

# DONOHUE - HITCHENS ONLINE

# DEBATE



The historic debate between Bill Donohue and Christopher Hitchens is available online. The debate took place in 2000 at the Union League Club in New York City. Though the debate extended for more than two hours, only the first part was recorded; it runs for about an hour and ten minutes.

Sit back and enjoy it. Donohue certainly did.

Part 1: click [here](#)

Part 2: click [here](#)

Part 3: click [here](#)

---

# BBC AND COPS KNEW ABOUT SAVILE



This is the eleventh installment of Bill Donohue's report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

The number of allegations against long-time BBC employee Jimmy Savile has now hit 300; more than 400 inquiries are currently being pursued. It is not as though this is breaking news to Scotland Yard: another allegation that was previously brought to its attention surfaced last night, bringing to seven the

number of times Scotland Yard investigated Savile. Whether the top cops are crooked or just plain stupid doesn't matter: what matters is that Savile was always given a pass.

The BBC is just as guilty in covering up this monster's crimes. The incoming president and CEO of the *New York Times*, Mark Thompson, wants us to believe that he "never heard any allegations" against Savile while at the BBC (he started in 1979). If this is true, it makes him a rare find for the *Times*: everyone else had at least heard about Savile.

Thompson, who was the head of the BBC until recently, now admits that he was tipped off about the "Newsnight" report on Savile's exploits (the one that never aired) and he—like everyone else at the BBC—never bothered to tip off the cops about all the women who were interviewed for the axed piece. "Newsnight" editor Peter Rippon, who resigned on Monday, said he thought the women had contacted the police. Wrong. But he could have. So could have Thompson: he was told by more than one employee about this mess at a Christmas party last December, but he elected to do nothing about it.

Thompson's successor, George Entwistle, smacks of the same elitism and arrogance that colors the BBC hierarchy. On Wednesday, he was asked why he shut out all those "Newsnight" reporters who tried to warn him about the consequences of spiking the Savile report. He said he doesn't believe it is "always appropriate" to "talk to people on the shop floor."

If ignorance is bliss, these guys must be basking. And for this, Mark "Mr. Clueless" Thompson is being awarded \$3 million—just for signing—with the *New York Times*.

---

# NYT STANDS BY THOMPSON



This is the tenth installment of Bill Donohue's report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

*New York Times* publisher Arthur Sulzberger Jr. is trying to calm the storm of concerns raised by his own public editor, Margaret Sullivan, over the ethical credibility of Mark Thompson, the former BBC chief who is slated to start next month as the new head of the *New York Times* Company. Sulzberger said in a letter to the staff that he and the *Times*' board of directors believe Thompson possesses "high ethical standards and is the ideal person to lead our Company."

The *Times* hierarchy is doubling-down on their man. They believe that Thompson knew absolutely nothing about the decision to kill a BBC documentary on child rapist Jimmy Savile last year, and is therefore "ideal" for the job. In light of what we know, such a judgment is premature at best, and grossly unwarranted at worst.

On October 10, the chairman of the BBC Trust, Lord Chris Patten, spoke about the role that BBC officials, including Thompson, played in the decision to stop the BBC report on Savile. He said they "all knew there was an investigation and did not intervene to stop it." But Thompson insists he knew nothing about the BBC investigation of Savile!

No sooner had Lord Patten fingered Thompson as knowing about the "Newsnight" report when his office put out a statement

saying he “misspoke.” The head of the BBC governing board names names and we are to believe that he “misspoke” about it. And that’s the end of the story? More convincing is Tory MP Sir Roger Gale who says Lord Patten must go.

Parliament needs to order Lord Patten to explain himself. It might go a long way toward resolving the issue of Thompson’s allegedly “high ethical standards.” It certainly appears that someone, or perhaps several persons, are not telling the truth.

---

## NEW YORK TIMES IS IN A REAL PICKLE



This is the ninth installment of Bill Donohue’s report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

Mark Thompson was the director-general of the BBC when the British media giant killed a “Newsnight” documentary at the end of last year on the sexual exploits of Jimmy Savile, the BBC child rapist who molested boys and girls for six decades, many of them on the premises of the BBC. Thompson, who worked at the BBC since 1979, and is scheduled to take over next month as the new chief of the *New York Times* Company, said last week that he had “never heard any allegations or received any complaints” about Savile when he worked at the BBC. Really?

Thompson made his profession of ignorance on October 7. But on the same day, the BBC's own press office contradicted him. Also on October 7, it was reported that last December Thompson was "warned by an angry senior journalist about the potential consequences of axing the Newsnight investigation." Today it is being reported that a well-respected BBC foreign correspondent, Caroline Hawley, also spoke to Thompson at the Christmas party about this issue; she says she informed him of the "broad context" of what happened. Now Thompson is saying that he recalls hearing something about this, but didn't ask for details.

If the *New York Times* were really on this story it would know that none of this is new. Consider this report by British pundit Guido Fawkes: "Thompson was tackled about the axing at a pre-Christmas drinks party, so he cannot claim to be ignorant of it." Moreover, when the BBC was asked to respond, it refused. Do you know when all of this was reported? On February 9, 2012. If I know it, why doesn't the *New York Times*?

