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2017 FACT COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Venue: St Luke’s Church & Conference Centre

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Room/Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28th January</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th March</td>
<td>Committee</td>
<td>Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th May</td>
<td>Conference</td>
<td>Main Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th June</td>
<td>committee</td>
<td>Room 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th September</td>
<td>AGM &amp; Conference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are we witnessing a chink in the armour of those who wish to continue to investigate cases of alleged sexual misconduct in the presently accepted manner? Following the debacle of the ‘investigation’ by the Metropolitan Police into allegations against several well-known public figures, the Commissioner of that police service authorised a retired High Court judge, Sir Richard Henriques, to examine the whole affair. Sir Richard’s report is now complete and parts of it available for public perusal. It makes interesting, if disturbing, reading particularly after comments I made at the recent F.A.C.T. AGM. Crucially at that meeting I queried the knowledge of our English language as possessed by some of our more senior police officers – in particular Mr. Simon Bailey, the chief constable of Norfolk and commander of Operation Hydrant which is overseeing inquiries into allegations of historical child abuse. Apparently, Mr. Bailey is also charged with compiling new guidelines on how officers should handle witnesses and alleged offenders. Some of the content of Sir Richard’s report serves only to confirm my view of Mr Bailey’s knowledge of our language but his recommendations actually support my stance totally and must, therefore, raise grave doubts over Mr. Bailey’s present professional position as well as the procedures presently employed by not only the Metropolitan Police but by many, probably all, other police forces in this country.

There are, no doubt, a great many points of both interest and relevance as far as members of F.A.C.T. are concerned but it seems that two recommendations, in particular, together with the discussion surrounding them, stand out. These refer to the meaning in English of two words used so often by police and others in cases involving allegations of abuse. These two words, so simple to our ears but so complicated for the police authorities to understand, are ‘victim’ and ‘belief’.

Sir Richard considered submissions and material from a great many sources but possibly the two most important were Operation Hydrant SIO Guidance, written by the above mentioned Mr. Simon Bailey, and the Report of the Independent Review into the Investigation and Prosecution of Rape in London, a report which was compiled by a group chaired by the Rt. Hon. Dame Elish Angiolini DBE, QC. Throughout the second mentioned report, a person making a complaint is described as a ‘complainant’ but Operation Hydrant guidance consistently describes the same person as a ‘victim’. Further, every recommendation advanced by Dame Elish uses the word ‘complainant’ but the response utilises the word ‘victim’. Obviously not all ‘complainants’ are ‘victims’ since, for example, some complaints are false. It is pointed out quite simply and clearly that, throughout the judicial process, the word ‘complainant’ is used up to the moment of conviction – if, indeed, there is a conviction – because it is only at that point that any ‘complainant’ may be described accurately as a ‘victim’. After all, the whole purpose of the judicial system is geared to determining whether, or not, a ‘complainant’ is a ‘victim’. This proper use of language cannot sensibly be questioned.

The whole purpose of the judicial system is geared to determining whether, or not, a ‘complainant’ is a ‘victim’.

However, Mr. Simon Bailey writes:

If we don’t acknowledge a victim as such, it reinforces a system based on distrust and disbelief. The police service is the conduit that links the victim to the rest of the criminal justice system; there is a need to develop a relationship and rapport with a victim (particularly in challenging and complex cases) in order to achieve the best evidence possible. Police officers and police staff investigators through their roles are required to deal with the emotional turmoil often presented by a victim and to determine what is relevant to the complaint that has been made. The term “victim” features in important legislation, statutory guidance, the policies of the police and Crown Prosecution Service. To remove this and replace it with the word ‘complainant’ will have significant detrimental effect on the trust victims now have in the authorities and fundamentally damage the efforts of many organisations re-built over the years.
This is a blatant attempt by Mr. Bailey to justify inaccurate terminology and totally ignores the consequences of this flawed terminology. Crucially, it gives a definite impression of pre-judging a complaint; indeed, in many cases there is little doubt that pre-judgement has occurred. Of course, the use of the word ‘victim’ is completely inappropriate in the case of false complaints. Here it is interesting to note that Sir Richard’s point was countered by Mr. Bailey with the claim that ‘only 0.1% of all complaints were false and thus any inaccuracy in the use of the word ‘victim’ is so minimal that it can be disregarded’. As an off-the-cuff comment this must count as being quite remarkable, especially as apparently no statistical evidence was produced to support such a questionable claim. Certainly, I personally know of enough cases of incorrect prosecution to make this percentage appear extremely dubious. However, be that as it may, since the whole investigative process is supposedly engaged in collecting and collating evidence to determine if an allegation is true or false, anything which serves to disrupt that process should be cast aside.

As for the word ‘victim’ appearing in legislation, that does not negate the fact that its use is inaccurate and consequently inappropriate. Incidentally, the Home Affairs Committee of the House of Commons doesn’t use the word when the word ‘complainant’ is available and it might be noted also that ‘For years all complainants in sexual cases were referred to in the Crown Court as victims until Senior Judiciary realised the injustice of the practice. In every Crown Court there were signs directing complainants to Victim Support rooms within the Court building. Those signs are now replaced with signs to Witness Support rooms. Legislation is not always perfect.’

Mr. Bailey’s assertion that replacing the word ‘victim’ with ‘complainant’ will have a significant detrimental effect on the trust victims now have in the authorities was noted as purely speculative and, as many realise, based on totally incorrect, unethical motives. Sir Richard interviewed a number of ‘complainants’ and found no support among them for use of the word ‘victim’; indeed some quite strenuously opposed and objected to the use of the word for a variety of easily understandable reasons. As for his assertion that the suggested word change will ‘fundamentally damage the efforts of many organisations re-built over the years’, this was found not to be the case and Mr. Peter Saunders of NAPAC actually agreed that ‘the use of the word ‘complainant’ before conviction is the fairest way of referring to an individual before a finding of guilty’. Mr. Saunders also noted that ‘to use the word ‘victim’ implies the crime has been committed’. There can be little doubt that here it is clear that a genuine ‘victim’ has more understanding of the meanings of these two words ‘complainant’ and ‘victim’ than the chief constable charged with being National Police Lead for Child Protection and Abuse Investigation. Furthermore, it appears the NSPCC habitually explains to clients that they will be referred to as ‘complainants’ in Court.

Sir Richard also found that the complainants he interviewed didn’t expect to be believed instantly; all they wanted was for their complaints to be fully and professionally investigated and only then to be believed. They expected difficult questions but were ready to answer them. They did not expect to be treated as if the crime is proven before it is investigated.

As a result of all his investigations, Sir Richard’s first recommendation was that throughout both the investigative and the judicial process those who made complaints should be referred to as ‘complainants’ and not as ‘victims’. Given the admitted normal usage of these two words in other sections of the judicial process, it is difficult to see how any sections of the police can continue to adhere to their present usage which, as has been known by many for a very long time, is entirely prejudicial and probably contributes greatly to the appalling treatment suffered by some when under investigation by the police.

When it comes to the word ‘belief’ however, the police authorities seem to exhibit an even greater lack of understanding of the effects of their procedures on justice in this country. In his report, Sir Richard notes that the stated policy of the College of policing is:

‘At the point when someone makes an allegation of crime, the police should believe the account given and a crime report should be completed’.

It seems that this notion has its origins in a police Special Notice dealing with rape investigations which stated:

‘It is the policy of the MPS to accept allegations made by the victim in the first instance as being truthful. An allegation will only be considered as falling short of a substantiated allegation after a full and thorough investigation’.
Here MPS refers specifically to the Metropolitan Police Service but there is no doubt that other forces adhere to this policy also. Further to this latter statement, Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary recommended in 2014 that:

‘The presumption that the victim should always be believed should be institutionalised’.

This amazing statement displays a staggering lack of understanding of the English language by a high ranking body in the overall justice system of our country. Dame Elish queried the approach of ‘always believing’ a complainant, pointing out that ‘it may prejudice the impartiality of the officer’s role and lead to their failing to recognise or give weight to other evidence inconsistent with the complainant’s account’. This is a rather kind and somewhat generous comment to make. As everyone knows, the word ‘believe’ means ‘accept as true or as conveying truth’. It follows that, in order to pursue a thorough, impartial investigation into any case, the investigating officer, or officers, must neither believe nor disbelieve the original allegation. They must simply listen to the allegation, accept it as a statement and then investigate, without fear or favour, to ascertain the actual truth. Their report should then be forwarded to the relevant higher authorities and, if a trial results, it should be up to the Court to finally decide on the truth, or otherwise. At present, the College of Policing advocates a two stage approach – the first stage is believing the account given by the victim, whilst the second stage, entitled ‘crime investigation’, involves a thorough investigation of the facts and allegations made. A brief glance at this policy statement immediately shows the dangers of using the two words ‘victim’ and ‘believe’. Only a truly remarkable officer would carry out a thorough impartial investigation of the facts and allegations under the burden of this highly biased starting point. Again as pointed out by Sir Richard, it is fundamental in any respectable criminal justice system that no erosion of the presumption of innocence is tolerated. It is certainly true that this assumed fundamental aspect of our criminal justice system has been ignored on many occasions in both recent, and less recent, years. Indeed, Sir Richard states that, in the cases he reviewed for his enquiry, there was plain evidence that the instruction to believe complainants had over ridden the duty to investigate objectively and effectively. This is a truly devastating statement but one which many members of F.A.C.T. will recognise as only too true. Also, it must be noted that at least some who end up being investigating officers in such cases are intellectually incapable of pursuing an unbiased investigation when faced with these highly dubious guidelines.

