

BOB GELDOF

THIS LETTER IS PRIVATE AND PERSONAL AND MAY NOT BE USED IN WHOLE OR IN PART OR QUOTED IN ANY WAY WITHOUT PRIOR PERMISSION OF THE AUTHOR. IT MAY NOT BE RE-PRINTED OR USED OR DISSEMINATED IN ANY MEDIA WHATSOEVER INCLUDING BUT NOT RESTRICTED TO PRESS, TV, RADIO, FILM OR ANY ONLINE OR INTERNET MEDIUM INCLUDING TWITTER, FACEBOOK, BLOGS OR WEB SITES. THE AUTHOUR RESERVES ALL RIGHTS IN THIS REGARD.

HOWEVER YOU ARE EXPECTED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT ALL THE INFORMATION IN THIS LETTER BEFORE BROADCASTING YOUR FILM AND RE-EDIT ACCORDINGLY.

SHOULD YOU WISH TO USE PART OF THIS LETTER IN OUR RIGHT TO REPLY PERMISSION MUST BE SOUGHT AND WILL BE GIVEN SUBJECT TO CONTEXT

Dear Chris,

Thanks for ruining my weekend! I got your letter late Friday night upon my return from Ireland and now have to do this bollox when I should be doing my usual weekend mooching about.

Ok. Taking your letter bit by bit.

I'm sorry I haven't heard of your film. But it's a pity you never allowed me the chance to respond to that while you were making it. As I understand you're making a polemical piece and polemics require a transparently biased, partial blast of opinion, unsubstantiated or otherwise to make its point. But still...fair's fair.

I may have seen your "Taking Liberties" show. Sounds familiar and I'm glad you won an award. But as you're keen to demonstrate your own prowess as a film maker and insistently refer to the expertise of your participants perhaps I should lay out my credentials too. Not for the sake of immodesty, boastfulness, pride or egotistical reasons but because I think the gist of your show is that us poor "Rock Stars", or general "Celebrities" are basically clueless and essentially harmlessly deluded amateurs whom the media can use to sell their declining rags (or even make tv shows or films about). In turn the public pay too much misguided attention to these clowns thereby missing the more profound underlying political truths behind any given situation which these naïve and hapless rockers couldn't possibly grasp or contend with.

Is that it or have I got it wrong? I don't know because you haven't allowed me to see your film. I suppose I could go and see the movie version and I did look it up but it doesn't seem to be showing anywhere and no-one had heard of it. But I gather from the title "Starsuckers" that this might be the gist?

For the record then, I do know about TV and journalism.

I have received many awards for both. Including a BAFTA, a Peabody, Royal Television Society, Golden Rose, Broadcasting Guild, Critics Award etc, etc.

I have written, presented and produced documentary series on Africa.

I have written on Africa for the Economist, the Financial Times, The Times, Observer, Daily Telegraph, The Guardian, The Independent, The Observer, The Sunday Times, The Sun, The Daily

Mirror, The Irish Times, The New York Times, Liberation (of France) Welt am Sonntag, Bild Zeitung, Suddeutsche Zeitung, Aftenbladet (Norway) La Stampa, La Repubblica, Corriere della Serra, Asahi Shimbun, TIME magazine etc

In 1973/4 I was the Music Editor and Circulation Manager of the Georgia Straight of Vancouver I have written two books. One on Africa and both bestsellers.

I have edited the second largest newspaper in the world Asahi Shimbun, the largest newspaper in Europe Bild Zeitung. Also La Stampa and in May I will edit the Toronto Globe and Mail.

For further clarity you consistently use the term “experts (or an expert) in humanitarian aid.

What constitutes their expertise? Is expert your designation or is it self-styled? Would others agree that those mentioned are expert? I accept it if you say so, but you must also accept that I too am an expert in humanitarian aid and development politics and economics with probably far more experience in the field and area than any of them. Again I should make my expertise clear.

I am the Chairman of the Band Aid Trust and have been for 25 years. I have overseen the distribution of the \$150 million of donated funds to the poor of the Sahel region of Africa. During that time we have funded or built countless development projects, bought and built a vast fleet of trucks, ships and other transport in order to distribute the huge volumes of food aid we were bringing to the starving during the Great African Famine of '84-'86, widely recognized as being the greatest famine of the 20th century. We also undertook this task during the intense conflict raging at that time in the region. Not easy.

