

COMPLAINT RE MORE4 "TRUE STORIES: WIKILEAKS: SECRETS AND LIES"

Dear Adam Burton,

Thank you for your email. I attach various documents as evidence of my complaint against the More4 True Stories documentary. As previously notified, the programme contained multiple breaches of the Fairness and Privacy sections of the Ofcom Broadcasting Code, the full details of which are set out below.

The documents are:

A - 6/7/2011 Email from Tilly Cowan, Assistant Producer, Oxford Films to my assistant Sarah Harrison

B - 6/7/2011 Email from Sarah Harrison to Tilly Cowan

C - 7/7/211 Email from Tilly Cowan to Sarah Harrison

D - 14/7/2011 Email from Tilly Cowan to Sarah Harrison

E - 21/7/2011 Email Sarah Harrison clarification request

F - 22/7/2011 Email Tilly Cowan clarification response

G - 18/8/2011 Email Tilly Cowan to Sarah Harrison

H - 22/8/2011 Email Sarah Harrison to Tilly Cowan

I - 23/8/2011 Email Tilly Cowan to Sarah Harrison

J - 17/11/2011 Email Julian Assange to Patrick Forbes, Producer, Oxford Films

K - 18/11/2011 Email Patrick Forbes to Julian Assange

L - Link to transcript of phone call Julian Assange to Patrick Forbes 16/11/2011 <http://wikileaks.org/Guardian-s-WikiLeaks-Secrets-and.html> (this link also sets out many other substantive points of my complaint)

M - Link to Wikileaks Statement on Daniel Domscheit-Berg 20/8/2011 <http://wlcentral.org/node/2171>

N - MOU Guardian Letter for Package 3 - 30/7/2010 (PDF)

The first thing to say is that the above emails clearly show misrepresentation and deception on the part of Oxford Films to gain my collaboration in the documentary (breach of Clause 7.14 - Broadcasters or programme makers should not normally obtain or seek information, audio, pictures or an agreement to contribute through misrepresentation or deception). The producers claimed (Doc C): "We are setting out to make a definitive factual account of the WikiLeaks affair. It will focus on the core of the story, the substance, content and impact of the Iraq, Afghan and diplomatic cables, rather than the way in which the media and others have handled them, or any unrelated legal

proceedings....". Wikileaks' participation was premised on this being the case. (cf Clause 7.3 - 'contributors should... be told the nature and purpose of the programme') Other representative examples are: Doc A - "We are honestly not at all interested in the personal life of Julian" (see my point below about content highly prejudicial to my appeal against extradition six days after broadcast, and ongoing legal case/s. The provisions of Clause 7.3 regarding preview rights discussed below is also relevant here); Doc C - "but this is not a media-focused story I want to stress" (cf Clause 7.3 - 'be informed about...wherever possible, the nature of other likely contributors'). This was such a crucial point for us we sought clarification (Doc E) but were never told that Nick Davies or Daniel Domscheit-Berg had been interviewed, despite all interviews with key contributors having been completed and editing started by the time my interview took place: Doc G - "it would actually suit us to interview Julian after all the other interviews -not least because they're happening in the next two weeks and will have been completed by the 2nd September." (cf Clause 7.3 - 'be made aware of any significant changes to the programme as it develops which might reasonably affect their original consent to participate and which might cause material unfairness'). I still knew nothing of either the involvement or extent of these two interviewees (or James Ball) by the time of my phone call to the producer on 16th November (Doc L).