Looks like Thompson's story is blowing up right in his face. The *New York Times* is in a real pickle. More to come.

---

## **NYT FEUD HAS THOMPSON ON THE ROPES**

This is the eighth installment of Bill Donohue's report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

If Las Vegas were taking odds on the likelihood that former BBC chief Mark Thompson will take over on November 12 as the new president and CEO of the *New York Times* Company, the smart money would bet against him. After what *Times* public editor Margaret Sullivan said about him yesterday in her blog, he's already on the ropes.

Sullivan asks, "how likely is it that the Times Company will continue with its plan to bring Mr. Thompson on as chief executive?" She even questions his integrity about his statement that he knew nothing about a spiked documentary last year exposing BBC icon Jimmy Savile as a child rapist. Sullivan writes, "His integrity and decision-making are bound to affect The Times and its journalism—profoundly. It's worth considering now whether he is the right person for the job, given this turn of events." If this wasn't enough to finish Thompson, she adds, "What are the implications for the Times Company to have its new C.E.O.—who needs to deal with many tough business challenges here—arriving with so much unwanted baggage?"

Sullivan, it would appear, is playing rabbit for Arthur Ochs Sulzberger Jr., publisher of the *New York Times*. It suggests that Thompson has been spoken to about stepping aside but has proven to be obstinate, which is why Sullivan has been rolled out to smack him in public. Either that or Sullivan is going out on a limb.

Last week more than 1,200 files were released on suspected child abusers in the Boy Scouts. Yesterday, a Rhode Island judge was asked to unseal documents in a lawsuit dealing with the Legion of Christ, a Roman Catholic order of priests which has been tainted by a sexual abuse scandal of its own. In both instances, the *New York Times* was among those seeking the files.

Parliament needs to secure the files on the BBC with an eye toward uncovering the truth about the BBC and the *New York*

*Times*. More to come later today.

---

## BBC CHIEF TESTIFIES BEFORE PARLIAMENT



This is the seventh installment of Bill Donohue's report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

George Entwistle, the new director-general of the BBC, told members of Parliament today that there was no cover-up of the Jimmy Savile scandal, and that no pressure was put on "Newsnight" editor Peter Rippon to cancel a documentary on Savile last December; Rippon has "stepped aside" from the BBC for his role in this matter. But not everyone is buying his account.

It is known that after working on a documentary to expose Savile's exploits, and finding many women who claimed to have been abused by the BBC icon, the documentary never aired. It is also known that the BBC was planning to air three tributes to Savile last Christmas. One influential member of Parliament, John Wittingdale, was skeptical of what Entwistle said, stating that the new BBC chief "was in the process of commissioning the most fulsome tributes to Jimmy Savile, which went out on the BBC over that Christmas, and I just find it very surprising that, having been told by the director of news, given a warning, he didn't think it appropriate at least to ask what the investigation was about."

Parliament members are also expressing disbelief that

Entwistle's predecessor, Mark Thompson, who is slated to head the *New York Times* Company starting next month, knew nothing. P.D. James, the famous crime novelist, said the other day that "Thompson has dropped George Entwistle right in it by stepping down as the BBC's director-general when he did." James added that "It seems everyone knew about Jimmy Savile." Everyone, apparently, but Thompson.

Just recently the head of the National Association for People Abused in Childhood, Esther Rantzen, admitted that she knew Savile had abused children, but never did anything about it. "We made him into the Jimmy Savile who was untouchable, who nobody could criticize." Now that Savile is dead, there is less justification for not telling the truth. Which is why Thompson is sure to be grilled by Parliament.

---

## **DeGENERES LETS LANGE RIP NUNS**

Bill Donohue comments on yesterday's episode of "Ellen":

Jessica Lange is mostly known as King Kong's girlfriend, though she has found a new life bashing nuns in the FX disaster, "American Horror Story: Asylum." Joining with her yesterday was the ever sensitive Ellen DeGeneres, a woman who bravely stands up against gay bashing. But when it comes to Catholic bashing, she is quite at home acting as an accomplice. Never once did she challenge Lange.

Lange and DeGeneres had a good time feeding the worst possible stereotype of "mean" nuns. Lange admitted, with typical Hollywood brilliance, that she "wasn't raised in any kind of religious situation, so, I mean, we didn't go to church or anything." We believe her. In discussing nuns, words like "insanity" and "evil" just rolled off their incoherent lips.



Lange ends by saying that her character, Sister Jude, “is the result of this kind of crazy, wild, drunken, loose life she lived before.” Sounds like even Kong would have dumped this tramp.

---

## DOCUMENTARY AIRS TONIGHT ON SAVILE



This is the sixth installment of Bill Donohue’s report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

Over the weekend, the BBC denied reports that Peter Rippon was resigning; he was the person who spiked a “Newsnight” documentary on BBC icon Jimmy Savile last December. Within hours, Rippon resigned.