At this point it will come as no surprise to find that Mr. Bailey stood firmly behind the presently stated policy. He and his team failed to understand the simple linguistic truth that actual belief of one party immediately implies disbelief of the other. Mr. Bailey was apparently concerned that ‘victims’ of abuse had had little trust in the police for many years but, as Sir Richard points out, replacing an unsatisfactory system with another flawed system is no answer to anything. Further, the present system really does originate with an assumption of guilt and some police officers see it as their task to prove that guilt – regardless of the facts. In cases where children are involved for example, they never even wonder if the child is lying and the fact is children do lie and do so for a variety of reasons. One such reason concerns accused teachers. One may well ask how often the accused teacher is noted for imposing discipline in class. The fact is there are pupils who object to such an imposition and know that, as soon as they make an allegation, the teacher involved will be suspended immediately and subjected to weeks of totally biased harassment by the authorities. If lucky, nothing further will come of it legally but that teacher’s career will at best have been damaged severely; at worst finished. The pupil involved will not even receive a reprimand, let alone a deserved punishment. If there is a criminal investigation, some police officers genuinely believe that, if the allegation is false, the accuser will be accused of perjury and wasting police time but, in truth, that rarely if ever happens.

Mr. Bailey stresses that ‘it is important to highlight that whilst the starting point for the police service is one of belief, this is not ‘blind’ belief that has no regard for credible evidence that suggests something contrary to that reported by a victim’. It is almost impossible to believe that such an unintelligent claim could be advanced by someone in his position. He is bound to know that it is entirely false and that claim is supported by numerous cases that have reached the Courts because blind belief has prevailed. Besides, belief is belief and introducing the term blind belief does little other than attempt to muddy some already cloudy waters surrounding police behaviour. The present system, since it starts from a presumption of belief in the allegations of an accuser, effectively shifts the
burden of proof onto the accused. This is totally contrary to the fundamental principles of British justice where a person is supposedly presumed innocent until proven guilty. Nevertheless, the National Police Chiefs’ Council reaffirmed the policy that ‘when an allegation is received police should believe this account’ and attempted to justify their untenable stance by noting that ‘to start an investigation from a position of doubt is unlikely to encourage victims to come forward’. This seems to imply presumed guilt on the part of the accused and any starting point that eliminates doubt must possess the hallmark of bias.

A further extremely worrying point in Sir Richard’s report is that, during his examination of the problem, he found that ‘belief campaigners are zealously opposed to any change’, asserting that an abandonment of ‘belief’ would result in a return to the bad old days when victims of crime were frightened to complain and, if they did so, their complaints were rejected too readily. Maybe the old system did require amendment but the use of the word ‘zealously’ raises huge worries for the future of our legal system if such people have their way. Zealots never do any good for any cause. Also, as Sir Richard says, ‘in any properly run system, no truthful, genuine complainant has anything to fear from a directive that prioritises investigation ahead of belief’. He recommended that ‘The instruction to believe a ‘victim’s’ account should cease. It should be the duty of an officer interviewing a complainant to investigate the facts objectively and impartially and with an open mind from the outset of the investigation.’

Could it be considered that the CICA are bribing complainants?

However, any likelihood of payment at a pre-Court stage would immediately increase the possibility of an accuser sticking to an incorrect story for financial benefit. In this sense, such a payment must be viewed as a bribe*. It would be interesting to know how many complainants have been motivated by the possibility of financial gain and how much has been paid out of the public purse by the CICA and others in this respect but I suppose that is strictly confidential and must remain so to protect the liars who have caused so much unwarranted misery to so many.

In conclusion, attention must be drawn to the prominent role of Mr. Simon Bailey in these proceedings. It was to his statements that attention was drawn at the recent F.A.C.T. AGM but here further proof of his intransigence is clear for all to see. He may be just a mouthpiece for the entire senior branch of the police service but the stance he has adopted must be seen by all in legal circles to be entirely unacceptable. He must either resign or be dismissed for the good of our once envied legal system and, if others in the senior echelons of the police feel like him, they should depart also. Trust is a vital part of police work and attitudes.

One further point in Sir Richard’s report concerned me greatly, especially after comments I made in my talk at the recent F.A.C.T. AGM and that concerns issues surrounding the person known as ‘Nick’ in the recent MPS enquiry. Amongst the failures of the MPS listed were failing to enquire of the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority (CICA) whether ‘Nick’ had made a claim; having learned that ‘Nick’ had made a claim, failed to ask the CICA for details of the claim; having learned that ‘Nick’ had made a claim, assisted ‘Nick’ to process his claim during the currency of the investigation. This relates directly to worries I voiced about the actions of the CICA and indicates, yet again, that claims are made and processed before any Court case has occurred. Of course, if ‘Nick’ was paid anything by the CICA, that would be confidential and anonymity of the recipient would be preserved.

*Editor’s Note: The issue of the CICA paying out compensation before the trial is picked up on page 13 of this Magazine.
One of the biggest challenges we face at the moment is the notion that false allegations are “rare” and that “rarity” means we should not have a voice. We are supposed to turn a blind eye and follow suit with “victims” groups who refuse to accept that those who suffer false allegations are also victims. As are their spouses and partners. And their children.

These men – and they are predominantly men – are also fathers, grandfathers, and uncles, et al. It is then the children in their families who carry the stigma of the allegation: some are even looked upon as being probable additional victims. Some are used as justification to separate the accused from their own family during the investigation.

And what does that do? It emotionally abuses the child, who can easily become so wracked with their own guilt as to what they must have done wrong. After all, they see their own family torn apart for doing nothing to anyone else. (Click http://www.colinwardwriter.co.uk/poetry to see a poem I wrote on this)

Where are the anti-child abuse campaigners when you throw THAT argument into the mix? Usually they are quick to reply that those who support the falsely accused assume every woman who claims to have been raped is a liar. We do nothing of the sort. The two arguments are like trying to polish a turd with tarmac. Moreover, we never even claim that an accused man should not have to face investigation. What we ask for is a balanced investigation. Interestingly enough: so does our legal system.

But if you only read Rick’s story you can see the calamity in his case. Error after error. Constant and repeated mishandling of the case. Even admissions from officers that there is not really any case to answer…as they still pass it onto the CPS without a care in the world for the sheer damage the whole façade has on the accused and their family. I know of another man wrongly convicted of charges that were physically impossible to have occurred. (I wonder if he is off the “suicide watch” list yet). I know of a teenager who was wrongly convicted even though the judge readily admitted they didn’t believe the accuser!

I’ve been there. I have felt that gut-wrenching feeling every time the phone rings. I have felt the blood drain from my face when I see a police car. I have known what holding my life in limbo is like. I have lost friends who I couldn’t tell what was happening; who lost patience as I dug my mental health into a hole so deep that not all of it got out. And I have felt the emptiness when it is all over. No justice. No recognition of my innocence. No resounding retraction of the allegation: just a nonchalant shrug of the shoulders and a pitiful “no further action.” (My accuser even went for their next victim as my case was still going on.)

So I say “no” to expensive inquiries that merely feed back into the same corrupt system that facilitates this abuse and just wafts it away with “lessons must be learnt.” I say “no” to pointless petitions for copious changes to laws, when that is not the source of the problem. And I say “no” to sitting back just telling each other our woes, preaching to the converted.

It’s time to make so much more noise. Get noticed, get heard. Face up to the ignorance that says our cases are rare. Don’t just meet in a group of mutually affected

---

Sticks and Stones may break my bones,
but it was words that damn near killed me.

by
Colin Ward, Writer & Victim
and supportive people, but also open up that closed circle and scream loudly from the rooftops, because:

*Sticks and Stones may break my bones... but it was words that damn near killed me.*

This is not a fight for those of us who have already been hurt. This is a fight for all those who WILL be abused in the future. The victims, their families, their community: our future. And if you can personally do nothing else, please read and follow “Rick’s” story on Facebook. Share it. Make it your goal to get three, five, ten, or as many more people to read the page as you can. It is a real story and it is happening now.

“Rick” is a false name, and no specific legal information is given out, and locations and details are masked, all to protect “Rick” who has said he will gladly share his real name when he’s able to.

And please, someone get me Ken Loach’s phone number because the stunning film “I, Daniel Blake” needs to be followed up with: “I, an innocent man…”

---

http://www.colinwardwriter.co.uk/

The Facebook page referred to:
https://www.facebook.com/Lies-Injustice-a-true-Diary-of-a-False-Allegation-1761876117411926/

The poem referred to above:
http://www.colinwardwriter.co.uk/poetry

---

*My Daddy Never Said Goodbye*

My daddy never said goodbye
When the police man took him away
And I don’t know where he has gone
But I hear the others say:

“Your daddy is a bad man”
“He’s gone away for good”
As their mummies stare and point at us
Like we’re all covered in mud.

My brother still has his football
But he never likes to play.
And I still have my dolly
But she has nothing to say.

Worst of all is in the night
When I hear my mummy cry.
I guess it must be just because
My daddy never said goodbye.

---

*False Allegations don’t just hurt the accused... they are an abuse of innocence for everyone*
The Fascinating Phenomenon of False Memories

Notes on a lecture on Friday 18th November 2016, at the Forensic Psychology Unit, Goldsmith’s College, London.

Panel: Professor Elizabeth Loftus, Professor Christopher French, Dr Robert Nash and Dr Kimberley Wade.

False memory: A memory that feels absolutely real, but the remembered event didn’t actually happen.

