

Brilliant blog from April 2019

Wednesday, 17 April 2019

The following is from an anonymous blogger rumoured to be The Secret Barrister.

It only contains the text.

Links to the Sources (important) can be found by reading this on the original - best, if possible, to go to them but I copy it here in case other servers get taken down.

<https://trollesexposure.wordpress.com/2019/04/16/investigator-mastermind-or-masterfool/>
and Part Two

<https://trollesexposure.wordpress.com/2019/04/16/investigator-mastermind-or-masterfool-part-ii/>

Investigator Mastermind or Masterfool?

What I am about to describe is a theory and some questions that result from that theory.

It is only so far a theory, however, please bear with me as it could be explosive if correct.

In November 2001, the now extinct News of the World newspaper published several articles about the then contemporary conviction of former DJ Jonathan King on child abuse charges.

Within one article lies a series of very thinly veiled identities of various individuals, all of whom have either been accused (whilst still alive) subsequently of child abuse or have been posthumously accused of the same.

This is the article and I'm republishing it here to demonstrate my theory:

source:

<https://spotlightonabuse.files.wordpress.com/2013/05/notw251101c.jpg>

Some of the individuals identities are pretty clear. Some a little more obscure but also possible to work out by jigsaw identification relatively easily.

The list is based on? A 700 page document allegedly produced by Surrey Police as part of Operation Arundel.

Coincidentally 'Arundel' being the name of former Prime Minister Ted Heath's property in Wiltshire. The deceased Heath who has also come under allegations of child abuse. Coincidence thingy or part of the plan?

However, there is another person in the article who appears to have made pre-judgements about the guilt of the people who are accused.

A Surrey Police 'source' is quoted by the News of the World as saying:

source:

<https://spotlightonabuse.files.wordpress.com/2013/05/notw251101c.jpg>

'You'd be amazed just how famous some of the abusers are. They've made their names by being squeaky-clean in secret they're monsters'

source: <https://spotlightonabuse.files.wordpress.com/2013/05/notw251101c.jpg>

Note not 'alleged abusers' but a definitive pre-judgement of guilt by allegedly a police officer.

No proof simply names on a list.

Remind you of anything? It should.

Now I have to wonder, based on material that he's given in the past to the likes of the Guardian, for example, whether the Surrey Police (it was only Surrey Police involved) 'source' in the News of the World article in 2001 is none other than? Mark Williams-Thomas.

Williams-Thomas, the former Surrey Police officer who left the police in 2001 (another coincidence thingy?), who then went onto supposedly expose the alleged crimes of Jimmy Savile in the 'Exposure' programme in 2012. (One of the possible identities of one of the people in the 2001 list).

IF, if! IF, (that's an IF in case you didn't realize yet!) Williams-Thomas was the source quoted by the News of the World

then despite his claims in various interviews about the Savile case and Williams-Thomas allegedly not being aware of allegations against Savile prior to Newsnight discussions, he would've been fully aware of allegations against Savile.

At least since 2001 and likely earlier.

A festering simmering resentment from Williams-Thomas possibly until after Savile died. And then an opportunity arose to deal with that simmering resentment: Newsnight and subsequently 'Exposure'. Make sense?

I'm making no judgment on the accuracy or inaccuracy of claims against Savile btw.

Williams-Thomas, who then went onto also be involved in unproven CSA allegations against Cliff Richard (almost certainly the first name on the News of the World 'list'). Williams-Thomas was named in material published in the High Court case between Richard and the BBC. Williams-Thomas who was clearly facilitating 'alleged victim' and police.

But which came first, Williams-Thomas or the 'alleged victim'? Or was there some trawling involved?

