

BBC AND THE CATHOLIC CHURCH



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

New York Times op-ed page columnist Joe Nocera has asked some tough questions about Mark Thompson's knowledge of the Jimmy Savile matter [click [here](#)]; Thompson, who will head the *Times* Company on Monday, was running the BBC when a report exposing BBC child rapist Jimmy Savile was spiked late last year. Concerning the question of whether Thompson ever heard about rumors of Savile's predatory behavior, Nocera cuts him a break, saying that "given the byzantine nature of the BBC bureaucracy, these are plausible denials."

Nocera's position is not without merit. The only reason I mention this is because of the double standard held by some of the harshest critics of the Catholic Church: they say that Pope John Paul II must have known about predatory priests in the employ of the Holy See, and that Pope Benedict XVI (Cardinal Ratzinger under John Paul), must also have known. Yes, of course they knew there was a problem, but just how big it was, and exactly who was involved is another matter altogether.

Thompson defends himself, in part, by saying that the enormous size of the BBC—23,000 employees, eight TV channels, 50 radio stations—made it impossible for him to know details that were known to others. Again, this position is not without merit. But the BBC is tiny next to the Catholic Church.

The pope governs an institution with over 1 billion members residing in every part of the globe. Besides the Roman Curia

and the College of Cardinals, those who work for the pope include: more than 5,000 bishops; 400,000 priests; almost 40,000 permanent deacons; 55,000 non-ordained male religious; over 700,000 female religious; and over 100,000 seminarians. They work in over 3,000 dioceses serving some 220,000 parishes throughout the world.

If Thompson is to be cut some slack, wouldn't justice demand that the pope be treated at least as generously? It should now be clear why I wrote these 12 reports.

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 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.

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

SAVILE'S SICK PAST HAUNTS BBC/NYT



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

Scotland Yard is hot on the trail of Jimmy Savile's victims,

and there appears to be no end to them. Not only are the top cops pursuing 340 inquiries, dating back to 1959, they are being assisted by 14 other police agencies. Savile, the celebrity BBC icon, was not only a child rapist, he was known for groping women on the air. Indeed, he may even have had sex with the dead.

One of the many investigations now underway is being undertaken by Stoke Mandeville Hospital, a venue where Savile is alleged to have abused young disabled patients. The hospital is probing his "unaccompanied mortuary visits." They have reason to do so.

In 1990, Savile admitted that he liked to hang around Buckinghamshire hospital in the wee hours of the morning. He said in his *Q* magazine interview that he took great pleasure being alone with the dead. "One of my jobs is to take away the deceased. You can look after somebody, be alone with somebody, who has lived a whole lifetime, and I'm just saying goodbye."

It may very well be that Savile, a rough approximation of Dick Clark and Michael Jackson rolled into one, did more than pay his last respects to the dead. Why else would he volunteer, "I'm not a necrophiliac." After all, the child rapist always said he never abused children.

How far up the chain of command did knowledge of Savile's perversions extend? George Entwistle, the new BBC director general, will appear before Parliament next week amidst several independent investigations. If Entwistle is being called, it is only a matter of time before they call Mark Thompson to testify: he has been working at the BBC since 1979, and was the director general at the time of a spiked BBC investigation of Savile. He is also the incoming president and CEO of the *New York Times* Company. More tomorrow.

THE MAN BEHIND BBC/NYT NIGHTMARE



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

When BBC icon Jimmy Savile died on October 29, 2011, he was mourned by the BBC faithful. Mark Thompson, the BBC's general director and now president/CEO-elect of the *New York Times* Company, said he was "very sad" to hear of his death. But many of those who recently grieved would now like to strangle Savile: senior BBC figure Jeremy Vine said this week that Savile is "one of the most serious predatory paedophiles in criminal history—and he was on our doorstep."

The flamboyant, cigar-chomping, big-time charitable fundraiser was, in the words of *New York Times* columnist Bill Keller, "a combination of Dick Clark of 'American Bandstand' and Jerry Lewis, maestro of the muscular dystrophy telethon." This is true but incomplete: add Liberace, Michael Jackson and Pee-wee Herman to the mix, and the portrait is complete.

Savile was Britain's first DJ. He was also a TV host, miner, wrestler, dancehall manager, cyclist, marathon runner, book reviewer, Mensa member, and a child rapist. His most popular gig was hosting "Top of the Pops," the legendary U.K. music show. His own program, "Jim'll Fix It," lasted almost 20 years; it allowed him to make promises to kids which he tried to fulfill. Unfortunately, for a lot of these kids, Jimmy

fixed them alright—they were used to fulfill his own sick needs. He was a switch-hitting, AC/DC, equal opportunity molester who preyed on boys as well as girls (he favored girls), both pre-pubescent and post-pubescent.

Everyone knew Sir Jimmy was bizarre, the kind of happy crackpot that was charming, if not engaging. Many suspected he was a pervert, but no one—not a single person over six decades—did anything about it. The question on the table is whether Mark Thompson had anything to do with nixing an investigation into Savile's sordid behavior. More tomorrow.

BLACK CLOUD OVER INCOMING NEW YORK TIMES CEO



The
New York
Times

Bill Donohue comments as follows:

Mark Thompson is slated to start next month as the new president and CEO of the *New York Times* Company. He comes in under a cloud of suspicion. Almost a year ago, a decision was made at the BBC to kill a “Newsnight” investigation into what is now becoming the most astonishing sexual abuse scandal in the history of the United Kingdom: Thompson was the director general at the BBC from 2004 to 2012, and serious questions have been raised about his role in squashing the investigation. He denies wrongdoing. The person of interest is suspected child rapist and serial predator Jimmy Savile, a celebrity icon who worked at the BBC for more than 25 years.

His predatory behavior extends back six decades, and some of his sexual abuse took place on the premises of the BBC.

I have personally collected a great deal of information on this subject and will have much more to say about my findings. My interest is twofold: both the BBC and the *New York Times* have been among the harshest critics of the homosexual scandal that took place more than a quarter century ago in the Catholic Church. Let's see how they react to a little "sunshine," as they like to call it. I'm just beaming.

We know the BBC is already in deep trouble over this issue—two internal investigations are under way—but it cannot be trusted to report on itself. Indeed, contradictory accounts have already been offered, involving what Thompson knew and when he knew it. British Culture Secretary Maria Miller has called off an independent inquiry, but she may not have the last word. We support British Labor chief Ed Miliband's call for a probe.

Bill Keller got out in front of this issue by writing a piece for the *New York Times* on its website; it appeared over the weekend, and it is reprinted today in the *Times*-owned *International Herald Tribune*. But why hasn't his article been printed in the op-ed page of the *Times*?

Stay tuned. You won't be bored.