In 2003 I persuaded Prime Minister Tony Blair to undertake a survey, a “21st Century Brandt Report”, in order to determine finally why Africa remained disconnected from the global economic well-being and what exactly was required to remedy this. I wrote of this initially in the Irish Times and subsequently the Observer. This was the springboard for the Commission for Africa upon which I sat for a year. This was a commission of economists, developmentalists, leaders at the highest level from the G7 including China and the African states. It was written by Nicholas Stern, (Lord Stern of the LSE) with a popular version by Paul Vallely the African expert and journalist of record for The Independent.

Upon completion of the report and pre-launch it was decided in a meeting of the Commission in Addis that I would be responsible for the public dissemination of the Report (which I named Our Common Interest) and PM Blair would accept responsibility for having it politically implemented. He pointed out that that would be impossible unless I did my job properly for without a public wind at his heels nothing would get through the “process”. At the time there was simply no mood for this internationally or domestically. So, along with Vallely’s text we distributed a paperback book in many of Britain’s supermarkets and produced a smaller brochure for distribution in schools.

Of course the Report is a dense piece of economics and politics but it began to get a public hearing and remains today the benchmark report upon which, for good or ill, the various development bars are set. This is mainly because it lays out a route map for achieving the UN determined Millennium Development Goals which would not be met unless the benchmarks outlined in the report were followed. These called for a doubling of aid to Africa by 2010, an immediate cancellation of all unpayable debt, and a restructuring of aid policy and implementation of the WTO Doha Trade Round amongst some 90 other proposals.

Hard for the public to get their head around and as it turned out impossible for the politicians. At the launch of Our Common Interest Blair was asked by a journalist, whom I had put up to ask the question, would the report be UK policy for the upcoming UK G8 summit in Gleneagles. Blair had

privately been resisting because he feared a failure. He was worried that the other leaders would not accept a deal of this magnitude or radical nature. He therefore had no desire for a domestic and international political disaster. Having asked the question and Blair hesitating in a stumbling response I, who shared the platform with the PM and Gordon Brown, jumped in and said “Yes he will. Won’t you prime minister?” Everyone laughs and Blair says something like “oh well if Bob says so I’d better”. All very jolly but now its on record and he’s anxious because the Sherpas are saying there’s no possibility of this happening. Fellow commissioners asked me what I intend to do that will allow him to carry this through the G8. I begin to think of Live8 which I absolutely, 1 thousand, million percent do not want to do. Live Aid exhausted and broke me and my personal and economic life. I do not want that again. Besides privately I believe the days of songs and concerts are passé and ineffectual.

I know this explanation is exhaustive and boring but it is vital that you understand what lay behind the concert. That is, contrary to your assertions Live8 was ENTIRELY political.

So to re-cap. I am Chair of Band Aid.

A Commissioner for Africa.

A member of the Africa Progress Panel under the chair of Kofi Annan amongst whom some other colleagues are. Peter Eigen, founder and chair of Transparency International, Mohammad Yunus, inventor of micro loans, founder of the Grameen Bank, Nobel Prize Laureate, Graca Machel, wife of Mandela, and an international advocate for womens rights,, Linah Moholo, governor of the bank of Botswana, Robert Rubin, Treasury Secretary to Clinton, Michelle Camdessus, ex president IMF etc, etc

I am a co-founder of DATA and subsequently ONE, a policy and lobby group with 70 full time expert staff in Washington DC, 20 in London, 6 in Berlin and 4 in Africa. We are made up of developmentalists, economists, lobbyists. We help to shape, suggest or lobby for development policy on Africa across many borders. We also have over 2 million members online who will lobby their local politicians people on poverty issues.

I consult with or advise or lobby several governments on an almost daily basis. Within the UK with the government and I was an advisor on the Conservative Party Poverty Policy group which resulted in one of the only two firm commitments by Cameron going into this election. That Health budgets and Overseas Aid budgets would be ring-fenced and even brought forward if necessary.

I have been an advisor to the Jubilee Debt Campaign.

Hardly naïve and ALL profoundly political. I do this Chris on a daily basis and presumably unlike your interviewees I am neither remunerated for it nor have any desire to be. That’s what those chumps Pop Stars get up to in their down time when they’re not responding to shite like this.

