

Hi Tom [and anyone who *isn't* a troll.]

Well well well, it looks like Spivey's second arrest was not staged after all. If you take a look at his 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 article you'll find he has now published police statements and the transcript of his police interview which took place on 6/10/14. Well more accurately the sneaky git has published a heavily *censored* version of the police statements and the police interview. I'll come to that in a minute.

First, a response to Keith Zero's last comment: You're not a nobody. We're all somebody and we all have to do our bit. You have to choose a side in this war. Doing nothing is choosing the enemy side. But then I think you know that. We do have the means to expose them; we have brains.

Look, this is not a game. Spiv's a big fish; just like Gerrish. You can't flush them that easily – they keep popping back up. Don't underestimate them.

Researching and exposing cointelpro is the key to our freedom. We need to expose as many as we can. If we don't at least try, we might as well roll over and join the sheeple.

I won't stop 'till I'm forced to. It is tough tho when your time is limited and you're up against apathetic people and you have to cope with things like family illness [my own health ain't that great either – I'm in need of a hip replacement ...] The latest thing pressing on my time is the matter of my late ex's estate. I had a feeling that would fall on my head to sort out.

As said my current task is unmasking Spiv's little helpers. I've made a good start, but there's lots more to do. These guys are not so straightforward cos I'm having to get my head around other related stuff first, such as the Newsnight/Messham/McAlpine affair [Messham btw is genuine] and Savile ... There's lots of documentation you have to go through. It's not easy – the deception is on many levels ... it takes full concentration.

But it needs to be done. And it needs to be done properly; otherwise those of us who are making some effort will just get eaten up. I really wish more people would get on board this fight. If we don't bring down the gatekeepers, or at least frikkin try, we haven't got a hope in hell of

doing any damage to the big beasts; in which case we might as well just surrender to injustice and slavery.

I've given up trying to gauge when my site will be updated as I'm still in the research stage. You'd be amazed at how deep and dark the rabbit holes are. In the meantime Tom, do NOT trust Jimmy Jones and all the others I've mentioned. Jimmy is a great pretender; he's still on team Spiv and is trolling you and me. His job is to neutralise the genuine opposition. You'll see what I mean. Just give me a bit longer - I have to do this right. What I'm gonna come out with next is gonna blow your mind. It'll probably get me killed. Oh well, c'est la vie.

Right take a look at Spiv's 3/7/15 post <http://chrisspivey.org/criminally-insane/#more-27747> We now have the names of the police officers in connection with his so-called 'illegal' arrests. I wonder why it took so long for their names to come out! Of the four officers who turned up at his house on 30/7/14, Spiv names two of them – PC 7539 [last digit unknown – paper torn] Andrew Ronald Chant and PC 73232 Kevin Oxlade and he shows us HALF OF their statements for his upcoming harassment trial on 30<sup>th</sup> and 31st July. Why doesn't he name the other two officers? We see from PC Oxlade's statement that the other two officers are PC 2726 Brown and PC 75454 McCullough. Why are there no statements from them? Spiv says: “Now like I say, the other two corrupt plods – or security service agents dressed as plods didn't do witness statements.”

Well, all four officers will have written statements. What Spiv means is he doesn't want to reveal too much. Remember common cointelpro tactics are omission and contextomy whereby they publicise part documentation or they'll produce a full document that, *when taken in isolation*, seems to support their story.

So the documentation available shows Spivey was arrested on two occasions and his premises searched twice. It is also now evident that the second arrest, which was for indecent and prohibited images [which I'll come to in a minute] is genuine, that it happened on 6/10/14 and that Spivey was interviewed by police at 19.40 hrs. It is also now clear that police did have to force entry. There is no evidence of either arrest being illegal or that police planted anything on his computers. Spivey has not proven any police or social services corruption. The evidence is that he, with the help of his eight unidentified team members, has been embroidering the truth, bending and spinning the truth or outright

lying/being dishonest by omission to present a scenario that he is a victim of the State.

**There is mounting evidence that supershill Chris Spivey is a paedophile.**

Now let's take another look at the documentation published. On Spiv's 10/10/14 article <http://chrisspivey.org/scandal-2/#more-23186> we see the 'Authority to Search' document, signed by PC 73232 Kevin Oxlade, is clearly dated 30/7/14. However the start and finish time is not so clear. It looks like it started 0200 but we don't know if that is 2 am or 2 pm. The end of search is not clear. The 'Search of Premises' document, signed by PC Oxlade, is clearly dated 30/7/14.

