

The internet is awash with reports of widespread paedophilia within government, banking, police, judiciary, the Royal family ... Former Tory Party treasurer Lord McAlpine was one of the names widely circulated [and one which had been exposed in the, now defunct, Scallywag mag back in the 1990s]. Phillip Schofield on primetime TV was primed to 'ambush' PM Cameron with a list of names and to emphasise that he got them "in 3 minutes on the internet".

Sexually abused victim Steve Messham was set up to participate in a Newsnight programme which would **specifically not mention names** and **state that evidence was insufficient** to do so.

On the day that McAlpine's lawyers released a statement denying that he is a paedophile or in any way involved in the North Wales children's homes scandal, Messham issues an apology to Lord McAlpine saying that it was a case of '**mistaken identity**' and that he should never have named him. [Publicly he hadn't.] He states: "After seeing a picture in the past hour of the individual concerned, this is not the person I identified by photograph presented to me by the police in the early 1990s, who told me the man in the photograph was Lord McAlpine."

Steve Messham had obviously been 'got at' by the dark suits. He'd been backed into a corner and I believe he'd agreed to toe the line under the threat of some horrendous consequence if he didn't agree to play their evil game. I should imagine the conversation went along the lines of:-

GREY SUIT: Mr Messham, do you want to watch your daughter being gang raped and tortured?

STEVE: You keep your fucking filthy hands off my daughter. Don't you lay one finger on her, you filthy motherfucking bastards ...

GREY SUIT: You can join in too. You can help us chop her up afterwards ... pop her in the pan and boil her up. Have you eaten human flesh before? It's very tasty. We'll film it all too, and share it with our friends. They pay big money for our snuff movies. And just think; you'll be a movie star. Do you think I'm Joking? Believe me, I'm not. This is our livelihood. We're Satanists - savage and sadistic psychopaths ... We thrive on gruesome horror - the more guts, gore and perversion the better. Oh, and don't be thinking that we'd never get away with it. We do this sort of thing all the time. We're untouchable. We rule, remember. We can do what we want.

The colour drains from Steve's face, his palms turn clammy with sweat; his body trembles uncontrollably. He is stunned into silence.

GREY SUIT: Right, listen up son. You will do and say EXACTLY as we tell you. Do you understand?

STEVE: Yes sir.

Whatever happened, he was driven insane by all the underhanded evil manipulations and ended up in a psychiatric hospital with depression for many months. Not surprising, as he knew that the last thing he or any of his fellow child sex abuse victims would get would be truth and justice.

This about turn allows the BBC to pay out £185,000 and issue a grovelling apology to McAlpine. The Masonic cabal would never have allowed it to go to trial; too much truth would have emerged. [The likes of Spivey and Ickie weren't sued because they're portrayed as 'conspiracy nuts'; not worth bothering with. But the BBC are the 'professionals' and are considered to be, by the majority of 'level headed' people, a respectable source of news; such is the successful *programming* by the paedo protecting PTB.]

The effect of all this is that doubt is cast over other sex-abuse victims' testimonies. The ruling elite want to persuade the public that they have sympathy for the victims, however there's not much that can be done about it now as it happened a long time ago and people's memories are dodgy.

The psy-op worked, McAlpine was seemingly innocent, the internet is just rumour and there is no need to look any deeper into possible paedo rings in high places or Savile's links to senior politicians and royalty. In a nutshell the elite Masonic controllers put the fog out, confused the populace and buried the whole paedophilia issue.

But McAlpine was guilty. His ownership of the Ovenden 'Art' [which he admitted] was enough to hang him
<http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2013/apr/02/graham-ovenden-artist-1970s-decadence> The fact that he didn't sue Scallywag mag
<http://scallywagmagazine.blogspot.co.uk/2012/11/scallywag-magazine-article-on-lord.html?m=1> spoke volumes. Why didn't he sue? Because Scallywag was **not beholden to freemasonry**. They were **independent** and **real opposition**. Scallywag said: Should Lord McAlpine choose to consult his solicitors over the story we have printed, we would **welcome the opportunity of dragging his name through the courts**. Should he choose **not to take action, then let his silence incriminate him. We shall defend our story assiduously**, for no one was there to defend the children continually abused by their rich and

powerful overseers.

http://www.seancopland.com/articles/More_Lord_McAlpine_Child_Abuse_The_British_Media_and_The_Tory_Grandees_That_Protect_Them.html

Sean Copland says:

Interestingly **Steven Messham** never originally claimed Lord McAlpine abused him. At the time the police were putting their weight behind a witness named Paul. It was only when the BBC popped up, under the guidance of Tory grandee Chris Patten, when he was shown a photo of one of his abusers by a police officer, and told it was Lord McAlpine, after which the entire BBC red herring farce unfolded.

More interestingly still, is the fact that it's claimed McAlpine received a formal caution from a police force in the former Strathclyde region of Scotland for kiddy fiddling way back in 1965!

Of course Scallywag was never going to be allowed to continue trading. By any means fair or foul, the Masonic powers would close them down.