My assistant specifically told Tilly Cowan in a phone call prior to the pre-interview meeting on 17 August how the Guardian and Domscheit-Berg had hidden agendas and were not credible. None of the other media partners she suggested the producers contact - and nearly all of the names mentioned in the above emails and during the pre-interview meeting: Josh Steiber, Ethan McCord, Naomi Colvin, a Kenyan contact, etc - do not appear in the finished programme. The documentary interviews eight WikiLeaks critics, five from the Guardian, but only one person from WikiLeaks, and none from more than 90 other organizations who have worked with WikiLeaks, with the exception of two brief interviews with Der Spiegel. No opportunity to partake was offered to anyone with expertise to speak on the Swedish case (cf Clause 7.9 - 'broadcasters should take reasonable care ... that anyone whose omission could be unfair to an individual or organisation has been offered an opportunity to contribute'. See also my detailed notes below on the editing of the programme.); Lastly, Doc F - "We would like to have Julian in the film because he was of course at the epicentre of the entire story and can tell us how it happened in more comprehensive detail than anyone" and Doc I - "we want Julian's account of events as the central protagonist... Julian was the driving force of this whole event, and at the epicentre as the story unfolded, and therefore it is essential to hear his take on what happened" are both deeply deceptive, given that the finished programme actually contains 8 minutes' footage from my interview, compared with 30 minutes of airtime given to Guardian interviewees and 6 minutes to Domscheit-Berg, who had little to no involvement in Wikileaks post-February 2010 and none at all after 25 August 2010 (Docs J and M). (cf Clause 7.2 - 'broadcasters and programme makers should normally be fair in their dealings with potential contributors to programmes unless, exceptionally, it is justified to do otherwise.')

It is clear from the above that my participation in the programme did not meet the criteria of 'informed consent' and therefore the producer cannot rely on the release form signed by me on 11 November. I formally withdrew my consent to the use of all interview footage, footage supplied by Sunshine Press Productions and footage of Ellingham Hall on 17 November (Doc J). Consent to use Wikileaks' trademarks and logo, which features extensively in the programme, was never

given in the first place. No payment was made to us either in respect of my interview or for footage provided by us at AP rates that was used in the programme.

Secondly, the programme as broadcast on 29 November contained material highly prejudicial to my High Court extradition appeal, due to be heard six days later on 5 December, including other interviewees who have no first-hand knowledge of events discussing the Swedish allegations in detail. I am legally barred from publicly discussing the allegations against me so the use of such material introduces inherent bias in the programme. No attempt to remedy this by interviewing any of the lawyers, prosecutors, legal experts or witnesses with the authority to provide a background, explain or discuss the controversy in Sweden was made. (See also my detailed notes on editing below in respect of remarks attributed to Donald Bostrom in the programme.) Clearly, the way the programme deals with the events in Sweden – and the inordinate amount of time spent on them – breaches the provisions of the Fairness and Privacy clauses many times over: Clause 7.2, I have not been treated fairly; Clause 7.3, I was not offered the opportunity to preview the programme (while the Guardian was – see Patrick Forbes' comments re preview rights in Doc K) or given any information about whether I would be able to effect changes to it; Clause 7.6, the programme has not been edited fairly – see my detailed notes below; Clause 7.7, guarantees that the programme would not cover "the personal life of Julian" or "any unrelated legal proceedings" were not honoured (Docs A, C); Clause 7.8, the re-use of footage shot in a nightclub in Iceland has been spliced together with highly defamatory remarks about me in a way that creates unfairness; Clause 7.9, material facts and potential interviewees have been presented, disregarded or omitted in a way that is unfair to me – see my detailed notes on the editing of the programme and my comments about an 'anti-American' agenda by the Guardian below; Clause 7.11, despite the producer's claims in a phone call (Doc L) that I am given the 'last word' "absolutely every time, the sequence cuts to you", I am not given adequate or timely opportunity to respond to significant, and libellous, allegations of wrongdoing – see detailed notes on edit; Clause 7.14, the producers misrepresented how the programme would treat the Swedish case to gain my collaboration; Clause 8.10, my reasonable expectation of privacy has been infringed by the re-use of footage of me dancing in an Icelandic nightclub – the videographer filmed under conditions of confidentiality, which he admits in the original YouTube posting.

