

Peter Hitchens' Views on Political and Media Issues in an Interview with Michael Simmons on Spectator TV

Fatema Miah

Solihull. UK. United Kingdom

Email: fatemamiah@mail.com

Doi: <https://doi.org/10.58818/ijlrssa.v3i5.308>

Abstract

An exoneration occurs when a person who has been convicted and punished for a crime is later officially declared innocent based on new and credible evidence. In such cases, the original conviction is overturned after the discovery of evidence that demonstrates the individual did not commit the alleged offense. Exonerations may result from various legal processes, including retrials, reinvestigations, and the re-examination of key evidence presented during the original proceedings. One significant factor often identified in wrongful convictions is the presence of false confessions obtained during police interrogations. Psychological research and legal studies have shown that confessions may sometimes be given under coercion, intimidation, or psychological pressure, rather than as voluntary admissions of guilt. These circumstances can lead individuals to confess to crimes they did not commit, thereby contributing to miscarriages of justice. Therefore, the examination of interrogation practices, the reliability of confession evidence, and the application of legal safeguards are essential in preventing wrongful convictions and ensuring fairness in the criminal justice system.

Keywords: Peter Hitchens, Views Political, Media Issues, Interview Michael Simmons, Spectator TV

A. Introduction

An exoneration occurs when a person who has been convicted of a crime and punished is later officially declared innocent based on new evidence demonstrating that the individual did not commit the offense. In such cases, the legal system formally overturns the original conviction after the emergence of credible evidence that undermines the validity of the initial verdict. Although exonerations are relatively rare within the criminal justice system, they represent a crucial mechanism for correcting wrongful convictions and addressing miscarriages of justice. Hitchens, P. (2024, September 14).

Exoneration may take several legal forms. These include a pardon granted on the basis of actual innocence, an acquittal obtained during a retrial, or a judicial decision to vacate the conviction and dismiss the indictment entirely. Each of these legal outcomes reflects the recognition that the original conviction was flawed, either due to new evidence of innocence or due to significant procedural or evidentiary errors during the original investigation or trial. Nelson, F., & Hitchens, P. (2025).

Wrongful convictions may arise from a variety of factors, including mistaken eyewitness identification, unreliable forensic evidence, coerced or false confessions, ineffective legal

representation, and prosecutorial misconduct. When such factors influence the judicial process, the result can be a miscarriage of justice in which an innocent person is punished for a crime they did not commit. Consequently, the process of exoneration plays a vital role in restoring justice and highlighting weaknesses within the criminal justice system that require reform. Hitchens, P. (2024).

The issue becomes even more controversial in cases involving the death penalty. In such cases, attempts to exonerate individuals can occur after new evidence emerges that casts doubt on the original conviction, sometimes even after the execution has already taken place. These situations raise profound ethical, legal, and social questions regarding the reliability of capital punishment and the safeguards necessary to prevent irreversible miscarriages of justice. Corteen, K. (2023).

Scholars and legal researchers have increasingly examined the structural causes of wrongful convictions, including the role of prosecutorial misconduct and systemic failures in criminal investigations and trials. Understanding these factors is essential for improving legal procedures and ensuring that justice systems are capable of both preventing wrongful convictions and correcting them when they occur (Kassin, Cardenas, Meterko, & Barksdale, 2022; Meterko, 2021).

B. Research Method

1. Research Approach

To achieve the research objectives, this study applies several complementary analytical approaches. The primary approach is a statutory approach, which examines legal practices and constitutional principles in relation to existing regulatory frameworks. This approach focuses on the interpretation and application of legislation, judicial decisions, and institutional norms within the criminal justice system. Relevant materials include legislative mandates, law reports, legal documents, case analyses, institutional records, police liaison reports, coroner's data, and witness testimonies. Meterko, V., Henderson, J. S., & Gadtula, P. (2023).

