

# Helpful guidelines for sex abuse investigations

Wednesday, 04 February 2015

New guidelines for police investigating crime.

If Cameron, Clegg, Miliband, Farage, Judges, Editors, Police Chiefs or anyone else were to be asked whether they would prefer to be raped or falsely accused of rape, I suspect the answer would be "neither".

Both crimes are appalling and the consequences ghastly. But, of course, making false allegations is not yet technically a crime. I suggest it ought to be but, until it is, the criminals are prosecuted for "conspiracy to pervert the course of justice" or at very least "wasting police time".

And indeed this does happen. The CPS recently had to justify pursuing a woman who killed herself rather than face court.

Recently it's been printed that only 6% of reported rapes results in a conviction. Therefore 94% are false allegations, whether they be misunderstandings or just difficult to prove.

As this dawns on the CPS, I suspect the grave crime of making false allegations will increasingly be prosecuted - after all, there are at least ten times as many false accusers as there are rapists and that doesn't count any successful, but wrongful, claims, though hundreds of them end up reversed by the Court of Appeal. And surely the CPS are poised to prosecute those proven, by the Court of Appeal, to have conspired to pervert the course of justice?

So will guidelines be issued to help police investigating this army of criminals in the future?

I suggest some essential questions.

1) Drink or drugs. Should these be accepted as an excuse for lying about sex abuse? I doubt it.

2) Assistance by police. Should individual officers be prosecuted for helping "victims" with their statements? Such as suggesting a date several years earlier in historical abuse cases? Making it a crime when, later, it would NOT have been? If the date can be proved wrong (such as showing a TV series had not been transmitted by then) the officer concerned was, certainly, conspiring to pervert the course of justice. Surely this is the very definition of "wasting police time"?

3) Consent. Does "failing to ask for signed consent in writing before sex" indicate a desire to provide negative proof for an intended false allegation?

4) STATE RAPE. Searching a home without consent? Penetrating a personal orifice without consent? A cotton wool swab is no different to a penis or a cucumber if consent is not given.

5) Individual accountability. A rapist would never get away with saying "the company I work for told me to do it" - likewise a police officer cannot say "I was obeying instructions". If he or she invaded personal space, violated privacy, penetrated an orifice they, as individuals, committed the rape. "Acting on orders" should be no excuse. "I was given a warrant" is no

more of an excuse than "someone else told me it was OK". If you rape someone, you are held responsible. If you plunge an object into an orifice without consent, it is your action.

These are just, off the top of the head, some suggestions. Those in a position to give guidelines and advice, (which I am not) will, I'm sure, think of many other clarifications.