

My answer to the question...

Wednesday, 21 January 2015

Would I do it differently if my trial was today instead of 15 years ago?

Oh yes. the situation in 2015 is very different to that in 2000 and I've learned a huge amount from mistakes made in my trials.

1) I think at last ordinary people are starting to suspect that false allegations DO exist. Fifteen years ago they were considered unlikely. I would, with the benefit of hindsight, now call Chief Constables and other top police to witness how many ludicrous false allegations there are every day. I would give jurors synopses of the NHS reports of the accusations against Jimmy Savile received since all the media coverage of his assumed perversion. I would put the Green Ink Brigade/conspiracy theorists in the witness box (there was one before me on the Leveson Inquiry and, believe me, they are clearly barking). And I would get my QC to ask top cops why anyone making an allegation about sex abuse "will be believed" whilst others will not. Like poor Sally Clark when she denied killing her son (it was eventually proved she didn't) or poor Breck Bednar's mother Lorin LaFave when she begged police to stop a paedophile grooming her son (who he went on to murder). They were NOT believed though they were telling the truth.

2) I'd have called Top Publicist Max Clifford and asked him to explain his role in my prosecution which provoked a "thank you" letter from the Chief Constable.

3) I'd NOT have asked the Judge to divide my trial into five parts (five, not three as inaccurately reported - after my second trial NOT GUILTY verdict the judge ordered the rest abandoned). Then, in one trial, the jury would have witnessed the majority of false claims get thrown out (instead of that happening in legal argument before the first trial) which would have virtually guaranteed a NOT guilty verdict in the only trial too.

4) I'd have then been able to produce all the "maps" of my house drawn by "witnesses" which all featured a door leading to another room in a wall which was and remains a solid brick party wall between my house and the one next door. And I would have got my QC, on oath, to ask them whether they had copied another map left casually on the interview table by "helpful" officers.

5) I'd have insisted on a far more rigorous examination of the stolen credit card used to buy thirty thousand pounds worth of goods in Paris a week after the police raided my house. I'm certain a bent cop took it. These days everyone films the individual police before allowing them to search so there would be photographic evidence.

6) I'd call many of the celebrities falsely accused over past years to give evidence about the appalling effects and the lack of punishment for those criminals who tried to pervert the course of justice and ask the police concerned why they did not prosecute the liars (could it be that police "assistance" might have been revealed?).

7) I'd have questioned why my Judge never mentioned the Internet to the Jurors. Although it was up and running and widely used 15 years ago, particularly the Guardian site, judges tend not to be aware of the real world. I'm sure jurors in my case logged on, saw the reports of allegations not mentioned in my trial (and actually thrown out by the Judge) and wrongly decided "he's done it before - he must be guilty".

8) I would not have accepted the Judge allowing the prosecution to change the dates after we showed I could not be guilty, without allowing me time to find my alibi for the new (later) dates (I was in America).

But all this is hindsight, 15 years too late!