

EP TWO - MUSIC; No MASTER, NO Credits

Fri, 7/22 11:09AM 48:42

SUMMARY KEYWORDS

people, private investigators, abrasive, quote, wiser, weiser, company, report, felt, individuals, ceo, workers, platform, employees, leader, contact, point, data, email, stories



00:00

This is a sequential podcast. Make sure you listen to all episodes in order as we have to follow a strict timeline to be able to tell this story.



00:07

Thank you than snow you were listening to super punk corporate meltdown, a podcast about workers rights, institutional betrayal and corporate retaliation. In the podcast, we analyze a recent case study straight out of the news, a vicious and unnecessary war imposed by an embattled beer company. I'm Kate Bailey. I'm a workplace consultant, and workplace investigator



00:45

and I'm fanning one though the hospitality industry workers advocate



00:49

and this is super punk corporate meltdown. This is episode two, invade and intimidate. This is episode two, public life, privacy strife. And episode one, we began the story in January 2022. With the publishing of a series of statements from a beer company BrewDog, and their CEO ahead of a highly anticipated documentary about the company. We covered how former workers and contributors to the program were being targeted. And we covered the genesis of quote gait. We also outlined what cultural problems are, and pointed to the fact that well, perhaps some key indicators of cultural problems exist in this case. So before we jump back into quote, gait and I know all of you just can't wait. I do want to talk for a second about cultural problems, and often where they stem from. And that's a term that practitioners in my world call a brace of leadership. And actually, I'm taking some of what I'm going to share with you today from a report that I've been working on for a completely different client. But let's get into it. So abrasive. abrasive is defined as harsh or rough and manner. And it generally relates to the interpersonal style of someone, and in this case, a leader, hence, abrasive leaders, I really, really encourage people listening to research this on their own, because it is a really great way to encapsulate the spectrum of a quote, bad manager, right? Because competencies are

different when it comes to bad management. People who are abrasive and who are bad at managing people are actually often effective in terms of their job function. But that's still not good management. And in the same way, someone who is nice and who you know, is maybe unable to advocate for themselves in certain situations, well, they may also be bad at managing people because of that. So in this particular case, the use of the term abrasive leader really refers to people who are in a leadership position, and who, through a series of behaviors could be considered harsh, or rough and manner. And these types of leaders, they will often display aggression towards others towards things towards the working environment, it can be kind of not personal, but feel really personal, right? These leaders, they often damage their working relationships to the point where it really disrupts the way the company functions, right. And then there's the aggressive behaviors. And these can range from something which is just mildly casually, someone say offensive to a downright open attack. The words and actions of these types of people often actually also create interpersonal friction within their teams. And it really grinds on those who report to them, their peers, even their superiors, and it really takes away trust and motivation, and disrupts what should be a smooth flow of work. And in fact, some of the harassment can be, you know, so consistent and so



04:32

abrasive, that they can inflict really deep trauma and wounds on employees. And we'll talk more about that throughout this podcast. But this is a thing. And it's so much a thing that when I go into an organization, nine times out of 10, dead serious nine times out of 10 the cultural problems that I've been brought into address often stems back to a breach of leadership. So here are some of the things things that I'm looking for when I start to get an inkling from the anecdotal data that I'm getting from an organization that, you know, there is an abrasive leader, or leaders in this mix, and something's gone wrong. So that would be the, you know, the attrition of employees, a valued employees. So how are people reacting to the environment? What's the trend rate in this organization? Can we see in real data, what people are reporting and anecdotal data. Now, what I also see is a complete, almost non existent morale and motivation. And generally, productivity is just very low. There are consistently issues with productivity when you have an abrasive leader at the helm. Generally, the workers will report or there will be reports of higher incidences of stress related illness. And that is usually reflected in what people are reporting in exit interviews. And, of course, high turnover rates. Now, the employee themselves often demonstrate what I would frame as an affected performance, their performance isn't normally what it is, they may seem a little absent. They may seem unwilling, but it's not unwilling, but not or seem incapable of certain duties and responsibilities. But that's because a certain type of paralysis takes over, when you have a culture of a brace of leadership and a culture of fear, right? People are so scared of the outcome of not doing something right, because that's probably what they're going to be told that they just are almost unable to work on the project, then you tend to look in an organization have there been claims brought against them, is that any sort of knowledge about either the people being discussed or the company in general. And that's going to point you in a lot of different directions. But it's important to understand if this has been addressed in any sort of regulatory or formal way before, because then it just verifies the problem from the get go. And then, of course, abrasive leadership is more often than not associated with retaliatory responses, right? Sabotage. So this can happen between employees and management, just trying to do one simple task. And this can happen with future job opportunities, or moving departments or anything that the employee may do to try and defuse the situation. This also includes a lot of gossip, and a lot of clicky behavior on the part of the brace of leader because they're trying to often times create a juxtaposition in terms of how they're perceived in the