A reminder from the judgement in the BBC case:

Williams-Thomas who trumpeted his next 'project' in the Guardian interview in February 2013:

source:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2013/feb/24/mark-williams-thomas-jimmy-savile>

On Twitter, rumours about Williams-Thomas and Cliff Richard's case were rife for a long time, Williams-Thomas himself referring to inside knowledge of the Richard case. source:

<https://trollesexposure.wordpress.com/2018/08/08/is-the-investigator-being-investigated/>

Note: if you look closely at the 2013 Avatar/Profile image for 'Jacqueline' above you'll very quickly see it's very close resemblance to the current Avatar for a certain CSA troll Louise Clare Davis (@craftymuvva). Odd that eh? 'Jacqueline' currently claims to be living in Amsterdam. Davis lives in London.

Williams-Thomas who has, since leaving the police, made a career out of supposedly investigating (and frankly not solving anything) famous individuals.

Bear in mind, his career took off after the Savile 'Exposure' programme in 2012.

Williams-Thomas who was allegedly involved in allegations against DJ Paul Gambacchini. Another name (Gambacchini) likely on the list based on the descriptions.

It's also possible to positively identify another three individuals on that list from those who have been subsequently accused over a decade on from 2001.

Now this creates several problems and in no particular order:

• Did Williams-Thomas become obsessed with the document produced whilst he was part of Surrey Police to the extent that he made material fit the earlier list?

• Did the accusers of various individuals in the list read the article above first? Did they also put 2+2 together to realize it's likely Williams-Thomas as the Surrey Police source thus explaining why they then contacted him as an intermediary?

• How reliable can a list created on the back of mere allegations be? We now know that the police believe the infamous 'Elm Guest House list' created by Carole Kasir and Chris Fay is utter bunkum. Then remember that project that Williams-Thomas was working on!

So from 2001, it was possible for false accusers to then start working out who the identities of the accused were.

It was certainly possible since 8th May 2013 because that is when that article was put BACK online in this article:

<https://spotlightonabuse.wordpress.com/2013/05/08/king-ran-child-sex-ring-for-stars-25-11-01/>

It's also possible that some of the allegations against Lord Janner are also based on some of the material in that 2001 article.

And thereby hangs another problem, how reliable can any allegations against the people identifiable in the 2001 article be?

How reliable can anything Williams-Thomas says in relation to the people identifiable from that 2001 article be?

IF of course he was the police source for the 2001 article.

Why was a police document being circulated to the press anyway?

Had Williams-Thomas, if he was the source, taken matters into his own hands?

He had form for it as you'll see.

I mentioned above a Guardian article, this is the one I was referring to:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2013/feb/24/mark-williams-thomas-jimmy-savile>

24th February 2013.

Only three months prior to the SpotlightOnAbuse re-publication of the NotW article. SpotlightOnAbuse is run by an unnamed individual going by the username 'murunbuch'.

Within his interview with the Guardian, Williams-Thomas revealed this:

source:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2013/feb/24/mark-williams-thomas-jimmy-savile>

The Guardian also revealed this:

source:

<https://www.theguardian.com/media/2013/feb/24/mark-williams-thomas-jimmy-savile>

Was that 'dossier' the 700 page 'dossier' that the News of the World referred to in 2001?

It seems possible and highly likely.

Lest we forget too that Freddie Starr's arrest for example was reported by Williams-Thomas on his now deactivated Twitter account within 30 mins of it happening.

So from 2001, the seeds of the allegations (unproven and false) against various individuals were sown.

All from an irresponsible police 'source'.

Effectively the clock was ticking waiting for an ideal moment for them to be resurrected.

The trigger? Savile's death.

Whoever that was created hell for people who were falsely accused.

Whoever marketed it to the News of the World didn't really care for due process either. Nor for the reputational damage that may ensue and subsequently did ensue.

It should also be noted that King himself has been a victim of false allegations too. Williams-Thomas's involvement in the King case which was booted out of court in 2018 was damned by the judge in the case.

You can read a little more about that in a previous article of mine here.

Part of that article was based on a report in the Daily Mail here.

If my theory about Williams-Thomas being the source for the 2001 article is correct then potentially he has been the mastermind and facilitator/manipulator behind a series of failed police cases, based possibly on an obsessional list from Operation Arundel and also based on a series of further allegations which he facilitated.