We don’t live far from Goldsmith’s College and jumped at the opportunity to hear these experts talk about false memories. We wanted to try and understand how someone could come to be absolutely convinced that something happened when in reality it hadn’t. This is a topic that’s of great importance to many FACT members who have suffered from a wrongful allegation of child sexual abuse.

The evening was introduced by A.R. Hopwood, a video artist who collected ordinary people’s experiences of false memories. Anyone could send him their false memories and then they formed the basis of his false memory archive. The stories were then told by actors and videoed. There were some amazingly bizarre childhood memories which only came to be recognized as false when challenged by older family members. The take away message was that everybody has false memories.

The panel discussion was opened by Professor Loftus who had been awarded the John Maddox Prize only the day before. The prize was for promoting ‘sound science and evidence on a matter of public interest in the face of deep personal hostility’ and she had had plenty of that in her long career.

She gave an engaging description of her 40 years of research which started in the 1970’s by researching memory malleability. She exposed subjects to simulated car accidents and then looked at how easy it was to alter people’s memory of the accident by asking them about it in different ways. The results confirmed that changes in the way questions were asked made people have very different memories of the details of the accident. This of course has important implications for the way in which witness statements are taken.

In the 90’s she became involved in “memory wars”. There was an epidemic of people relating bizarre stories about satanic abuse. Her research found that they had commonly been having psychotherapy involving dream interpretation, imagination exercises and sometimes hypnosis. She and other researchers decided to find out how easily false memories could be implanted. They found that they could implant childhood memories of being abandoned in a shopping mall, being attacked by a vicious animal or even being rescued by a lifeguard. Her publication of these findings caused her to suffer much angry criticism from repressed memory psychotherapists and their patients, and she had to spend five years fighting a lawsuit.

Dr Kimberley Wade followed with a fascinating description of her work on implanting false memories using fake photographs. She had shown her subjects photos of their own childhood, and one was a fake picture, showing them in a hot air balloon. They were asked to imagine the events in the photos for a week and then questioned about their memories. Surprisingly 50% of the subjects had formed rich memories of the hot air balloon ride, which of course had never happened. They were convinced that it had really happened, and they would describe details such as the appearance and smell of the burning gas, the people in the balloon etc. They ‘remembered’ far more than the information shown in the faked photo.

More worryingly her experiments showed that it was possible to make someone remember that they had committed a crime when in fact they hadn’t. They were given a task to perform which at times involved the
transfer of money using a computer. The team showed people fake videos of them keeping some of the money for themselves, and many came to believe that they had actually done so. This opens the possibility that some interrogation techniques, such as pretending to have incriminating evidence that doesn’t really exist, could induce false confessions. Unfortunately, there wasn’t time to hear more about risky interrogation techniques, we were told it would have been a subject for a whole lecture in itself.

Professor French followed on by discussing his research into the process by which people come to develop rich memories of impossible events such as alien abduction. He had discovered that those who suffered from sleep paralysis, which is a state between waking and sleeping during which someone feels they can’t move, were more likely to have developed these memories of alien abduction. During sleep paralysis some people have auditory hallucinations. He thought that these could be so disturbing that some would seek explanation for these experiences. They might look for help from UFO specialists or memory regression therapists. Psychotherapy or memory regression techniques are very powerful ways of inducing false memories, and the result would be another alien abductee!

Most importantly for many who have suffered from wrongful allegations of historic child sexual abuse Professor French stated that ‘repressed’ memories of historic sexual abuse ‘recovered’ during psychotherapy are unlikely to be true. There is no evidence that repressed memories exist. A child older than say three or four would remember a traumatic event, a younger child would have not formed any lasting memory that would persist into adulthood, so it couldn’t possibly be recovered.

I was wondering if false memories could be formed without undergoing psychotherapy. Professor French explained that false memories can also be self-induced, for example by hearing other people’s stories on TV or through reading (e.g. ‘bibliotherapy’ using self-help books). The more imaginative someone is, the more likely they are to develop a false memory. More importantly, false memories are just as emotionally charged as real ones, so can sound very convincing to a jury.

The audience were then able to ask questions. Here are some of them.

Q. Can you tell fake memories from real ones with a lie detector?

A. No, not with current knowledge, not even by scanning someone’s brain while they recall their memories. Lie detectors wouldn’t work; there is rich emotional content to a false memory and therefore physiological arousal when that memory is recalled. The physiological responses (heart rate, breathing rate, blood pressure etc.) which lie detectors measure would be the same for a false and a real memory.

Q. Is there any gender difference in susceptibility to false memories?

A. None has been discovered so far. Following on from this, even people with very good day to day memory, who can accurately recall events, can be just as susceptible to false memory implantation.

Q. Do false memories lead to wrong convictions?

A. [Many wry smiles from panel]. ¾ of 300 prisoners exonerated by DNA evidence in the US were wrongly convicted by false eyewitness testimony.

Q. Is it right to publicise suspects such as Jimmy Savile?

A. It’s a political question, but the answer from science is that such publicity could induce false memories of abuse in some people.

Q. What should we do about dangerous psychotherapy?

A. A lot more! There is a problem in that it’s possible to do a weekend course in regression therapy and then start taking clients.

Q. What about the ethics of implanting good memories?

A. Dr Nash described his research into people’s preferences in this area. About 50% of those questioned felt it would be right to do this. For example, making someone falsely remember an unpleasant experience with fatty foods could be used to help them lose weight.

Q. Is there any research into collective false memories?

A. Prof. French told us that 50% of people can remember a paparazzi video of Princess Diana’s car crash, when in fact there is no such video. The Chinese seem to have attempted to alter the nation’s memory of what happened in Tiananmen Square using techniques similar to those use in false memory implantation experiments.
Q. Do power relationships affect false memory implantation?

A. People are more likely to form a false memory if the source of the false information is believed to be more credible than their own experience. So power relationships could have an influence. Kim Wade commented that in New Zealand, a US accent was shown to be more effective than a NZ accent when used to implant a false memory. Of course this has implications for people undergoing psychotherapy because the client believes the therapist has expert knowledge and authority and so is more susceptible to developing a false memory.

This was a fascinating evening and the two hours went past all too quickly. It was very encouraging to hear the way in which science was addressing a puzzling question. How can someone be absolutely convinced that something happened when it didn’t?

Now that evidence is no longer needed to corroborate someone’s testimony of being sexually assaulted, it is extremely worrying that the criminal courts attach so little credibility to the knowledge of memory scientists. In the common situation where a jury has only the testimony of the complainant and the defendant, a complainant with a false memory could seem just as credible as someone with a true memory.

To quote the late Judge Gerald Butler, in a BBC programme in 2008, when asked whether we needed memory experts to explain to juries how people's memories work.

"I think, frankly, that is a faintly ridiculous suggestion. We do have experts who can be very helpful ... there are handwriting experts, there are fingerprint experts, and of course there are the DNA experts who have turned out to be of immense value in the courts. But we also have juries who are there in order to use their common sense and when it is a situation that you weigh up a witness’s evidence and decide whether he or she is telling the truth or that he or she has a faithful recollection of what has taken place, this is essentially a matter for the jury. It is not a matter for an expert."

After this evening at Goldsmith’s I was left in no doubt that Judge Butler was wrong.

Submitted by John Chatwin

A Chink of Light? continued from page 6

such as those displayed by Mr. Bailey and his supporters achieve exactly the opposite of what they claim to want. It might be commented also that it does not reflect well on our legal system as presently operated to realise that these revelations have surfaced because of grave injustices suffered by various prominent people. Many others have suffered as much or more but their cases haven’t been investigated or even highlighted. It is now time to examine the procedures adopted in these sexual investigation cases afresh and realise from the outset that, in the vast majority of historic cases, it is virtually impossible to achieve proof beyond reasonable doubt. This, however, must not be used as an excuse to adopt the heinous suggestion of Mr. Keir Starmer of aiming for proof on the balance of probabilities as a moment’s reflection will indicate this to be a backward step in the pursuit of justice since the term ‘balance of probabilities’ is far too vague to lead to any form of justice and could easily be interpreted differently in different situations to the benefit of interested parties on the prosecution side. It may be a vain hope but let us just hope that this report by Sir Richard Henriques indicates a chink of light appearing at the end of a very long tunnel – a much longer tunnel for some than others!

________________________

Publications to which reference has been made:


In Mr Justice Leggatt judgment relating to in Gestmin SGPS S.A. v Credit Suisse (UK) Limited and others [2013] he said:

“15. An obvious difficulty which affects allegations and oral evidence based on recollection of events which occurred several years ago is the unreliability of human memory.

16. While everyone knows that memory is fallible, I do not believe that the legal system has sufficiently absorbed the lessons of a century of psychological research into the nature of memory and the unreliability of eyewitness testimony. One of the most important lessons of such research is that in everyday life we are not aware of the extent to which our own and other people’s memories are unreliable and believe our memories to be more faithful than they are. Two common (and related) errors are to suppose: (1) that the stronger and more vivid is our feeling or experience of recollection, the more likely the recollection is to be accurate; and (2) that the more confident another person is in their recollection, the more likely their recollection is to be accurate.