office. Sometimes it's conscious, and sometimes it's not. But abrasive leaders rely on other people saying, no, they're a good person, when someone says this person did something bad to me. So that's a brief on abrasive leadership. And there are some amazing practitioners working in rehabilitation of abrasive leaders, and they do incredible work on this topic. There's lots of academia. And there's lots of coaching techniques that we at hand in the heart employ when when implementing change in organizations. The point of bringing this up is that for all of the talk for all of the media that goes on about workplaces, there is a very real academic concept that can be used to discuss this type of leadership. And it's really important that we frame these kinds of conversations like this, because it affects so many people, workers, first and foremost, who go home to family and friends and partners unload all of this stress all of the burdens that working for an abrasive leader can bring who often have to seek counseling close by people who clearly refuse to go to counseling. When we have topics like this. There is key language that we can use, which is attached to something tangible indicators. And when we have these tangible indicators, we can build a toolset to address them. That is, when abrasive leaders are willing to be rehabilitated. That, of course involves recognizing you have a problem. So funny. You've been witnessed to hundreds and maybe 1000s of stories about workplaces. What is your take when you hear something that's more theoretical and clinical like that?

 09:28

It's for sure something that rings a bell from your breakdown in some of the materials that you're referring to. It's also something that can at times seem complex, and it can come in different shapes and forms for those experiencing it or perpetuating it. Being able to define these issues is so important, as is all information that can offer context in order to help people with spotting these issues both in others and also within themselves and further provide a vocabulary to those who may not Aren't feel able to articulate their feelings or even identify these behaviors until something like abrasive leadership is thoroughly explained to them within the realm of brewing hospitality and yeah, probably business, I imagined that something like a course on abrasive leadership and how to manage ourselves out of it could be helpful to staff on all levels of a company, not least the employers. Speaking of KB, should we dive back in a quote gate?

 10:27

Yes. So community quote, gate temperature check, given that our timeline is at the beginning of March, like what's the temperature check, if any.

 10:38

So at this point, not much yet has been found out about the evolution of the quote itself. So for now, the general reception to this quote, circulating is anger. But there doesn't seem to be a whole lot of surprise. At this point. Having talked to people, both consumers, EFP shareholders, former and current staff, it felt like a lot of people have been desensitized to the sort of antics that this company projects, and it took a few days before momentum really started to pick up. So at the start of all of this, it felt like it was something that I was logically going to get an answer to. And I think maybe the people who were following thought so as well, but after about

a week, then it was seen quite publicly that people were asking for both the CEO and the company to clarify these things within the forum within the Twittersphere. And I also became aware of the many people who reached out to both Weiser and BrewDog. To clarify,

 11:39

and we wanted to speak to one of those individuals who did try and find out who said this, quote, individual is not a participant of the BrewDog, or factory workers platform, but they are a former employee of BrewDog. These are their words, it is not their voice. How did you become aware of the quote,

 12:02

I believe I first read the quote and an insider article about BrewDog, starting a complaint to Ofcom on March 3 2022. It quoted the press release directly, which was on the BrewDog site at the time, and I cross referenced it. I think they've changed the wording on the press release itself since then. But who knows what's in the material that was actually sent it to Ofcom? I doubt they'd have bothered dad at that.

