is
12. corrosive.
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1. Yes, it is. The — yes, it is, certainly. Leaking I am
2. referring to there, yes.

Q. Yes, yes. Now, you then go on to say:
4. "It's disgusting the way the BBC is hanging you out.
5. It must have been a corporate decision, whatever your
6. blog says."
7. A. Yes.
8. Q. Now, I take it that you mean that it must have been, in
9. substance as opposed to in form, a corporate decision,
10. because in form, on any view, the decision was
11. Mr Rippon's decision; is that fair?
12. A. Yes, I am referring to the substance of the decision,
13. yes.
14. Q. Yes. In other words, your suggestion is that although
15. Mr Rippon was formally the decision maker, he was, in
16. effect, delivering a judgment as an agent of management.
17. Is that fair —
18. A. It is my belief, but I have no evidence.
19. Q. How would such a corporate decision, to use your words,
20. in practice, be arrived at? Is that something that you
21. have any knowledge of?
22. A. Well, as I said earlier, they do — they do a lot of
23. talking to one another.

| 1 | Journalism should be the — in my judgment, journalism |
| 2 | should be the enemy of the quiet life, and that is the |
| 3 | sort of context that I am thinking about. |
| 4 | Q. And this corporate decision that you are thinking about |
| 5 | would be a decision, would it, taken within the news |
| 6 | organisation? It would not be something taken at |
| 7 | an even higher level of the BBC; is that right? |
| 8 | A. I would be astonished if it was higher than — higher |
| 9 | than Helen Boaden. |
| 10 | Q. Yes. |
| 11 | A. I really would be quite surprised. Although I think — |
| 12 | I don't know whether it is still true, but in theory, is |
| 13 | not the Director General the editor-in-chief. |
| 14 | Q. I think that is what the rules say, yes. |
| 15 | A. I think that may be the case; in which case, possibly it |
| 16 | might — it might have gone higher. But I — I don't |
| 17 | think so, but I don't know. |
| 18 | Q. No. Interestingly, your e-mail proceeds on the basis |
| 19 | that what the blog says isn't right. That was your |
| 20 | assumption? |
| 21 | A. Yes. |
| 22 | Q. So your attitude to the blog was one of — it might |
| 23 | fairly be described as one of scepticism? |
| 24 | A. I would say so, yes. |
| 25 | Q. Now, if you go, I think, over the — over a couple of |
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| 1 | pages, you should find an e-mail from Mr Rippon to you, |
| 2 | nine minutes later, at 9.52 on 3 October. |
| 3 | A. Yes. |
| 4 | Q. He denies your suggestion of the corporate decision: |
| 5 | "It wasn't corporate, honestly. I guess I may have |
| 6 | been guilty of self-censorship. In the end, I think we |
| 7 | had ..." |
| 8 | And you will see what he says. |
| 9 | A. Yes. |
| 10 | Q. Do you think that Mr Rippon was susceptible to |
| 11 | self-censorship? Is that something you are able to |
| 12 | comment on? |
| 13 | A. Well, I don't think you — you are the sort of BBC lifer |
| 14 | that he is, without — without absorbing the mindset of |
| 15 | the organisation. And I think that they were — they |
| 16 | all had it, whether it is Helen or Steve or Peter Rippon |
| 17 | or many others, doubtless, and that was the — that was |
| 18 | at the heart of why they didn't really see what the |
| 19 | problem was, the broader problem in terms of editorial |
| 20 | management, and the specific problem in this case, of |
| 21 | one man making an apparently independent decision while |
| 22 | in fact, reflecting a corporate culture. |
| 23 | Q. It would appear that Mr Rippon had missed the angle in |
| 24 | the story that is now presented perhaps as being rather |
| 25 | obvious, that allegations of serious sexual crimes on |
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| 1 | BBC TV sets, albeit a long time ago, were a matter of |
| 2 | journalistic and public interest. |
| 3 | A. Is there a view on that? I mean, where are you getting |
| 4 | that from? |
| 5 | Q. I am not getting that from your e-mail, but — |
| 6 | A. Oh, I see. |
| 7 | Q. When he says that he was guilty of self-censorship: |
| 8 | "In the end, I just felt we had ... 40-year old |
| 9 | contestable claims about a dead guy was not a Newsnight |
| 10 | story and not worth the fuss."

But there were other aspects of the material that
has been gathered which included allegations of serious
sexual crimes in the BBC TV —

A. Well, yes, I mean, I know the newspapers have gone big
on all of that. I would have thought it was more
appalling, frankly, that — what happened in hospitals,
Broadmoor, Stoke Mandeville, Leeds or wherever. But
I agree that I do not see any reference to that aspect
of the story in what he has had to say.

