

Sent: 15 December 2003 21:17
To: BBC Charter Review
Subject: Charter Review

From:

Max Kaye

Short-form Response to the 'KEY QUESTIONS QUICKIE'

General comment - The Review Document I downloaded is bloated and bulky (much like the BBC itself) and appears to be written in such a manner as to deter the general public from gleaning any meaningful information. Hence, my response to the 'Quckie' key questions.

My responses to the key questions:

a) I value most the BBC's core provision of Radio & Television NEWS, the World Service (radio), and such pearls as Radios 3 & 4 and local radio services. Beyond these core public broadcasting services, all other activities are strictly unnecessary.

b) In terms of technological challenges, the BBC should concentrate on its core public services by replicating its TV & radio output on digital, rather than creating unnecessary and wasteful new channels. It should maintain a core News and information-based internet presence.

c) The BBC's output is unnecessarily large in terms of its quantity and diversity. It should limit its services to core activities (see above). All other activities should be left to the private sector.

d) The BBC should not run commercial enterprises (with the exception of exploitation of its intellectual property - proceeds of which should be retained by the BBC to fund ongoing operations and product development, thus reducing reliance on the tax-payer).

e) The universal Licence Fee should be abolished. The (much reduced) BBC should be paid for out of the state purse (with due provisions for operational & editorial independence, regulation and responsibility to the public, etc).

f) A 'slim-line', much reduced BBC (as described above) would be, by definition, better organised and more efficient.

A general comment:

The BBC feels obliged to produce cheap, populist programming (and chase ratings) in order to justify its universal licence fee. Freed from this need to cater for the masses of resentful licence payers, the BBC would be able to concentrate on its core strengths and quality.

Is this 'elitist'? Yes. And what, precisely, is wrong with quality?