



Sir Michael Lyons  
Chairman, BBC Trust  
Room 211  
35 Marylebone High Street  
London W1U 4AA

By e-mail and letter

5th August, 2009

Dear Sir Michael,

Thank you for your kind reply of 3<sup>rd</sup> June to my letter of 2<sup>nd</sup> June, and for passing it on to Mark Thompson so that he might reply to me directly. So far, I have had no such reply, or indeed an acknowledgement from his office.

I was disappointed that neither you nor Mr. Thompson had time to answer the suggestion I put to you in our Parliamentary meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> July.

This is that the BBC remains editorially biased:

- (a) In favour of the anthropogenic global warming (AGW) theory; and
- (b) Against those who believe that the UK would be better off out of the EU.

The first of these suggestions is the subject of a specific complaint I made against the *Today* programme, which I am now passing to the Editorial Standards Committee in view of Ceri Thomas's unsatisfactory replies (all attached).

Can you tell me whether the BBC held a seminar on 26<sup>th</sup> January, 2006, at which its editorial line to support AGW was agreed? If so, who was present, and who spoke on each side of the debate?

The second suggestion is more within the sphere of my own personal knowledge and experience, and I regret that the points I put to you in my e-mail of 2<sup>nd</sup> June remain unanswered. Indeed, *Today's* treatment of Nigel Farage sank to new lows on 8<sup>th</sup> June, and this is the subject of another specific programme complaint (attached).

And then the BBC decided to airbrush UKIP out of the recent Norwich bye-election, even after it had finished second in the European Parliamentary Elections on 4<sup>th</sup> June. The attached letter of 28<sup>th</sup> July from Nigel Farage to David Jordan is a model of restraint in the circumstances.

**Continued .../**

You say in your letter of 3<sup>rd</sup> June that “the Trust does not get involved unless, for example, it relates to a breach of the BBC’s editorial standards”.

So I come back to where I started, yet again. The BBC’s failure to explain to the British people how the EU works and how it affects their daily lives is also an editorial failure, and I am beginning to suspect that, like AGW, it is deliberate. Let me be more specific.

In its reply to the Wilson report in May 2005, the BBC claimed that its editorial line on “Europe” was and would henceforth be as follows:

“With specific reference to Europe our aims are:

- to offer our audiences across all platforms clear, accurate and accessible information about the way EU institutions work and their impact on UK laws and life;
- to ensure impartiality by reflecting the widest possible range of voices and viewpoints about EU issues; to test those viewpoints using evidence-based argument or informed opinion;
- to demonstrate the relationships between the different member states and the European Union;
- to reveal and explain to our audiences areas of contentious fact and disputed principle.”

The BBC’s words, not mine. Yet, as far as I can tell, the BBC has done none of this. Surely the Trustees should now instruct the executive to fulfil that promise?

I have been asked to address the UKIP conference in Southport on the 4<sup>th</sup> of September on “UKIP and the BBC”. I would be grateful for your reply about editorial policy before then, and for that of Mark Thompson about its execution, so that I can share it with my audience. It would also be helpful to have the Executive’s reply to Nigel Farage by then, of course.

I look forward to hearing from both of you.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Pearson of Rannoch". Below the signature is a horizontal line.

Lord Pearson of Rannoch