17. Underlying both these errors is a faulty model of memory as a mental record which is fixed at the time of experience of an event and then fades (more or less slowly) over time. In fact, psychological research has demonstrated that memories are fluid and malleable, being constantly rewritten whenever they are retrieved. This is true even of so-called ‘flashbulb’ memories that is memories of experiencing or learning of a particularly shocking or traumatic event. (The very description ‘flashbulb’ memory is in fact misleading, reflecting as it does the misconception that memory operates like a camera or other device that makes a fixed record of an experience.) External information can intrude into a witness’s memory, as can his or her own thoughts and beliefs, and both can cause dramatic changes in recollection. Events can come to be recalled as memories which did not happen at all or which happened to someone else (referred to in the literature as a failure of source memory).

18. Memory is especially unreliable when it comes to recalling past beliefs. Our memories of past beliefs are revised to make them more consistent with our present beliefs. Studies have also shown that memory is particularly vulnerable to interference and alteration when a person is presented with new information or suggestions about an event in circumstances where his or her memory of it is already weak due to the passage of time.

19. The process of civil litigation itself subjects the memories of witnesses to powerful biases. The nature of litigation is such that witnesses often have a stake in a particular version of events. This is obvious where the witness is a party or has a tie of loyalty (such as an employment relationship) to a party to the proceedings. Other, more subtle influences include allegiances created by the process of preparing a witness statement and of coming to court to give evidence for one side in the dispute. A desire to assist, or at least not to prejudice, the party who has called the witness or that party’s lawyers, as well as a natural desire to give a good impression in a public forum, can be significant motivating forces.

20. Considerable interference with memory is also introduced in civil litigation by the procedure of preparing for trial. A witness is asked to make a statement, often (as in the present case) when a long time has already elapsed since the relevant events. The statement is usually drafted for the witness by a lawyer who is inevitably conscious of the significance for the issues in the case of what the witness does nor does not say. The statement is made after the witness’s memory has been "refreshed" by reading documents. The documents considered often include statements of case and other argumentative material as well as documents which the witness did not see at the time or which came into existence after the events which he or she is being asked to recall. The statement may go through several iterations before it is finalised. Then, usually months later, the witness will be asked to
The Criminal Injury Claim Authority (CICA) is an executive agency, sponsored by the Ministry of Justice which deal with compensation claims from people who have been physically or mentally injured because they were the blameless victim of a violent crime in England, Scotland or Wales.

The tax payer would be surprised to hear that the CICA pays out compensation from the public purse before a claim has been proved in court of law. Therefore they are paying compensation to people who have made unproven allegations. To quote a Crown Court Judge "an allegation is just that, an allegation. It is not a fact until proven in a court of law". This is a misuse of the public purse.

21. It is not uncommon (and the present case was no exception) for witnesses to be asked in cross-examination if they understand the difference between recollection and reconstruction or whether their evidence is a genuine recollection or a reconstruction of events. Such questions are misguided in at least two ways. First, they erroneously presuppose that there is a clear distinction between recollection and reconstruction, when all remembering of distant events involves reconstructive processes. Second, such questions disregard the fact that such processes are largely unconscious and that the strength, vividness and apparent authenticity of memories is not a reliable measure of their truth.

22. In the light of these considerations, the best approach for a judge to adopt in the trial of a commercial case is, in my view, to place little if any reliance at all on witnesses' recollections of what was said in meetings and conversations, and to base factual findings on inferences drawn from the documentary evidence and known or probable facts. This does not mean that oral testimony serves no useful purpose – though its utility is often disproportionate to its length. But its value lies largely, as I see it, in the opportunity which cross-examination affords to subject the documentary record to critical scrutiny and to gauge the personality, motivations and working practices of a witness, rather than in testimony of what the witness recalls of particular conversations and events. Above all, it is important to avoid the fallacy of supposing that, because a witness has confidence in his or her recollection and is honest, evidence based on that recollection provides any reliable guide to the truth.

Although the above points are relate to a Commercial Case, they are relevant to all historic cases that rely mainly on evidence dependent upon peoples memories.

Is the Criminal Injury Claim Authority (CICA) fuelling False Allegations of Historic Abuse?

The Criminal Injury Claim Authority (CICA) is an executive agency, sponsored by the Ministry of Justice which deal with compensation claims from people who have been physically or mentally injured because they were the blameless victim of a violent crime in England, Scotland or Wales.

We know that some legal firms attract false historic abuse claims by advertising in prisons and stating on their website that 98% of their claimants get compensation without going to court, but is the CICA also enticing people to make false allegations by paying out compensation before the veracity of the claim is examined in court.

Let me put that another way; you could easily imagine someone in need of money being told the following:
“If you want easy money, all you have to do is to tell the police that you were abused as a youngster. Once you have given the police a statement, you will be given a crime number, and then you can make your claim. The police will even tell you how to claim. You don’t even have to go to court before you get your money. The more serious the abuse, such as rape, the more money you will get. Don’t worry if it is not true, the police always believe the victim and will support your claim. If it goes to court and the jury does not believe you, you still keep the money. You are not robbing anybody, there is a huge pot of Government money just sitting there waiting to pay out thousands of pounds; it is there for the taking.”

Some police officers are walking a fine line between legitimately informing those they have interviewed of the CICA scheme and judging them as telling the truth by encouraging and supporting them in their claim for compensation. I actually heard a complainant in a historic abuse trial in the Crown Court in Leeds (2015) state on oath in the witness box that police officers from Humberside Police helped him obtain the CICA claim forms and also helped him fill them in. Of course the witness may have lied, but this story is now circulating by word of mouth, legitimising the claim culture; “even the police want you to make a claim”.

The CICA pay out system makes any allegation for physical or sexual abuse a financial win-win situation

If you don’t live in certain cultural circles you will be unaware of the common knowledge that the CICA pay out system makes any allegation for physical or sexual abuse a financial win-win situation. An example of how the CICA unwittingly creates a financial win-win situation for any false claimant is encapsulated in the following true story.

Teacher F once taught disturbed teenagers in a Children’s Home with Education (CHE). In 2015, after a local newspaper ran a story that Teacher F had an allegation of historical abuse made against him, a past resident of that same Children’s Home, whom we will call Resident B, made a statement to the police that he was raped by Teacher F. However, sixteen years previously, Resident B had also given the police a similar witness statement stating he had been raped by another teacher in the same Home. However, it was obvious that he did not remember the exact contents of the previous statement (or naively thought nobody would remember it), because when the two statements were examined it was obvious that Resident B was lying. Therefore the CPS did not proceed with the case, to the great relief of Teacher F. However, Resident B still won as he was eligible for thousands of pounds of compensation from the CICA. (N.B. Due to the data protection act we cannot prove that he made a claim).

Anybody who has been in this situation will know that Teacher F was not a winner; he in fact became a victim due to the assassination of his good character. He will gain for life a note on the police computers and his DBS stating, ‘rape allegation did not proceed due to lack of evidence’; such vague statements do not go down well with future employers.

Just to complete the story Teacher F went to court regarding the allegation reported in the paper and was found not guilty; he has no convictions, the only thing he is guilty of is working with disturbed teenagers, some of whom became disturbed adults.

We can only speculate that once Resident B brags amongst his friends that he was never abused, but made lots of money from the Government, others might try the same ‘trick’.

In my opinion, one way to reduce fraudulent historical abuse claims is to remove the monetary reward. This would cause an outcry from those who were genuinely abused as a child and also from those who support them. However, people cannot complain if the Government stops the ICIA from paying compensation related to historic abuse cases before they have been scrutinised and proven in a court of law. Of course, this would not stop courts making unjust convictions, but it would be a good start in reducing the ‘gold diggers’ without affecting those who have been sadly abused as a child.

Michael Curran
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**Denis and Aideen Jones** will be talking about their experiences following their arrest by Operation Pallial in August 2013 for false allegations of historic child abuse and child cruelty, through to their trial in March 2016 and the not guilty verdicts.

Both have spent their careers working with and campaigning and supporting children and vulnerable adults, Denis mainly in youth justice and Aideen in learning disability and mental health. At the time of their arrest Denis was working as the national research officer for CAFCASS, and Aideen was the Chief Executive of a special needs housing association. Denis has a Ph.D (ironically his thesis was on the history of residential child care and custody of young offenders) and Aideen was awarded the OBE for her work with adults with learning difficulties.

As a result of their arrest and the 18 months they initially spent on uncharged bail, both lost their jobs and had to resign from a range of charity and voluntary work that they did. Since their acquittal they have both become active members of FACT and other campaign groups concerned with false allegations and their consequences.

---

**Gurpal Virdi** is currently an elected councillor for London Borough of Hounslow, he is however more famously known for his work in the police and even more for his stance on equality and fairness. Gurpal, whilst growing up in Southall noticed that ethnic minority people who were low in numbers were not being treated properly or fairly. He decided at a young age to join the police. He was the first Asian from Hounslow to join the Metropolitan police force. Most of his police service has been in the CID and uniform, he had worked throughout London on national and international assignments. Still challenging how ethnic minority communities were being mistreated he was very vocal in making change within the police service. Despite facing several obstacles, Gurpal completed thirty years of unblemished service. He has been praised for his balanced judgements, thorough investigations and integrity. When not fighting inequality Gurpal has given a great deal of his time to voluntary and charity work as he believes in making a difference to the quality of other people’s daily lives and prospects. In 2012, after leaving the police Gurpal carried the Olympic Torch from Richmond to Hounslow on Kew Bridge. He is a trained tutor for Adult Education. In 2014, whilst he was campaigning to become a councillor, Gurpal and his family had to endure further difficult times with the police making false and malicious historical allegations against him. This led to him facing bad publicity, being suspended from the Labour Party and losing his employment both paid and voluntary.

In July 2015, Gurpal was cleared at Southwark Crown court of any wrongdoing.