 12:23

What were your initial observations about the quote,

 12:27

shock as a punctual purpose letter signatory. The central message of the letter was that we believed there was both a potential and urgent need for positive change both in the company and the industry as a whole. It seemed to have taken the whole messaging we tried to send and engage with and flip it on its head to dismiss pumps with purpose entirely. Like it was a handful of people rubbing their hands in Glee about ruining lives, which was literally diametrically opposed to what it actually was. It shocked me because the company was the target of the most extreme case we've seen of a small group of former employees on a mission to cause damage to a brand was not at all the vibe that I got from Weiser. When I spoke to them, they were very sympathetic and seemed to understand the frustrations of those they were interviewing. Moreover, the top level report that Weiser and BrewDog had published on or about 23rd December said absolutely nothing hinting of that conclusion. That's the thing that made me go Hold on, something's not right here. Where did this quote come from? Because it's nowhere in the materials that have been made available to the public.

 13:28

Why did you decide to inquire about the quote,

 13:31

11 13:51

I couldn't believe that a conclusion like the most extreme case we've seen of a small group of former employees on a mission to cause damage to a brand could be drawn from the results of the published parts of the review. What were they leaving out? The quote was initially attributed to Weiser, both in the press release and the insider article where I first came across it. It also made me really question the supposed impartiality of Weiser, they said they were impartial. And we keep responses anonymous. We now know that they've passed names and personal data on from those anonymous interviews straight to BrewDog. So in hindsight, it wasn't surprising. I mean, it should be surprising, and it looks terrible in terms of impartiality.

14:11

Who did you inquire about the quote with,

14:15

I emailed the address, as the had been indicated as the initial point of contact for anyone participating in the interviews. That was on March 3. I also emailed the author of The Insider piece on the same day with the following. I read with interest of the article this morning on BrewDog and their complaints to Ofcom. In it you quote the Wiser report to the culture at the company as concluding the company was the target of the most extreme case, we've seen of a small group of former employees on a mission to cause damage to a brand. I've read through the publicly available materials from wiser and have not been able to find anything about such a conclusion. Would you be able to confirm where you came across this conclusion? And how can it be verified? I find it strange that the quoted statement would be so at odds With the tone of the overall material otherwise available, I did not hear

15:04

back from the author. Can you describe those interactions?

15:08

I had not heard back from Weiser the following day. But notice that the insider piece had changed the attribution of the quote from wiser to the chairman of the board, the former as the Chief Exec. I emailed the same address at wiser again, noting the change asking if this has come from them, or if the author of the piece had changed it based on something else, such as my emails, questions to him, I did not hear back about that, or about weather wise, his conclusion had, in fact been that quote, if it had, why had the insider piece changed its attribution to be the chairman of the board. It all seemed really odd. As I did not hear back, I got an email address from another punks, the purpose signatory, whom I knew for direct contact at why I emailed them on March 9, after not having heard back from Weiser for a week. She then replied back to me on March 14, with a short message stating simply, in short, this was not a quote from Weiser products PR advisor has confirmed the quote was attributed to Weiser in air. And this has now been changed online, he has confirmed this error will not be repeated. He has said you're welcome to contact them anytime for further clarification, His

email is I figured I'd get through dogs PR advisor a call on a number that was publicly available on their website, because I was getting frustrated with all the runaround. When I did, I could clearly hear him talking to a person who initially answered the call asking her things like, where's he calling from? And what did you say his name was? Eventually I was told he would call me right back 20 minutes later, he did, in fact, call me back. He was very dismissive of my query, saying at the time that I have no idea who you are, why should talk to you or where you're calling from, when I said that I had been advised to contact him by the Wiser representative, as someone happy to talk about the press release, and the quote, he said, Yes, I'm happy to talk to the media and the like. Okay. So let's say I'm from the media. I'm trying to get to the bottom of an attribution of a quote that keeps getting changed, I replied, He says, James White has posted a number of times about this on LinkedIn, multiple blogs, all publicly available stuff. It's from a credible third party consultant. I say, so you can't tell me who the consultant is. Is it wiser? The rep says, You're haranguing me. This has now been going on for 12 minutes. You keep pestering me, I have no idea who you are. At this point, I checked my phones called length counter. It's been six minutes and eight seconds. I'm just after the source of a quote that is in material that's out there, and is changing. First, an insider article said it was wiser. Now, it's been edited to the chairman. I know nothing about the article, or why it says that, he replied, but you're the contact person for the press release. You're haranguing me, he cut me off. I'm doing nothing of the sort. I'm trying to get to know who said this thing, which is, frankly, a doozy of a quote, the company was the target of the most extreme case, we've seen of a small group of former employees on a mission to cause damage to the brand. You're not able to tell me who said that. A credible third party consultant, he repeated. So you know who that third party consultant is? I asked, look, you're harassing me. If it was something that they chose to disclose, it would be disclosed. Now if you want to send me the article, which you're referring to, you have my email. I thanked him for his time, and he slammed the phone down. So I emailed him the link to the article detailing how the quote had been changed in its attribution on the insider piece from March 2 to march 3, and how the Scottish son called it a independent report by workplace consultancy, sick. It looks like they just cut off the name



