

The Brittan And Janner Controversies



FEATURED NEWS POLITICS
SCIENCE

By Alexander Baron



17
SHARES

Two senior politicians, one dead, one still alive, have been in the news for the past few months accused of unspeakable crimes against the young. The cases are very different, as is the quality of the evidence against them. Leon Brittan and Greville Janner were not exactly peas in a pod. Brittan was and Janner is a Jew, which gives the green light for all manner of nutters to crawl out of the woodwork espousing sundry “theories” of what they did and who protected them, but let us stick with the facts.

Although Leon Brittan spent some time in Europe and was elevated to the peerage fifteen years ago, he is remembered principally as Home Secretary in the Thatcher Government, a post he held for little more than two years. In spite of achieving high office, Brittan appears to have had a bland career and to have been an equally bland individual.



Lord Leon Brittan (Foreign and Commonwealth Office)

In the early 1980s, a scurrilous rumour was circulated about him. Because there was no social media at that time, it was confined largely to whispers, and there were variations of it including that he had been arrested for possessing child pornography but released without charge on orders from above, and that he had indecently assaulted a young boy. This latter claim was probably based on a real life incident; a 6 year old boy was kidnapped by 3 men in a car who sexually assaulted him – the Brighton Beast case. This was a very unusual crime because men who do things like this are generally loners, although nowadays with social networks, people meet up more frequently to do things which are anything but social.

There is absolutely no credible evidence that Leon Brittan had anything to do with crimes against children; scurrilous rumours about politicians like those about celebrities have always been two a penny, and just because a lie is parroted incessantly does not make it true.

Also when he was Home Secretary, Leon Brittan was handed a dossier by the MP Geoffrey Dickens which is said to have contained all manner of allegations about paedophile rings, Satanism, and Heaven knows what else. That dossier is said to have disappeared mysteriously. If it contained anything important, Mr Dickens would doubtless have kept a photocopy; it is more likely it contained insane ravings from his fellow travellers. Anyone who is skeptical about this claim does not realise how deranged some of these people are; a good starting point is the recent Hampstead **Satanic abuse hoax**.

Some of the people with whom he rubbed shoulders believed babies were bred for sacrifice in Britain on a colossal scale, indeed some still do. This **assessment** of Dickens is probably a bit over the top, but not by much.

Whatever rumours may have been circulated about Leon Brittan in his later career were if anything of the usual corrupt politician variety, but after the Savile affair and *Operation Yewtree* broke, he was accused of raping a woman. The “victim” claimed he had raped her at his flat in 1967,

before most of you reading this were born! Why the police would even entertain an allegation that dated back over forty years remains to be seen; had it concerned any non-sexual offence short of murder she would have been shown the door, but this is where this absurd witch-hunt has been leading us, and what Americans will face if certain **toxic women** dupe enough politicians into removing statutes of limitations for sex crimes.

In October last year, an MP made a scandalous comment about Brittan under the cover of Parliamentary privilege – clearly an abuse – but the floodgates really opened after Brittan died in January this year, and there was no calumny too vile to heap on his corpse. He was said to have visited the notorious *Elm Guest House*, to have participated in homosexual and/or paedophile orgies and even to have been complicit in murdering boys. One alleged witness, a customs officer, is said to have claimed to have stopped him bringing child pornography into the country. Claims about Brittan’s alleged paedophilia and worse have been circulated widely, including by publications that should know better, like the *Occidental Observer*. Not one of these allegations is supported by a contemporaneous document of any kind, but the conspiracy cranks, fantasists, scandal-mongers and plain liars don’t care whose reputations they tarnish, be their victims alive or dead. Which brings us to Greville Janner.



Lord Janner of Braunstone
(Gibnews)

According to **the DPP**, “The core allegation was that Lord Janner, in a position of authority and trust as the local MP for Leicester West at the time, befriended the manager of a children’s care home to allow him access to children in order to allow him to perpetrate serious sexual offences on children.”

This manager was Frank Beck. She continues: “Evidence relating to ten individuals was developed by the police and CPS to the fullest extent possible”.

Evidence is not supposed to be *developed* by the police, it is supposed to be collected.

In total, Alison Saunders says there was enough evidence to charge Janner with offences against no fewer than nine individuals, as follows:

- 14 indecent assaults on a male under 16 between 1969 and 1988,
- 2 indecent assaults between 1984 and 1988,
- 4 counts of buggery of a male under 16 between 1972 and 1987,
- 2 counts of buggery between 1977 and 1988.

What are we to make of all this? To understand how this came about, we need to go into the Frank Beck case in some depth. In 1991, following a lengthy trial, Beck was convicted of a number of sexual and physical assaults on his charges, and was sentenced to life imprisonment. He had worked in a number of children's homes (so-called) for Leicestershire County Council. The boys and some girls in his care were not orphans waiting for people to adopt them but often emotionally disturbed, difficult or "troubled" youngsters. Beck used some bizarre techniques as part of their therapy, bizarre being the operative word. Although these techniques appear to have had some success, at times they involved violence, and Beck admitted this. His no-nonsense approach to dealing with the youngsters in his care appears to have stemmed from his background; he spent nine years in the Royal Marines, receiving an honourable discharge.