Let's also remind ourselves of the reason for the first arrest. The bail sheet which he publishes on 10/8/14 names the people he must not harass <http://chrisspivey.org/the-high-cost-of-free-speech/#more-21834> It states he is "[1] Not to contact any family members of the deceased soldier Lee Rigby either directly or indirectly. [2] Not to contact directly or indirectly Gavin Vitler or Christopher Amos. [3] Not to publish any communication via any website or through any social media with regards to Lee Rigby or his family." He publishes the charges against him here <http://chrisspivey.org/above-the-law/#more-24830>

PC Oxlade has written a two page statement, however Spivey only publishes the first page. What is he hiding that is on the second page? PC Oxlade testifies that the search started at 2.00 hrs and concluded at 3.35 hrs. He also states that his shift started at 11pm on Tuesday 29<sup>th</sup> July '14. So it seems that there was a search at 2 am on Wednesday 30<sup>th</sup>. Also, according to PC Oxlade Spivey seems to have been harassing someone between the hours of 11pm on 29/7/14 and 1.35 am on 30/7/14 as he and his colleagues had been told to affect the arrest during that period. PC Oxlade states that from briefing he recognised Spiv. So it seems Spiv had been under surveillance.

According to Spivey it was "[Greater Manchester Police who had requested Essex police to arrest him for the harassment misdemeanour.](#)" Well someone must've made a complaint in the first place! If Spivey were to publish his first police interview he could prove he is not the one who is lying. He publishes his police interview for his second arrest [well sort of – I'll come to that], so why not the first one?

Also according to PC Oxlade Spiv would not allow the police entry, so PC Oxlade told him he was arresting him for suspicion of harassment

and that he was required to attend at the police station for a tape recorded interview. Spiv did then let them in, but after being told that the police would be doing a search, he became very obstructive, stating the search was illegal. PC Oxlade states that Stacey [wearing a dirty vest top] was also obstructive, was shouting hysterically and was abusive to officers, with most of her verbal abuse directed at PC Brown who guarded them during the search.

As for PC Andrew Chant's statement, Spiv will only let us see half of that too. He publishes part 2 of 2. What doesn't he want us to see that is in part 1? He claims the dogs ate the first page! "[And what follows now then, is the statement \(page 1 was eaten too badly by the dogs unfortunately\) of the criminal Andrew Chant... If anyone has any further information on this thug please let me know.](#)" Nice try dickhead. Why don't you simply request a copy of it?

The filthy degenerate Chris Spivey even photographs a pile of torn documents. Of course he's not to blame for ripping them up; the dogs did it! Someone should have told him to throw a couple of torn, wet A4 envelopes in there too – might've looked more convincing.

From what we're allowed to see of PC Chant's testimony, Stacey was shouting and agitated and saying she couldn't be left alone in the property. Spiv and Stacey were instructed to remain in Stacey's room. Computer towers etc were seized.

Until we get to see the transcript of the first police interview I don't think it is definitive that the arrest and search occurred during the small hours of the morning. Something extremely serious must have happened for that to occur. I don't think allegations of harassment would be a good enough reason. If you read the harassment charges you will see that there would be no need to do an arrest and search at such an unsocial hour. In fact it would be absurd. I think it's more likely that Spiv was actually arrested and his flat searched at 2 o'clock on the *afternoon* of 30<sup>th</sup> July. [We see from the 'Authority to Search' document that it isn't clear whether the time states 2 am or 2 pm.] If that is the case then PC Oxlade is lying and is 'in' on the conspiracy. PC Chant is probably genuine; hence why Spiv won't let us see the first page of his testimony – it might reveal the time to be pm and not am. The other two officers PC 2726 Brown and PC 75454 McCullough are probably genuine too.

Who knows what was stated by the police re concerns over Clay that prompted the referral to social services. And we don't know what is said

in relation to Stacey's two friends who had *allegedly* turned up to comfort her. PC Chant says that a 'sterile area' was created in Stacey's room for her and Spiv. That probably means her room was a shit tip. Spiv would have us believe it was messy because the ["thug cunts did a fingertip search of the fucking room."](#)

From the police evidence available, wouldn't you think Spivey would be raising a right stink about the seeming omission from their statements of any worries over Clay? At the top of his list of rebuttals, shouldn't he have been demanding to know why there was a 'malicious' referral to social services when it would seem that the police officers who attended at his house had done a good search but had not felt it necessary to pay any attention to Clayton? The only mention of Clay is from PC Chant who says that *Stacey was claiming* her baby was asleep.