18:45

what was notable to you about the interactions. I felt



18:49

like I was being given the runaround, where I got replies they were dismissive. That's why I picked up the phone to call the PR people. To be honest, I'm surprised they called me back after only 20 minutes. I didn't enjoy being told I was harassing a man whose name had literally been referred to me as the point of contact to clarify about the



19:05

origin of the quote, was your inquiry satisfied?



19:09

No. I would not say that the inquiry was satisfied. After I get off the phone with the PR rep. I felt

no. I would not say that the inquiry was satisfied. After I get on the phone with the PR rep. I feel I had been dismissed. And like I should be happy with what I read in the press release originally, and not ask questions.



19:20

Is there anything else that you'd like to share about these experiences?



19:24

It just feels so odd. Why would an initial press release that papers quote from place the quote to have come from Wiser if it didn't? Why do pieces that were edited post publication? attribute it to various sources from Workplace consultancy to the chairman? And is that anonymous workplace consultancy? Wiser or someone else? Why did BrewDog engage another workplace consultancy? If it is indeed someone else? Did they not like wiser as a result that much? In their initial commissioning of the review BrewDog promised to act on the results of that wiser review, have they? If the Wiser report did In fact, have that quote in some part of its non published conclusion. Why does the rest of the report not show any indication of leading to that conclusion? It seems so in Congress. And that's what made me want to dig into this as someone who participated in the review as a PW P signatory, as someone who wants bought into the BrewDog thing. And as someone who really wants the industry as a whole to improve, for everyone's sake,



20:25

is there anything else that you'd like to share with the listeners of this podcast about this topic or the topic at large,



20:32

I still believe that punks with purpose needed to do its thing, we needed to publish that letter. And I'm glad that BrewDog after some initial moves to get a forced internal response published, decided to listen and commit to an external review. But I'm not sure if they intended to act on the results of that review. What I would like to see is actual organized labor in the company, a more equal footing of staff to bosses rather than employee representative groups. But it's so goddamn tiring. The CEO has all the money in the world, and he hasn't been shy about using it to come after people who just want to do the right thing. He used private investigators to come after signatories. All of us have jobs outside of this thing. It's not an organized campaign against him. I left the industry because of BrewDog. I saw recently that the CEO said on his show, he has gone through extensive therapy, I'd love him to offer that extensive therapy to those of us who needed it after working for him. I know I'm lucky to have been able to afford it after I left and bounce back somewhat. But I feel there's others being grounded in a paste in that corporate culture to this day, and that's just not right.



21:57

In mid March, The Guardian reported that BrewDog CEO had hired private investigators in order to gather evidence against individuals he believed to be involved in a campaign against him, which included an unnamed woman as well as Dylan Gray and Rob McKay. Both former BrewDog employees who participated in the BBC documentary The Truth About BrewDog. Quote, gate continues as BrewDog and Wiser give conflicting answers about the source of the quote, then and then encourages platform participants to submit data subject access requests, while talks with BrewDog. Regarding reconciliation continue, KB what is happening with the affected workers platform when this reporting came out?



22:35

When this reporting came out, I was appalled that they had brazenly admitted to it. I mean, this is the stuff that Tesla and like Israeli spy firms that fucked around with Britney Spears were doing is become so brazen to intimidate employees that Elon Musk is even doing it to companies he doesn't own. Yet,



22:56

Elon Musk criticized Twitter employees despite a promise from the entrepreneur Not to disparage the company, or its employees while he completes the acquisition deal. Musk earlier had agreed to refrain from targeting Twitter employees as part of a 95 page agreement covering his \$44 billion acquisition deal.



