

The Truth About Jimmy Savile

(my narration only)

The BBC is to screen a drama about Jimmy Savile, 'to give a voice to his victims', according to *The Sun* newspaper. A cynic could well ask what victims might they be?

Jimmy Savile wasn't an A-List celebrity, he was hardly known outside the UK, but in these islands the DJ and TV presenter was as big a star as they come. When he died in October 2011, he was given a funeral fit for a king, literally. Less than a year later, his reputation was in ruins, and his gravestone was consigned to the scrap heap. This was due largely to one man. Mark Williams-Thomas spent 12 years as a police officer, but resigned to work as a journalist. That was a strange career change for a man nearly half-way towards a fat pension.

The Williams-Thomas documentary was advertised well in advance, and by the time it was screened, more accusers had already crawled out of the woodwork. *The Other Side Of Jimmy Savile* was based largely on allegations from former pupils of Duncroft School. In the 1970s!

The documentary and the resultant outcry led to an extensive inquiry conducted by Dame Janet Smith. A High Court judge and an impressive intellect, she was previously given the task of investigating the crimes of Dr Harold Shipman who is universally recognised as Britain's worst serial killer ever. She did a sterling job, but with the Savile inquiry she appears to have allowed herself to be swayed by the sheer number of accusers, concluding that Savile had raped six female and two male victims while indecently assaulting many more.

There is a big difference between the Shipman victims and the purported Savile victims. The crimes of the former resulted in literally hundreds of dead bodies. Some of these victims were shown to have been poisoned, and Shipman also left a paper trail when he clumsily forged the will of his last victim, Mrs Grundy.

With Savile, we have only words, years and decades after the events which may or may not have happened. There is not one contemporaneous police report or medical report to back up the claim that Savile was a rapist or any kind of sexual predator.

The allegations against Savile have a Bill Cosby type feel to them. The American entertainer is supposed to have drugged and raped dozens of women over a period of decades, yet the only (delayed) police report was made by a woman who by her own admission dined with Cosby alone when he had come on to her before, and she had been drinking as well as voluntarily ingesting drugs on the night of the alleged attack.

The claims against Savile are even less credible because there is no suggestion he drugged his victims, and many of the assaults were allegedly carried out while other people were around.

Before making a frontal attack on the Williams-Thomas film, a few words about celebrity allegations and Savile himself. The famous maxim often falsely attributed to Samuel Clemens about a lie travelling around the world before the truth has had time to put its boots on, was true even before the invention of the telegraph, much less the Internet. Indeed, Savile himself was the victim of one demonstrable lie on Boxing Day 1994 when it was announced by Radio 1 that he had collapsed and died. Like the later car crash which was said to have resulted in the death of Britney Spears, this was claimed to be a joke.

Celebrities, powerful men, and people of both sexes in the public eye have always been the targets of malicious allegations for all manner of reasons and none. Attacks on women are often alluded to by feminists as misogyny. Such attacks often involve claims they slept their way to the top. Scurrilous allegations against men, including of sexual harassment or actual rape are often viewed by the same feminists as credible, even when they are totally anonymous. In reality, it is the same type of people if not the very same ones who are responsible for both types of allegations, but people like Jessica Valenti are too dumb to realise this. Both men and women in the public eye are also often accused of fraud and other financial crimes. Sometimes these allegations are true, but let's not talk about Hillary Clinton.

Many celebrities court publicity, and Savile was no exception. When he began his media career in radio and especially television, he was somewhat older than his fellow presenters, who were the first crop of disc jockeys in Britain. He bleached his hair white, smoked a big cigar, and acted the clown.

The now long defunct homosexual newspaper *Gay News* was first published in 1972. At that time there was still something of a stigma about homosexuality in Britain, but Savile had no problem about appearing on the front cover of its launch issue. As he was over forty and unmarried, many people would have interpreted that as him "outing himself". In fact long after that, Savile was believed to be homosexual. He wasn't, but he didn't care what people thought.

At the end of his one-sided documentary, Williams-Thomas spoke to Ian Glen QC, and the well-meaning but gullible Esther Rantzen. The barrister said the evidence, so-called, adduced by Williams-Thomas, would have been sufficient to lead to Savile's arrest. Esther, a long time friend of Savile, was visibly upset.

