

Unit 3 Topic 2.3 Page 48
Activity: Research
The relevance of evidence

Learning objective

At the end of this activity you should be able to:

- understand problems that could arise with historical evidence and historical trials.

A. Using the article answer questions 1 to 16 that follow.

<https://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2014/feb/06/william-roache-acquittal-inconsistent-testimonies>

1. Why was the case against Bill Roache difficult to prove?
 2. When had Roache's accusers gone to the police?
 3. What evidence did the 63-year-old accuser have?
 4. Did this evidence incriminate Roache? Give reasons for your answer.
 5. What inconsistency is highlighted in the 59-year-old woman's testimony?
 6. What was the problem with the account mentioning Roache's gold Rolls Royce?
 7. What was the husband who contacted the *Sunday Mirror* accused of?
 8. Why were the women criticised by Roache's barrister?
 9. Why was one charge thrown out halfway through the trial?
 10. How did Roache's evidence in the witness box differ from the responses he gave in a TV interview?
 11. Why was the evidence about how many women Roache had slept with inadmissible?
 12. How is Roache's testimony described?
 13. How did Roache's co-star describe him?
 14. What has been the impact of the Jimmy Savile case on allegations against celebrities?
 15. According to the prosecution, why did the allegations not make sense?
 16. Why do you think the Chief Crown Prosecutor attended court?
- B. Overall, what is the problem of taking historical cases to court?