Back to Sean Copland:

Curiously, it was neither McAlpine, Portillo or Lilley that sued, but none other than John Major, after Scallywag published an article accusing him of having an affair with his caterer. Apparently he wasn't shagging her at all, as he was too busy being unfaithful with Edwina Currie at the time. He sued and won, as they named the wrong partner, bankrupting Scallywag magazine, and finishing them off in the process.

There is no such thing as fairness in court when all lawyers and judges have their straws in the same Masonic trough. Sleazebag John Major won on a minor point – the *name* of his mistress. The fact that the mag was correct about him having an affair didn't matter. Stinks doesn't it.

McAlpine [under orders from the Masonic heavyweights] *threatened* to sue all and sundry. His Masonic controlled lawyer [all lawyers are either masons themselves or beholden to freemasonry] Andrew Neil was [according to the Masonic narrative] **sending out letters to certain people prior to commencing court action**. Chris Spivey says: **Why would McAlpine do that? One can only presume that in doing so the piss taking kiddy fiddler is offering the recipient chance to settle out of court...** Oh, how that makes my blood boil. Now, I assume we all know

Bercow's link to parliament. With that in mind, what better way to stop others telling the truth about the Nonce McAlpine, than to use Sally as a decoy? Spivey's giving us partial truth again. He never mentions the Masonic maneuverings backstage. Sally Bercow, wife of the speaker of the House of Commons, is firmly under the Masonic thumb. She had said sod all about McAlpine during her twittering to her thousands of fans. Yet in a 'landmark legal case', during a brief hearing at the high court, she settled and agreed to pay the peer undisclosed damages and his costs. **All** of this was, of course, a massive Masonic show for **us** millions of impudent tweeters; the **real opposition**. If Sally was acting independently and had tweeted what she did off her own bat she would have defended herself in court. She could afford to do so. She'd said nothing more than "Why is Lord McAlpine trending?" How could that, in any shape or form, be considered defamatory??? [She could've outright said he was a paedo and it wouldn't have been defamatory, anyway.] She would've also questioned why others who were being far more outspoken in the 'alternative media' [not] were not being sued.

Notice how the most expensive libel lawyers Carter-Ruck were used in the script. They were obviously not there to uphold the law. If they were they would have pointed out that McAlpine did not have a case on the basis that "*any distress and hurt feelings suffered would have to be compensated by reference to the totality of the publications and not on the artificial basis of the sum total of the impact upon his feelings by one individual publication; otherwise there would obviously be a significant risk of overcompensation*" [Smith V ADVFN judgement.] If this was not a Masonic conspired story the judge would have thrown it out straightaway on the basis of it being an abuse of process <http://tompride.wordpress.com/2013/05/19/something-odd-in-the-mcalpine-v-bercow-case-is-legal-precedent-being-ignored/>

What this was really all about was to send a powerful message to us pesky twitterers that we'd better not get above ourselves and tweet the truth about the toffs, cos it didn't matter how much evidence anyone had that McAlpine and fellow nonces were as guilty as sin, they would never be brought to book and if any of us nobodies had any ideas of spreading 'false rumour' we could expect to be sued – even for just *implying* guilt. And by joves, if that ever happened we'd be in need of the most expensive lawyers to defend us.

Tom Cahill has personal experience of Carter-Ruck. Check out his videos.

Joshua Rozenberg writes for the Masonic controlled Guardian gutter propaganda 'news'rag

<http://www.theguardian.com/law/2013/may/24/sally-bercow-social-media-macalpine> I've copy/pasted some paragraphs below. My comments are in red.

The Speaker's wife has learned the hard way that while her husband and his fellow MPs make the law, it is the judges who interpret and apply it. Well that would be true if the political establishment and judiciary weren't fully infected by the force of freemasonry. These people are ALL actors who get handsomely paid for prostituting for their Masonic masters. And:

We know that Bercow, above arriving at court, had made two offers of compensation that were rejected by McAlpine. So it's clear that the undisclosed, agreed damages were higher than she had hoped. This is all a STORY concocted by Masonic conspirators whereby all the actors dutifully speak/act scripted lines. So whatever Bercow did or didn't do in the way of offers or anything else, it was all according to the script. And:

Bercow claimed it was a deadpan look. She had simply noticed in all innocence that McAlpine's name was circulating widely on Twitter – "trending", as it's called – and was hoping someone would tell her why. Why does Sally allow the Guardian to portray her as some stoopid femail who needs someone to explain that to her? Can she not read? And:

But it was accepted by Bercow and by the man who had made the original complaint to the BBC, **as well as by the public at large**, that McAlpine **was entirely innocent** of the abuse that had been committed at care homes in Wales. The tweet was seriously defamatory and Bercow was left without a defence to the libel action brought by McAlpine. As said Bercow hasn't got a mind of her own. She is firmly under the control of the Masonic boot boys. Why don't you say his name Joshua, you lying paedo protecting presstitute. And the Guardian, nor any other filthy propaganda rag speaks for the public. The tweet was not defamatory. Bercow did have a

defence – the truth. But Sally obviously doesn't care about truth, and cares even less about abused children. And:

The law of defamation is well known to those who write for a living. One hopes Twitter users are beginning to learn what a powerful and potentially dangerous weapon they have at their fingertips. A tweet is more like a broadcast than an email and is subject to the law of libel in the same way. It was Bercow herself who drew the obvious conclusion: "**Today's ruling should be seen as a warning to all social media users.**" Joshua Rozenburg, what lofty height in the lodge did you reach to spew this patronizing bullshit? Hang your head in shame. We twitterers know we have a powerful and 'dangerous' weapon. Yes, it is 'dangerous' to you lot cos we are using it to expose you cowardly lying nonce-loving fakes. We 'little people' are the ones adhering to the law; you and the nonces you protect are the law-breakers. You lot are up to your necks in filth of the highest order. And you can take your threats and shove them where the sun don't shine.

Take a look at some paragraphs from this page of filthy Guardian propaganda. I comment in red. <http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2013/oct/22/lord-mcalpine-libel-row-sally-bercow>

Sir Edward Garnier QC told the judge that she had apologised for her "irresponsible use of Twitter", which caused the peer great distress and embarrassment, and had agreed to pay him undisclosed damages – which had been given to charity – and his costs. How much money does this lying low-life 'sir' get for protecting child-rapists? If Bercow had any spine, self-respect and a sense of morality she would not have made any apologies and she would have at least pointed out that the peer was guilty based on his liking and ownership of child pornography. She would have also pointed out that Scallywag mag were stating things like: "**Lord McAlpine is a copper bottomed, true blue pervert who, it appears, enjoys nothing more than being sucked off by little children**" http://www.thetruthseeker.co.uk/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/mcalpine_3.jpg and asked why his lordship didn't sue them. Then we would have seen his 'distress and embarrassment'. As for 'charity' there are none; the so-called charities are all fronts covering up for child abusers.

Bercow's QC, William McCormick, said: "Mrs Bercow wishes and hopes that as a result of this matter other Twitter users will behave more responsibly in how they use that platform. She certainly intends to do so herself." Mrs Bercow and her scumbag solicitor are both sell-outs. They should both crawl back into the sewer where they belong. Neither of them can call themselves human beings. Decent people will continue to twitter responsibly until all paedos and paedo protectors are flushed out and face their due deserts.

Afterwards, McAlpine's lawyer, Andrew Reid, said: "Today has seen closure of a piece of litigation which has now become the leading case in terms of internet responsibility.

Our client had never wanted the situation to get to this stage. It was always his intention to avoid litigation if at all possible, just as it was always Mrs Bercow's intention, until today, not to provide an apology satisfactory to our client." Mrs Bercow had no intentions of anything but dutifully toeing the line and playing her part in the courtroom farce. The only people she should be apologising to are **all the child sex abuse victims** whose lives have been **destroyed**. Then she should have announced in court that she intended to do everything in her power to fully expose McAlpine and his paedophile ring and to bring them and all their powerful protectors to book. Lord McNonce and his paedo loving lawyer Reid and the Guardian shit rag and all the other lying low-life underbellies who are involved in this dirty **charade** have conspired to close ranks and prevent the truth emerging. The pervy panto included the **pretence** of litigation. There was never any intention of it going to trial. All of them great actors. All are beyond contempt. All of them criminals of the highest order. And:

"In January of this year, Lord McAlpine made a 'without prejudice' offer to Mrs Bercow to settle at a substantially lower sum than his leading counsel, Sir Edward Garnier QC, advised that he was likely to obtain if the matter went to full trial."

"He made the offer in an attempt to avoid the detrimental effect of litigation on his health, but sadly, Mrs Bercow was not prepared at the relevant time to avail herself of this reasonable offer." This **story** is all Masonic bullshit of the highest order. Apart from when he's molesting little boys, the paedophile peer doesn't think or act for himself and what is reported here in the Guardian [and repeated in all the other Masonic controlled gutter propaganda rags – the 'Independent' and all the other Dailys and on TV **programmes**] didn't happen. The Guardian gutter rag

is portraying the nonce as an innocent kindly man, who sympathises with poor confused Messham and kindly offers to settle with Sally for a lower sum than his QC [the lying co-conspiring 'sir' Garnier who earns obscene amounts of money as a loyal high level mason or friend of the freemasons and protector of upper class paedo filth] tells him he'd get if it went to trial. We have the Masonic engineered *pretence* that the paedo peer made this offer as he didn't want the stress of a trial and the *pretence* that Bercow had refused to settle at that time.

The master masons are, for now, managing to keep a lid on the fact that Masonic paedophiles control government, all her agencies, the judiciary and MSM. They could not risk letting the McAlpine/Bercow **story** go too far i.e to trial for fear of some truth emerging which could lead to a complete unravelling of the truth.

ALL OF THE CHARACTERS IN THE MCALPINE MASONIC SOAP ARE WEAK COWARDLY IMMORAL PRETENDERS. ALL OF THEM GUILTY OF COVER-UP AND CONCEALMENT.