Gurpal has been recognised for his police service by being awarded with commendations and medals. The communities have also recognised him. His work has been exceptional not only in London but nationally as a direct result of his tenacity and sustained actions because he believes in the principle of natural justice, equalities and Human Rights.

---

**For further information, contact;**

FACT Secretary: 83 Ducie Street, Manchester. M1 2JQ   Email: sec@factuk.org

or book via the dedicated mobile number for the conference 074640436496

**Directions**

**Car**

St Luke’s has some parking and is easy to find using a Sat Nav; post code: B15 2AT

**Walking**

It is ten to fifteen minutes from New Street Station

**Bus 63** along Bristol Street.

Alight by Bristol Street Motors, cross the road and walk to St Catherine’s Church. Turn left and walk up Great Colmore Street. The church is on the right.
The shocking case of David Bryant
events the fallacy that we can always spot a liar

By Matthew Scott, barrister

Matthew Scott has kindly given us permission to reproduce his blog on David Bryant that he published on his blog, barristerblogger.com, on 21 July, 2016. Some readers may be aware of this case from the press, but Matthew Scott looks at this case with a barristers eye and gives us the wider picture of false allegations.

N.B. We have left the only the active (22/1/17) underline blue Internet links in for those who read FACTion the e-copy on-line. The images were not part of the original blog.

Last Friday [i.e. Friday 15th July, 2016] David Bryant, a 66 year old retired fireman with a distinguished record of brave public service was freed after spending 3 years in gaol for a crime that he did not commit. Yesterday his conviction was finally quashed.

His story is quite appalling, though not, I fear, in any way unique.

His accuser, unusually, has waived his right to anonymity so we know that he is a man called Danny Day. His accusation, which he first made in 2012, was that Mr Bryant and another fireman called Goodman (who is now dead) had raped him on some unspecified date between 1976 and 1978.

Mr Day explained how he came to make his accusation in an interview with the Sevenoaks Chronicle. He heard that Mr Bryant had become:

“Chief fire officer, a councillor and a freeman of the borough – a local celebrity practically. He had had a long and distinguished career and people looked up to him.”

“The traumatic memories of the attack came flooding back, and [I] decided to ‘confront’ Bryant by posting a letter through his door.”

“All I wanted off him was an apology,” said Mr Day. “If he had said, ‘I’m sorry, I was misled’ that would have been fine.”

But when Mr Bryant complained to the police about the letter, Mr Day decided he now wanted more than an apology. He went to the police with his allegation.

His account was both vivid and shocking. There was plenty of extraneous detail which made his account believable. The two men, he said, had invited young Danny to the fire station to play darts on three separate days. On the third day they held him over the table and took it in turns to rape him, whilst simultaneously having sex with each other. He was screaming with pain. At the end of it all one of them gave him a £5 note.

Mr Bryant protested his innocence but the jury believed his accuser. He was convicted.

The judge, sentenced him to 6 years imprisonment. Mr Day was still not satisfied. He complained that the sentence was too short. Speaking to the Bournemouth Echo he said he was “very disappointed” with it.

With little obvious sense of irony he continued:

“I don’t think justice has yet been fully served in this case. It is as though because he has led an unblemished life since then that somehow makes up for it. But I do still want to encourage anybody who has experience this sort of thing to come forward. It can’t be left alone.

“I also want to thank the police and the Crown Prosecution Service who did a sterling job ….”

Explaining why he had waited nearly 40 years to report the offence, he said that he had been partially “inspired by the Jimmy Savile revelations.” The rape, he said, had deprived him of 35 years of his life, and was responsible for his two failed marriages, as the events were “always on my mind.”

The Attorney-General agreed with Mr Day that Mr Bryant’s sentence was unduly lenient. He appealed, and the Court of Appeal agreed too. It increased his sentence to eight and a half years, grimly observing that the trial judge had not given sufficient weight to the case’s “aggravating features.”

Mr Bryant was less successful. He tried to appeal his conviction on a point of law. He failed to persuade a single judge that his case was even arguable.

A gloating Mr Day observed:

“He’s in the place he should be in. He keeps on trying but he’s been in court with me three times, and three times he’s lost.”

Having put Mr Bryant safely behind bars, Mr Day then turned his attention to obtaining compensation for
the abuse that he claimed to have suffered. Mr Bryant by now was probably a ruined man, so just to be sure of getting some money he joined the Dorset County Council to his action, accusing the fire service of failing to protect him. He did not just want any old damages; he demanded “aggravated damages.” These are damages paid not just for compensation, but as a means of punishing a particularly egregious wrong. But the compensatory element was considerable nonetheless. Indeed, had it not been for the rape, Mr Day said, he would have been able to participate in the 1984 Olympics. He had a “better boxing record than Mohammed Ali,” and had given up his place in the British boxing team because of the trauma of the rape. Mr Day said he wanted “£50,000 to £100,000.”

What is more, Mr Day did not want to wait around for his money. He instructed solicitors to pursue his civil claim under a “no win no fee agreement.” Generally speaking, once somebody has been convicted of a criminal offence, success in the civil courts is something of a formality. After all, if a criminal case has been proved “beyond reasonable doubt” it is usually a simple matter to prove a civil claim to the lower “balance of probability” standard. So confident were his solicitors that he would win that they demanded interim damages of £30,000, together with legal costs of £30,000. By now a civil claim, Mr Bryant’s defence found itself in the hands of Rupert Butler, a commercial barrister more used to dealing with employment disputes and large personal injury claims.

By the skin of his teeth Mr Butler managed to persuade a judge not to award Danny Day his interim payment, or his solicitors their costs.

And Mr Day had made a mistake. His insatiable greed led to his downfall. Unlike his allegation of rape, where it was just his word against Mr Bryant’s, his claim of having been an Olympic standard boxer was demonstrably untrue. There was no evidence that he had ever so much as stepped foot in a boxing ring. Then he relied on the report of a psychiatrist to prove the extent of his suffering. But this led to his medical records – inexplicably perhaps overlooked or ignored by the police in the original investigation – being examined. It turned out that, to use the language of Mr Justice Singh:

“over a period from 2000 to 2010 the complainant in this case had to seek medical attention from his GP in relation to what can only be described as his being a chronic liar”.

When the case eventually made its way back to the Court of Appeal even the Prosecution conceded that the conviction could not possibly stand and Mr Bryant was finally set free.

The case raises any number of deeply disturbing issues, most of which I can’t begin to do justice to in this blog, and especially not late at night. But here are some of them:

First, had Mr Bryant not been believed in by his wife Lynn he would almost certainly still be rotting in Dartmoor Gaol. She eventually persuaded the commercial barristers, Rupert Butler (who originally smelt the rat when instructed to defend the claim for an interim payment), Peter Knox QC and Rachael Earle, all of 3 Hare Court, to work on the case for free. So shocked were they by what they found that they in turn persuaded a firm of hard-nosed investigators, ex-coppers more used to investigating company insolvencies, also to work on the case without payment. Most men convicted of such offences are not so lucky. As Mr Butler has told me, Mrs Bryant is an incredible lady.

Secondly, whilst Mr Bryant has been able to prove that his accuser was a fantasist at best, a gold digger at worst, other innocent people in his situation will not be so lucky. Without the cast-iron evidence of Mr Day’s absurd claims to have been close to being in the Olympic boxing team, and the evidence disclosed in his medical records he would no doubt still be able to portray himself as a “survivor” of appalling sexual abuse, and Mr Bryant would still be considered that most hated and despised of all people, the convicted and unrepentant paedophile.

Thirdly, the case raises deeply uncomfortable questions for the police and the Crown Prosecution Service. Looking at a complainant’s medical records ought to be absolutely fundamental in any investigation of a historic sex allegation. It is almost inconceivable that it was not done, yet, it seems the fact that Mr Day was being treated for a whole decade for what the Court of Appeal described as “chronic lying” did not feature in any way at the trial.
It would also be easy, and very possibly wrong, to blame his original defence team. Under rules introduced in the 1990s the defence are not entitled to look at all the “unused material” (which would probably include medical records) that the police collect in an investigation. Even if the police and prosecution had obtained the records, if they had insisted that they contained nothing to undermine the prosecution case it would have been very difficult for the defence to obtain the records to see for themselves. Ever more restrictive rules about what material the prosecution are required to disclose, coupled with ever fewer prosecutors to review the evidence that they do have, means that miscarriages of justice are much more likely to happen as a result of vital evidence of this sort simply being overlooked.

Mr Bryant’s case itself illustrates just some of the manifold reasons someone might have to lie: people lie for money, for revenge, for attention or because they simply can’t stop themselves. Mr Day’s problem with chronic lying seems to have come to the attention of his doctors, although as far as I know there is no known medical condition of “chronic lying” and sadly no very effective treatment for it. And of course “lying” in the sense of knowingly telling falsehoods is not the only problem: we also need to be sure that we can spot people who give accounts of crimes from decades ago that they believe to be true, but which in fact are not.

His case seems to have involved failures by some, at least, of those involved in an increasingly cash-starved and over-worked criminal justice system. Yet even if the police and CPS and defence all do their job to perfection, this case perfectly illustrates the fallacy at the heart of that system. It is this: that a jury of ordinary men and women, or for that matter a bench of magistrates or a single professional judge, can be relied upon, without extraneous evidence, to discern beyond reasonable doubt when someone is telling the truth.