Q. Now, just moving away from these e-mails, just for
a moment. It has been suggested to us that editorial
power, whatever that means, has shifted in recent years
to something called the editorial policy department,
which I think is headed by David Jordan.

A. Oh yes, yes.
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Q. Insofar as you understand the position, what is the role of the editorial policy department, and is it a force for good, in your opinion?

A. I don't know what they do. I mean, they talk to each other, I suppose, as all these bloody people do. I wish I had an idea! I assume he makes -- it makes editorial policy.

So I can't really help you there. I think it is almost certainly the case -- and I am speculating here, but I think it is the case, probably, that post-Hutton, there has been a greater centralisation -- or a desire for greater centralisation of editorial decision making, that -- and that that has been at the expense of the sort of independence that editors previously exercised at the time that George Entwistle was running Newsnight or Peter Barron or various distinguished figures before them like Tim Gardam, and so on.

So I think that is probably the case, but again, you'd better find out from -- I don't know whether you are going to have David Jordan in front of you, but you could ask him -- it would be rather interesting to ask him what his job is. I expect you would get rather a long answer.

Q. So if I asked you: in a story like the Saville story or some piece of investigative journalism that has been done by Newsnight, where do you think real editorial control lies, in practice? Is that too general a question?

A. Well, it depends upon the story, I think. I mean, if you were, for example, running a story about the finances of the Tory party or the Labour party or the Lib Dems or something, during a period when an election or a similarly -- or another important political event was imminent, then no doubt some functionary from the editorial policy department would express a view, and that view would be binding.

At other times, I think it depends upon the strength of your story. If you have a strong story, they just have to accept -- accept it.

So I would not -- I mean, there are many things I find intensely irritating about the BBC's overmanaged system, but I would not accuse them of directly interfering by -- in saying, "This is what this programme may or may not do." I really wouldn't accuse them of that. I think they will have very -- you know, irritating or nitpicking things to say about particular stories in a particular context, but I don't think it would lay down a policy: "This is what this sort of programme does or that sort of programme.""
| Page 61 | 1. A: The 10 October, okay. That's presumably further in.
2. Q: Isn't it?
3. A: Yes.
4. Q: Why?
5. A: Yes. Why did you not think that?

| Page 62 |
| Page 64 | 1. Q: And did you not think that the decision to pull the original Seville investigation was the right one?
2. A: Yes.
3. Q: And for whatever reason, he continued to maintain that the original investigation was correct.
4. A: Yes.
5. Q: And you said that you disagreed with Peter's decision.
6. A: Yes. But that was not here before here.

| Page 63 | 1. A: The 10th, okay. That's presumably further in.
2. Q: Isn't it?
3. A: Yes.
4. Q: Why?
5. A: Yes. Why didn't you think that?

| Page 65 | 1. Q: And did you not think that the decision to pull the original Seville investigation was the right one?
2. A: Yes.
3. Q: And for whatever reason, he continued to maintain that the original investigation was correct.
4. A: Yes.
5. Q: And you said that you disagreed with Peter's decision.
6. A: Yes. But that was not here before here.
Q. So we can see, and we discussed this earlier, you disagreed with his decision that was made in the beginning. But the ball's-up, then, what was, the events of October 2012?
A. I am just looking at how these -- yes, yes. The ball's-up is the decision that -- well, the discovery that it wasn't broadcast, and the subsequent so-called explanation of why it wasn't broadcast. That is what I considered to be the ball's-up, I think.
Q. And you didn't believe the explanation that the BBC had been giving, or you found it unconvincing, or ...?
A. I think we went over this just before lunch, didn't we?
Yes. I had found it -- I found it initially implausible that he had made the decision on his own. The only way I can imagine that to be the case is that he is, you know -- that -- what have they said about someone who

---

Q. Yes.
MR POLLARD: Can I just ask you a specific question about --
A. Yes.
MR POLLARD: -- your view of Peter's decision to drop this. There are, if you like, two branches of the way this
decision might have been made.
One is, if you like, a purely editorial decision;
and for those who criticised it, it is driven by
timidity and the idea that it might not be a Newsnight
story or it might just be too difficult, it might be
a bit messy or lead to complaints, et cetera; but at its
heart, an editorial decision.
And the other one, as you know, is that -- is the
suggestion that it was, shall we say, and I think
Mairion is on record as saying this, to save the
Christmas tributes. In other words, something way
outside what you might call an editorial decision.
Do you have a view on that?
A. I have a view, but it is uninformed, Nick. I mean,
I don't know. My original --
MR POLLARD: It may be uninformed, but you were absolutely
at the heart of this programme, all the way through.
A. Oh, look, I was going to say "bollocks", which would
give your shorthand writers some entertainment.
No, that's not true. I am not at the heart of it, at