So those are my credentials. I hope they satisfy you.

Oh yes. Early Bob was only ever interested in music and politics from the age of 11. Indeed it was music got me interested in politics. As a result I was very active in Anti-Apartheid from the age of 13 where I formed the view that marching around for a couple of hours parroting awful slogans and singing dreadful folk songs achieved precisely zero and after a few whacks with a baton I decided to give that activity a knock on the head myself! From 15 on I worked at night with the Simon Community in Dublin helping the homeless.

Now your stuff.

Your points 1 and 2)

Live Aid did no harm whatsoever to anyone. The exact verifiable opposite is true. It did nothing but good. There are many independently monitored and evaluated documents underscoring that fact. Unsubstantiated assertions are meaningless.

Rieff presumably is referring to the hideous re-settlement policy of the brutish Mengistu regime – the Derg. He is right in that the entire policy was political. It had zero humanitarian objectives which of course we knew.

I will let Concern, the Irish agency deal with this in detail as they were the ones on the spot and they have the exact figures which were issued in a publicly available 2004 report which you obviously didn't bother looking at but which will now be forwarded to you. This is the definitive report and not the speculative MSF stuff you are using. Indeed MSF were not even in the country at the time having taken the luxurious position of the moral high ground (in a time and place and situation where morality hardly existed) and left the country entirely thus abandoning the people in their care causing increased intolerable burdens on the other NGO's who didn't have the option of bailing out and instead had to tend to the people MSF had abandoned, as well as their own people!. It is well to note that at this period I shared offices in Paris with Bernard Kouchner the founder of MSF and now French foreign Minister. It was a joint MSF/Band Aid office. I knew what was happening.

As Concern will show, something like 100,000 people were killed in the total re-settlement programme before it was prematurely halted because of the vast condemnation by me, Band Aid as an organisation, Concern, the UN etc., That figure of 100,000 people sickens me but it is still 100% less than MSF's figures. But Chris it would have been much, much worse had Concern and others had not stepped in. Fr. Jack Finucane, Concern's founder, found these people abandoned in a swampy malaria infested area where few others lived. They had been simply left there to fend for themselves. He decided there and then that, quite rightly, he could not be party to such a crime. Funded by the Canadian government, the Irish government, the UN, Band Aid and others he set about enabling what he still calls 'our greatest work ever'. Jack Finucane and Concern prevented the murder of 650,000 people – the total number involved in re-settlement. Perhaps if he had got there earlier more could have been kept alive. Who knows? But it's not a question of 100,000 dead – it's the fact of 550,000 allowed to live because of that man and others!

Imagine Chris if you had come across 650,000 people abandoned to die. Would you ponder your political and moral stance and decide "no, I'll walk away". If that would have been your decision than in my view you would be complicit in murder. To be made aware of a crime (such as the original BBC report on the famine) and do nothing about it, however modest ones activity, makes one complicit. I will not be complicit in horror. To make the case that those poor, bewildered, starving wretched people should have been left abandoned is to demonstrate intolerable moral decadence. Concern, like Band Aid, like MSF are humanitarian organisations. Despite our personal revulsions our job is to help other human beings regardless of where they are and how they got there. Moral theorising is best left to the armchair developmentalists with political rather than humanitarian agenda. Sometimes these two ideas are compatible, often they are not.

Band Aid took two courses. First we would help to fund Concern and secondly we would use our massive access to the media and scrutiny by it, to draw attention to the disgrace of 're-settlement' and create intolerable international pressure on the Derg to stop it.

As for my part..This was the time when I went to Addis and saw Mengistu. He was a silent humourless person who had a reputation for shooting colleagues who disagreed with him, even round the cabinet table. I approached him and berated him on his “re-settlement” policy. I told him it was mass murder and as Michael Buerk has reported I called him a “cunt” to his face. He simply stared at me. Luckily he decided not to shoot me. I don’t believe I shirked my responsibilities. In fact I took secret photos of plain clothes Soviet air force personnel loading peasants onto Antonov transporters to dump them in the re-settlement area. These photos were published in several papers and caused a furore. I had stumbled upon the sight by pure chance. I still have the photos and you are welcome to see them. I spoke out often and vehemently against the programme. We are not dupes and I don’t like thugs.