As well as the issues reported in the Daily Mail and my previous article (links above) one would hope that any investigation to Williams-Thomas's conduct and those he facilitated too also now includes :

• that 700 page dossier from 2001,
 • who it's author was,
 • why Williams-Thomas may potentially still in possession of it,
 • why it was released to the News of the World,
 • whether the names presented to the police in 2013+ were as a result of that dossier partially already in the public domain

• what was the provenance of the list in 2001 and the one in 2013
 • how reliable any testimony could possibly be after the NotW article was republished in 2013 on SpotlightOnAbuse
 • have innocent individuals been targeted as a result of such republication by SpotlightOnAbuse
 • whether Williams-Thomas was the "source" in 2001 to the News of the World.
 • whether charges should be levelled potentially for perverting the course of justice and/or misconduct in public office amongst others.

Because from the seeds of that one article in 2001 and it's deliberate republication on SpotlightOnAbuse in 2013 massive issues likely grew. Not least for the likes of Cliff Richard etc.

The questions will keep coming and Williams-Thomas' recent deactivation of his Twitter account now possibly seems more suspect that it already did.

As always, these are merely opinions and observations and in this article a theory only.

Investigator Mastermind or Masterfool? " Part II

In my previous article in this mini-series of articles, I revealed a growing theory of mine concerning the possible (and in my view highly probable) involvement of Mark Williams-Thomas, the self titled "The Investigator", in an article in the now defunct newspaper News of the World (NotW) in 2001.

In this follow-up article I'm going to reveal some more of my reasoning and some of the background evidence which may suggest a specific problem within Surrey Police, the force with which Williams-Thomas was an officer.

The Police operation around the matters in the

NotW article, Operation Arundel, run by Surrey Police ran between supposedly 2001-2006.

Those dates are confirmed by a third party Freedom of Information request the details of which can be found here.

source:

As you can see from this and other material, Operation Arundel itself resulted in the conviction of two individuals, for a total of three charges.

It also reveals that the operation was run from the police station at which Williams-Thomas was allegedly based as a Detective Constable: Guildford.

However, contrary to the FOI information, it is already known that Operation Arundel was actually running before 2001 as the two individuals first arrested were named in an article by now deceased blogger Anna Raccoon and were arrested in 2000.

The second of those two links also reports on something that is still a problem 19 years on:

source:

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1375942/Simply-Red-star-cleared-after-arrest-for-rape.html>

One of the individuals, as well as DJ Jonathan King also referred to in the

NotW article list in 2001 was later identified as former DJ Chris Denning who was on the run effectively and had been hanging out in Prague in the Czech Republic. Denning had already been jailed in the Czech Republic on similar offences.

source:

<https://spotlightonabuse.files.wordpress.com/2013/05/notw251101c.jpg>

Denning and King were the only individuals convicted in Operation Arundel.

In the aftermath of the Savile exposure, the launch of Operation Yewtree etc, the media were clamouring for various little snippets of information about Savile and attempting to link into other individuals etc

One such snippet is this from 2014 in the Daily Mail:

source:

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2780935/Police-admit-told-Jimmy-Savile-paedophile-DECADE-exposed.html>

However, two years prior to the phone call (in 2003) described by the Daily Mail in 2014, the News of the World had all but named Savile in the list of individuals it printed. Why was this a surprise then?

It wasn't difficult to work out, even without knowing what we now know who the various individuals were who were in the NotW list.

It wasn't therefore exactly news either to Surrey Police as they clearly had an inkling of Savile's alleged involvement in 2001, otherwise a description of him wouldn't have existed on the News of the World list. So why all the subsequent drama in 2014?

source:

<https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2780935/Police-admit-told-Jimmy-Savile-paedophile-DECADE-exposed.html>

And if Savile wasn't a suspect in Operation Arundel then why was there an effective description of him in the News of the World article sourced from Operation Arundel allegedly?

i.e. it's a circular problem.

However, what appears to have happened is that no other credible witnesses or alleged victims came forward to Operation Arundel and by default it reached a natural conclusion when avenues of inquiry had been exhausted some 5 years after King's 2001 conviction.

