

Sex Scandals And Shysters In The News

By **Alexander Baron** - Mar 30, 2016



48
SHARES

What do a former Canadian radio broadcaster, a veteran singer-songwriter, a dead politician, and three disreputable law firms have in common? That's a tricky one, or is it? How about false allegations and other people's money? If you haven't been following the insane antics of a bunch of so-called detectives in the UK, refresh your memory [here](#). The ludicrous *Operation Midland* has now been shut down without a single person being charged with any criminal offence, although if there is any justice at all in this world at least one of the fantasists responsible for it will be stripped of his anonymity and put in the dock to face charges of at the very least wasting police time. Both the live former MP Harvey Proctor and the dead career politician Leon Brittan have now been **totally exonerated** from charges of torture, rape and murder.



Jimmy Savile

This insanity started in 2012 with **a documentary** about the then recently deceased TV presenter Jimmy Savile. Soon, half the men who have entertained us for the past fifty years were being accused of rape and paedophilia, arrested and dragged into court. Although this witch-hunt appears to have run its course, the hysteria has if anything intensified.

The allegations made by sundry chancers and mental defectives were historical in nature, which means that by and large there was no physical evidence. That means too it comes down to one person's word against another – usually one woman's against one man's. Realising this, the imbeciles who control our criminal justice system have resorted to something known as corroboration by volume, literally trawling for accusers, because *all* these women can't be lying, right?

That approach backfired in spectacular fashion in the recent case of Jian Ghomeshi, the aforementioned former Canadian radio personality. In Canada as in the UK, there are no statutes of limitations for indictable offences such as rape. In the United States where there are, toxic women and corrupt lawyers are **lobbying to remove them**. The Ghomeshi case is a salutary warning against this, because it shows that rather than deeply wounded souls who require years or even decades to *heal* before they come

forward to point the finger at their violators, most of the women (and men) who make such allegations are either mentally disturbed, or as in the Ghomeshi case, lying.



Jian Ghomeshi (Image Credits: Canadian Film Centre)

This was not simply a case of lying though, the three women who testified against Ghomeshi in his recent trial conspired with each other to destroy an innocent man and put him behind bars for years or even decades. Predictably, on his acquittal the usual suspects have been making a lot of noise about violence against women, believing women, believing survivors...again, these women are not victims, much less survivors, rather they are liars and conspirators. You can read the full judgement of Justice William B. Horkins [here](#), but the bottom line is that these harridans would have succeeded had they not provided a trail of physical evidence – handwritten letters and e-mails dating back 13 years – which obviously none of them thought Ghomeshi would have kept. Fortunately for him, he did. The extant physical evidence proves these women lied about Ghomeshi to the public, the police and the courts, and that they colluded to put him in gaol.

In Canada as in the UK, accusers of this nature are protected with lifelong anonymity; only one of them has waived this, false accuser Lucy DeCoutere, who incredibly was

given space in the *Guardian* newspaper **to reiterate her lies** which were exposed in open court. Essentially, what DeCoutere and her ilk want the public to do is believe uncritically any woman who accuses a man of assault – sexual or otherwise – years and decades later, even if she pursues him relentlessly after that phantom assault, if she is not living under the same roof and he has no financial or other influence over her. Believe women. How could you not, don't you know that constitutes misogyny?

One of the grounds on which this gaggle of witches cried foul was that Ghomeshi's lawyer was able to surprise them with these old e-mails and letters. And if this hadn't been a surprise? They would have tailored their evidence to fit as best they could. A striking example of this is what happened when veteran comedian Jim Davidson was accused of an absurd oral rape of one of his accusers; Davidson refuted the claim at once, the police relayed this to her, and she **changed her witness statement**.



Diana Davison (Twitter)

The anti-feminist vlogger Diana Davison has posted a **typically masterful analysis** of the Ghomeshi case. Americans readers, before you are swayed by the **dishonest rhetoric of Gloria Allred** and her gang of miscreants into supporting the removal of statutes of limitations, bear this in mind, if Ghomeshi had not kept that trail of documents, he would be behind bars already, and would not be released for a very long time. Something that may one day happen to you.

Rather than removing statutes of limitations, the American criminal justice system would do well to reduce them. A reasonably intelligent, educated woman who has been sexually or otherwise assaulted by a man does not require decades, years or even months to file charges. A woman who delays reporting reduces her credibility, and in the absence of either special circumstances or compelling physical evidence should have no credibility at all if she does not file charges within a week or two at most.

Across the border in the United States, an allegation of sexual impropriety has been made – in civil court – against a much bigger name than Jian Ghomeshi. Elton John is **being sued** by a police officer no less who claims the star sexually harassed and groped him in 2014 while he was moonlighting as a security guard. Seriously? This begs the question, if this incident had really happened, why didn't Jeffrey Wenninger arrest him? Perhaps it took him two years to find the courage to face up to the trauma; that is the usual gambit with head cases and chancers.



Elton John has never made any secret about his sexuality, which would in any case be difficult as he “married” another man two years ago. But what clearly Wenninger does not know about Elton is that although he has a well-deserved reputation for generosity, he is not the kind of man who can be pushed around. Back in the 1990s, he was the subject of a tabloid smear campaign which accused him of extremely serious sexual offences. This led to him firing off libel writs left, right and centre until the allegations were withdrawn. No one should expect him to bow to any kind of out-of-court settlement in this case.

Back in the UK, one of the law firms that has been instrumental in stoking the feeding frenzy against ageing celebrities is about to get a comeuppance of sorts. The Australian firm Slater & Gordon was on the front page of *The Law Society Gazette* earlier this month, for all the wrong reasons. Although it has been here only a relatively short time, it has a staggering 3,800 employees. One of its big names, Liz Dux, appears on TV regularly spouting drivel about alleged victims of Jimmy Savile and the like.

While that may be profitable, its other business appears to be anything but, because it posted half year losses of £492.5 million, which will undoubtedly lead to its downsizing considerably. In Australia, it has done even worse, its share price having crashed from \$8.00 to 30c. Who would buy shares in a law firm anyway? The answer to that question appears to be mugs. The company’s problems began when its management bought a firm called Quindell without exercising due diligence. If the company does go bust, other law firms will lose no sleep on account of the unethical practices some of its staff have used when trying to muscle in on civil claims.

Another law firm is in big trouble with UK regulators, and this time we are not talking simply about money but about serious fraud. An [article](#) by the Defence Correspondent of the *Daily Mail* has revealed that Public Interest Lawyers has been drumming up business by trawling for clients in the Middle East, in particular fraudulent claims have been made on behalf of Iraqi citizens alleging *inter alia* brutality by British troops. The firm appears to be following in the steps of Leigh Day. Between October 2003 and July 2004, a special team of military police investigated claims that British soldiers had raped hundreds of tribeswomen in Kenya. They found a staggering 2,187 false allegations. The firm Leigh Day was complicit in many of these claims for

compensation. The investigators found forged documents dating back over half a century. The scams were reported by the London *Times* in December 2006, but Leigh Day is still in business, and still making money out of doubtful claims of sexual abuse.

Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that if the financial incentives for corrupt lawyers and *survivors* were removed and vigorous prosecution of blatantly false allegations were substituted, the sexual abuse industry in this country would disappear overnight. Don't hold your breath waiting for that to happen, even if as expected Slater & Gordon does soon go belly up.

This opinion article was written by an independent writer. The opinions and views expressed herein are those of the author and are not necessarily intended to reflect those of TheLatestNews.com.

49
SHARES



Alexander Baron

<http://www.infotextmanuscripts.org>