Unfortunately, as we have learnt time and time again, neither jury nor professional judge can do anything of the sort. Liars sometimes look shifty and nervously play with their hair; but so do people telling the truth, especially when defending themselves in the witness box under extreme pressure. At other times liars are utterly believable. Think of the horrible case of poor, innocent (in both senses of the word) Timothy Evans, hanged for the murder of his wife and daughter largely on the testimony of Reginald Christie, who shortly afterwards turned out to be a serial killer and the real murderer of Mrs Evans and her daughter. Think of the succession of police officers who must have concealed the truth about confessions “elicited” from the innocent Birmingham six and Guildford four.

After each such high-profile outrage the legal establishment tends to do the same thing: inquiries are held, reports are produced and indeed sometimes great improvements are made to police procedures. Tape recorded interviews and written custody records, for example, introduced by the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984, have all but abolished the once common practice of “verballing,” whereby police officers would insist that suspects in custody said something incriminating. Judges and lawyers preen themselves for a few years that we have the “best legal system in the world” and politicians, nearly all of whom want to be considered tough on crime, lose interest until the next scandal emerges.

But while congratulating ourselves on advances of this sort, we are deluding ourselves if we think that we are now no longer in much danger of convicting the innocent.

Our experience of past errors, and our now much greater knowledge of experimental psychology ought to have taught us, but seemingly hasn’t, that without supporting evidence of some sort, it can simply be impossible for anyone safely to decide who is telling the truth when there is a clash of evidence. Of course the problem arises from time to time in non-historic cases too, but it is particularly acute in cases relating to the distant past because the chance of finding either corroboration or undermining evidence from decades earlier is very often non-existent.

Mr Bryant’s case bears an uncanny resemblance to that of Geoff Long who was falsely accused and then convicted of sexually abusing his own daughter. He too was cleared only after extraordinary detective work by his wife, and by evidence she found that
demonstrated that the complainant may have been less than entirely honest.

It would be comforting to assume that Mr Bryant’s and Mr Long’s cases show that the system is working, and that innocent men are readily cleared by the system. But that would be complacent. The truth is just as likely to be that there are many more men – almost always men – wrongly convicted of historic offences, sometimes on the flimsiest of evidence.

The April 2016 edition of the (always excellent) magazine for prisoners, Inside Time, contained a powerful article under the headline: “We are surviving victims of a false accuser and wrongful conviction. Our family is in trauma.” It took the form of an open letter to the Prime Minister. Understandably the article gets some of the law a bit wrong, and of course it is perfectly possible that the writer is simply pretending to be innocent. But – for what it is worth – to me at least, the anger and raw despair seem genuine, and even if it is not then there are tens or hundreds of other families who seem to be telling similar stories: uncorroborated historic accusations, fantastic allegations, no proper attempts by the police to check or disprove those allegations; and then, once convicted, the almost complete impossibility of challenging a conviction unless you are lucky enough to somehow discover overwhelming new evidence (which is of course quite impossible when you are locked away in prison unless you are lucky enough to have a devoted wife willing and able to turn private detective for years on end), or some glaring legal error during the course of your trial.

Do read the article yourselves, but hear is a short extract:

“Prior to this horrific incident, we brought up our family to be kind, caring, human beings and to have morals and to trust in the police and justice system. We were so wrong. The first time me and my family ever needed the police to protect us, they completely destroyed us, without a second thought or care for the lifelong consequences.

Ours was a historical case, allegedly 11 years ago. This crime did not happen, it was totally fabricated. All fantasy. There was no corroborative evidence, as it did not happen. The police and CPS did not conduct a fair and thorough investigation. I know this as I was present at all times and so was my stepson and the accuser’s sister. No one interviewed any one of us. All of us, key witnesses as we all know the truth. We were all present. The Merseyside Police were only interested in a conviction. It seems they are conviction chasers not truth chasers. When challenged about not interviewing key witnesses, they stated that they are guided by the CPS and the CPS did not require them to interview key witnesses. I would like to know why?

It seems the Appeal Courts require new evidence. Evidence that wasn’t available at the trial. Can you please advise me on how I do this? How do I get new evidence of a crime that did not happen 11 years ago? This is my task.”

The article, led to the InsideTime website being inundated with similar accounts from people in a similar position:

“Many say that men, often partners and fathers, were convicted with no evidence, except the word of one person; nearly always the cases relate to accusations of abuse many years, often decades, before and families despair when they are told they have to find evidence that proves innocence when there was no ‘evidence’ in the first place.

Disturbingly many of the accusers were known to police as serial accusers and many had a history of mental health problems. Neither of these, it would be claimed, mean the accuser is lying, but in the face of no supportive evidence their word is taken against that of a man, often in later years, with a history of a stable family and no previous convictions.”

This could almost be describing Mr Bryant’s case. It shows that it was not an isolated anomaly. Mr Bryant’s deeply disturbing experience ought to make us realise that the current vogue for prosecuting cases from the distant past, sometimes on the uncorroborated word of a single accuser, is so dangerous that it ought – save perhaps in vanishingly rare cases – not to happen at all.

Questioning whether there are now too many historic cases prosecuted will provoke a barrage of what might politely be called angry criticism. For even raising the issue you will be called a “paedo-apologist,” an “establishment stooge,” a sympathiser with child abusers and so on. So let me be as clear as I can: I do not support a statute of limitation. I readily accept that there are cases where there is sufficiently compelling
The Shocking Case of David Bryant continued ……

Evidence to justify prosecution after many years or even decades have elapsed. I can even accept, though only with great caution (especially in the age of social media) that the fact of multiple similar allegations from independent sources can sometimes, in itself, be compelling evidence. What I cannot accept is that criminal courts should be asked to decide cases from decades ago which depend on the word of one complainant against one defendant. Distressing though it may be for individuals who were sexually abused when they were children not to be believed, the danger that justice will not be done in such cases is simply too great.

In 2003, the then Lord Chief Justice, Lord Woolf, quashed a conviction largely on the grounds that there was no rational way of deciding who was telling the truth in a case which turned on which of two people was right about an incident that allegedly occurred about 30 years earlier:

At the heart of our criminal justice system is the principle that while it is important that justice is done to the prosecution and justice is done to the victim, in the final analysis the fact remains that it is even more important that an injustice is not done to a defendant. It is central to the way we administer justice in this country that although it may mean that some guilty people go unpunished, it is more important that the innocent are not wrongly convicted.

The case in question has since been so thoroughly distinguished in subsequent Court of Appeal judgments that it is largely pointless to refer to it in court any more. You may get a contemptuous sneer. At best you will get a knowing smile from the bench which says: “Woolf was a lovely old buffer but times have moved on now. We like to let juries decide who’s telling the truth these days, never mind that they have no sensible way of doing so. It’s better they make an educated guess than that we let possibly guilty old men get away with it. If I am wrong the Court of Appeal will put me right”

Except that the judge on the bench will be wrong and the Court of Appeal will hardly ever put it right. Indeed, in Mr Bryant’s case the Court of Appeal put it even more wrong.

But Lord Woolf was not just a lovely old buffer. He was one of the brightest and best judges of the last three decades, and he was right. We should have listened to him. If we had done so Mr Bryant, and I suspect many other innocent people, would not have been wrongly imprisoned in the intervening years. Until we accept that there are some cases of this sort in which proof beyond reasonable doubt is simply impossible we will continue to sweep up the innocent along with the guilty. It is a disgrace, it is an embarrassment at the heart of our justice system, and it ought to stop.

---

A SPECIAL INVITATION

TO

A SERVICE OF FELLOWSHIP AND ENCOURAGEMENT FOR ALL WHO THOSE HAVE BEEN AFFECTED BY FALSE ALLEGATIONS OF ABUSE.

Saturday 18th March at 12 noon

St James’s Church Piccadilly in the heart of our capital city London has agreed to host a special service for all those, plus their friends and supporters, who have been affected by false allegations of abuse. This will be a private service and is open to all members of FACT and other organisations who have joined the alliance and who support and campaign for an end to the epidemic of wrongful allegations and convictions.

We welcome all to attend irrespective of your religious beliefs and affiliations. We hope that our advisors, legal contacts and families of those who have been made victims of wrongful allegations will attend for sharing and encouragement.

We are mindful of those members who continue to suffer in prison, or on license, and for the many lives and careers which have been ruined by miscarriages of justice and the unfair legislation which has been applied to many.

We hope to especially remember those who remain in prison unjustly and their respective families.

Following the service we hope to be able to meet informally in the Church hall to share with each other. Enquires are being made about some light refreshments.

If possible we would like you to let us know your intention to attend by emailing sec@factuk.org. You may also wish to know if others near you are attending so that travel can be shared.

We are very grateful to Sister Frances Dominica, OBE for being instrumental in arranging this welcome event.

St James’s Piccadilly, 197 Piccadilly London W1J 9LL
between Piccadilly and Jermyn Street, about 200 yards from Piccadilly Circus.
Website; http://www.sjp.org.uk

More details to follow nearer the event date.
On the evening of 18 December 2012, boarding school teacher Simon Warr, who had been described by his Headmaster as ‘one of the outstanding schoolmasters of his generation’, was arrested at his home following an allegation of historical child abuse.

The complainant was unknown to Warr other than the fact he happened to be a pupil in a school where Warr had taught over thirty years previously. Even though there was no evidence to support the complainant’s allegation, Warr was kept on bail for nine months before being charged. He then had to wait a further thirteen months for the case to go to trial.

This is the story of how Simon Warr spent 672 days on bail, single-handedly mounting his defence against the seemingly limitless resources of a police incident room team. In the end, however, truth is the strongest resource of all, and the jury took fewer than forty minutes to acquit him unanimously on all charges.