It also raises a question as to the identity of the journalist involved in the 2003 phone call.

Wouldn't happen to be an Exaro News staffer would it by any chance? Or another mate of Williams-Thomas?

This raises another question though: what were Surrey Police doing on Operation Arundel for those 5 years?

Fortunately, again Anna Raccoon's material provides some answers

source:

<https://annaraccoon.com/2015/10/03/the-walton-hop-and-operation-ravine/>

If they already had a list of suspected paedophiles, and it's clear that the suggestion from the material provided to the News of the World in 2001 by allegedly a Surrey Police officer, what were they doing? Widening the ambit it would appear and holidays in Sri Lanka? I'm being sarcastic.

Which then raises another question: if Surrey Police intended on investigating those named in the dossier why did an officer release such to the media in advance, 5 years in advance, of Operation Arundel closing?

For instance, these snippets of information could have contaminated other cases:

source:

<https://spotlightonabuse.files.wordpress.com/2013/05/notw251101c.jpg>

What was the purpose of releasing this sort of info?

If the individuals concerned noted the contents of the NotW article they could also have destroyed vital evidence.

I think that the inclusion of Denning specifically in the NotW list was likely to increase the perceived eligibility of the others on the list being similarly involved.

In other words, the inclusion of some real criminal activity then implied the rest were also involved. But prior to any investigation concluding,

5 years before it did conclude too. i.e to contaminate mindsets.

It may not have been effective in 2001 but by 2012 it was an epidemic.

Once the News of the World published the article in 2001, that investigation into the other alleged suspects was effectively screwed over.

Nothing that came forward from that point could be relied upon.

The phone call in 2003 the Daily Mail reported on in 2014 was potentially only as a result of the 2001 article.

See how circular that then becomes?

i.e. a leaked report generates through the backdoor a trawling exercise for other "victims" who react to a report and then make allegations which could be false.

Given the number of false allegations in the likes of Operation Conifer, the Wiltshire Police operation into alleged abuse by former PM Ted Heath, then that is always a possibility when the police ask for more witnesses to come forwards in such publicity seeking ways.

However in the case of Surrey Police, this wasn't the only time that they'd had used the media to possibly prejudice outcomes it would appear (also from Anna Raccoon's material):

<https://annaraccoon.com/2015/10/03/the-walton-hop-and-operation-ravine/>

For the all the coyness of Surrey Police in the naming of the lead investigating officer in the FOI response above, the name was already known.

Thanks to Anna Raccoon's work.

The same lead investigator who had seemingly screwed up on Operation Arundel by allowing leaks to the media of operational details had then allegedly screwed up regarding the Milly Dowler inquiry.

Some of the latter screwups were recently part of the compelling drama "Manhunt" starring Martin Clunes on ITV.

Also bear in mind that in 2001, the police in general were in the middle of a series of damning reports about their trawling activities to obtain "victims". Some of which was subject to a Home Affairs Select Committee investigation.

If they couldn't do it directly, they'd use the media or lawyers to do the trawling for them. It still happens too.

So what precisely was to be gained other than trawling or financial gain for a police officer, or indeed a possible police operational decision, to leak what was likely exceptionally confidential and sensitive information ahead of the conclusion of an ongoing criminal investigation?

Were they testing the water to see if "victims" came forward regarding the other thinly veiled individuals who mostly would appear to have been wholly innocent? After subsequent investigations demonstrated that innocence?

It doesn't make any official operational sense to potentially be tipping off suspects in such a way. Especially if they were to remain under suspicion.

So why do it and why repeatedly do it?

This whole matter raises some very serious concerns about the activities of Surrey Police in regards to how the leaking of information around Operation Arundel was allowed to happen.

And that is not the only problem for Operation Arundel either as we'll now see.

Surrey Police referred Operation Arundel to Merseyside Police for an independent report into the conduct of its officers after previously identified errors had been flagged up.

Another police operation, Operation Ravine, then took place.

This resulted in another arrest and charges against King and 2 other individuals, one of whom was Denning.