Part of what I felt Band Aid had to do, particularly given the presence of all those cameras around us all that time, was “bear witness”. Speak truth unto power if you will. And also speak truth about power when you should. I think I did that. I think I was able to articulate what people felt directly to those who were affected by what they did. Here and in Africa. I never went to meetings without journalists present. Which was difficult for many leaders, both local and African, not being used to media scrutiny or direct, unvarnished confrontation. A name was coined for it at that time. The press called it “Punk diplomacy” The first thing I would do at these meetings would be read out sections from the Amnesty International Report on each countries unsavoury activities. Did you attempt to interview any of the journalists present? I think that wht I was doin was political was political. I dont think it was naïve and I’ve never seen your interviewees from WDI or WOW doing it despite their avowed “radical” stance. Frankly it’s easy stuff to march pointlessly around in circles dressed as a clown which seems to constitute the bulk of their “radical” activities. They take no responsibility therefore nothing changes.

Finally all this has been argued before and I’m sure, had you been interested in balance or fair mindedness, you could dig up loads of archive from the period with TV debates and print etc. But, and I do not say this in mitigation or as a point but more as a general observation. In the extremities of a grotesque and brutal war and the worst famine of our times you do not have the luxury of making fine moral distinctions. You must act to stop as many dying about you as possible. Band Aid was and is entirely politically agnostic. At the time I’m quoted as saying “I will shake hands with the devil on my left and the devil on my right to get to those who need our help” We did exactly that and it is still my strongly held view. Yet in another way that too is deeply political. We crossed lines, we rafted down rivers with supplies, we hauled giant trucks to Darfur, we were bombed and killed and wounded and our supplies shot at and destroyed and we still did it. To have you now and two people who have never undergone that responsibility carp now 25 years later when they probably weren’t around is a little rich. In the end we killed nobody and “enabled” nothing. Rather we saved 500,000 people from dying a miserable death and helped halt a monstrous programme of murder.

I would caution you on your use of the word “enable” We obviously reserve our rights in all of this. And I sincerely hope that word is NEVER used in your piece. Our lawyers are looking at it and so should Channel 4’s.

From my point of view this is the same as saying something like – because the Red Cross were allowed occasionally into Auschwitz to give succour to the inmates Hitler was enabled to continue the Final Solution. QED the Red Cross are responsible for the massacre of the Jews. Hmm. Don’t think so. That is preposterous and disgusting

That's enough of that. I refer you to Concerns rebuttal and their 2004 report on the whole matter which, as I've already said, you could have researched, it is a public document, and spared me the bother of writing this and you the boredom of reading it.

3 and 4)

Adrian Lovett will answer for MPH. I personally, was not a member of MPH ever and Band Aid as an organisation was not a member. In fact I thought it was a bit lame given that here, finally, was something really big happening on the NGO's own doorstep with a huge political agenda shaped to their concerns, and all that the combined lobbying might of the total NGO community could come up with was a errr...march. Spare me.

I'm not big on committees and conferences when action is required. Meetings give a false impression of movement. Resolutions are not results. I'm a pragmatist not an idealist. We were going ahead with Live8 and they could do what they liked. They could use all of Live8 or none of it. It was entirely up to them. I gave them the dates of the concerts and they could have organised their march on a different day but they chose not to. Indeed the majority thought that was the best day to do it on.

I was feeling pressure from two sides. My fellow commissioners were asking me exactly what activities I was going to do because the other G8 leaders were simply not listening to the Commission for Africa agenda. And Richard Curtis who had coined the name MAKE POVERTY HISTORY (that would be another showbiz naïve type I suppose in the "experts" world would it? That sap Richard Curtis who only raised a billion for the poor and through his movies and interventions addresses millions of people on the issue of African poverty and the actual misery and reality behind the "experts" clichés, unlike a really important eh..march. That's it. Yeah we'll have another march. That'll get 'em going) which is now used around the world endlessly.

Richard and Bono came to me and said do another gig. I said you fucking do it if you're so eager. They kept on at me for weeks. Bono said he'd play with Mc Cartney and they'd open the gig with "It was 20 years Ago Today".- a reference to Live Aid. I wanted to see that. Precisely that rock n roll moment I wanted to see, so I said ok. That's why I did it. Pathetic but y'know...