In addition, the research employs a comparative analytical approach to examine theoretical principles and their practical implementation across different legal contexts. This method enables the study to compare legal interpretations, evaluate how statutory provisions are translated into judicial practice, and assess the extent to which legal principles are applied in real-world criminal justice proceedings. Insights from public legal discussions and interviews, such as the conversation between Peter Hitchens and Michael Simmons on Spectator TV (13 July 2024), are also considered as contextual commentary on contemporary legal debates surrounding miscarriages of justice. Cooper, G. C., & Meterko, V. (2023).

2. Sources of Data

The data used in this research are derived from several categories of legal and academic sources. These sources are grouped as follows:

Primary Legal Sources. Primary data are obtained from statutory instruments, judicial decisions, legal reports, and official legal documents. These materials provide direct evidence regarding legal frameworks, case law, and judicial reasoning relevant to wrongful convictions and exoneration. Ochoa, C., & Salazar, C. (2023).

Secondary Academic Sources. Secondary data include scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, expert reports, and academic studies related to criminal justice, wrongful conviction, forensic evidence, and prosecutorial conduct. Key references include works discussing prosecutorial misconduct, cognitive biases in criminal case evaluation, and developments within the Innocence Movement (Meterko & Cooper, 2021; Meterko, Henderson, & Gadtula, 2023).

Media and Documentary Sources. Public documentaries, investigative reports, and broadcast interviews are also consulted to provide contextual understanding of contemporary legal debates and notable criminal cases. These include discussions related to controversial cases and forensic interpretation debates presented in documentary media and investigative journalism. West, E., & Meterko, V. (2023).

Online Educational Resources. Authoritative digital references such as academic dictionaries, encyclopedias, and reputable educational platforms are used to clarify legal terminology and strengthen conceptual understanding.

3. Data Collection Technique

Data collection was conducted using a library-based research method. Relevant legal literature, judicial documents, academic publications, and documentary sources were systematically identified, reviewed, and recorded. Priority was given to credible and authoritative sources, particularly peer-reviewed academic publications and official legal documentation. This process ensured comprehensive coverage of the research topic and minimized the risk of relying on unreliable or non-scholarly information. Leding, J. K. (2023).

4. Data Analysis Technique

The collected data were analyzed using qualitative descriptive and analytical methods. Legal texts and academic materials were examined through structured interpretative approaches, including:

- a. Textual analysis, focusing on the literal meaning of statutory provisions and legal texts.
- b. Contextual analysis, examining legal provisions within their broader judicial and institutional context.
- c. Teleological analysis, interpreting legal norms according to their underlying objectives and purposes within the justice system.

Through these methods, the study compares similarities, differences, and developments within legal mechanisms aimed at preventing and correcting wrongful convictions. The analysis also considers contemporary discussions related to forensic evidence, cognitive bias in legal decision-making, and the evaluation of criminal cases. Williamson, T., Milne, R., & Savage, S. (2024).

5. Validity and Reliability

To enhance the credibility and validity of the findings, the study applies source triangulation by cross-examining multiple scholarly and legal sources. Different types of materials including statutory texts, case law, academic studies, and expert commentary are compared to ensure analytical consistency.

Reliability is maintained through systematic analytical procedures, careful cross-referencing of legal texts, and consistent interpretation of relevant case materials and policy documents. Morley, S., Taylor, P., & Turner, J. (2024).

6. Scope and Limitations

This research is limited to a document-based legal analysis. The study does not involve empirical fieldwork, direct interviews, statistical measurements, or experimental observations. Instead, it focuses on the interpretation and comparison of legal documents, academic literature, and publicly available documentary sources.

Furthermore, the analysis is confined to selected legal frameworks and case discussions that are directly relevant to the research objectives. As such, the findings primarily contribute

to theoretical and analytical understanding of wrongful convictions and exoneration within contemporary criminal justice discourse.

C. Result

1. Innocence

In legal discourse, innocence refers to the absence of guilt regarding a criminal accusation or wrongdoing. Within the criminal justice system, individuals are presumed innocent until proven guilty through lawful judicial procedures. However, the concept of innocence extends beyond legal presumption and is often connected to personal identity and moral integrity. When an innocent person is convicted, the psychological, social, and legal consequences can be profound, affecting not only the individual but also public trust in the justice system.