It goes without saying that the kind of discipline to which he was subjected in the Marines was not necessarily suitable for care work. Three years before his resignation, Beck was charged with assaulting a ten year old boy – whom he had spanked. Had he been convicted, that would have been the end of his career, but he was cleared, and continued to work for the county for another three years. Beck appears to have been a homosexual, and after two male residential social workers accused him of coming on to them, he resigned. It is a bad idea to allow homosexuals **unfettered access to young boys** for the same reason it is unwise to allow normal men access to young girls – it gives them the opportunity to take sexual advantage of their charges (whether or not they *consent*) and it also gives rise to false allegations.



Frank Beck

In 1989, Beck was accused of an historical sex offence by a woman who had been in his care as a child. After his arrest, he would never see daylight again. At his trial, he was anxious to portray himself as a protector of the young rather than an abuser, and he did this by claiming he had saved one of his charges from a powerful predatory paedophile, the long term Member of Parliament for Leicester West.

In spite of Beck's conviction and his sexual proclivities, there are those who believe him to have been totally innocent of the sexual assaults. The solicitor Chris Saltrese has **discussed this case** in depth, and is obviously of the belief that Janner as well as Beck was totally innocent. According to

Beck, one of his charges, a youth named Paul Winston, had been sexually abused by Janner, and he, Beck, had saved him from that abuse.

This claim was naturally dismissed by Janner and his supporters as scurrilous lies, but Winston testified for Beck claiming Janner had taken him to an hotel and the House of Commons. Furthermore, there was [a paper trail](#) which meant Janner could not deny having had some sort of relationship with the boy, the big question though is was it all totally innocent, or did Janner do things to him no man should do to another man, much less to a boy?

The Crown insisted this claim was a red herring, and Beck was duly convicted. So how is it that one allegation against Greville Janner became 22 charges against multiple victims dating back to 1969? The Beck investigation became a police trawl; this technique has been the subject of [an investigation](#) by the Home Affairs Committee in 2002, which argued strongly against it, but no one was listening, and still thirteen years later, no one who matters is listening. What the police do is contact former residents of care homes, children's homes and other institutions, tell them others have been abused sexually or otherwise, then invite them to make allegations against named individuals or simply members of staff generally.

These potential *victims* are told their allegations will be treated in confidence, they are given tea and sympathy, and there is also the lure of compensation. Some of those invited to make such allegations have not only troubled backgrounds but troubled times, a few have been in prison, and this offers them not only the prospect of compensation but gives them a ready made excuse to rationalise their own failings or ill-fortune – it was the abuse that made me do it. We have seen this nonsense taken to extreme lengths with the mentally disturbed Richard Kerr who claims to have been a victim of the mythical [Westminster paedophile ring](#). We have seen the same thing in the United States with what is in effect a media trawl for [victims of Bill Cosby](#): did you meet Bill Cosby 20, 30 or 40 years ago? Did he buy you a drink? If so, we would like to hear from you, so would [Gloria Allred](#). And of course we have now seen dozens of women coming forward making all manner of allegations against Cosby. Is he supposed to refute every single one?

Although we should be mindful of false allegations, demented women (and men in this case) liars, publicity seekers, and simple tricks of memory, we should not dismiss all allegations of historical abuse *per se*, not when as in the Janner case there is a paper trail. There is a lengthy document at [this link](#) which discusses the allegations against Janner made by Paul Winston. Similar material can be found [here](#). In both cases, *caveat emptor*!

Has there been a cover up? Almost certainly not, as with the recent Hampstead case, when the authorities take steps to protect the innocent by suppressing proven lies, there will always be people who cry cover up. So it is not impossible that the police who investigated Greville Janner were convinced there was no substance to any of the allegations. Janner being an MP at the time and heavily involved in Jewish causes, it is quite likely he had a full diary and some of these allegations were refuted by chronology. Also, in these investigations the police were looking for paedophile rings, which can exist – recall the Brighton case alluded to earlier – but the idea that the children's homes of these islands – from Haut de la Garenne to Kincorra – are controlled by

secret networks of men (and occasionally women) who traffic young boys and girls around the UK to be sexually abused or even murdered by the high and mighty is too silly for words.

There remains the issue of Janner’s dementia, which he is probably suffering to some degree, but dementia sufferers are not comparable with paraplegics who are confined forever to their wheelchairs; many of them have their good days. It is quite likely that Janner is both suffering from dementia and swinging the lead to avoid prosecution. Hopefully we will learn very soon if the DPP is going to change her mind so that he becomes the highest and mightiest of those so far indicted by the court of public opinion to stand trial for crimes against the young.

If he does not stand trial, there could still be a trial of fact, furthermore there is no reason the correspondence relating to Paul Winston should not be put into the public domain so that we can judge for ourselves what if anything transpired between the senior Labour MP and the wayward teen.

This opinion article was written by an independent writer. The opinions and views expressed herein are those of the author and are not necessarily intended to reflect those of TheLatestNews.com

17
SHARES