Despite gaining his freedom, Warr lost his home, his career, his reputation, an extraordinary amount of money and, of course, his peace of mind. Conversely, although it became abundantly clear during the trial that the complainants were mistaken or lying, they were able to walk away with impunity and anonymity.

*Presumed Guilty* outlines the appalling injustices that falsely accused people have to suffer in what has become a symptom of the state’s imperfect approach to historical child sex abuse allegations. In it, Warr suggests measures that should be urgently adopted to ensure that, in these emotive cases fairness and justice prevail and that a veil of doubt is not cast over genuine abuse sufferers’ complaints.
Book Review

Wrongful Allegations of Sexual and Child Abuse,
Ros Burnett, editor,
Oxford University Press, 2016, £75.

When anyone who suggests that some accusations of sexual abuse and child abuse are false faces allegations of being ‘paedo-sympathisers’ or even abusers themselves, it takes a brave academic or journalist to contribute to a collection of articles on this theme, and an even braver one to edit the collection. Ros Burnett has brought together a fantastic collection of contributors that cover almost every area of false accusations.

As someone who has himself been falsely accused of historic child sexual abuse and child cruelty, I admit that this review is influenced by this. When first arrested, and during the nearly 3 years between arrest and trial, as an academic I tried to find published work that would help me understand what was going on, but the nearest that I could find was literature on hostages and prisoners of war, particular those that reflected the experience of never knowing when it would end. Every year hundreds of people are arrested, some charged and prosecuted, for accusations that fall apart during the police investigation (I have a list of over 100 a year over the last 2 years just from monitoring the national press). Many are wrongly convicted and imprisoned, subsequently winning appeals, yet claims are still made by the police and campaign bodies that false accusations are extremely rare. If only this book had been available then.

There are too many chapters (21) to do justice to them all, and I urge readers to get hold of the book from their local library or, if you can afford it, buy a copy and then share it around. Even the 1 page ‘foreword’ by Andrew Ashworth is helpful, pointing out that righting past wrongs (to those whose complaints may have been ignored in the past) should not be allowed to produce more wrongs (false convictions) in the future.

Part 1 of the book focuses on ‘The reality of wrongful allegations’. In her ‘Preface’ Burnett provides a brief account of how false allegations have been ignored and discounted politically and legally in recent years. She quotes Lord McAlpine as saying that the false accusation against him was like being in ‘the lowest circle of hell’. Then in Chapter 1 she summarises the contents of the book, and in chapter 2 she quotes from the interview transcripts of six of those she interviewed for other research. One says that ‘it is not that far from being terrorized. You live in fear’ (during our experience we started to call the police ‘terrorists’ as their fanaticism and zealous in ignoring all the evidence of our innocence seemed similar to those whose ‘belief’ trumped ‘evidence’). Many of these, like myself, had spent their career in the caring professions, and now began to feel guilty about devoting their life to helping others, as this in itself seemed by the police to indicate a suspicious motivation. They got little support from their trade union, lost all faith in the police, and the last interviewee quoted points out that it is virtually impossible to prove something did not happen, especially years ago.

In part 2 of the book, on ‘culture and terrain’, Mary DeYoung (chapter 3) provides an excellent overview of the satanic ritual abuse allegations in day care establishments in the USA in the 1980s and after, in which over 100 such centres were investigated, including McMartin, and Frans, where children claimed they were thrown into swimming pools full of blood and sharks and where the owner, Dan Keller, served 21 years of his 48 year sentence in prison before having his conviction overturned. DeYoung shows how these allegations, all fitting a similar pattern, spread to New Zealand, the Netherlands, Italy and the UK. What she is unable to add is how these allegations have
continued until now: on the day of writing this review we discover that satanic ritual abuse allegations were part of the allegations against Ted Heath, while last year was dominated by the false allegations against Ricky Dearman, subsequently exposed by Judge Pauffley.

Frank Furedi contributes chapter 4, focusing on moral crusades, celebrities and the ‘duty to believe’, in which people like us are ‘collateral damage’. While similar to much of his previous publications, this succinct summary of how the distinction between ‘truth and falsehood’ has become based on ‘moral positioning’, rather than on evidence, shows what has become ‘a fundamental revision of the language of due process’. He traces the history of moral crusades back to the 15th century. Mark Smith (chapter 5) focuses upon historical allegations of abuse in residential child care and how the ‘narrative’ has been shaped by the flawed Waterhouse Inquiry in North Wales, drawing on Richard Webster’s deconstruction of this inquiry in The Secret of Bryn Estyn, and other exposes of major inquiries, such as the Nottingham alleged satanic ritual abuse allegations.

Chapter 6, by Brigham looks solely at the United States and how an extreme form of feminism has created ‘rape culture’ and a presumption of guilt, and chapter 7, by Hebbeton and Seddon is on the politics of risk and danger. These are fairly theoretical and may be of less interest to FACT members.

Why would anyone make a false accusation?’

The sub-heading of part 3 is ‘why would anyone make a false accusation?’ this is something which Felicity Goodyear-Smith answers thoroughly in chapter 8 with an overview of 16 possible reasons and motives. I wish I had read this before I answered the fatuous police interview question on ‘why would they allege this against you, if it was not true?’ While the likelihood of compensation is one of the reasons, she also includes suggestive counselling, the importance of a ‘self-service false narrative’ that gets the accuser an alibi for a poor self-image, and kudos with victim-supporting groups.

Barrister Barbara Hewson develops the ‘compensations of being a victim’ in chapter 9, showing how police and prosecutors have been turned into ‘advocates’ for accusers, and identifies the role of firms of compensation solicitors, whose financial interest in making the allegations seem more harmful has become a major concern. Hewson includes the wonderful story of ‘Laura’ who moved from being a ‘satanic ritual abuse survivor’ to a ‘holocaust survivor’, neither of which were true, but she was able to profit from the sales of books and large media exposé in the USA, even ‘performing’ at a concert for Holocaust survivors.

Part 3 finishes with an account by David Rose (chapter 12) of how, as a journalist, he came across cases of false accusations of residential care staff and has continued to champion them and expose false accusations as part of his work over the last 15 years. He begins with the case of Roy Shuttleworth, almost certainly wrongly convicted and imprisoned after accusations by serious criminals from his time when he cared for them when they were teenagers. Rose discovered how important interactions between the police and Shuttleworth’s accusers were never recorded, in ‘a mutual collusion to tell lies’ (something that I have also discovered occurred in my own and other former colleagues’ cases), and how ‘the apparent credibility of complainants who could not possibly be telling the truth was impressive’ (but then, they had a lot of experience of appearing in court!). He also exposes the role of compensation solicitors and their close links with investigating police officers.

Again, in part 3, there are chapters that may be of less interest to FACT members: those by Villalobos et al (chapter 10) on sexual miscommunication and ‘honest false testimony’, which focuses on US research and experience, and chapter 11 by French and Ost on how misconceptions about the true nature of memory are widely held by clinicians, legal professions and the general public.

Part 4 focuses upon wrongful convictions. Chapter 13, by Davis & Leo, is on the special vulnerability of sexual abuse suspects to false confession, and chapter 14 by Luke Gittos on the decline of objective prosecuting and how prosecution decisions are being made on the importance of ‘public perception’ rather than the evidence. Gittos also points out how ‘special measures’ to protect ‘victims’ have distorted the
criminal justice process in that they can influence jurors before they even hear the evidence, and how this can be used by false accusers. (I know of one case where the false accuser (who also accused me) insisted on being behind a screen when he gave his evidence, so neither he nor the person he accused ever saw each other in court, but he then later posted on FaceBook that the person he accused was so ashamed that ‘he would not look at me’).

In chapter 15 Daniel Medwed explore the problems of maintaining innocence after conviction, and Michael Zander contributes chapter 16 on the problems of the appeal system in England and Wales.

I found part 5, the section on ‘finding ways forward’ the weakest part of the book. In chapter 17 Steve Herman suggests that developing the importance of ‘corroboration’ in evidence in the USA could reduce false convictions, but in the UK we have seen how ‘corroboration by volume’ can be used to make weak false accusations stand up, and how the police (as set out in Rose’s chapter) can even plant corroboration information with accusers (as in my own case). Nahari (chapter 18) suggests using lie detection equipment to prove falsehood, but if someone has convinced themselves that they were abused the technology would not discover this. Belli (chapter 19) tries to reconcile true and falsely recovered memory, but I did not find this convincing, and then Bakken (chapter 20) suggests a new plea of ‘innocence’ could be entered by those accused, instead of ‘not guilty’.

Finally, Burnett sums up (chapter 21) suggesting the need to recognise wrongful allegations ‘as a problem’, improving investigative interviewing and the standard of evidence, reducing hostility to those wrongfully accused, and the need to ‘transcend binary thinking’.

While these would help, the main need is for a statute of limitations, the prosecution of false accusers (and the end of anonymity for accusers) and a time limit for compensation payouts, which also should not be paid out before the trial of the person accused. The paying of thousands of pounds to convicted criminals by the Criminal Injuries Compensation Authority, and their unwillingness to investigate false claims, simply fuels the false accusation industry.