As noted in my 17 November letter to Patrick Forbes (Doc J): "While you and Channel 4 have both OFCOM and legal obligations to present accurately and impartially, I note here that you have extra moral and legal obligations in relation to the courts and to myself. Your broadcast issues on November 29. On December 5, two high court judges at the Royal Courts of Justice will decide whether I am to be extradited or whether I may appeal to the Supreme Court. Your promo, broadcast and resulting publicity will occur during the time when the judges have retired to consider the matter. Given that the legal basis of the appeal is entirely whether the requested appeal point is of general "public interest", the judgement is political and will be influenced by your broadcast. If the broadcast is adverse, it may lead to a chain of events which would see my incarceration or killing in the United States. Similarly, other courts, including the Grand Jury currently sitting in Washington, a future and highly politicised Swedish criminal trial, Manning's military trial, a future criminal trial against myself in the United States, and/or the administrative hearings currently being conducted by the European Commission into the banking blockade against

WikiLeaks may be affected. Likewise, the political will of the Australian and British governments to intervene on my or Mr Manning's behalf may be adversely affected by untruths or partial reportage broadcast by the film or its promo."

A third point is that two very clear themes emerge in the final edited version which betray the fact that the programme is driven by the Guardian's own agenda, and that of a producer eager for US market sales. First, the programme makes concerted attempts to redefine my role – through interview questions put to me and by other means – and returns frequently to the question of how I am to be defined – hacker, activist, systematizer, engineer, as anything but a journalist or publisher it seems. Second, the introduction of the word 'American' in wholly inaccurate contexts, ie in relation to 'informants', 'dirty tricks' etc, occurs throughout. This is deliberate, untruthful and designed to paint me as 'anti-American' and the Guardian as pro-US. I've highlighted a few instances in capitals in my detailed notes on the editing of the programme below, but the programme contains many other less obvious examples of this agenda-setting by the Guardian.

The Guardian's senior investigations executive David Leigh was made an advisor to the production and did "timetabling" and "fact-checking" but this was not disclosed to Wikileaks or to the audience (see Docs C, F, I, J, K, L). The Guardian was paid for its involvement, whereas Wikileaks was not – this too was not disclosed to the audience (Docs J, K, L). I do not accept Patrick Forbes' assertion that this payment related purely to commercial rights (I cannot see any Guardian material in the finished programme to which this would apply). Neither does the programme make any mention of material facts regarding Wikileaks' ongoing dispute with the Guardian – I list these below in the Further breaches of Ofcom's Broadcasting Code section. Lastly, The Guardian was given preview privileges for the documentary whereas WikiLeaks was refused such access to fact-check (Doc K). Luke Harding and James Ball from the Guardian previewed it on 27 November 2011 – both tweeted about it. Note that in Forbes' letter he says preview rights are only granted in advance within limited parameters, which is inequitable and unfair treatment if agreed with Guardian staff but not Wikileaks. (Relevant clauses: 7.2, 7.3 – other contributors, significant changes, rights and obligations, previews, 7.9, 7.11, 7.14)

Further breaches of Ofcom's Broadcasting Code

Clause 7.7 – We were told in the pre-interview meeting there would be no narrator (see Doc L and my notes on the editing, which show that much of the defamation of myself and my organisation is done via the voiceover narration.) Patrick Forbes also blatantly denies that there is voiceover narration during my phone call to him of 17 November (Doc L).

Clause 7.9 – The programme omits crucial facts:

- The banking blockade is not even mentioned, neither is the ongoing, documented in the public record, legal harassment of WikiLeaks volunteers by US authorities.
- That David Leigh broke a written agreement (Doc N) and revealed a secret decryption key, which led to the publishing of the unredacted cables. Patrick Forbes said over the telephone that the interview was made prior to the "fuss over the password" (Doc L). This argument does not hold water as the final programme includes events up to my High Court appearance on 2 November. The programme completely

obscures the fact that David Leigh was responsible for the publication of the unredacted cables, and says that this was an incomprehensible and reprehensible decision made by WikiLeaks.