As I said earlier that contrary to Rieff and Southworth (not of MPH but in fact of War On Want who are ok in their own way but whose past doesn't really bear scrutiny, given the investigation into them by the Charity Commission over dodgy accounting and the resulting dismissal of ALL staff) Live8 was entirely political.

Live Aid was to do with Charity. That great urge of shared humanness, compassion and sympathy for another hurt person. It is a fantastic thing but we have lost our ability to see that. It is also profoundly political. The most that most people can do is put their hand in their pocket and drop a quid into the Oxfam box or Comic Relief. It is that simple act that is profound and if done in enough numbers becomes intensely political. For if you can say to a politician that X number support your proposition of change they must listen. That pound in the box is the equivalent of a tick in the ballot. Now you don't just help the wounded, now you can begin to change their lot. Really, spare me the comfortable yet vacuous theorising of yer World Development crowd and get on with it. Its simple stuff this.

That was Live Aid. There was a monstrous human event occurring in Africa, we were told about it, therefore we were compelled to act and help and we could at the same time try to change things but first we needed cash NOW. Numbers IS politics. The question then becomes how do you get the most numbers. Poverty and its symptoms like Famine is a world problem. The potential death of 30 million fellow humans is not allowable, it would be a body blow to the human corpus, so it follows we need to address the totality of us. We would do the biggest gig ever because Chris, the lingua franca of the planet is not English – its Pop music. I know that world. It's my job.

I had understood early that famine, ill-health, lack of education, conflict etc are all only symptoms of a singular but soluble condition – Poverty. But the structures of Poverty are as ever Political and Economic. The next 20 years were spent talking of that, building organisations that could deal with that and bringing my fellow musicians who had become interested through Live Aid to use their access for political ends.

See I think you've got the wrong end of the stick here Chris. You made a film about the naïve politicisation of "celebrity" but you missed the real story – the celebritisation of politics. This is a direct result of the all enveloping media where we demand to know everything about someone who is constantly on our screens. No-one is more media ubiquitous than the politician. They and us then become confused because they seem so familiar to us, so famous they must be "celebrities." It follows that other 'celebs' have access. Shit finds its own level. Now fame these days is a currency. It just depends on how well you spend it. In my first ever interview in the UK in 1976 I said "I only wanted Fame so I could use its platform to talk about the things that bother me." I think I've done that. And so have others. My 4 daughters all have regular checks for breast cancer because Britney made them aware of it and told them they should do it. Thanks Britney and well done. It's small and it's profound and it's good. Sneer if you wish but you're the one who's wrong.

Live Aid was about charity and taking an issue nowhere on the international political agenda and placing it right at the top. Before 1985 Africa was not discussed at the G7. After '85 it has been the single constant issue on the agenda. We did that. Those silly, sad and deluded pop stars in the days when the World Development Movement did serious developmental analysis rather than posturing gesture politics. Live8 was even more specific. "We don't want your money – only your voice". The direct opposite of Live Aid 20 years before. "The Long March to Justice" and "From Charity to Justice" were our slogans illustrating the road we'd all be on together and were nakedly and manifestly profoundly political contrary to your contributors ignorance. With Live8 we would now deal with the politics of poverty rather than its symptoms. This was not possible in '85 because the Cold War was in play and the Ethiopian tussle was simply one manifestation of that. Those days were now thankfully over and we could begin to re-draw the map of equity and justice. The world was coming to Britain and we had the political plan which I had helped draft – the Commission for Africa. I really need no lectures from Southworth on the politics of the Gleneagles summit, given I'd helped write the fucking programme! If he or others had another agenda it wasn't mine and they were free to do their own thing.

Curtis set about making the most profoundly political films I've ever seen on the topics of poverty in Africa. These were to play behind the artists and in between acts. Disgracefully the BBC refused to show them. Instead we had Jonathan Ross camping around in a yellow suit talking bollox while the rest of the world were exposed to the full political impact of everything Richard and his team were doing.

Believing that MPH were singularly failing to ignite the public's imagination and despite their claims (and me going along with them) in reality they were getting no traction because the coalition hardly existed in any other country save Canada.