23:13

And its worker retaliation, plain and simple. From my position at that time, as a mediator representing the platform, and whom the company knew I was willing to coordinate the investigation of any claim. This was just beyond belief. It was totally contradictory to where things seem to be at otherwise. To me, it also indicated a complicit board, and a failing of corporate governance. And it really did prompt one of the biggest fearful responses that I have ever personally experienced or heard of. And by that, I mean, you know, that just the amount of emails and contact that I had from people on the platform, when this reporting came out. All of that said, I was still in a diplomatic position with the company, right. And I think anyone who finds himself in the situation, you know, it was it, and many people do people who represent unions and things like that. I couldn't really offer how I made the decision to ultimately address this reporting publicly. Because, in essence, I sat there and looked at the circumstances and asked myself, what serves the workers best here. We have a large multinational corporation, we have their private investigators. We have the chairman of a board admitting that they have sent people out to investigate former workers and they did it because they apparently thought that these former workers were criminals. What would serve the workers best in this situation, thinking about that? Because I also knew that they weren't involved in it. What would serve the workers best would be that they have support publicly, and that the platform was seen to take this seriously and to take the countless concerns that were expressed to me leading up to and on that publication date, then beyond that what would also serve them best is to help them understand why or how they've been targeted. Many, many people expressed their concerns about how they were located and contacted and why. And as all of these countless testimonies of strangers began to add up, I really understood that as a result of this quote, and its initial

attribution to wiser and wiser, subsequent denial, that I really felt that it really was wiser. And that a breach had occurred in the independent review. And this was different to what was expressed to me by participants. So it really was, you know, a colloquially a hunch, but the participants were expressing to me, I just really want to know what they know about me and why. And, thankfully, the law provides for that. I spoke to a lawyer in the UK, I myself am quite familiar with GDPR. But obviously, I wanted to verify what action could be taken here. And any person where the GDPR or privacy laws exists, can issue what's called a SAR, and that stands for subject access request. It's also known as a de sol, which is data subject access request. Issuing a SAR is basically issuing a request for any and old data that a company holds or processes about you. And this can include emails, notes, recordings, contact details, identity details, medical records, timesheet records, and employment records in the EU and GDPR. The law dictates that these items must be handed over to an individual with a few exceptions, for example, when the data of a third party would be breached. So my final decision was to email participants individually or via the platform, or to inform them, if they weren't concerned what they could do, about accessing the information that BrewDog or wiser or Integritas had processed about them, or what they held on them. Many people went on to issue these SARS over the coming days. And the ultimate idea was that if information was being handled correctly, at least individuals could be vindicated from having provided anything that would result in them being targeted and attacked. We're gonna return to Charlotte Cooke. Now. Charlotte, you began having experiences with what we assume and have very good substantiated reasons to believe a private investigators hired by we assume the CEO, but very possibly the company. Can you tell us about those experiences?

 27:39

So the first that I became aware that they're potentially private investigators looking into me was I was told, whilst I was in Charlotte, North Carolina for a conference, I suddenly felt incredibly unsafe, I felt really jumpy, kind of didn't really want to be there anymore. And felt really freaked out. So something that happened earlier that week was that my boss had received a call from a woman calling herself Sandra, who had asked to speak to me wouldn't disclose why she wanted to speak to me, or anything at all, who she was where she was, from, why she wanted to talk to me. My boss refused to hand over my number, but passed her number on to me to speak to I didn't call it back because my instincts went off. And it's like, you know what, if this person wants to speak to me, they'll find a way. I'm not that hidden. It's not difficult to find me. And but once I found out about the private investigators, I kind of put two and two together and pass the number on to a couple of other people who could look into it, but just waited to see what might happen. So the day after I got back from the States, my boss received another phone call from Sandra asking to speak to me very insistently. He told me this, so I went and reported it to the police, because I was utterly convinced that this was a private investigator. And we have good reason to believe that it was and so I wanted, everything logged, I wanted a paper trail of all of this harassment, so that if anything ever comes of it, then it's there.