- It repeats – with embellishment this time– the libellous statement attributed by David Leigh to me that “they’re informants, they deserve to die”. The programme does not mention that John Goetz and Holgar Stark of Der Spiegel, who were also present at the dinner, have no recollection of me making such a remark. In a meeting with Oxford Films John Goetz specifically denied my making this remark but was never asked about it when actually interviewed. I have denied it publicly many times but am given no opportunity to respond directly to this allegation. This is intentional libel.
- That David Leigh violated a written legal agreement between WikiLeaks and The Guardian (Doc N) that the material would not be passed to third parties (The New York Times), published before the publishing date, or be kept in an insecure manner. David Leigh has admitted that he deliberately went behind editor Alan Rusbridger’s back to break the agreement in a case study by Columbia University: <http://jrnetsolserver.shorensteince...>
- Daniel Domscheit-Berg is interviewed as a critic of WikiLeaks, but no attention is given to the role he has played in a) stealing funds, sabotaging the organisation b) deleting (according to his account) thousands of submissions revealing war crimes and corruption in finance institutions, profiteering and unleashing the chain of events that led to the publishing of the unredacted diplomatic cables (see Doc M). Despite two public statements issued by Wikileaks about Domscheit-Berg, on 9 February 2011 and 20 August 2011 and later provided directly to the producer, no attempt has been made to fact-check this individual and he has been misrepresented as “Wikileaks Spokesperson”.

Clause 7.11 – I am not given appropriate and timely opportunity to respond to serious allegations of wrongdoing:

- No opportunity is given to respond directly to Nick Davies’ extraordinary allegation that I have lied about the Swedish case – about which he has no first-hand knowledge – and the editing further creates the impression that ‘untruthfulness’ relates to the Swedish allegations. I am legally barred from speaking about the allegations or the criminal investigation but Wikileaks could have countered his remarks about ‘US dirty tricks’ with, say, the actual tweet (note, singular) from our Twitter archive.
- No opportunity is given to respond directly to the allegation of “informants deserve to die” remark – Wikileaks can provide evidence John Goetz/Holgar Stark cannot recall the remark being made.
- No opportunity is given to respond to the libellous statement made that the release of unredacted cables was a reprehensible and irresponsible decision by Wikileaks.

Notes on edit

In the pre-title sequence the narrator v/o states: “Have the actions of one man turned triumph to disaster?” over screenshot of newspaper headline “Julian Assange Swedish Rape Claims”.

Claims my teenage nickname was Mendax “given to lying” instead of Splendide Mendax “nobly untruthful”, which is a teenage joke on handles being inherently untrue. It is self-referential, not a psychoanalysis 20 years ahead of its time! DDB is described as recruited as a German deputy, Berlin-based computer programmer, labelled as “Wikileaks spokesperson”. He was only a spokesperson in Germany, was only involved with Wikileaks from 2008, with little or no involvement from February 2010 and none after 25 August 2010. He was not present during any of the following releases: Collateral Murder, Afghan War Diaries, Iraq War Logs, Cablegate.

Screen text “April 5, 2010 Washington Press Club” c/to clip from Collateral Murder with v/o “edited for maximum impact, he calls it Collateral Murder” - no explanation that the full original footage released in tandem. C/to comments on it from DDB, despite his non-involvement.

Section on Manning equates me with Adrian Lamo, described in screen text as Grey Hat Hacker and of No Fixed Abode and “one of Assange’s few rivals for most famous hacker in the world. He earned his cult status after breaking into a string of secure databases” - this narrative link implies I am still a hacker breaking into secure databases, as opposed to something I did more than 20 years ago.

After Lamo i/v, cut is to Guardian headline “Hacker turns in US soldier over Wikileaks Iraq video” and DDB i/v explaining it’s “worst thing” for leak orgs when potential source is arrested. Narrator v/o over Berlin street scenes - “arrest prompts a furious row within Wikileaks....docs arrive anon so is Manning their source? And if he is, what responsibility do they owe him? WL has a mountain of unpublished secrets from same source... Julian wants to keep going, Daniel doesn’t”, then the cut is back to DDB i/v. The supposed ‘last word’ the producer claims is always given to me is clearly an answer to a tangential question: “well, it is nice to help courageous people who seek justice but they enter into a larger process...” (I have already explained in an earlier i/v segment Wikileaks’ procedures“ for source protection purposes”) then c/to DDB again: “we should have stopped thinking about ourselves at that moment”. No explanation given that from February 2010 DDB had no direct involvement in Wikileaks’ work. After ad break there is an i/v section where I describe myself as “systematiser” and “engineer” (apart from the very beginning, none of the questions put to interviewees are ever audible). Narrator v/o over footage of Guardian offices “BM’s arrest leaves Wikileaks split over what to do” - no ‘split’ internally, DDB was not ‘internal’ at this point.

