

Enablers - Part Three looks at Charity

Sunday, 25 August 2019

If you were a senior police officer and you found that the head of a charity, claiming to help sex abuse victims, was accused of raping a vulnerable girl, would you put two and two together and decide this needed serious investigation?

Especially if, then, a second woman claimed she had been raped by the same man?

And then, if you suspected that both were False Accusers, as so many are, would you simply stop your investigation there? Or would you consider it your responsibility to investigate further?

Likewise if you were the Crown Prosecution Service, would alarm bells ring out? Would you think - these are probably two more False Accusers (there are thousands of them) but, since the man does run a charity for vulnerable abuse victims and admits he did have sex with one of the accusers, perhaps we should investigate him, and his "charity", further?

And if you were investigators for the Catholic Church, examining the backstory of someone appointed to a Commission on Sex Abuse by The Pope himself, and you discovered this man had dragged a vulnerable abuse victim into a public toilet and admitted using her for sex - claiming to have been drunk and that she was consenting, although she immediately accused him of rape - would you strongly suggest he should NOT be allowed onto any Inquiry calling for sex abuse victims to come forward to meet him?

Indeed, if you were on that Commission, and eventually heard about this, would you not, unanimously, decide to throw him off the panel?

My problem with all this is - why on earth would a commission NOT censure him publicly and inform the media, in order to avoid other innocent abuse victims from being drugged or plied with alcohol and raped in a public toilet?

Answer: because the man would squirm and wriggle and deny and make excuses and blame The Pope himself, somehow. He would say "I did not commit a crime" and, to be fair, he'd be quite right. Being the victim of a False Allegation is not a crime. Neither, technically, is having drunken consensual sex in a public toilet. But, if the partner is a young abuse victim and you are the Head of a Charity for Abuse Victims it must be seen, at very least, as a slight error of judgement.

Why would Manchester Police NOT investigate his charity - there could be other perverts working there, hiding in plain sight? Why would the CPS NOT say - hang on; this stinks?

Answer: because police only investigate False Allegations if they are SO blatant that the media will criticise them for failing to do so ("Nick", also known as Carl Beech, also known as Stephen in a NAPAC backed TV documentary). Because, if it is discovered that police assisted witnesses, they, too, could fall under the spotlight (although "independent" bodies tend to absolve cops doing so - like saying "credible and true"). Because police and CPS want to keep those on their side of False Accusers on their side too, increasing conviction rates and budgets and getting promotion.

Why would the media, discovering all this, continue to book such people onto shows like Victoria Derbyshire as "spokespersons" for the abused? Why would charities, finding this out, allow such people to continue to work for them?

Well, that is, indeed, a can of worms. Especially if, for example, the teenage son of someone accused of rape, had been a witness of the abuse, had contradicted his father's admission in a sworn statement, in a possible attempt to allow Dad off the hook, and now works for those very mainstream media outlets that his Dad hypocritically appears on, himself?

ITV and BBC must be quaking at this moment.

And those other employees of the charity, who might have something to conceal themselves, must be quaking too.

I wonder how the two women who falsely accused the man of rape - one oral, one vaginal - must be feeling at this moment?

They are unlikely to be hauled before the courts, as Carl Beech was, because police and CPS seem not to prosecute False Accusers much - see the previous suggested reasons and examine such cases as Danny Day's involvement with David Bryant, causing an innocent man to spend years in jail and effectively killing his wife. Cliff Richard's False Accuser (and his Enablers) are allowed to walk free, to commit other crimes. Paul Gambaccini's are still out there. Ditto my own False Accusers. Hundreds of others, making millions in media interview fees and compensation cash, are still free to shout MeToo whilst "spokespersons" for "victims" pop up on TV saying "False Allegations are vanishingly those False Accusers who got away with it" in the past are busily repeating - and improving - their attempts. I bet many innocent people in prison find their False Accusers have tried it before.

Innocent people are still jailed, prosecuted, wrongly convicted. Whilst guilty criminals walk free, enabled and assisted by police, lawyers, CPS, media. After all, it's a "great story" and what is there to lose, especially if the person is dead, like Michael Jackson. Who can disprove the lies? And there is money to be made. Loads of money. Would Jeffrey Epstein be getting all this attention had he been a penniless plumber?

Very rarely (Carl Beech; Jemma Beale) a False Accuser who is so mad and foolish crosses all the lines, is blatantly guilty and gets sent to prison but even then, they are announced as "the exception that proves the rule" instead of being seen as they really are - the tip of the iceberg; the iceberg called the False Allegations Industry.

It is very hard to find proof of lies, especially historical ones. And liars are very good at wriggling out of it by expressing remorse, throwing bricks and insults at their accusers, ducking and diving. And, intimidated, those in charge tend to evade confrontation.

Just as the Church is accused of avoiding problems if priests really DID abuse someone, learning from years of wisdom, the Enablers are far better at squirming away from the spotlight. They know how genuine abusers escape. They use the same words. The same excuses. And they probably train potential false accusers in "how to appear convincing".

I see Cardinal George Pell's appeal failed. I wonder who trained his false accusers? The living and the dead. I wonder who condemned Jimmy Savile, early on (after his death). I wonder who early supported Carl Beech or Esther Baker or Danny Day.

I'm not saying charities are training grounds for Enablers. I'm not saying Inquiries become honey pots attracting vulnerable potential victims to wolves in sheep clothing. But it is possible, is it not? I'm not saying the media, generally, hates carrying stories that prove their past Exclusives false (did you notice how few times Savile was mentioned amongst

the Carl Beech lies?).

But I am saying that Karma has a habit of coming around and biting people on their bottoms.

We can expect resignation (at great personal financial cost) from all association with NAPAC because I'd hate to stop genuine victims of abuse from seeking help because of my foolish indiscretion. Remorse is such a valuable asset. Let's hope Saunders also adds to that, when it happens, as inevitably it must, he strongly suggests that NAPAC as well as the NSPCC are thoroughly investigated to see whether there are many other abusers working there who take advantage of vulnerable victims by plying them with drink or drugs before dragging them into a public toilet and abusing them, whilst making sure they are consenting, and then denies accusations of rape using all the excuses and tricks successfully employed by past abusers over previous decades.

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-7391713/Charity-chief-quits-child-sex-abuse-inquiry-drunken-lunch-tryst-molested-victim.html>

<https://www.ncronline.org/news/accountability/abuse-survivor-disputes-removal-vatican-commission-seeks-papal-meeting>

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-surrey-49350013>