Take a moment to have a think about that. Spivey has been banging on about these 'illegal' arrests and the planting by the police of obscene and prohibited photos of children on his computers, to enable the 'evil State baby snatchers' to take Clay into care. This is the picture he paints: ["But worst of all, the fact that our police forces and social services are prepared to work together and break the law, in order to condemn a happy, much loved baby to a life of misery just so as they can stop someone telling the truth is absolutely unforgivable... I will never forgive. Never!"](#)

[How fucked up, sick, de-fucking-ranged and evil is that? In fact anyone who is prepared to do that to a child certainly warrants the attention of the social services and is a good an example of the back to front world that we live in as any."](#) [5/5/15 post.]

So the snatching of Clay is at the core of the Spivey story and yet he doesn't see fit to even mention what appears to be a vitally important omission from the police testimonies. As for police and social services breaking the law, he hasn't proven that.

Of course the truth is Clayton absolutely should be removed from that family, as he *is* at risk. And as he grows older he will be pulled into the criminal lifestyle of his grandfather; just as his mother has been. In fact Stacey has totally failed to protect her son. If she really cares about Clay she will find the strength to break free from her control freak of a father. She will move as far away from him as possible and not have anything whatsoever to do with him.

Notice Spiv doesn't mention in his rebuttal points the seeming omission re Stacey's friends either. There is no evidence that they did turn up at 2 o'clock in the morning to comfort her. That looks like just another lie amongst a never ending stream of lies that he's told to try and convince us that he and Stacey are innocent victims of the 'State baby snatchers'.

Spiv you're supposed to be *proving* police and social services corruption, not forcing us to play guessing games, which have been going on for almost a year now. Publish your first police interview - in FULL. Publish in full all police statements. Let's have the full truth out.

In the meantime, on to the second arrest. Spiv now names the "[three plainclothes thugs who trashed my home](#)": PC 74159 Ian David Patterson, PC 1723 Daniel Francis Brand and Sergeant 70858 Ashley Peter Holland. He publishes Holland's statement, HALF of Brand's statement – what a surprise! And he shows us a photo of a TORN statement and tells us "[Now unfortunately PJ Patterson's statement is too badly eaten to put up.](#)" Prick. Will someone get the message through to him that he's supposed to be trying to convince the public that he's GENUINE; not that he's got something to hide.

Let's look again at the documents he published nine months ago. There is an 'Authority to Search' document. The officer in charge of the search is PC 1723 Brand; however the date is blurred and therefore unknown. The start time of search is 16.45 and finish time is 17.10. The date on the 'Search of Premises' document which states "[NO DAMAGE](#)" is blurred too. It turns out the concealing of the date was a red herring. It was the 'NO DAMAGE' document and the deliberate obscuring of the date that threw me and had me convinced that the recording was of a staged arrest that had been done some time after the real arrest. See my previous comments. When you take these documents together with the police [albeit censored] statements and the transcript of Spiv's second police interview [albeit censored] it is clear now that they do relate to his actual arrest which took place on 6<sup>th</sup> October '14. [\[Remember he says he's been arrested numerous times and had his door kicked down, so he must have lots of these documents.\]](#)

Take another look at my comments re the photos of the damage that he shows us. Spiv comments on the photos: "[And this one is hilarious ... No damage?](#)" Now zoom in and look a little closer at that 'NO DAMAGE' document. It is a damage report relating to the SEARCH OF THE PREMISES, not the break in. Spiv of course has been using that document as 'proof' that the police perjured themselves. Sly bastard.

On taking another look at the videos that Spiv published 'chris arrest' <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pqpyQ0hSW80> 'chris arrest 3' <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O-gP2xXEXBg> and 'chris video2' <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKHnRXw0yxE> from another perspective, I am now of the belief that they are recordings of what actually happened. It does seem likely that Stacey made the first two recordings and that the neighbour Mickey? made the third recording. As I have previously commented, videos 2 & 3 were not uploaded at the same time, but rather the next day. I suspect that the reason for this is that 'team Spiv' were busy scrutinising the recording to see what would be safe to publish. By that I mean the Spiveyites allow us to see the parts that seemingly support his story. I have a feeling it was never the intention to publish parts 2 & 3, but that Spiv and his co-collaborators felt pressured to do so amongst an ever increasing mocking, sceptical and contemptuous public.

