

Sir Stephen House,  
1 Maunsel Street,  
Westminster  
London SW1P 2QL

93c Venner Road,  
Sydenham,  
London SE26 5HU  
0208 659 7713  
a\_baron@btinternet.com

April 13, 2018

Dear Sir,

Or perhaps that should be Dear Sir, Sir,

In *The Scotsman* of February 22, you are quoted thus: there is “nothing to suggest, either anecdotally or evidentially, that false reporting of rape is prevalent, in fact such cases are very rare”.

If that quote is accurate and in context then it is better for Scotland and innocent men generally that you are no longer a police officer. In fact, false reporting of rape is extremely common, something most police officers know even though they are being encouraged to voice the contrary opinion. In December 1943, a senior American police officer stated that half of reported rape cases were “Bunk”. That was when rape meant rape, and was a capital crime.

Please check out the International False Rape Timeline which documents cases from around the world.

<https://www.infotextmanuscripts.org/falserape/a-false-rape-timeline.html>

Please also check out this article

<https://news.wikinut.com/The-Truth-About-The-Rape-Crisis-Network/57wro8ps/>

which demonstrates clearly how by encouraging so-called delayed reporting, so-called rape crisis workers are encouraging false allegations. In that connection I would ask you what would have been the consequences for the falsely accused police officer in the timeline entry for February 26, 1996 had this woman waited a year or more before reporting this alleged assault, and then the police gone trawling for victims as they have in recent celebrity cases?

Rape should always require at the very least some minimal corroboration to prosecute as argued in this video:

<https://archive.org/details/rape-and-corroboration-archive>

Yours Faithfully,  
A Baron