Chris Denning, who I mentioned earlier, was further convicted on additional offences as a result, King was charged with further offences but the trial was abandoned when major problems as to prosecution and police (especially) disclosure (and other issues) came to the attention of the court.

I'll link you to the description of Operation Ravine and its connection to Operation Arundel via Wikipedia's "note Ravine" subsection of a larger article about Operation Yewtree (the overarching inquiry into Jimmy Savile):

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Yewtree

source:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Yewtree

On 10 September 2015, three men were arrested as part of Operation Ravine, including Jonathan King.[132] Denning was charged with 6 offences stemming from the investigation on 7 June 2016,[68] and he pleaded guilty to 21 offences on 22 August 2016.[133] On 7 October, Denning was sentenced to 13 years for these additional offences.[134] King stood trial in June 2018 but the jury was discharged for legal reasons.[135] On 6 August 2018, King received an apology for the collapse of the trial, with Judge Deborah Taylor saying that Surrey Police had made "numerous, repeated and compounded" errors during the investigation, describing the situation as a "debacle".[136]

source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Operation_Yewtree

And what were those "numerous, repeated and compounded" errors?

source:

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2018/08/06/surrey-police-apologise-judgment-reveals-disclosure-failings/>

It suggests the problems for Operation Arundel and by inference Operation Ravine started way back in 2001 or even before in the publicity surrounding the arrests on the back of false allegations in 2000.

Any investigation now into Operation Ravine needs to examine the events in 2001 (and possibly before) too.

i.e. Why it was necessary to reveal ongoing operation details to the media? And who did so?

It is a pattern which has been repeated numerous times over the last 18 years, however it undermines our justice system.

Any investigation into Operation Ravine also needs to examine this sort of lunacy (which suggests a very quick withdrawal of allegations):

source:

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1375942/Simply-Red-star-cleared-after-arrest-for-rape.html>

The presumption of innocence was clearly lost in the mind of the Surrey Police "source" for that 2001 report:

And for that to happen, it also undermines the whole investigation of such matters because some officers are clearly biased, no matter the heinous nature of the alleged crimes they are investigating, into believing that people who are named in such matters are automatically guilty ahead of any trial in a court of law.

It's a mindset which has caused problems, not just for King etc, but for many others non-famous and non-media reported and not just in the arena of CSA.

It is precisely that issue of "belief" which has undercut all of the cases which I've mentioned on this site in the past, the belief of guilt prior to proving a case. The loss of the benefit of doubt.

When evidence is manipulated, overlooked not disclosed to convict someone incorrectly then it's corruption pure and simple.

It's misconduct in a public office and also in my view where it exposes innocent individuals to arrest and prosecution as a result of those actions it's also an attempt to pervert the course of justice. When that occurrence becomes not just a one-off it clearly is a mentality or policy issue.

It's clearly a problem with Surrey Police have or had. If that problem is not gone now, it needs to be swiftly gone.

Mistakes only cover so much, once such behaviour becomes either formal or informal policy or a cultural mindset, it comes with inherent knock-on consequences to others including both accuser and accused. Which then removes the element of fairness and integrity that police officers are supposed to uphold at all times not when it suits an agenda or a perceived need to meet targets or to stitch someone up because their face doesn't fit or an officer (or more than one) wants to see them done for a crime and manipulates the evidence accordingly.

It also exposes innocent individuals and families to distress etc that is un-necessary. It sometimes also causes people to take their own lives because they would rather do that than live with the shame of the crimes they are falsely accused of.

The abhorrent presumption of guilt when someone does commit suicide in such instances is a blight on our society and demonstrates a lack of understanding by those who engage in such bigotry as to the costs of false allegations. The greater the heinous nature of an allegation the greater the affects are on the accused, especially if those allegations are entirely false.

Unfortunately, the media reporting and police "leaks" of such actively encourage that blight and bigotry to propagate.

The fix is simple though: all it requires is a loss of that belief that someone alleged to have committed a crime actually has, until the point of conviction.

