

The IICSA

Saturday, 07 September 2019

IICSA

Martin Smith and Alexis Jay have responded to my questions regarding Peter Saunders and Carl Beech; essentially they imply that as long as perverts manage to conceal their crimes, they are considered acceptable members of the Inquiry.

So I have tabled a formal statement to them to make sure they are aware of my point of view.

Despite the Vatican throwing Saunders off their Commission in February 2016, the IICSA did not consider it worth investigating why that happened. You took Saunders's™ word for it - that he was being too critical.

Despite the Carl Beech scandal showing he had worked with both NAPAC and the NSPCC, you simply issued a statement saying "no further comment".

Despite not only the Vatican but the media, in the shape of the Mail On Sunday, discovering that Saunders used his position as spokesperson for the abused to track down and abuse a vulnerable abuse victim, you say "no comment".

And you claim to do "rigorous checks" on participants. Well, clearly not rigorous enough. Both the police and the CPS knew about Saunders's™ behaviour; he had been arrested and questioned, after all, accused by two women of rape. Falsely accused, it appears, yet he spent hours on TV and radio and in the press since then saying "false allegations are vanishingly rare". And concealing his personal experience of false allegations, possibly because many of the claims he admitted were true. Showing that he had a penchant for having sex with vulnerable young abuse victims.

So the "rigorous checks" got nothing from police or CPS? Why not? Deliberate or unintentional cover ups?

Question One; if you are so lax in your "rigorous checks" could it be possible that many of the statements you are hearing about institutions, cover ups and sex abuse are lies? Either exaggerations or total fiction? If you are not "rigorously checking" the "survivors", how can you know these "witnesses" are really "victims" at all? After all, you no allegations are not just "vanishingly rare" but are, I suspect, the vast majority, particularly when made against dead people wealthy institutions, celebrities or grudge targets. Do you check the background of witnesses? Are you told about them by police and CPS? Or do you simply "believe"?

You write to me about "significant uncontested incidents" of abuse in Institutions; you know as well as I do that many institutions cannot contest false allegations in this era of the presumption of guilt. And you now know that many of those making claims are deluded or lying or unhinged or after cash or attention.

What a waste of time and money the Inquiry is, when the structure is so based on believing people who may well be lying, like Peter Saunders and Carl Beech.

Question Two; is the IICSA, like NAPAC and the NSPCC, acting as a "honeypot" for people who get sexual gratification from hearing stories of abuse, from seeing obscene photographs, from even, sometimes, acquiring fresh victims for their physical lusts (as Peter Saunders did with the drink sodden young abuse victim in a Manchester toilet)?

How many people on the panel, on the Inquiry itself, in ancillary positions - have not yet been found out, arrested, even convicted, like Beech and Saunders eventually were? How many perverts are getting paid to get their jollies hearing fictional tales of institutional abuse, expressing shock and horror whilst secretly being stimulated, and we, the Tax Payers, are footing the bill?

We are the losers. So are genuine abuse victims whose stories, 100% true, are now being rejected in the light of Carl Beech and Peter Saunders revelations? So are the decent, worthy institutions having to divert funds and energy from supporting the truly damaged? Can you imagine being a priest or a vicar hearing a story of sex abuse? What do you do? Run a mile, I suggest. Have nothing to do with it. Ignore it. Reject it. Do not hear it, report it, do anything about it, or you may be sucked into the web of deceit that is the False Allegations Industry.

So this is a formal statement to the IICSA. Your funding, efforts and examination may well, it seems, be based on lies and exaggeration. You may well, yourselves, be supporting perverts, either hiding in full sight, or disguised as sympathetic listeners, hearing people like Carl Beech and Peter Saunders, who are, I suspect, just the tip of the iceberg.

Even if you clean up your act and make your "rigorous checks" seriously rigorous, what is the point? You'll never expose those who secretly get pleasure out of hearing these stories, true, false or a combination of both. Institutions are well aware of past dangers and have, by now, almost universally cleaned up their acts already. By allowing fantasists and liars to expose themselves to you, you are demeaning yourselves and wasting our badly needed government funds. By paying people like Saunders and Beech (until they get found out) you are subsidising perversion. By blindly accepting lies, you are colluding with crime and helping to pervert the course of justice.

Your excuse to me about Saunders'™ behaviour was that it was in 2008, long before the IICSA was set up. By that I assume you do not care whether he has indulged in similar behaviour through meetings obtained through his IICSA work, which have not yet come to light. And as long as other panel members, VSCP members, Truth Project staff, security officers, cleaners, secretaries have passed your "background checks" it is fine for them to behave badly as long as nobody finds out about it or, as you put it, there is "no suggestion of impropriety".

If the IICSA has any integrity it will shut up shop today. Before the next Carl Beech or Peter Saunders scandal comes around the corner tomorrow.