Panicking a bit that the whole thing was going to be an embarrassing and catastrophic failure I decided to set about a series of Abbie Hoffmann-type Yippie moments. On Jonathan Ross Show (in a red suit!) I said that teachers should lead their kids out of school and take them on a long walk to Edinburgh. We would set up rests along the way and people should ring in and volunteer their houses etc., They would remember it all their lives. Cue uproar and my irresponsibility etc. I then said forget the teachers go by yourselves and we'll lay on buses. To parents I said they'd learn more from this than ten days at school. Which is true. I contacted the teachers unions who were up for it. It was fun.

I then pretended there were millions of MPH'ers trying to get to the UK from France, Germany and Holland and we should re-enact a sort of Dunkirk and have all the little boats go and pick them up and bring them over to waiting trains and buses. Literally I think there were 2 French MPH'ers prepared to come on a sail boat. I sat in a rowing boat somewhere and they took pictures. Further outrage, cries of irresponsibility. Edinburgh police said they expected over a million people and they'd close the city. I said the churches should open and allow them to sleep etc... Do you remember any of this? Poor old Midge had to come out and address the Scottish hordes and ask them to calm down and it was "only Bob" doing his thing. I was kind of .. but I'd have loved it to happen. Maybe one day. All of this is easy and they spent a year discussing ONE march! Marches my arse. A million people marching couldn't prevent a simple thing like reversing a decision to go to war, 250,000 will not prevent world poverty.

Anyway, desired effect achieved. Everyone knows it's the G8. Everyone knows double aid, drop the debt etc., Now get the lobby. But not just here. In fact don't you think your film is a little parochial. A little Britcentric. Britain alone could and can do nothing. You and your exclusively British interlocutors forgot the World Chris. People always do. We didn't.

Live Aid was done by telex but technology had improved, the internet had been invented, mobile phones, satellite technology was the norm, so now we could hopefully draw the leaders out with a massive concert in each G8 capital and for the first time include Africa from Joburg with Mandela.

The leaders had been at best indifferent to the Gleneagles proposal. We would change that. We gathered 1,100 artists. The greatest names to attract the greatest audience. The greater the audience the more powerful the lobby. They paid for everything themselves in some cases costing millions. The negotiating temperature began to change. I know. I was in almost daily contact with Sir Michael Jay the Head of the British Diplomatic Service and the lead British sherpa. Finally two days before the gig in Philadelphia with more than a million expected to attend (and they did) Bush went to that city and announced he would double aid to Africa by 2010. Which the US has done.

Live8 and all its simultaneous concerts followed. All huge attendances. You may, if you like, consider these as marches. Except they don't wander down police prescribed byways fruitlessly. They are vast numbers of people in one place, all day, all over the world, brought to together in a community of shared interest and all sympathising with your messaging. They are the vast billions watching. Brought together around the electric hearth of the tv or computer screen by the Pied Pipers of Rock 'n Roll. Now that's a lobby. That's a vote and a half. That lends legitimacy.

Live8 was also the 'pointy' end of the chimera that was MPH. It gave it a focus and drew whatever strands there were together to a specific moment. If they didn't take advantage of the vast crowds we delivered them, don't blame Live8. Blame Rieff and Southworth and the rest of the bystanders.

The G8 has become a pointless ritual where the marchers and the wankers dressed as clowns (wow! Radical) get to throw stones at cops miles from the decision makers, who can't even hear them, and the cops get to crack some heads. Honour is satisfied all around and meanwhile the leaders get away with doing precisely nothing as per. Now what exactly is the political messaging in that. Explain it to me. Besides which, fuck the messaging, where's the concrete results?!

In Murrayfield there were 72 nations represented. It finally brought all the Live8ers and MPHers into one stadium. (And James Brown was amazing!!). I had another plan as well, but Pope Benedict fucked it. But still, the G8 knew we were there.

Gleneagles was a success. Probably the G8's greatest success. Indeed months later at the UN Kofi Annan called it "the greatest summit for Africa EVER". Obasanjo of Nigeria said it was "the Rubicon crossing moment in the relationship between the North and South". I don't disagree. Blair pulled it off and he should be praised for it whatever ones views of the man. Ceaseless carping is pointless. If someone has been asked to do something and succeeded they should be praised and congratulated. Although it may sometimes stick in your craw one should also speak truth about power as well as to it – as I said earlier. Besides the vast Live8/MPH audience needed to know what they had achieved. Being able to demonstrate results enables one to take the audience to the next plateau. You have given them, and they you, tangible influence and politics have been seen to work. This is cynicism defeating which I enjoy. The problem for your mates in your film is my view that to enact or enable change one must engage with the agents of change. Whether they like it or not the agents of change in our world are the politicians. Otherwise you're always outside the tent pissing in. They stay inside their tent pissing back out at you. This is futile. My solution is to get inside the tent and piss in there. Look, you're either serious about this shit or not. I am. Anything else is juvenile and amateur posturing.