 29:10

Yes, and two points here. The first is that going to the police doesn't necessarily mean that action can happen. And that can be a very difficult position for people who are in a situation like what you're experiencing. However, I think it is good practice, to note what you've done

here by going to the police and reporting these repeated instances because it is a paper trail. And it does counteract this sort of constant feeling that you have to undo some sort of gaslighting from the other side in these types of situations. One of the things that I want to know about your situation Charla is that I was able to look into it, and the one thing that we had which was kind of anchoring the whole thing was this phone number. And when that phone number was searched, it was directly linked to a private investigator. And then I tried to call the number. So I ended up speaking to a woman who claims that, that the number has been fraudulently used, if what I'm saying is true that it's being used to contact people's employers. And I thought, well, we should go to the police, we should look into this, this is not good if you've been implicated in whatever is going on here. But this is a very real situation, other people are going to the police, and we should make sure that we document everything. And I eventually hear nothing, the person is completely reluctant in the coal to note anything, whatsoever. And it was just super weird. But my theory is, if they're going to rattle the cage, people need to rattle it back. Because I see this constantly with workers who are intimidated in ways like this. And my personal approach is to find out who, what, when, where, why and get it documented. So in this case, I think probably just the one thing that I think is brings a little bit of levity to the situation was that after this, I provided my details and wanted to remain in contact with the individual and genuinely follow up and get this individual to go to the police because maybe it was true. But after I did that, the private investigator looked at my LinkedIn. And I know that because I paid for that wencke Premium LinkedIn. And I was just like, wow, this is so incompetent. Like not only is your phone number registered to an individual who's a private investigator, but then when I send details, you just go and look at my LinkedIn profile. It was absolutely bizarre to see that.



31:45

Yeah, the incompetence is quite astounding, I'm not hard to track down, there's no need to contact my boss. So to me that either proves that they're spectacularly incompetent, or this was an attempt to intimidation. Either way, neither worked.



32:00

So I've had my suspicions for a while that BrewDog CEO had engaged with private investigators. So when I had seen the reporting from The Guardian had come out, I decided to dig for those conversations and those screenshots, and my new have about 10,000 screenshots, just screenshots on my phone, I was able to find a screenshot that contain their names, and I looked up Integritas. And everything matched from something I had sent to me already in September. So Koch is already in full swing. But I did some late night Googling, and found a few really interesting articles about their background. And so both of us investigators that run Integritas, they are former police officers, and both of them. About nine years ago, were part of an anti Terror Squad and we're under investigation for corruption. And I believe both of them were able to, you know, retire, or at least one of them was, and it was sort of a dead end issue, because these type of court documents aren't sealed when it's specific to those police. But other than that, they seem to pick up quite quickly their own business of being private detectives, and notably, I found a few articles. And it's super notable that the common thread seemed to be that they frequently would engage in something that was maybe a bit high profile, and that the clients that they took on, were usually men that they believed had been wrongfully accused. On top of that, they also seem to have interacted quite a bit with the

media. One of the things I had read about was them participating in a Channel Five documentary series, where they urged the Scottish Government to reopen a case that seemed quite open and closed, another where they came to the defense of a police officer who had attempted to take his own life after being accused of misconduct. And finally, there was the statements that they have made to the Guardian regarding the issues with BrewDog and its CEO. And finally, there was the quote that they had provided to the Guardian article where Integritas had said they had uncovered evidence of a very clear criminal campaign organized by a small group of individuals seemingly intent on causing harm to the CEO and BrewDog. So this was really interesting. I felt that it had echoed quite a bit from the quote that was otherwise circulating from the Ofcom report. And what I also thought was interesting was the fact that they even mentioned the company in this because I was under the impression that they were hired privately by the CEO. Shit, should I say the CEO I said Mr. Watt. So that was really interesting only because I was under the impression that the CEO had hired them privately. And this indicates that perhaps they were also looking into any issues within the company, which then begs the question of who hired them, and more importantly, who's paying them.



35:24

The Guardian reporting comes out. And this details that not only were the company admitting to hiring private investigators, but the other people had been looked into as well. Could you describe what that day was like for you?