Dr Denis Jones

Special Offer

Wrongful Allegations of Sexual and Child Abuse,
Edited by Ros Burnett

Until 31st March you can obtain 20% discount, details below:

ONLINE: www.oup.com/uk/law
POSTAGE & PACKING: Website Orders: Free for orders £20+
* Please quote ALFLY5F when ordering.
This offer is only available to individual (non trade) customers when ordering direct from Oxford University Press website.
This offer is exclusive and cannot be redeemed in conjunction with any other promotional discounts.
Dear Editor

May I first congratulate the editor on the quality of the autumn 2016 FACTion. Its great to see FACT robustly challenging the received view that those making allegations of abuse in residential schools, care homes always tell the truth and must be believed.

As the police and prosecuting authorities are now slowly beginning to recognise allegations should only be believed after due process and where there is compelling evidence that what is alleged did actually take place.

It has always been FACT’s case that great care needs to be taken in dismissing all ‘abuse’ allegations as false - some may be lies and some maybe true. To do so would be just as bad as a denial by the police that sometimes people are completely innocent of the allegations made against them, and that accusers do sometimes time lie.

I was therefore a little concerned that the article titled 'Bryn Alyn Seven and Operation Pallial: one Guilty verdict and 30 Not Guilty’s” implies that Operation Pallial was only concerned with Bryn Alyn, and that only one person has been convicted of abuse as part of the National Crime Agency’s investigation into alleged historic abuse in the North Wales care sector.

By implication the article seems to suggest that all of those accused by Operation Pallial are innocent. It is a matter of public record that Operation Palial is responsible for a number of convictions - some the result of guilty pleas.

It is of course equally true, as stated in the article, that dozens of former care home staff (and others) have been accused, interviewed by the police with no further action being considered necessary. Their lives will never be the same again. The revelation that once gain there have been significant errors of investigative process will come as no surprise to FACT members, however FACT must be ever vigilant and not fall into the trap of denying that abuse does (and has) occurred in care homes - even when its not on the scale alleged.

Sincerely,
Michael Barnes.
Life Member.

The Rolf Harris Conviction....Fact or Fiction?

There is an eerie silence which I am certain is caused by a lack of courage about the heinous miscarriage of justice which one of the nations most prominent celebrities fell victim to in 2014.

Rolf Harris is not only a victim of a miscarriage of justice but also a victim of the 'you find out who your friends are' phenomenon which appears to underpin our weak, 'follow the sheep' society.

With the barrage of the celebrity witch hunt victims either not being charged or found not guilty, it was only a matter of time before an innocent victim of the witch hunt was convicted. Not a single celebrity has spoken out in his defence. Not a single newspaper has looked into his plight and taken a neutral stance. Not a single politician has looked into his case.

Continued on the next page
Sir,

A man in his thirties whom I was helping through a Charity by finding him a flat, and for a second time after a prolonged spell of illness; for whom I provided the wherewithal from a Charity and my own pocket to furnish the flat, and from the same sources cleared all his debts, suddenly turned against me and accused me of unprofessional conduct.

It took eleven month for the police to say there was not sufficient evidence to proceed with any accusation, but this is not the same as being declared innocent, and has left me feeling tainted. The Asthma I had as a child has returned, and the GP says this is a result of stress, for which I need a preventative pump and a subsidiary for when needed. I also have a cough caused by stress for which I have tablets.

I have been strongly supported by my wife, two daughters and their respective partners, and in particular five friends.

I have also been aided by my prayer life, which I have tried to develop. I have pictures from the media of those falsely accused, and now in the past few days a list sent by CARE of those imprisoned: all for my prayers.

Inspired by Joost de Blanc’s book “Saints at Sixty Miles an Hour” I have tried when breathless, to picture Jesus on the Cross only able to breathe by pushing on his feet to lift his diaphragm, and so gradually suffocating.

My cat, Matilda has also helps me by frequently coming to find me, purring away, and wanting to be stroked.

And, finally but by no means least, and this is why I write: being a Member of FACT has shown me that the problems borne by many others falsely accused are far greater than mine, and that in that sense I am fortunate

Alan Horsley.

Why does it take rank amateurs like me and my colleagues to take an interest in this case and to actually get up and do something about it?

I have done what I can do, I can do no more and my friends and colleagues can do no more. We are little people fighting a big establishment but please tender your support and help us raise the profile of Mr Harris’ case.

Visit www.rolfharrisisinnocent.com and have a look for yourself some very interesting aspects of Mr Harris' case that you would not have read in the press.

Thank you and regards,

Anne Pyke
Over the last 30 years, support groups for those accused of false accusations have worked tirelessly to provide advice and a shoulder for victims of unfounded allegations. The support groups include FASO, FACT, Accused.me and Safari. Whilst each group supports a wide range of different people and accusation, all the groups have a similar will to witness change to the British Legal System to better protect victims of false allegations and wrongful convictions.

Alliance brings together the wide range of Groups that support victims of false allegations, to speak as one voice in the fight for justice. The Alliance is committed to working together to raise awareness and influence policy to improve services to victims of unfounded allegations and miscarriages of justice.

The initial aims of UNFOUNDED are:

- **Campaign** to get the recommendations of the Henriques Report implemented.
- **Raise the profile** of unfounded accusations to wider parties.
- **Strengthen** the position of victims of wrongful allegations in the criminal justice system.
- **Unified voice** to influence and engage with government and wider stakeholders.
- **Work together** in a positive and respectful way to improve outcomes for victims’ families.
- **Networking** across member organisations with swift communication of key information.

The Alliance is due to be formally launched in March 2017, the website address will be published on the FACT website as soon as it is launched.

If you have any specific experience in political campaigning and would like to volunteer to help please contact FACT.
Also Supporting Victims of False Allegations

We are happy to introduce other organisations, where you may find additional information / support:

accused.me.uk - www.accused.me.uk
The Accused Me organisation help link you with others and provide advice if you are going through rape allegations. They also campaign to improve the investigation and detection of sexual crimes in the UK.

F.A.H.S.A - Falsely Accused of Historic Sex Abuse - http://www.falselyaccusedhsa.co.uk
Until 2 years ago, my husband and I believed in British justice. We assumed that the fundamental principle of justice - innocent until proven guilty - was enshrined in British Law, but how wrong were we.

B.F.M.S. - British False Memory Association - www bfms.org.uk
False memory is the phenomenon in which a person is convinced a memory is true when it is not. It was first postulated and diagnosed more than 100 years ago. More recently, clinical evidence suggests it is more widespread than had previously been appreciated. Contact: Kevin Felsted - 0161 285 2583

SAFARI provide powerful and positive information that is likely to be of use to those who are in a position to make necessary changes in the UK's Investigative and Judicial systems, those who have been affected by false accusations (including the family & friends of victims) and those who have suffered from being pressurised into making false accusations.

A voluntary organisation that offers clear information, practical advice, and emotional support to anyone affected by false allegation of abuse. Contact - Margaret - 0844 335 1992

Chris Saltrese Solicitors
mail@chrissaltrese.co.uk www.chrissaltrese.co.uk/

Chris Saltrese Solicitors
is a law firm providing a premium service in representing clients accused of sexual offences and domestic violence, in criminal proceedings.

We have unrivalled expertise in these areas, both regionally and nationally.

Many of our clients face allegations as a result of domestic or relationship disputes, contract disputes, mental health problems, financial incentives and have no prior experience of the criminal justice system. Often these allegations involve uncorroborated, historic allegations.

In this complex area, specialist legal advice and representation is vital, especially as recent changes in the law designed to convict genuine offenders, also put the innocent at greater risk of injustice.

We particularly welcome careers, teachers and health care professionals who have been accused of abuse and are likely to be subject to criminal investigation.

Where allegations have been made we would be happy to advise, whether or not criminal investigations are underway.

For further information please contact
Chris Saltrese Solicitors
3 Regent Road, Southport,
PR8 2RB
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FACT is a not-for-profit organisation founded more than 16 years ago and is 100% run by volunteers.

Due to attitudes and changes in the law we are moving further away from the precept of innocent until proven guilty. Add to this a zero risk tolerance in employment and we find ourselves being called upon more and more to support those who have been falsely accused of abuse when working in positions of trust (including volunteers) who are maintaining their innocence or have been cleared. As an organisations we need more volunteers to help us respond to these calls for help and to enable us to provide first class support to the victims of false allegations and their families, as well as to seek changes to reverse that increase. We need skills and experience across a broad range of areas. Many of our volunteers bring with them skills and training they have gained through their careers and previous volunteering, or from their own personal experience of the devastating effects of false allegation and who want to use this to help others.

We do not provide legal assistance or attempt to influence the outcome of a case, instead we provide information, practical support and comfort during a very difficult time when the victim can feel very much on their own, vulnerable and shunned by society. Many of the effects of false allegations last for life.

Whilst FACT is a UK based organisation we recognise a spread of the problem worldwide and are often contacted from abroad.

How You Can Help?

MEMBERSHIP: If you aren’t already, become a member.

WEBSITE: Website design. Sourcing and adding news and information

TWITTER: Managing and writing

MARKETING/COMMUNICATIONS: Producing leaflets, Producing PowerPoint presentations, Producing Pod Casts and audio recordings at conferences

WRITING: For website, For FACTion

Preparing responses to government consultations

Open letters & press releases representing FACT’S opinion to governments and media

EMAIL SUPPORT: Supporting individuals by email

RESEARCH: Find out about a topic and keep our knowledge up to date i.e. DBS, employment law, parliament, Issues in other counties

FUNDRAISING: Writing grant applications. Finding funding sources

VOLUNTEER COORDINATOR: Supporting volunteers. Training and recruitment

MANAGEMENT/COMMITTEE:

These are not the only ways of helping.

If you would like further information please see inside front page for contact details.