The negotiations were endless. We met most of the leaders in Gleneagles. They wouldn't budge and uniquely Blair insisted, despite the bombs in London, in refusing to bend an inch. That is true. I was there. Rather than massive public failure and the public expectation raised by the concert and MPH, they succumbed and in a great moment of political coup de theatre Blair had them publicly sign the communiqué thus in effect turning it into a contract, which we have subsequently being able to use to great effect in our lobbying.

Far from the political demands being "watered down to nothingness", all the political demands were more or less fully met with one exception. Maybe others had a different demand but I never noticed it and nor did anyone else and if they did they weren't mine or Live8's business. We wanted the resolutions of the Commission for Africa implemented. I hadn't given up a year of my life so that one more African report could gather dust on one more shelf.

But incredibly the essential resolutions were achieved. The G8 agreed to double aid to Africa within 5 years. AMAZING!! Can you imagine, I'd worked on this for 20 years. I never thought it would happen. So yes, it was exactly what we'd asked for, so then and now and still 10 out of 10.

The next question was would they do it? I and my colleagues have spent the last 5 years pursuing them doggedly from conference to conference and again amazingly, (we're out of time this year,)

but we're 60% of the way there which is more than any other G8 resolution made tangible ever. But at that year of 2005 they had agreed completely to what we'd asked, so 10 out of 10

Debt I have to upgrade my score from 8 out of 10 to 10 out of 10! They agreed in 2005 to cancel it with some caveats so 8 out of 10. But within 6 months and with constant forceful lobbying at the World Bank and IMF spring meetings in DC which I and others attended, the unpayable debt of the poorest was finally cancelled. Since then among other triumphs 42 million children have gone to school as a result. Can you imagine that? That staggering figure of human brains turned on to their own possibilities. We did that! There is of course more, but not for now. Whatever Jubilee said at the time, (and remember I was a consultant/advisor/speaker for the Jubilee 2000 debt campaign) they were wrong.

The big disappointment was on Trade, which is the critical one. However I didn't give it any rating because it was made clear in the months before Gleneagles that the other countries were not prepared to accept the trade question as part of the G8 remit. As result it never appeared on the Gleneagles agenda. Therefore there was nothing to score. The G8 said it should be decided by the WTO at their September 05 Hong Kong meeting. It was the correct forum but it was also a cop out by the G8. And of course nothing happened in Hong Kong. And disgracefully still hasn't. However Blair let it go in order to get the rest. Still in NGO terms there was "some useful language" in the final text. Which bizarrely in these kind of things is significant.

Whatever way you cut it, it was a significant political success and was partly engineered by Live8 and MPH and was as I hope I've made clear entirely political. Though I do accept that the WDM and War On Want who both inhabit the left of the NGO "movement" may embrace a more "anti-capitalist" agenda but for me that is boring, futile and adolescent.

5) Are you serious? Is this a joke question? Given the vast amount of effort and work across every continent and the 9 capitals and the millions of people and the thousands of artists etc the question is how many people signed your petition? Who cares? Is that seriously what bothers your "Humanitarian Aid expert" critics? Get a grip and a life for fucks sake. But anyway...

I think the petition was an MPH thing though I'm not sure. Doesn't matter. It WAS and probably still IS the largest one in history. I'm not into that sort of gigantism for its own sake. Too Guinness book of Records for me, though your "Live8 critics" pathetically seem very exercised by it. However when the numbers ARE large enough it is effective. I'm perfectly happy to accept your "low" estimate of "only" 31 million. I've no idea what figure I've used, probably the one on the Live8 website though the last time I looked at that was 5 years ago.

Anyway I've lugged that bloody box of cd's around so many G8's I'll be glad to see the back of it. It FEELS like 31 million! Anyway when exactly am I supposed to have used those other figures? I reject your stupid and laughable "accusation". I certainly NEVER said 100 or 500 million. Why would I? Who fucking cares! For the sake of clarity I don't believe I used other figures and it is up to you to prove otherwise if you could be bothered with such a nonsense. In the meantime take it out. You and they are wrong. Or lying.