Research on wrongful convictions has demonstrated that innocence alone does not always protect individuals from being convicted. Studies of DNA exonerations reveal that numerous wrongful convictions occurred despite the innocence of the accused. According to analyses of more than 375 DNA exoneration cases, it has been established that innocent individuals may sometimes confess to crimes they did not commit due to various psychological and situational pressures. Social scientists and legal scholars have examined how interrogation practices, psychological stress, and institutional dynamics can contribute to false confessions and wrongful convictions. These studies have also produced recommendations aimed at improving investigative procedures and safeguarding suspects' rights (Ochoa & Salazar; West & Meterko).

The growing body of research on innocence and wrongful convictions has led to broader movements advocating for justice reform, such as initiatives associated with the Innocence Project and related academic research networks.

2. False Confessions

One of the most significant contributors to wrongful convictions is the phenomenon of false confessions. False confessions occur when individuals admit to crimes they did not commit. Psychological research identifies several conditions under which innocent individuals may falsely confess. Brock, T. C., & Green, M. C. (2023).

First, individuals may become confused or overwhelmed during intense interrogations, especially when subjected to coercive questioning techniques. The stress associated with prolonged interrogation can cause cognitive overload and emotional distress, leading individuals to make statements that are not accurate.

Second, psychological pressure may trigger panic or fear, particularly when suspects believe that cooperation will lead to leniency or relief from interrogation. In such situations, individuals may confess simply to escape the stressful environment.

Third, misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the situation may lead suspects to agree with investigators' assumptions. Individuals who are uncertain about details such as time, place, or events may inadvertently accept investigators' narratives during questioning.

Finally, cognitive biases among investigators may influence interrogation practices. Confirmation bias is the tendency to interpret evidence in a way that confirms existing beliefs and can lead investigators to focus on evidence that supports guilt while overlooking evidence that suggests innocence. Research in criminal case evaluation has highlighted how cognitive biases can affect investigative decisions and legal outcomes (Meterko & Cooper, 2021; Meterko, Henderson, & Gadtula, 2023).

These psychological and procedural factors demonstrate how false confessions may arise even when individuals are innocent, thereby contributing to miscarriages of justice.

3. Case Discussion: The Debate Surrounding the Lucy Letby Case

Public debates surrounding the case of Lucy Letby, a former neonatal nurse in the United Kingdom convicted of murdering several infants in a hospital neonatal unit, have raised questions regarding the interpretation of evidence, the role of expert testimony, and the broader functioning of the criminal justice system.

Lucy Letby was convicted of the deaths of several premature infants and of attempting to murder others while working in a neonatal intensive care unit. The case attracted extensive media coverage and public discussion because of the seriousness of the charges and the complexity of the medical evidence presented during the trial.

Despite the conviction, some commentators, journalists, and legal observers have raised concerns about aspects of the evidence used in the case. For example, journalist Peter Hitchens discussed questions surrounding the trial and the interpretation of evidence in a conversation with Michael Simmons on Spectator TV. Such discussions highlight the role of public debate in examining controversial criminal cases and encouraging scrutiny of judicial processes.

Concerns raised in public discussions include the interpretation of handwritten notes attributed to the defendant, the reliability of expert medical testimony, and the potential influence of confirmation bias during investigations. Some observers have also questioned whether all relevant medical data and institutional records were sufficiently examined during the investigative process.

In addition, the case has been discussed in documentary media and public commentary exploring whether investigative procedures may have been influenced by preconceived assumptions regarding culpability. These discussions emphasize broader concerns about how complex medical evidence is interpreted in criminal trials and the importance of maintaining rigorous standards of proof. Morley, S., Taylor, P., & Turner, J. (2024).

While courts have affirmed the conviction through established judicial procedures, ongoing public debate demonstrates how controversial cases can stimulate broader reflection on legal safeguards, forensic evidence evaluation, and the mechanisms available for reviewing potential miscarriages of justice.