Long section with i/vs Nick Davies, Rusbridger, Leigh, Keller, Schmitt, me, Georg Mascolo, John Goetz detailing the media alliance setup. Talks of security arrangements - “all very cloak and dagger” says Schmitt, Leigh talks of “a shredder” - but omits that Guardian broke them all.

Next section details analysis of Afghan War Logs using combination of v/o narration, Leigh, Schmitt, Davies i/vs, tracking screenshots of war logs data and footage from Afghanistan (some very odd - sepia-toned/clearly dramatized), hospitalized casualties. Deals with TF373 but Guardian takes all the credit - omits that I found this story by searching ‘children’ in the AFG data and told the Guardian about it.

Cuts to i/v with me explaining that higher levels of secrecy (than the data's classified status) "leaked through into it". Part 2 concludes with Schmitt i/v about asking me about BM, the "never heard his name" quote, Goetz i/v saying I'm just the middleman, leading into severe criticism of Lamo.

Part 3: Starts with i/v segment where I'm asked whether I see myself as "journalist" or "activist", then Leigh i/v starts ad hominem attacks such as "carried himself like a cult leader" and "we started making jokes early on that people around Julian were drinking the Koolaid" c/to Schmitt about the skipping incident, back to Leigh about sleeping in my clothes "all these things made you feel you were dealing with someone who wasn't quite from the same planet as the rest of us"

Screen text July 10, 2010 (note US date format throughout programme - obviously eye on US sales potential). V/o narration: "an unexpected issue threatens the mould-breaking alliance between hacks and hacker" - in line with programme's obvious theme throughout to redefine me as not a journalist. I/v with Davies explains moral and legal reasons for redaction. Cut to Leigh "WL had a mindset that was very different to our mindset. They wanted to dump it all out. 'That's what we do' said Julian". Leigh tells his little story - says it stuck in everyone's minds (we can counter with evidence from John Goetz but are not given the opportunity to do so) - and quote is now "Well, they're AMERICAN informants, they deserve to die" - This is new embroidery, he's never included 'American' before. Leigh i/v is intercut with soft-focus footage of a night-time restaurant, to add authenticity. I've denied this libel multiple times publicly yet 'last word' given after Leigh makes allegation is a cut-back to me saying "there was no row at all, only hints of a conversation" - obviously not a response to a direct question about this allegation.

V/o gives impression that dispute with the Guardian is only about the treatment of informant names - i/vs with Schmitt and Mascolo giving their positions, then Davies saying "what finally got through to Julian was the political point..." Schmitt i/v "to his credit, overnight he did rethink this..." (so earlier i/vs give misleading impression of the length of this dispute). Narrator: "dispute over, the project's back on". Series of i/vs with newspaper editors, all self-congratulatory. Leigh v/o over Frontline footage "we turned Julian and Wikileaks into global rock stars".

Nick Davies i/v and v/o says "The Times went to WL website and found documents which clearly put into jeopardy the safety of identifiable Afghan civilians" - leads into highly edited soundbite "blood on hands" (repeated twice) contextualised by Nick Davies saying WL had "handed the initiative back to the Pentagon" and "we had just made their job easier for them or to be clear Julian Assange had just made their job easier for them" - then edits back to full soundbite included the words "could have..." No opportunity to respond given to me.

