

**Alexander Baron**

<http://www.infotextmanuscripts.org>

**2 Comments****The Latest News****Alexander Baron ▾**

Recommend

Share

Sort by Best ▾



Join the discussion...

**Sean Coleman** · a year ago

Alexander, this is a really excellent article. It is very informative and has made my own enquiries (such as they are) easier. I have been looking at the phenomenon of witch hunts over the past few years since stumbling on the late Richard Webster's excellent website, Sceptical Essays. I assume you know about it. If not be sure to look it up. Read Casa Pia - The Making of a Modern Witch Hunt first.

I had been keeping a close eye on the Westminster paedophile ring fantasy over the last while but never got round to Savile. I was amazed when finally a named witness was found but have heard little since except indications that she is disturbed. Hilariously a Newsnight report some months ago seriously advanced the suggestion that the reason for the lack of police witnesses is the Official Secrets Act. In these things, as you obviously know, common sense is absent.

Last week I finally decided to have a look at the Savile case. Being familiar with the way these things go, I expected to find a possible small core of truth and loads of fantasy. This has proved to be the case. I have watched a number of YouTube videos along the way and left comments here and there as I have gone along. Now I knew what to expect but on two occasions, near the start, I began to doubt myself and wonder if this was the case to prove the rule. The first was the allegation by his grand-niece that he abused her twice when she was 12 and 15. The second was the man who had appeared as a cub on Jim'll Fix It. When I checked the story behind the claims it became quickly apparent they were not to be believed. Then I saw the evidence from the Broadmoor arsonist. And this is this the way it has gone. Last night I looked quickly at the necrophilia claims. I had assumed this was people taking Savile's sense of humour literally. An Associated Press report (YouTube) said that he had access to the morgue, that he had told a student nurse that he like having sex with dead bodies and concluded that that was that. Unfortunately, it went on, the man in charge of the morgue had since died ('unfortunately') 'so we couldn't talk to him'.

As you obviously know, in witch hunts (as also in global warming and other issues, by the way), you can in no way rely on media reports but have to check the facts, each one, as best you can.

Two things you might not have noticed I might mention briefly. Firstly, a Guardian leader (the Guardian is particularly gullible to moral crusades) suggested that the 'sheer improbability' of how Savile managed to rape all those people (rape of course being the media description of nearly every assault, no matter how petty) in broad daylight (and this, remember, with all those rumours which were (apparently) raging and the beady eyes of the tabloids watching his every move hoping for him to slip up). A better explanation of course is that it was highly improbable because it was highly improbable. The second was a suggestion by a guest on one of Philip Schofield's breakfast programmes that Savile was so cunning that he chose as victims young girls who were petty criminals so that nobody would ever take their word against 'Sir Jimmy Savile OBE'. I kid you not! (Was that one of his catch phrases?) On the same programme Schofield himself (I think) mentioned that Savile's biographer knew him well for six whole years and had no idea. You see, the 'sheer' evil of the man was so absolute that it conferred super powers on him.

Finally,, as I must leave it here for now, I have been looking up the cases of the men charged under Yewtree, including Tarbuck and Cliff Richard last night. The collusion between S. Yorks. Police and the BBC, who were tipped off about the raid on his house, is a blatant example of what Webster calls 'crossing the line' where, in their righteous war on evil, those who should no better leave objectivity behind.

Your speculation about the motives of the false witnesses is close to what I have been thinking, but I'll leave that for another occasion.

One final thing before I go (like Columbo), I think you mentioned the sheer number of allegations conferring validity on each one. This is the case in the Savile case. The Janet Smith review has no, or very little, evidence but it is clear (she says so throughout) that Savile's guilt is assumed and then banal occurrences acquire a 'chilling' significance. Wherever you look in the case each allegation cannot stand up for itself but relies on the other allegations. But they in turn can't stand up either, so there's the problem.

In the Casa Pia case in Portugal, Carlos Cruz (their 'Mr Television') had proof of his innocence (eg phone and credit card information proving he couldn't have been where he was alleged to have been) but the court did not accept it. Moreover, they withdrew many of the charges at a very late stage (they didn't stand up) and replaced them with new ones, allowing the defence no time to prepare. They invented a new concept, or concepts, in order to convict him: 'emotional resonance' and 'the resonance of truth' ('a resonancia de verdade') which is the same thing, obviously, as in the Savile case. Cruz is still behind bars.

^ | v · Reply · Share ›



Sean Coleman · a year ago

test

^ | v · Reply · Share ›