Of course, as we do not have a continual recording, we cannot possibly know what actually happened. Spiv the snake lists his rebuttals of the police officer's testimonies. But how can we judge whether or not he is right when he heavily censors the evidence? Spiv if you want public sympathy you have to show us the full recordings. And while you're at it why don't you show us the recording that the "boys upstairs" took.

Let's examine these police statements. There is no evidence that any officer has lied. There are some silly typos, and Sergeant Holland has dropped a clanger re the date, but there's nothing to suggest perjury. Once again the evidence points to Spivey lying, concealing and spinning. Take a look at 'Piglet' [PC Patterson]'s statement. Even though the dogs ate most of it [yeah ok!] we can make out that his testimony backs up his colleagues' statements. In a nutshell the officers had turned up at Spiv's in plain clothes in an unmarked police car to affect an arrest. Spiv had resisted, had locked his door and had begun to barricade himself in. The police were left with no other option than to force entry. Now take a look at Spiv's rebuttal of Sergeant Holland's statement, just after point 15, Spiv says "[piglet quoted on the video that it was Section 35 although the paperwork makes no mention of Section 35. And not Section 17 which is on the paperwork. You also wanted me to sign a form saying that no damage had been caused. Do you accept that was a bit of a piss take Robocunt?](#)" Read my previous detailed comments re PACE. I point out that Spivey gets himself all confused in his efforts to confuse us. Consequently he constantly contradicts himself – just on the issue of sections alone. So it is no surprise that

SPIV FUCKS UP YET AGAIN, cos on the video 'piglet' says it was section 32 [not 35]

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SKHnRXw0yxE> 'Piglet' explains that they have authority to search under Section 32. He also tries to explain Section 17 but Spiv keeps butting in. It is stated in PC Brand's statement that Section 17 is the authority by which police can access an address if a wanted person is inside. Sergeant Holland confirms this.

Spivey just can't stop contradicting himself. Here's another of his blatant lies. In his response to PC Brand's statement [of which we are only permitted to see the first page] he says: "So I **"SLAMMED THE DOOR SHUT"** did I? ... Errr it was on a sliding latch dick head." Well err, no it wasn't. You said so yourself Spivey. I quote from your 10<sup>th</sup> Oct '14 article: "Now, the thing with my front door is that unless you lift the handle and lock it, it remains unlocked – meaning anyone can just walk in. Luckily, I always put the latch on as a matter of routine. Yet before I could open it, the shorter of the two knockers had beaten me to it. *"What you opening my door for, what do you want?"* I snarled angrily. *"You got bail today"* the short arsed twat snarled back, pushing his warrant card up to the gap. *"And?"* I snapped, furiously adding; *"whatcha opening my fucking door for"*. *"Ya bails been extended till the 19th of November. Ere take it"*, he said thrusting the sheet of paper through the gap in the door." In any case, you can see from the video that there is a chain on the latch. Oops.

His rebuttals in relation to the social services are a load of old bollox, which I have already covered in detail. As for his comment that he wasn't read his rights, how do we know whether that's true as he doesn't show us the part of the video where he is being handcuffed and we don't see the first couple of pages of his police interview.

So now he tells us that the neighbour Bree *and* her friend were in the communal doorway. [I had wondered whether the other woman that we get a glimpse of was a stagehand.] As said, on taking another look at that video from a different perspective I can see that the female voice we hear from behind the door was not an actress posing as a WPC as previously thought, but was in all likelihood Spiv's genuinely concerned neighbour. We can hear [at 1:10 of chris video2] Bree seems to be saying **"Is this the same thing Chris?"** If that's true it sounds like he's been feeding her a pack of lies. On the 'chris arrest' video, which cuts out at 45 seconds, it sounds like Bree is asking to come in [perhaps she's offering to take the baby somewhere safe], Spiv, in his agitated state, is shouting **"no no"** as if on autopilot.

From the half of PC Brand's statement that we are privy to, it seems that all he describes had been happening *before* the recording of 'chris arrest' starts. [We don't know when that recording actually starts. There's obviously stuff on there Spivey doesn't want us to see.] As pointed out already, Spiv's rebuttal attempts fail. He even tries to mock PC Brand, saying he must have "[superfuckingman x-ray vision](#)". Brand was simply stating that whilst trying to gain access he could see that items had been placed behind the door to try and stop officers gaining entry. That of course is evidenced.