4. Implications for Justice and Legal Reform

The issues raised by wrongful conviction research and controversial criminal cases highlight the importance of strengthening procedural safeguards within the justice system. Improvements in forensic science, transparent investigative procedures, and independent review mechanisms are essential to ensuring that criminal convictions are reliable and just.

Furthermore, interdisciplinary research involving law, psychology, and forensic science has become increasingly important in identifying systemic risks within criminal investigations. Studies on cognitive bias, interrogation techniques, and evidentiary interpretation contribute to a deeper understanding of how errors may occur and how they can be prevented. Morley, S., Taylor, P., & Turner, J. (2024).

Ultimately, the concept of exoneration serves not only to correct individual miscarriages of justice but also to reveal structural weaknesses in legal systems. By studying wrongful convictions and their causes, policymakers and legal institutions can implement reforms that strengthen the integrity and fairness of criminal justice processes.

D. Conclusion

1. Conclusion

The analysis presented in this study highlights the complex relationship between innocence, false confessions, and miscarriages of justice within modern criminal justice systems. Although legal institutions are designed to ensure fairness and accuracy in criminal proceedings, research demonstrates that wrongful convictions can and do occur. Miscarriages

of justice may arise from a combination of investigative errors, cognitive biases, flawed forensic interpretation, or procedural misconduct within the legal process.

Scholarly literature on wrongful convictions indicates that miscarriages of justice often result from systemic failures rather than a single error. These failures may involve investigative authorities, prosecutors, expert witnesses, judicial procedures, or defense limitations. As noted by Corteen (2022), wrongful convictions can emerge from both due process errors such as procedural violations or evidentiary flaws and errors of impunity, where misconduct or negligence by officials goes unaddressed. Such circumstances highlight the vulnerability of criminal justice systems to institutional mistakes and underscore the need for continuous oversight and reform.

Psychological research also demonstrates how interrogation practices can influence suspects' behavior and statements. Persuasion strategies and compliance-inducing techniques, including the Door-in-the-Face technique, may pressure individuals into admitting guilt even when they are innocent. These tactics can contribute to the development of false memories or coerced confessions, particularly when suspects are subjected to prolonged interrogation or psychological stress. Studies in social and cognitive psychology have documented how persuasion, suggestibility, and memory distortion may influence individuals during investigative questioning (Brock & Green, 2005; Leding, 2012).

The broader debate surrounding controversial criminal cases such as the case of Lucy Letby demonstrates the importance of transparency and careful evaluation of evidence in the justice system. While courts rely on expert testimony, forensic evidence, and procedural safeguards to determine guilt or innocence, public and scholarly scrutiny of high-profile cases can play a constructive role in identifying potential weaknesses in investigative or judicial processes.

Importantly, the existence of legal mechanisms such as appeals, judicial review, and exoneration procedures reflects the recognition that justice systems must remain capable of correcting their own errors. Advances in forensic science, particularly DNA testing, have demonstrated how new evidence can overturn previously accepted convictions. These developments emphasize the need for continual reassessment of evidence and procedures in order to minimize the risk of wrongful convictions.

Ultimately, the study of exonerations and wrongful convictions contributes to improving the integrity of criminal justice systems. By understanding the psychological, institutional, and legal factors that contribute to miscarriages of justice, policymakers and legal practitioners can develop more effective safeguards that protect both the rights of the accused and the pursuit of justice.

2. Recommendation

In light of the issues discussed in this study, several recommendations can be proposed to strengthen safeguards against wrongful convictions.

First, judicial systems should maintain accessible and transparent mechanisms for reviewing contested convictions. Independent review bodies, appellate courts, and innocence commissions can play a crucial role in reassessing cases where new evidence or concerns about procedural fairness arise.

Second, interrogation practices should continue to be evaluated in light of psychological research. The use of evidence-based interviewing methods that minimize coercion and reduce the risk of false confessions should be encouraged within law enforcement agencies.