---

entirely comfortable with the solidity of the evidence.
I argue that in those circumstances, it is beholden
upon you -- incumbent upon you, sorry -- to pursue the
investigation until you get it, not to run away from it.
MR MACLEAN: In other words: "We are not broadcasting on
Wednesday, but we will keep looking at it and we might
come back to it", or whatever?
A. I don't think "we might come back to it". Once you've
got someone making those claims with that degree of
specificity and apparent plausibility, then somehow
you've got to find a way of standing the story up,
unless somebody says, "That is completely untrue because
I can demonstrate [x, y and z]."
So it is not a case of postponing it, and frankly,
we very rarely -- it is a benefit, I suppose, of being
five nights. We very rarely say, "We are going to do
this next Tuesday." It makes no odds whether it is
Monday or Friday. We tend not to throw it away on
Friday because the audience is so small, if we can avoid
it, but -- no, I mean, there is lot of flexibility
there. So it is not a question of postponing
transmission; it is a question of being satisfied with
the evidence, I think.
MR POLLARD: Okay, thanks. I just have got two more
questions, Jeremy. One was really to ask you about
MR POLLARD: Well, I think it won RTS programme of the year, didn’t it?

A. Oh, come along! You of all people in this -- you should know how those things are worked out. I mean, we didn’t – I did not feel --

MR POLLARD: It would not be given necessarily to a programme that had a dull and tedious year, though. I understand the limitations of awards, yes.

A. Yes, and there are those who say that it was about the -- it was a really unhelpful thing to have happened.

reality got completely screwed up was when it was disclosed that there were significant aspects of his original account of his involvement in the affair which were wrong. I don’t think he deliberately lied.

But before that, there was a really serious problem. The BBC’s line had been, hadn’t it, that decisions are in hands of individual editors. This is an attempt to demonstrate that it is not some great corporate monolith. In fact, as I think I suggested earlier, it doesn’t need to be, because the -- the cast of mind that has overtaken the senior echelons, the sort of people that they appoint -- and you know, you will have to talk to others about this, but there is a raft of appointments now that have been made of people who are clearly not the most creative, and decisions appear to be being made about appointments which are politically -- I mean "politically" with a small "p" -- politically-based, and they are to do with perpetuating a particular type of journalism, rather than simply saying, "This man or woman is very good. Let’s give them the job."

So the argument that individual editors make individual decisions really only works if those editors have themselves not been appointed or somehow -- because they have fulfilled through a particular set of congenial criteria, or if they have not somehow developed an osmotic understanding of what is required of them. So you know, it is a slightly thin line.

I don’t know how they could have defended themselves at all, given that it has been a pretty -- I don’t know, but I think -- what would I have done if I had been in their shoes? I think I would have reacted differently immediately, and once you are -- once you are involved in something, once there is some storm breaking over your head, you have got to get on the front foot, and -- because the BBC press operation is so terrible, because there is a real problem in finding spokesmen who will defend an articulate point of view.
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I think there is one other thing here. It may be to do with how -- the question -- the really important question here is: what was the BBC doing? This isn't strictly your remit, I know. But what was the BBC doing promoting this absurd figure, this absurd and malign figure? And I think that that is to do with the fact of the BBC having been slosh from popular culture for so long. Suddenly pirate radio comes along and all these people in metaphorical cardigans suddenly have to deal with an influx -- once pirate radio -- once pop radio broadcasting is legalised, they suddenly have to deal with an influx of people from a very, very different culture and they never got control of them and I am not sure even now they have. That is the reason there are ongoing legacy issues here too. But they -- they have never felt comfortable with popular culture, and they have therefore given those who claim to perpetrate it too much licence, and that is why, when anyone looks at the question of the licence fee, they always raise questions about Radio One, for example.

So I think that is -- I think that is the bigger challenge the organisation faces, that it has not really properly defined what its core values are, and how -- and they can sloganise about that, they can do that to their heart's content, but how those core values are properly expressed in a multiplicity of media and across various platforms. I think that is the real essential problem here that hasn't been engaged with, and they need to do that badly.

Sorry for ranting. I will get on.

MR POLLARD: Jeremy --

MR MACLEAN: We have no more questions for you.

(3.23 pm)

(The telephone interview concluded)