35:40

That was a strange day, because in a way, it was really validating to see that we were telling the truth that I wasn't just paranoid that people were looking into me that I was being contacted, but that it was happening, and it was happening to other people. And it was a clear campaign of targeted harassment. And journalists really don't like to see other journalist sources being intimidated. So he wasn't particularly kind, he didn't go easy on them. And that was quite good to see because I could prove, look, this does happen. This is what the CEO is actually like, this is the length that he will go to, to scare people. And just to have that out there in a beautifully written piece of evidence was



36:24

spectacular. Yes. And I guess the the flip side of it as well, though, was that having it validated, also raised, this also gave way for people to have genuine concerns, because it was disturbing what was being reported. And a lot of people from the platform and beyond were coming to me and expressing their concerns. And at hand and heart, we recognize that we had to look into this and to understand individuals concerns and express to them. Well, if you're interested, we can provide you with information to help you understand your rights, and you can make a decision. So hand in heart provided to you and many others, that information. And you subsequently issued saw requests to BrewDog, wiser and Integritas, can you tell us a bit about that decision.

 37:17

So the reason that I wanted to issue SARS was because everything that I was seeing that was being put out there by the CEO didn't have grounding in my understanding of the situation, or in any kind of reality that I saw, I can't get an understanding of where you know, the quote for, quote, gate came from, or my documented antipathy or anything like that, without seeing the evidence for it. And I didn't believe that there was any evidence to show any of this, there certainly wasn't any evidence to link me to a criminal conspiracy. But if there was, I wanted to see where it came from, if I'd actually said it, if I'd done it. And if there wasn't to say, look, there's nothing here.

 38:01

I think that was the reason why a lot of people ended up submitting saws as well was because at the very least, if there were no problems, and I think everyone hoped that there would be no problems that if the data was being handled correctly, there would be absolutely nothing in what was handed over that would implicate people and this brewing conspiracy of criminal accusations that we're starting to roll out?

 38:26

Absolutely. There's no reason that I can see for anyone who's been involved in trying to improve the brewing industry for workers to have anything negative in any of those sores that come back to them.

 38:39

Absolutely. And it's very clear that this, this is where the story really starts to follow the track of corporate retaliation, the textbook version that we've become accustomed to over the last three, four or five years of these, you have a corporation, you have a leader, and then these companies come in from the periphery performing their services, and they get involved. It is very rare with all these public stories about corporate retaliation, that you have a creative recruitment firm provide a court like that, it is even rarer that that quote reflects what was initially implied by BrewDog that it was wiser than wise. I said, No, it wasn't us. And then no one knew who it was and then eventually, you know, it comes out something else. So in from my perspective, this is a very clearly forming picture of what the apparatus of corporate retaliation is. You have people out there getting trying to get information to investigate some criminal campaign, but the individuals that are publicly being accused of being a part of that campaign have have no reason to have been involved in any of this at all. And there's no evidence whatsoever. And everyone's shocked and confused. When you bring up the history and you bring up things like that, of course, we could jump to conclusions. But I think it's enough to take on board what you found was notable when you looked into Integritas.

 40:23

By late March, dozens of inquiries had been made regarding quote, gate BrewDog and Weiser continued to evade, and the issue remains unresolved, sparking debate around the results of

the recent culture review performed by wiser Hannon Hart received a data subject access requests in relation to the affected workers platform, good beer hunting covers a news embark and by BrewDog rep uses legal maneuver to unmask victims and their stories.