When Williams-Thomas phrased his question to Ian Glen, he was executing a masterful stroke of deceit, because Glen could not have realised Savile had indeed been questioned about the Duncroft allegations two years before his death, and had debunked them totally.

On October 1, 2009, detectives from Surrey Police travelled to Stoke Mandeville Hospital in Buckinghamshire where they questioned Savile at length by prior appointment. The spinal unit here was one of Savile's pet projects. Over the course of his public career he had raised enormous sums of money for various institutions, and more importantly had raised public awareness for them, especially of mental health. Savile turned up without legal representation, he was that confident, something no lawyer would have advised him to do. And he answered every single question they put to him, as well as a few they didn't.

With their *de rigueur* disrespect for truth, the authorities claim Savile wasn't prosecuted because of insufficient evidence, which is a bit like saying there is insufficient evidence for the fairies who live at the bottom of your garden.

When the transcript of this so-called interview was released initially, the police hid Savile's reference to Princess Alexandra, a friend of his who was with him when he visited Duncroft. There are still some redactions in the final version, but these are innocent.

Princess Alexandra is a cousin of the Queen. Now 83 years old, she is currently fifty-third in line to the throne, ie she is a very minor royal. But...what happens when even very minor royals go walkabout? There is security, lots of it, official and private. There are managers, personnel officers, press officers, journalists including photographers...

The police wanted to give the impression that when Savile visited Duncroft on this and other occasions, he was free to roam about and sexually assault vulnerable girls at will. It's kind of difficult to do that with so many onlookers, but people, including police officers, lawyers and jurors are often taken in by this kind of flim-flam. Ask Cardinal Pell.

The big question is where did these allegations come from in 2009, and why? That question has been answered comprehensively by two bloggers. The pseudonymous Moor Larkin runs the *Jim Cannot Fix This* blogspot (named after a Savile TV series). This is an impressive body of research. Equally impressive was the blogger Anna Raccoon. Susanne Cameron-Blackie/Susan Nundy had been a pupil/inmate of Duncroft in the 1960s. A troubled teen, she went on to a career in law late in life, and when she heard about Savile allegedly visiting it at that time, she smelt a rat. Until her death in 2017, she devoted much of her time to exposing the lies about Savile and similar matters.

She and Moor Larkin have traced the genesis of the lie to a gaggle of demented females who conspired openly through social media to frame Savile in similar fashion to the false accusers of Jian Ghomeshi in Canada, and the thirteen girls in Arizona who kept teenager Tyler Kost behind bars for three years by branding him a serial rapist.

After the Williams-Thomas documentary, the police appealed for other "victims" of Savile to come forward. And come forward they did, literally in their hundreds. In

January 2013, the *Daily Express* published a story by a woman who claimed to have been abused by Savile in 1975. During a Satanic mass. He has even been accused of defiling bodies in a hospital mortuary; in short, no calumny is too great to heap upon his corpse.

None of Savile's accusers have been properly investigated. If they had, more specifically if they had been warned in advance by the police that any wilfully false statements they made about him would bring criminal charges, how many would have thought better of it?

In 2017, Esther Rantzen gave an interview to the *Mail Online* in which she whined that Google had refused to take down "vile slurs" that branded her a child killer. Yet still the penny hasn't dropped.

Of course, it isn't possible to disprove all the allegations made against Savile, but the suggestion that he sexually abused girls at the BBC beggars belief. It isn't and indeed has never been possible simply to walk into the BBC, especially at that time when the Provisional IRA was bombing soft targets all around Britain. One woman claims to have been sexually assaulted by Savile on camera, and the footage is extant, but if you take a closer look you will find a very different interpretation. Here she is and some more footage analysed by Mandy O'Brien of *Bombards Body Language*.

The BBC has been accused of covering up Savile's crimes, but in truth there was nothing to cover up. Allegations of this nature are easy to make, but proving them is another matter entirely. One person who will testify to that is Matthew Appleyard, a Yorkshire police officer who was awarded £60,000 damages and £18,000 costs against a website that claimed he had covered up for Savile and had himself sexually abused the young.

The supposed failure to bring Savile to book during his lifetime led in turn to the *Operation Yewtree* witch-hunt, the echoes of which can still be felt today. The public record of Jimmy Savile is of a man who throughout the last half of his life did nothing but good. The Williams-Thomas documentary and indeed the Dame Janet Smith report, should be consigned to the dustbin of history where they belong.