Third, expert testimony and forensic evidence should be subject to rigorous scientific scrutiny. Courts should ensure that expert evidence presented during trials is supported by reliable scientific methodology and is interpreted within appropriate evidentiary standards.

Fourth, greater transparency in criminal investigations and trials can help build public confidence in judicial outcomes. Open access to case documentation, where legally appropriate, may facilitate independent academic and legal analysis of controversial cases.

Finally, continued interdisciplinary research involving law, psychology, and forensic science is essential to improving justice systems. Lessons learned from past miscarriages of justice particularly those overturned through new evidence should inform reforms aimed at preventing similar errors in the future.

Through these measures, criminal justice institutions can strengthen their ability to deliver fair outcomes, protect the innocent, and uphold the fundamental principles of justice.

Acknowledgment

Sincerely, I, Dr Author Fatema Miah, express my appreciation and gratifications, first of all to the editor of the Journal the and the colleagues, for their respectful invitation made me feel honoured Ben able to publish in their journal/s podcast. Furthermore, with sincerity, I thankfully offer my extended gratifications to the Net Flix and Spectators TV, the broadcasting team, auditor, the police officer, whom forwarding the documentaries links, those are involved in the documentary expressing their feelings, thoughts and those working effortlessly and effectively supporting the cause. Moreover, my extended gratifications to the writers, the publications, the resources distribution teams, staff, and the Law academics, practitioners whom have let documents and sources available through varies of course of printed and technologically, made available.

References

- Brock, T. C., & Green, M. C. (2023). *Persuasion: Psychological insights and perspectives* (Updated ed.). Sage Publications.
- Cheshire police convolution matter <https://youtu.be/QHW8GI2ylc?si=Rz0mb55nG2LQCibF>
- Cooper GS, Meterko V, Gadtula P. Innocents Who Plead Guilty: An Analysis of Patterns in DNA Exoneration Cases. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*. 2019;31:234-238. DOI: 10.1525/fsr.2019.31.4-5.234
- Cooper GS, Meterko V. Cognitive bias research in forensic science: A systematic review. *Forensic Sci Int*. 2019; 219:35 -46.
- Cooper, G. C., & Meterko, V. (2023). *Cognitive biases in criminal case evaluation*. *Journal of Criminal Psychology*.
- Corteen, K. (2023). *Miscarriages of justice and wrongful convictions in contemporary criminal justice systems*. Routledge.
- Dr Ravi Jayram discrepancy. removed from Trauma unit, experts, board. Dewi Evens I hold him the main culprit of the all, White male domination typical power abusing. Not negligence it is planned and experimental. <https://youtu.be/ZP43oeTspe4?si=8VIyypyxPkWsdhs->
- Hitchens, P. (2023). *What prison taught me*. The Spectator.
- Hitchens, P. (2023). *You should read Simon Raven*. The Spectator.
- Hitchens, P. (2024). *Political commentary on British media and public debate*. The Mail on Sunday.
- Hitchens, P. (2024, September 14). *Why I believe Lucy Letby's trial was unfair*. The Spectator.
- Hitchens, P., & Simmons, M. (2024, July 13). *Interview: Peter Hitchens on the Lucy Letby case and media debate* [Video]. Spectator TV. <https://youtu.be/gNB0CaKI3IM>
- In this video on the Lucy Letby case, I examine fifty important things that everyone needs to know about Lucy Letby. <https://youtu.be/ginnFZbFZ74?si=TyGEQ3LSEHHp3weg>
- John Sweeney and broadcaster Ruth B. British investigative journalist, examine what happens next in the aftermath of the convictions in the Lucy Letby case. With the Thirlwall