40:47

So at this point, I am meant to be having a meeting to present at this point, what is a requested reconciliation concept for BrewDog. Diplomatically, it feels totally fucked already. And they are just not willing to acknowledge or discuss anything, the red flags of that. And at this point, I'm really just convinced that Well, I don't know what they want as a company. And as a board. I do sense that they don't want genuine engagement. And the chances of a reconciliation concept are zero. But I am a professional, I'll do the work. And I'll show up for the people that I'm there to represent. Then this whole thing turned into. Yep, thought was just a day before the meeting, I got an email from lawyers of the CEO, it was the CEO exercising a personal right, which, by the way, I never revealed the nature of what this individual was doing. But BrewDog did. So we can talk about it now. And that was a saw from the CEO of BrewDog, to my company, which that's actually no problem. That's there, right? Except that my company was obviously storing and retaining the data submitted to us by platform participants. I was perplexed, and I immediately phoned the lawyer who had sent the letter. To clarify, I am in discussions with this individuals company on behalf of a lot of people. And those discussions relate to the stories you've now requested access to, can you confirm that you want access to the platform data, there was a little bit of back and forth here. But eventually, the lawyer did confirm in writing this intention. So here's what I want to know, at this point. One, the individual wants access to his data, which he believes would be any data on the platform about him, too, that would negate the entire negotiation process with this company, which was about how these cases would be investigated. Actually, three, that would therefore be catastrophic to individuals who fear the CEO for obvious and good reasons for for, there are exemptions to this. Normally, if my company had to process a PSA is pretty straightforward. But in this case, I knew that because we'd had legal advice, setting up the platform that these individuals were essentially coming to the platform for legal consideration, and that likely were reasonable, we would be able to exempt that data from what we hand over as part of fulfilling the request. The intention, however, was to completely fulfill the request outside of the data of those on the platform, I knew the company was up to something. And given a half an hour chat was scheduled to discuss substantial and long documents that had been sent via email. The meeting didn't really feel like it was intended to do anything other than be one last contact. At this point, they confirmed as much at least by stating that they could not comment on anything that I had raised from the nature of the request. While I was negotiating to the requests of platform participants. It was at this point that I felt on behalf of the hand and heart BrewDog affected workers platform that I had to pause the discussions and I issued a public statement. I'll share a little bit of that statement now, but you can obviously read it online. I do not feel at this time it is possible for hand and hot to engage in discussions around the reconciliation program recommendation. Due to this development when and if BrewDog reach out. To continue the discussion hand and heart and platform participants will require a much stronger signal of earnestness and commitment to the program and a willingness to protect its independence and integrity. I believe in light of the situation it is fair to require this recalibration of the discussion today as it relates to potential future discussions. I notified the representatives from BrewDog who had been working with in good faith of the pause on the discussion and here is what I wrote.

 44:53

And and heart and platform participants still advocate for the most amicable fair, transparent unjust solution for all parties. This hope and agenda do not change even when things develop as they have. It is my hope the opportunity to continue the discussion is back on the table as soon as possible. If BrewDog ever do want to initiate solution driven contact as it relates to anything I've discussed today, the door is always open. If I reach a point wherein I could reach out with a view to positive progress, of course, I will. I do want to be clear that this is not handled hot exiting or ending the negotiations. And enhanced door will always be open as it relates to resolving this professionally. And as respectfully as possible. I go on to write any assertion of the platform existing to perpetuate false claims is refuted by its very purpose. As such, I reiterate, we want a peaceful, innovative and agreeable solution for all it is my personal and greatest hurt that hand and hot and BrewDog can be back at the discussion table.

 45:59

All of the decisions that individuals were making about that data and about the allegations that were coming out online, and in hot had been informing people and engaging with people on the platform over the course of contact that we had been having with BrewDog and their subsequent request for a reconciliation concept proposal. Then, at the end of March, we alerted the platform and the public, that we were pausing our discussions. And that was due to the fact that the platform data was trying to be accessed by a representative of the company. Even though we were negotiating for those exact stories to move forward to investigation in coordination with the company and external third party vendors. What was your initial reaction to hearing about that pause. And the reasons why

 46:48

my initial reaction was the this hadn't been entered into in good faith on equal footing by all the parties involved, and that there was something really wrong afoot. I also found it incredibly chilling that somebody could use a legal instrument that's designed to help people who are in a position of lesser power to try and get information about people who've been hurt by them, who were scared of them, who wanted to try and put all this behind them in a fair and equitable way. And they were just trying to get to the information. I saw it as another attempt to intimidation so I can find out what you're saying about me. But luckily, the law doesn't agree. So the law is on the side of the workers in this situation, and I think that was incredibly important.

 47:42

We are going to conclude episode two and hopefully we've been able to communicate the chaos and the unnecessary stress created by an abrasive leader, supported by complicit and willing. When an abrasive leader has unlimited resources, they can tip the scales, all moving parts in a super punk corporate meltdown.