DDB - recruited as a German deputy, labelled as "Wikileaks spokesperson" - is not challenged by interviewer when he claims "we hadn't taken care of redactions" "things shifted to publishing for the sake of publishing" "becoming the kind of organisation that does things because no one can stop you" - ie he had little to no involvement in WL operations post-February 2010 and none after 25 Aug. This information was published by Wikileaks in February 2011 so producer should have fact-checked and prepped interviewer properly. No

mention of sabotage being the reason for DDB suspension – published on Wikileaks website from 1 Sept – so facts were available to producer. No opportunity to respond is given to me. Instead c/to i/v with Chris Heben, US Navy Seal/poss. member of Task Force 373. Cut to quote US official that the leaks puts troops in danger. Finally cuts to response from me about informant names in Afghan Diaries.

Part 4: opens with interview with me re our “precarious position” and that threats against WL were the reason for giving copy of cables to Guardian “for safekeeping”. Cuts to i/v with Leigh about password, says told “it would expire in a matter of hours”/ treats it as “souvenir”. Does mention it finishes with “this little hash symbol” – plonker! Leigh finishes with news of phone call telling him “Julian’s gone to Sweden and got arrested for rape”.

Davies i/v re hearing the news – intercut with Espressen headline and shots of London – says he doesn’t believe it initially, discusses various explanations including “outside possibility it could be some wrongdoing by the US”, finishes with Donald Bostrom telling him “My friend I’m sorry to tell you, it’s true”. No context to explain that Bostrom only telling him the news was true, not the allegations (clear from Bostrom’s police witness statement that he doesn’t believe the allegations). No opportunity to partake offered to Bostrom. No opportunity to respond given to me. Using this i/v segment therefore introduces bias which cannot be remedied.

Dancing in Iceland footage with Leigh v/o “Julian had upset these two women by his incontinent sexual behaviour which had involved, it would appear, jumping on them and not using a condom, even though they had very much wanted him to”. “After he had had sex with these women in quick succession and misconducted himself with both of them, they had got together and one of the things they had wanted him to do was to have an Aids test”.... Quotes Bostrom (Bostrom not given opportunity to take part in programme – he would make it clear that he told police he doesn’t believe AA’s story) “by the time he’s agreed it’s 10 past 5 on a Friday and you can’t find a clinic open so they go to the police.” (Littered with factual inaccuracies, ie. they were already at police station 4pm, using words like “jumping on” is outrageous libel, deliberately prejudicial to my case.)

Cuts to tracking shot of Guardian headline “Wikileaks founder Julian Assange in web furore over Swedish rape claims” then c/to DDB i/v – again subtitled as “wikileaks spokesperson” and claiming he heard about it “while on holiday” – “it was bad.” (screen shot of Espressen frontpage) “However we tried to approach this internally it boiled down to the fact...” (not challenged by interviewer although easy for producer to factcheck DDB was on holiday in Iceland and no longer involved in WL by this date. Met Kristinn, Birgirtta, Ingi and Anke same day). Narrator v/o: “Assange talks to the police once then leaves Sweden, claiming this isn’t just a rape inquiry but something more sinister”. Maybe false suspicion, not claim. Cut to Sky news? presenter saying “Julian Assange says his own country’s intelligence service warned him of a dirty tricks campaign shortly before he was the subject of a rape allegation. Assange says all the allegations against him are untrue”. Cut back to DDB “that’s what he told everybody. That he had been warned about some kind of subversive CIA attack. That was the initial response that’s been printed all over the world. That’s what people started to believe...” I’m not given any opportunity to respond directly to these libels.

Cut to news footage outside February hearing. Cut back to DDB i/v saying "we said that maybe means you step back for a bit". Cut to ITV News footage of Jemima Khan at December hearing.

