

A thought about all those Westminster murders

Friday, 28 August 2015

Since every time a celebrity - lots of publicity - is accused of sex offences, we (and police) see dozens of others come forward. The majority cannot accept that some or all of these are imagined or exaggerated and indeed now they are considered evidence and proof of guilt.

But more serious charges (for example, murder of small children) seem to provoke very few new witnesses. One would have thought that parents, siblings, friends of those killed - teachers, doctors, social workers - would be rushing forward. Even if it was years ago.

It's not although there is less coverage. And we all know, the greater the story, the more inches of press and TV/radio minutes. So how come the hundreds of victims such as those abused by Jimmy Savile have not emerged?

Well, a fair assumption would be that those victims were genuine. Truly abused, only waiting for the courage given by bulk accusers. But another might be that murder, being a more serious crime, might end up with serious consequences, both for innocent people and for false accusers. "I saw X throttle Y", if found false, is more liable to get several years inside. Especially when other details (other witnesses, names, places) are likewise provided. It's not so easy to get away with claiming something happened when specifics are provided (how do you think we managed to get so many false allegations thrown out in my case?). Observers of my TWO trials were intrigued when we proved that a witness in my second trial was "mistaken" - enough so for me to be found [b]Not Guilty[/b] in that trial (strange that media covered that so little). Of his, and other's, false allegations.

So is it possible that people, even subconsciously, are less prepared to claim to have witnessed murder than sex or abduction by aliens? And that police find it far easier to disprove claims of someone being killed (even if they consider it acceptable to say such claims are believed - before investigating?).

Further, in this useful era of the Internet, is it easier to research names, places, events from decades ago, to back up ones memories? A press clipping about a missing girl called Eunice can be found with one click of a mouse. In my era (15 years ago) my false accusers could not so easily have discovered that the TV show they were asked to watch and review had been first broadcast three years later than they claimed (although, to their shame, police could, did and failed to mention it in court). Luckily, with volumes of press cuttings, I could and did find facts that got 22 fake claims dismissed.

Even trickier with dead people. Police don't bother, most journalists and editors don't like killing great stories. The new availability of information has a lot to answer for.

"Mavis WAS in Great Yarmouth on that day. He must have killed her". Nope; the photo and local news coverage of the fete is freely available through Google, officer.

Did famous DJ ever visit that hospital in Hull? Five seconds on Google before you put in your claim, through Slater and Gordon, missus.