Now a swift look at Sergeant Holland's statement. Again I can only theorise. Let's assume the police testimonials are 100% true. Let's assume the video recordings are authentic [they might not be!] Holland's testimony up to the point where he says he left the communal hallway [which is almost all of the first page of his statement] could have been happening prior to 'chris arrest' starting. During the 40 seconds of activity that we see on that video, Holland could have been making his way to the rear of the property. The big question is, what is happening during the break in the recording i.e between 'chris arrest' and 'chris arrest 3'? Holland states he heard Clay crying and Stacey screaming. We don't of course hear Stacey scream until the window breaks and we don't hear Clay until after that. Obviously we don't know how much pounding on the door had been going on before the second video starts. It would be surprising if Clay had not woken up and started crying when the banging started. Sgt Holland says Spivey walked towards him at the back, whereby they shouted things to each other. Spivey then walked towards the kitchen. Holland says Stacey's voice was manic and she was shouting and crying etc. All of that - if true - must have been happening before what we see on 'chris arrest 3'.

Now, for the first 40 secs of that video Stacey is calm and there's not a peep out of Clay. So did Spivey just order Stacey to pipe down, pull herself together and get on with the filming? Is she holding Clay at that point - to keep him quiet? Or did Bree sneak around the back and beckon Stacey to hand Clayton over to her, whilst Sergeant Holland was distracted looking up Spiv's back passage for something to smash the window? [Or perhaps Bree just let herself in through the back door that Spiv says was unlocked – wtf – and spirited Clayton away to safety!]

Sgt Holland says he feared Spivey was hurting Stacey. Perhaps he was. Perhaps Holland had very good reason to smash his way in via Spiv's bedroom window. The cynic in me says that's a bit farfetched. It

would not surprise me if Sergeant Holland is another lying little weasel and is 'in' on the Spiveyite saga. Notice we have no way of knowing if the other cops confirm his account! I have a sneaking suspicion that the piss taking Masonic scriptwriters have written this into the story for the sole reason of explaining who broke the window and why. Remember Spiv's story is dynamic; it's constantly developing and changing direction in response to the annoying sceptics who take the piss or ask for proof or ask awkward questions or point out contradictions and absurdities ...

Spivey and his degenerate co-conspirators [he doesn't write his articles singlehandedly] are setting the scene that will enable him to come out smelling of roses. They have to convince you that he is the victim of "corrupt and incompetent cops" who are serving the 'State baby snatchers'. Spivey tells us that the prosecution is manipulating events to prevent the police officers taking the stand in front of a jury. [It is actually the Masonic machine, of which Spivey is a part, who is responsible for all the manipulations. Remember super shill Spiv's strings are pulled by the same Masonic hands who control the police, social services, courts, newspapers ... ] The plan is for Spiv to be able to cry foul, claim that he was robbed of his day in court which would have seen the plods perjuring themselves; the net result is he garners public sympathy and support for the gross injustice of being convicted and jailed for crimes that he was stitched up for.

The Masonic scriptwriters have, it would seem, cleverly succeeded. On the surface Spivey does *appear* to have shown that he is up against a bunch of 'immoral and incompetent police buffoons', who'll do anything for a pay check, even if that means serving bosses with an evil agenda. Readers would be wondering why officers would take a sledgehammer to the front door when [according to Spivey] they could've walked in the back door. People would question how likely it is that the sergeant would just stumble upon a spade at a most appropriate time. And regular readers [who regularly read about the close relationship between Spiv and his daughter] would sneer at the idea that Spivey would ever hurt Stacey; and they certainly wouldn't believe that Stacey was in such immediate danger from her dad that it warranted a sergeant to smash a window to gain entry. Picture it: The sergeant is certain he hears Stacey screaming, whilst under attack from her dad. He makes a snap decision to go in search of something suitable to smash his way in. On sniffing around Spiv's rear, which includes taking a good look up Spiv's back passage ... Eww ... he spots a garden spade. Intent on saving this damsel in distress [she does need rescuing from him – but that isn't in the Masonic script] and secure in the knowledge that he is within his

legal right - as a police officer acting under section 17 of PACE  
[http://www.findlaw.co.uk/law/criminal/your\\_rights/500466.html](http://www.findlaw.co.uk/law/criminal/your_rights/500466.html)  
swings at the window, smashing it to smithereens.