Nick Davies i/v starts: "to see Julian tweeting and giving mainstream media comment which clearly suggested this was some kind of AMERICAN dirty trick was very distressing because the guy is supposed to stand for truth and that wasn't true". Claims WL tweet re 'dirty tricks' is that I have "misled the world by claiming, or hinting, that there was some kind of AMERICAN conspiracy behind it". There is no mention of the fact that the first prosecutor cancelled the arrest warrant and dropped all but one minor allegation of 'molestation' within 24 hours, so in context 'dirty tricks' might be a fair assumption at the time. Edit does not make clear Davies can have had no first-hand knowledge of events - 'last word' producer claims is always given me is in fact a cutaway to Daily Mail headline "Supporters dismissed rape accusations against Wikileaks founder Julian Assange but the two women involved tell a different story" then cut to me talking about what the case has revealed to me about Swedish/US/EU relationships and power elites. No opportunity (or possibility) to respond directly to these libels.

Narrator v/o: "Once back in London he acts swiftly to deal with those inside Wikileaks critical of his leadership. He suspends DDB for disloyalty, insubordination and destabilisation in a time of crisis". Inaccurate and misleading. Producer could easily have fact-checked that DDB suspended 25 August 2010 (after sabotaging mail server) and sacked 14 Sept. I wasn't back in London until beginning October 2010. DDB given chance to respond, I'm not given opportunity to comment at all.

Analysis of Iraq War Logs - combination of Davies, Leigh, Ball i/vs intercut with tracking shots of data, stills of Abu Ghraib torture, and Iraqi killings/casualties. Narrator v/o "Davies no longer happy to be main point of contact with Assange because of his desire for TV coverage of the Afghan War Diaries." Davies i/v griping about this, claiming a contractual guarantee and "we had kept everything secret. Secrecy was essential because UK media law makes it so easy for the Pentagon to go to court and get an order to prevent us publishing" - cut to my response about "credit stealing, whoring UK media industry and Nick Davies is a part of that industry" - cut back to Nick saying "if he said that to someone else there's a chance he'd be believed but he was saying it to me, I'd had multiple conversations about this agreement. He made it up, but I think he believes the things that he invents so when he says that to me I think that he believes it at that moment [stop projecting, Nick]... and it's the same when, for example, he's talking about the two women in Sweden and tries to pretend this is all dirty tricks by the Pentagon I think he believes it"... "I think most people who get close to him go through this process, you start off liking him and then suddenly ... monster appears from behind the scenes...you suddenly discover this extraordinarily dishonest man. I don't know that I have ever met a human being as dishonest as Julian." Impossibly strong statement which was picked up by the press and libelled me (Davies has met David Leigh for a start!) Not given opportunity to respond directly.

AFTER ad break: Segment where I talk about corruption of large media groups. Narrator v/o footage of War Logs press release. "Increasingly frayed alliance holds together just long enough to get the Iraq War Logs out". Headline from Guardian. Footage of Clinton statement. Narrator v/o screenshot of NYT headline

“Wikileaks founder on the run, trailed by notoriety” and tracking shots of article: “It claimed the Swedish case was having a terrible effect on internal morale”. Bill Keller i/v saying “all of my exchanges with Julian Assange have consisted of him complaining to me or haranguing me about things that the NYT had done”. Cut to me: “sleazy hit piece full of factual inaccuracies that could easily have been fact-checked” Narrator v/o: “Furious, Julian insists that the New York Times are out. They will have no part in the release of the last and most significant batch of documents from that initial leak; a quarter of a million secret reports from US ambassadors” – implies reason for not wanting NYT involved in Cablegate is personal gripe over “sleazy hit piece” – no mention that the NYT told Pentagon about earlier releases, killed the Task Force 373 story, libelled Manning, etc.

Keller, Leigh i/vs giving their positions re the fallout/Leigh passing copy of his “memory stick” cables to NYT – intercut after this Leigh quote with me saying “I find that deplorable” but that is the only opportunity to respond I’m given – then goes on to more Leigh, Rusbridger and Mascolo i/vs – very unbalanced. Section on Manning’s treatment narrated by Leigh i/v. Leigh makes point this treatment may be “to break him in the hope he will implicate Assange in some kind of conspiracy that the Americans can indict him for.” Plus i/v with David House.