Tonight, “Panorama” will air an hour-long special on the BBC scandal and cover-up. George Entwistle, the BBC’s director-general, refuses to speak to the media, but that hasn’t stopped his own journalists from accusing him of misleading the public about the spiked documentary. For example, here is what *The Daily Telegraph* is saying today: “Liz MacKean, a “Newsnight” reporter, told the programme that Mr Rippon had enthusiastically given the go-ahead for the film to be broadcast but had an ‘abrupt change’ of heart and appeared to be ‘under pressure’ from above.” Furthermore, Newsnight producer Meirion Jones says she warned Rippon of “substantial damage” to the BBC’s reputation.

For reasons like these, an editorial in yesterday’s *The Sunday*

*Telegraph* said, “It is becoming clear that there were many warning signs within the BBC that Savile’s behaviour was not merely odd, it was criminal.”

Bill Oddie, a former actor, jacks up the heat on Entwistle’s predecessor, Mark Thompson; Thompson is slated to take over as the new president and CEO of the *New York Times* Company. Oddie says “everybody knew” within the BBC that Savile was a pervert who preyed on children. When asked how he could explain Thompson’s claim that he never knew a bad thing about Savile, Oddie exclaimed, “You worked at the BBC and you don’t know anything about it? That is absolute nonsense.”

British pundit Jane Genova is even more pointed: “Will Thompson go down in this, much like the late Joe Paterno did with the Jerry Sandusky sex abuse scandal?” Stay tuned.

---

## SAVILE’S EXPLOITS WERE NO SECRET



This is the fifth installment of Bill Donohue’s report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

It was reported over the weekend that BBC celebrity Jimmy Savile was so sick that he sexually assaulted his own niece on two occasions. Worse, her grandmother knew it all along but kept her mouth shut: grandma’s brother, Jimmy, made sure she had a very comfortable lifestyle.

Savile’s exploits were no secret. Here are a few examples. In

1976, a 9-year-old boy was molested by Savile in his dressing room, and was caught in the act by a man who simply said, "Oops," and shut the door. At about the same time, a teenage girl, whose father was a pedophile friend of Savile's, was abused by Savile. In 1985, Savile recorded a BBC song where he bragged about becoming a dancehall boss so he could meet girls. And no one thought this odd? In 1992, after a 7-year-old boy was asked by Savile to take off his clothes in a performance with male strippers, a complaint was filed with the authorities, but nothing came of it. Indeed, the BBC called the episode "a lighthearted item."

In 2000, Savile was finally accused in a TV documentary of pedophilia. But he got away with it. Astonishingly, Savile actually said he intentionally lied about not liking kids because it was a convenient decoy. "It's easier for me as a single man to say I don't like children because it puts a lot of salacious tabloid people off the hunt," he admitted.

George Entwistle, the director-general of the BBC who succeeded Mark Thompson, wants us to believe that he was clueless about Savile's predatory behavior. "Jimmy Savile was regarded by a great many people as odd, a bit peculiar and that was something I was aware some people believed," he recently said. Just peculiar? Entwistle is now refusing to talk to the media, and Thompson, who is set to become the new president and CEO of the *New York Times*, isn't exactly making himself available for comment either. Look for this to soon change. More to come later today.

---

# SAVILE WAS “CLASSIC CHILD ABUSER”



This is the fourth installment of Bill Donohue’s report on the BBC sexual abuse scandal and its implications for the *New York Times*:

Here is what MailOnline said last week about the victims of the late BBC entertainer Jimmy Savile: “The picture they paint is of a ‘classic’ child abuser, targeting vulnerable youngsters at schools, hospitals and children’s homes...He plied them with treats—under the noses of teachers, doctors and BBC managers—and took them for rides in his Rolls-Royce...Savile sexually abused them in his car, his BBC dressing room, on hospital wards and in the bedrooms of girls at Duncroft boarding school in Surrey.” Former BBC chief Mark Thompson, who will soon head the *New York Times* Company, says it’s all news to him.

Some of those who got to know Savile the best saw him as a Michael Jackson-type predator. Janet Cope worked for him for 32 years and here is how she describes him today: “He was like Peter Pan, forever surrounding himself with youngsters.” Acting like the “classic child abuser” that he was, Savile sought out the most vulnerable young people to exploit. For example, just this week, a disabled female actress, Julie Fernandez, confessed that she was groped by him when she was 14.

The more dysfunctional the youngster, the more attractive they were to Savile. Two days ago it was reported that he preyed on kids at an institution for emotionally disturbed girls; at least five former pupils from Duncroft have come forth to tell what happened. As one of them said, “Jimmy treated Duncroft

like a paedophile sweet shop." So why didn't they report him? "The girls at Duncroft had been sent there by the courts for prostitution, drugs and because they tried to kill themselves," Toni Townsend said. "Who would have believed us against Saint Jimmy?"

Savile's predatory behavior extends back decades. English folk legend Meic Stevens revealed this week that in the 1960s, "It was well known in the music business that he [Savile] was like that, that he liked to mess around with underage girls." Savile was also generous with his victims: Stevens was offered underage girls to abuse in the back seat of his Rolls-Royce. More to come next week