As for your “Great Live 8 TV Audience Figures Controversy” I’m totally happy to accept your lowest figure 2.2 billion...Oh dear, is that all!!! As opposed to what? Their massive protest march wandering around Edinburgh. A decent amount of well-meaning 250,000 activists for sure. And well done them for turning out and making a racket and noising their concerns. But there should have been more. And that was the job of yer WDM and yer War On Wants, but they didn’t get them out. They failed. However the police say the numbers were no more than 100,000, the papers say variously 75 – 500, 000 depending on their political persuasion. So which one is it guys eh, eh? Can we have some consistency here. I couldn’t care less. It represents a failure to me. After all these months of activity and the combined fire power of worldwide NGO members and sympathisers you can only muster a fairly small number on your biggest day. Tragic. Do you seriously imagine that could or would have affected the outcome of the Gleneagles summit? The leaders couldn’t care less. The marchers were never ONCE mentioned by the politicians in the building. By either the Africans or the G8 guys and girls. Nothing. Not a single shred of influence.

As for us according to the TV people more than 3 billion viewed or had available to them Live8 in all its guises, domestically, internationally or online where you could watch them all simultaneously and put your name on the petition. Again I think (but I’m not sure) the Live8 site says something like an estimated 3 billion...you can check. (Or not). I’m happy to accept any number from anyone but I have always used the 3.2 figure as that was what was given to me. Again I did not vary or alter that and why would I, it such a vastly inconceivable number of human beings all for a moment accepting that the indignities and humiliations of Poverty are entirely unacceptable to the modern age and that world leadership should co-operate, compromise, and consult rather than compete in order to end the entirely absurd and soluble issue of global poverty. So who actually cares, but I’ve always used that figure and you must prove otherwise or else remove the point. Actually you know what, its fine. Its such a stupid, lame and embarrassing thing to argue but typical of your ineffectual Dave Spart-like friends down at the ol’ WDM et al. The thing is, I probably agree with 98% of everything they say, its just our methods are different and I believe ours are more effective and I suspect they do too, but you work with the tools you got. I can do rock n roll, they can do marching.

7) This is nasty and sly and beneath you. But I will leave it up to Brian Lapping to answer for Brook Lapping the makers of the film. He is a journalist and film maker of impeccable standing and rectitude and is incensed by your insinuation.

From my perspective it went like this. I am a minority shareholder in Ten Alps, a company that owns 6 separate production companies. All factual documentary makers. One of them is Brook Lapping. They are independent of one another and often find themselves competing with the broadcasters for the same job. Ten Alps does not interfere in their bids, their subjects, choices or has any editorial control over their output.

I do not have an office at Ten Alps. I do not work for Ten Alps and I do not work at Ten Alps. I own some shares in the holding company as I do in a few other companies.

Brook Lapping quite independently of Ten Alps or Band Aid approached the BBC with the Live8 pitch. No-one else did. The BBC thought it was a good idea and commissioned the show. Brook Lapping then approached me. I called Alex Connock the CEO of Ten Alps and asked about potential conflict of interest.

I then spoke with the other Trustees and they referred and registered the matter with the Charity Commission. They in turn asked for a written submission and asked specific questions. I remained completely apart from the process. I was just as happy to do it as not. How many interviews do you think I've done about Live Aid/8 over the years? Brook Lapping were happy, as were the BBC and I did the programme in the same spirit I would have done it for anyone else and have done over many years and endless Live Aid docs. I have never received or asked for remuneration or expenses for any Band Aid activity over 25 years and if you are suggesting by innuendo or allegation that either I or Band Aid trustees seek personal or professional advantage or remuneration by exploiting our position you are disgraceful and you will be sued. To be clear no trustee including myself has ever received or asked for any remuneration for any of their work. They have also never asked for a single penny in expenses including flights, professional fees, phone bills or biscuits. So fuck off.

Of course I reserve all my rights in respect of your film, its broadcast and the consequences of the allegations you make.

That's it I think. Another Sunday gone. Thanks pal. The full detailed responses from the actual relevant parties are contained within or will come to you separately. Good luck with your show and I hope it's not too naff.

Yours unbelievably bored

Bob Geldof