

Mike Smallcombe in *Michael Jackson: Chase the Truth*:

"I don't think this [*Leaving Neverland*] is a deliberate hijacking or piggybacking onto #MeToo. These allegations were first made way before that, 2013. What I do believe is that #MeToo protects the documentary. The media are very, very scared, very wary of doing any investigation work or questioning this documentary whatsoever because of #MeToo. Because we cannot challenge anymore. We cannot question alleged victims, which goes against all journalism. Journalism is about seeking the truth. If you upset some people, then so be it. So #MeToo really protects *Leaving Neverland*, really protects Safechuck, Robson and Dan Reed, because the media will not challenge the allegations. For example, the work I've done in the media. I know that people will probably look at that as victim-shaming, or be on the side of this alleged pedophile, but for me that's not the case. If people see me in a negative light because of the research I'm doing, so be it, because I want to seek the truth. I want to put this under a microscope and do my job as a journalist, and try and seek the truth. The coverage in the media has been, again, so one-sided and no journalist can be bothered to do their job. It's all copy and paste, copy and paste, each article and all this "Michael Jackson needs to be cancelled." No challenge made, whatsoever, because journalists are scared of the damage to their reputations. People think I'm defending Michael Jackson. Directly, I guess, yes I am. But what I'm trying to do is balance what didn't happen from the beginning. So from the beginning Dan Reed, the director: not investigating the claims, not making a balanced 50-50 documentary where we interview Robson and Safechuck, and then we challenge them about all the different inconsistencies, about the lawsuit, about the financial motive.

#MeToo is at its core a great cause for people to be able to speak out. That's fantastic, that's great. The core values of #MeToo are incredibly positive. But when that gags the media, that's incredibly dangerous.

While it can't be completely ruled out that Michael Jackson abused Safechuck and Robson... You just never know. I can't sit here and say, "Michael Jackson's innocent, this definitely didn't happen." But what I can say, is that at least half a dozen things are inconsistent. They are lying in court. So if I'm sitting on the jury and I hear that those two have lied under oath to be able to sue for money, and are just lying in general, and their stories are not adding up, just so they can sue the Michael Jackson Estate, I'll think to myself, "They've lied about that, what about the rest?" Because all of it is testimony. There's no physical evidence. There's no forensic evidence. The only evidence that they've got is their oral testimony and in that oral testimony they've lied several times. So what about the rest of the whole testimony? Can you convict? Can you be sure that Michael Jackson is guilty when part of that whole testimony is irrefutably false? That's what you'd have to ask yourself if you were a juror trying Michael Jackson. That's what it comes down to."