

Responses from Clayton Harrop,

Question: Do you think there was value in having the debate?

There could have been significant value, if viewers had been shown the full breadth of what was actually discussed. We sat for close to two and a half hours, during which there were powerful, constructive conversations about masculinity and relationships, which is what SBS told us the discussion was meant to be about. I spoke at length about what masculinity truly means, and every panellist agreed with the healthy view and idea of it. Chris made excellent points that were unanimously supported as well. None of this made it to air.

Instead of uplifting healthy masculinity and celebrating the strengths of both men and women, the edit stripped away anything balanced or unifying. My airtime was reduced to make it look like I barely spoke, which is far from the case. My comments on “body count” were heavily edited, removing the context where I clearly stated that it would be hypocritical for a man to have a standard like mine if he were also sleeping around. I explained that, for a man without that standard, if he was a gentleman and honest in his dealings, his experiences could help him better understand women and meet his partner’s needs in the future. All of that was cut, leaving only a distorted fragment that made it appear I was endorsing promiscuity, which is a gross misrepresentation of what I actually said.

Likewise, I spoke in depth about how my personal preference is rooted in values. Valuing and wanting a partner who treats sex as special, personal and intimate, who is more conservative and less provocative in nature. I explained how this is rooted in values and principles, for personal reasons which was edited out as well. Myself and other panellists and even mentioned close female friends with highly promiscuous histories, are treated with as much love and respect as those without such a past to emphasise the importance of respecting and valuing women, and anyone for that matter, all the same. That context was also removed.

Had SBS aired full, unmanipulated answers, the program could have offered genuine insight and value to viewers. Instead, they pieced together the most divisive soundbites they could, “Frankensteining” edits to create something very different from reality. It was not only a wasted opportunity but a deliberate misrepresentation and waste of everyone's time.

I'm now actively pursuing the raw footage under misrepresentation and mischaracterisation provisions so the public can see the truth. SBS is refusing to release it, but I intend to persist and, if necessary, take legal action to obtain it.

Question: What do you think of how SBS conducted and managed the debate?

Overall, it was poorly executed. The staff themselves were polite and professional, which I appreciate, but the structure and management of the debate fell far short. Answers were repeatedly cut short, and the moment a conversation began to gain real depth or a panellist made a strong, constructive point, it was abruptly shut down so they could move on to the next question. Important topics were left hanging mid-discussion. While I understand there are time constraints in television, this was not a matter of efficiency, it was a choice from how I see it. Instead of rushing through and half-answering every question, they could have focused on fewer, more meaningful ones and allowed them to be explored properly. That would have given the audience genuine insight, rather than surface-level soundbites.

Question: There's been some criticism of the program for promoting toxic masculine views, including from you. What's your response to this?

My response is that, given the way SBS framed and edited the program, I can understand and empathise with how someone without the full context might reach that conclusion. But that conclusion is built on a heavily distorted picture, intentionally engineered by SBS.

Across the two-and-a-half hours of recording, I contributed a great deal on healthy masculinity, views many of which, all panellists agreed with, which celebrated mutual respect between men and women, integrity, and strong values. None of that was shown. Instead, SBS selectively cut and stitched fragments of my comments to create a narrative I believe they wanted to push, a narrative that paints masculinity in a negative and divisive way.

For example, my comments on "body count" were edited to strip out the reasoning and nuance I gave. I made it clear this was a personal standard, rooted in values, and not a universal judgment of women. I also stated openly that I respect and value women with different histories, including close female friends who've had highly promiscuous pasts. That was all removed, leaving a misleading impression that I was making a blanket statement. I believe in respect and treating others as equals, regardless of their past, which was communicated, but also removed.

I reject the idea that it's "toxic" for a man to have personal standards, so long as they're grounded in integrity and do not harm or diminish others in any way, shape or form. I

promote healthy masculinity, living by principles, providing, protecting, showing respect, and continually improving oneself for the benefit of loved ones and the wider community.

The way SBS chose to edit my contributions was not representative of me or my values. It cut out the most important, constructive points and left only the most provocative fragments. This approach didn't just fail to promote healthy masculinity, it actively undermined it, damaging both the conversation and public perception.

Question: Would you participate again if asked?

I absolutely would, however I would also, absolutely be bringing a camera of my own to record it, to protect both myself and other panellists from having a false, damaging and unhealthy narrative created around them, or the all important topic of healthy relationships between men and women. This is an important topic and a lot of good could and should've been created, but wasn't. My expectations for the future would be for it to be like a podcast style interview, where the entirety of what is said is shown, in all it's completeness.

On a final note, I will say there were absolutely moments in the discussion that I would describe as unhelpful and less than ideal when it came to conversations about masculinity between certain panelists. However, I cannot and will not speak on their behalf. Not everything discussed was useful—but that is the nature of open conversation. There were points that, in my view, didn't deserve or need to see the light of day. That said, there was far more content that should have been included, and by choosing to present it the way they did, SBS produced an unhealthy and unproductive final piece that served no purpose other than to spark outrage and upset.