Narrator explains “back in media land a tentative truce agreed, all the original partners are back in plus at Assange’s insistence two new ones, El Pais and Le Monde. No sooner had peace broken out than the NYT threaten it. They’re going to tell the White House what they plan to publish”. Cut to i/v Keller “but of course we’d get their reaction”, Leigh “for God’s sake don’t tell them we’ve got it too”, my i/v segment: “the organisation you’re exposing should not know before the victims... Keller once said I’m not his kind of journalist, well thank god I’m not”. On to i/vs with NYT deputy ed, PJ Crowley, Ian Katz, Leigh and Rusbridger (saying his lawyers warned him he could be extradited).

Part 5: includes footage of US figures calling for my assassination, lots of shots of Guardian headlines, Clinton on “sorry” tour, footage of Tunisia intercut with comments from Rusbridger, Goetz and me.

Cut to ITV News “Behind bars tonight, the founder of WL website is refused bail” Narrator: “but increasingly another set of images is grabbing the attention of the world’s cameras” v/o images of prison van being papped and footage from court appearances. Nick Davies i/v: “There were a series of terrible misjudgements by Julian. First of all, the failure to properly redact the Afghan material, was hugely damaging. Secondly I think his becoming embroiled with the accusations of sexual misbehaviour in Sweden was somewhat damaging. What was even more damaging was that he was clearly not telling the truth about it” then cutaway to my arrival at Belmarsh hearing. Back to Davies “WL moral and political authority flows from the fact of truth-telling and you cannot do that and then also tell lies to the world, it doesn’t work.” Cutaway to Frontline Afghan press release with ND v/o “If you look at the moral standing that Julian Assange had on that Sunday night when we published the Afghan War Diaries it was potentially huge... look where he stands now, way way down from moral high ground and that’s not just a loss of moral authority, it’s a loss of political impact, it’s a loss of credibility and insofar as there is this character Bradley Manning awaiting trial it’s a loss of potential benefit that might have gone in his direction” (Narrator v/o explains extra Manning charges inc death penalty one) and the response is given to DDB

(NB only second time interviewer is heard actually asking a question) DDB blames continuing publication after Manning's arrest for his predicament. No 'last word' is given to for me to respond directly to these libels. The single largest total attack on my credibility over the past year has come from the Guardian itself.

Narrator v/o "to worldwide condemnation, Julian Assange announces he is planning to put out all cables with nothing blacked out" over screenshot of Guardian newspaper headline "Wikileaks publishes full cache of unredacted cables. Former media partners condemn Wikileaks' decision to make public documents identifying activists and whistleblowers" - No mention of the Guardian breaking contractual arrangements over the security of the cables, no mention of: pros and cons of doing so in context that they had already leaked; Wikileaks contacting the State Dept; of DDB/Leigh actions that had led to the leak - and cuts straight to comment from DDB "That's about the worst decision I'm aware of... back to the difference between a pro-whistleblowing organisation and an anti-secrecy one... there's a big, big difference [interviewer: and the difference is?] One is a responsible thing and the other isn't." Cuts to Nick Davies (initially v/o over shot of Guardian article with photo of computer screen with WL LOGO and legend 'Information wants to be free') "It's like a Greek tragedy you've seen a triumph turned to disaster... I don't doubt that the NYT and the Guardian has made mistakes along the way... but ultimately the triumph has become a disaster because of one man's personality flaws" Cut to me seems only tangentially relevant - obviously not an answer to a direct question about what happened. "There is a view that one should never be permitted to be criticised for being even possibly in the future engaged in a contributory act that might be immoral. And that that type of arse-covering is more important than actually saving people's lives. That it is better to let 1000 people die than risk going to save them and possibly run over someone on the way. That is something that I find to be philosophically repugnant."

Programme ends with footage of media scrum outside court then screen text on black background "November 2nd 2011 High Court rejects Julian's appeal. Julian is appealing - again" followed by "[no date] Wikileaks suspends all publishing". WL suspended publication on 27 October due to the financial blockade imposed by Visa, Mastercard et al. By omitting this date and swapping the order of events the programme creates libellous falsehood that publication suspended due to the court decision.