Consequently Chris Spivey [seemingly] proves himself to be this self-sacrificing, long suffering, heroic freedom fighter after all, despite the ever increasing voices of scepticism. And where does that leave we spook observers? Neutralised. Worse though is that the few of us who are genuinely going through hell, risking life and limb for the sake of truth and ultimately freedom, find our credibility being questioned; after all if the likes of me and Tom can get it wrong on Spivey, who else could we be wrong about? Jobs a good un.

Likewise the genuine policemen suffer unjust ridicule and scorn; Satan smirks and laughs his socks off, and the NWO marches on. I sincerely hope that at some point the genuine officers [and the genuine social workers] who got caught up in this charade - and are probably unaware of the Masonic puppeteer - set the record straight with publication of the full truth.

As for Sergeant Holland, if he *is* a police Masonic stooge, I sure as hell hope his colleagues take the right royal piss out of him, and shame him publically [and that goes for PC Oxlade too; if he's also a member of the bullshit brigade.]

Of course, Spivey aided by his filthy troll team played a smart move when they decided that Spiv himself should tell us the reason for his second arrest. This makes his story of a police stitch up – the planting of indecent and prohibited images on his 'illegally obtained' computers - more convincing. After all, he will argue, if he was guilty there is no way in the world he would be volunteering such information.

This is what he says in his 3/7/15 article: "[However, what the prostitution have been busy with is making applications for my accusers to give 'hearsay evidence' at the trial on the 30th & 31st of July.](#)

[Or put another way, just have their statements read out in court so as they cannot be cross examined. And if that application gets turned down, the Prostitution want the Judge to allow my accusers to give evidence via webcam – which like it or not, my Barrister is going to strongly oppose.](#)

After all, I have seen the witness statements and if those claims are to be repeated, then I want them in court so as **perjury is committed** in person – something that I can prove beyond ALL DOUBT, just by producing the transcripts to various conversations which are already logged with my solicitor.” Has he heckers like got any such transcripts!

He continues: “You will all be committing perjury with your evidence statements... Or put another way, you have deliberately lied to try and cover up your serious misconduct which includes conspiracy to steal a child, dig yourselves out of a fucking shit filled hole and convict an innocent man – for which I feel 100% positive that most people will consider you each to be on a par with a syphilis ravaged paedophile who has a tendency to forget to wipe his fucking arse.

You see orificers, I can prove beyond all doubt that you are lying cheating whores ...

Sooooo, who wants to read the solidified diarrhea witness statements – I will have to be selective in my response to them though, because where would the fun be in not seeing the look of total horror on their ugly, dwarf like features when the penny drops that they are nowhere fucking near as clever as they think they are, before it then dawns on them that I have the intellect, determination, ability to see errors that most can't and obviously the driving skills to enable me to run absolute rings around the fucking idiots... You are going to prison boys.”

What he means by his 'abilities' is that he has the full force of the Masonic heavyweights behind him.

As said, the only officers that I can see *might* have committed perjury are PC Oxlade and Sergeant Holland - but not for the reasons Spiv says. To prove perjury there needs to be full disclosure of evidence. The first police interview needs to be made public i.e. the tape recording and an *unedited* transcript of the full interview, so that we can establish the full facts and determine once and for all that the 30/7/14 arrest and search was indeed done during the early hours of the morning.

However whilst freemasonry continues to lurk in the background of the Spivey saga, there is little chance of that recording ever seeing the light of day. The only time it *might* surface is if the masons can find a way of writing it into the script; but if that happens, you can bet your bottom dollar that it too will be heavily censored – to support the Spivey storyline. As for Sgt Holland, we need to see the full police statements

of PCs Patterson and Brand to see if they back up Holland's account that he did indeed break the window with a spade. We also need to see the full and continuous video recording of the police break in to see whether or not Holland is lying, for example about hearing the baby crying, Stacey screaming ... and to see if there is evidence to support his claim that Spiv was hurting Stacey, such that it warranted his actions. As it stands the part recordings that are shown do not support his testimony.

Of course those who are Masonic puppets [and not just the ones involved in the Spivey storyline] will be safe from prosecution whilst they continue to play the Masonic game. The only time that would change is if they found the guts to come clean and spill the beans on what is really going on. But as that would mean a direct challenge to high level freemasons, said person could expect to be punished; which would mean s/he would all of a sudden find him or herself facing all sorts of criminal charges.