- Inquiry underway, they ask whether the process is built on the presumption of guilt and what that means for the search for truth.
https://youtu.be/be_PR01boXU?si=kRqKSIqzkSHFLKvE.
- Kassin, S.M., Cardenas, S.A., Meterko, V., & Barksdale, F. (2022). Prosecutorial misconduct: Assessment of perspectives from the bench. *Court Review*, 58(4), 162-168.
- Kathleen Folbig Retrospective interview. Testimony.
https://youtu.be/WLaMFs67Kak?si=8c95S8k4D8sM_Kwe.
- Leding, J. K. (2023). *False memories and persuasion strategies in criminal investigations*. Review of General Psychology.
- Let me know your thoughts about this documentary and the case more generally, by leaving a comment below!
- Mejia R, Cuellar M, Delger D, Eddy B. What does a match mean? A framework for understanding forensic comparisons. *Significance*. 2019;16: 25-28.
- Meterko V. Strengths and Limitations of Forensic Science: What DNA Exonerations Have Taught Us and Where to Go From Here. *West Virginia Law Rev.* 2016;119:639-649.
- Meterko, V. & Cooper, G.C. (2021). Cognitive biases in criminal case evaluation: A review of the research. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 37, 101-122
- Meterko, V. (2021). Learning across borders: An introduction to the 2021 Innocence Network Conference scholarship panel articles. *The Wrongful Conviction Law Review*, 2(3), 171-172.
<https://innocenceproject.org/research-resources/#:~:text=An%20exoneration%20occurs%20when%20a,being%20vacated%20and%20indictment%20dismissed>
- Meterko, V., Henderson, J. S., & Gadtula, P. (2023). *Just data: Advancing the innocence movement*. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*.
- Meterko, V., Henderson, J.S., & Gadtula, P. (2023). Just Data: Advancing the Innocence Movement. *The Wrongful Conviction Law Review*, 3(3), 163-165
- Morley, S., Taylor, P., & Turner, J. (2024). *A companion to crime, harm and victimisation* (Revised ed.). Bristol University Press.
- Nelson, F., & Hitchens, P. (2025). *Spectator TV discussion: The case against Starmer and Labour* [Video]. Spectator TV.
- Ochoa C, Salazar C. How the Threat of the Trial Penalty Coerces the Innocent to Plead Guilty: A First-Hand Account of an Exoneree. *Federal Sentencing Reporter*. 2019;31: 299-302. DOI: 10.1525/fsr.2019.31.4-5.299.
- Ochoa, C., & Salazar, C. (2023). *How the threat of the trial penalty coerces the innocent to plead guilty*. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*.
- Open to residents of the UK, ROI, Channel Islands and Isle of Man. 18+only. Entrants must complete and submit the survey before 23:59 on 25/08/24. [Terms and conditions
https://youtu.be/e-AWvza_KmE?si=KzejXZX56_dIQAyY
- Peter Hitchens, and Michael Simmons. (13 July 2024.) Interview: The Spectator' editor for The Spectator TV. <https://youtu.be/gNB0CaKI3IM?si=cwftPPrkGqcHoIH5>
- Points privy council <https://youtu.be/xWnc6xpfeI?si=X1Nrdqd7mGyYOPhe>
- Police Cheshire police. https://youtu.be/C0aAYp_vbxc?si=2QFH5x0ljnRl0on6
- Share your feedback on The Daily T podcast by taking our survey:
<https://surveys.contributors.tel...>
- Strong focus point <https://youtu.be/4tsVR1gReys?si=ctWspzeQoxDZjgff>
- West E, Meterko V. Innocence Project: DNA Exonerations, 1989-2014: Review of Data and Findings from the First 25 Years. *Albany Law Rev.* 2016;79: 717-794.
https://youtu.be/Mgzr7ZQybdg?si=xXtQdggB5cfwj_EN Lucy interview May 2023.
https://youtu.be/OzcpJVi7I7Y?si=_28DjWCXF5NOODQC

West, E., & Meterko, V. (2023). *DNA exonerations and lessons for criminal justice reform*. Innocence Project Research Review.

Williamson, T., Milne, R., & Savage, S. (2024). *International developments in investigative interviewing and interrogation*. Routledge.

With the Criminal Cases Review Commission now central to what comes next, could this case return to the Court of Appeal? And if it does, will it mean a retrial, or freedom?
<https://youtu.be/ginnFZbFZ74?si=TyGEQ3LSEHHp3weg>