To persist in such a view of "presumption of guilt" is a very dangerous and bigoted path to take and one which in my view, should see police officers out of a job (even at a time when resources are stretched) if they are proven to have done so.

The idea that someone is accused of something making them automatically guilty is so ridiculously wrong. Especially if that bigotry then lasts for years, decades etc until a suitable time comes along for the bigotry to be acted upon. Storing things nasty or unfinished business up for a rainy day springs to mind.

Even the most heinous of accusations deserve to be treated with the same fairness any other offence is, the right of the presumption of innocence has been eroded during all the CSA fiasco particularly since the revelations about the alleged activities (and they are only allegations) of Jimmy Savile since he died.

That fairness may be difficult for some to accept but without it we are no better than medieval witchhunters.

It is therefore even more important that those tasked with upholding the law don't think that they are above it.

The rights of the accused directly and then later further accused were seriously undermined by that 2001 article, jigsaw identifications were easy.

It also potentially seriously undermined any possible conviction because of those jigsaw identifications.

Whoever it was who leaked a confidential document to the News of the World needs to be jailed in my view.

Especially if said person then used the same material over a decade on to make a career out of it and doubly so if that person has then created more hell for the same people in the 2001 list and actively sought to do so. Why? Because those would not only be acts of misconduct but also other criminal acts.

Whether that happens remains to be seen.

But now that the dots are effectively joined between the various who have since been accused, some falsely accused too and some can be traced back to being part of that NotW published list in 2001 at least (which has little to no basis in genuine allegations it would appear), there needs to be some major questions asked about the motives of those involved including it has to be stated both serving and ex-police officers.

In the public interest.

What is immediately apparent, however, is that many of those names were likely sourced from the now debunked Elm Guest House list also which may suggest some other motives behind the allegations in the 2001 NotW list. Again those possible motives and methods need to be explored, documented and questions surrounding them answered publicly. Questions like: how did an operational document which could have led to future convictions reach the hands of a national newspaper and one which had such a bad reputation as the News of the World?

The IICSA should be partially taking on that role, it would appear not to be, yet.

At the end of the day, for all the false allegations that fly around there are also genuine cases of abuse and when the police screw up investigations it can affect both genuine and false cases and justice is lost along the way.

The end result being no-one wins and we all risk losing because the falsehoods and stitch-ups could happen to you or me, or anyone else very easily.

Otherwise, all of this could happen again and again and again and the lessons are never learnt by those who need to learn them.

At present, the apparent culture of covering things up or pensioning off officers who may be corrupt so they avoid further investigation and/or prosecution seems to still be an issue. That culture of avoidance then never actually tackles the issues that should be tackled.

Ironic that includes some of the same people who are entrusted to uphold the law, act with fairness and integrity etc. i.e. the police.

Until the errors of the past are exposed and dealt with, trust in the police and by knock-on effect the criminal justice system will likely continue to deteriorate. The police need to accept being part of that process of change, the mentality of cover-up or pensioning people off to avoid difficult questions, for example, is part of the problem not the solution.

If it means investigating current or ex-police officers for misconduct or other offences whilst they were in the police, so be it. Same applies to current or ex-politicians or indeed anyone else in any walk of life. Whether charges result is dependant on the nature of each case, but whilst the police investigate themselves part of that culture and mentality will continue to be a problem.

None of them should be above the law, in fact they have more of a duty to uphold the law than the average man or woman in the street and to set examples that they can be trusted.

For every bad copper tarnishes the reputations of the rest.

I will however end this article with a link to another article about why and how the case in 2018 against Jonathan King collapsed as it highlights very neatly the points I have made above:

sources:

<https://www.getsurrey.co.uk/news/surrey-news/surrey-police-failures-jonathan-king-15070657>source:

<https://www.getsurrey.co.uk/news/surrey-news/surrey-police-failures-jonathan-king-15070657>

or putting it another way, Surrey Police allegedly prosecuted Jonathan King to save it's own skin and reputation by further tarnishing his.

That's not justice.

As usual, only my opinions and observations.