Back to Spivey's 15 rebuttal points re Sergeant Holland's statement. Take a really good look at them. Do you see any mention there of the date of Holland's statement? No, me neither. He has dated it 17<sup>th</sup> SEPTEMBER 2014. Holy cow! That's nearly three weeks *before* the second arrest! Careless mistake? Or something sinister? Why isn't Spiv creating a stink over that? He doesn't even utter a squeak about it. The twat pulls Holland up on his spelling error though: "[what is a ppolice station?](#)"

As for Spiv's 'proof' against the 'pigs' by way of photos etc, they don't prove anything. For example, we have no way of knowing when they were taken, we don't know if his gate did or didn't have a padlock on at the time of the break in ... We can't even be sure that those photos are actually of Spiv's pad. Some might not be.

If Spivey wants to *prove* that the police have perjured themselves he has to show us the full unbroken recording of the police break in and all the police statements; and by that I mean complete statements, not half statements or dog eaten ones! He also has to publicise the tape recordings and the full uncensored transcripts of both of his police interviews. Nothing less will do.

Notice he doesn't publish the statements from the Rigby family! That's cos too much truth would be revealed. This is what he says in his 12/7/15 post: "[Never the less, there are FOUR people alleging that I](#)

have harassed them by stating in their police witness statements that I repeatedly tried making unwanted contact by sending them messages over social media

And as such, were they to repeat those allegations in court they would have been committing perjury – which carries up to 7 years in prison.

Except 1984 has finally arrived and with it came; *right is wrong, up is down, black is white, good is bad, lies are truth and the truth is a lie...* In other words, the very nervous prosecutor, who was absolutely crap stated to the JUDGE presiding over a misdemeanour – which had been investigated by the CID and which should never have been in court in the first place – that (and I directly quote here) “IT IS NOT IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE THAT THE FOUR WITNESSES SHOULD COME TO COURT TO GIVE EVIDENCE”.

the arse about face, unbelievable affront to justice was then upheld by the blatantly biased JUDGE – which may have been something to do with the not so secret hand signals being made by the prosecutor, but in all probability was always going to happen from the off.

And in passing that judgement, any chance of me getting a fair trial went out of the window because a barrister cannot cross examine a witness statement... Therefore, the accusations of harassment can not be effectively challenged and I have been denied my lawful right to face my accuser across the courtroom.

Course, the very fact that the prosecution stood up in a court of law and came out with that breathtakingly ludicrous argument, which was bizarrely accepted by the Judge who totally ignored my useless barristers objections, is a measure of the lengths that the Establishment are prepared to go to in order to prevent my Four Accusers from committing perjury.

Indeed, it is now blatantly obvious that any argument put forward by my defence counsel in support of my innocence, along with the irrefutable proof to back it up will be disregarded and the implications of such injustice ought to send a shiver down the spine of every right thinking person in the land.”

Hand signals, my arse. Show us the transcript of that court hearing; and the judgement. As for 1984, you are one of the main stinking filthy perverted traitorous cointelpro monkeys bringing it in.

The pathological liar continues: “Yet throughout the past three and a half years, in which the government authorities have shown appalling contempt for the very people who put them where they are, I have still remained staunch and focused in my quest to expose the monsters plotting our downfall, despite knowing that to do so will in all likelihood cost me my life... If I could go back to January 2012 knowing what I do now, would I say; *“fuck that for a game of soldiers”*?”

Would I fuck... I could never live my life as a coward, I could never betray my duty as a man to protect my family and I could never look myself in the mirror knowing of the horrors that innocent children throughout the world are being subjected to, every single moment of every single day, while as a father and grandfather I chose to look the other way.

In the end you reap what you sow... Just sayin’.”

**Chris Spivey you are no man. You are a narcissistic machiavellian psychopathic coward. And yes you do reap what you sow.**

And now a quick look at the transcript of his 2<sup>nd</sup> police interview – well the bits of it he allows! Detective Constable Adam Coombes and PC Yapp were the interviewing officers. There is nothing to suggest they are not genuine. I wonder why Spiv left it so late – nearly nine months - to publish it. He could have requested that transcript at any time. Why now? Do you suppose the masons are under pressure from an increasingly sceptical public to *prove* Spivey’s story is true? Of course the piss taking sly bastard does a good censoring job on it first – he feeds a lot of the pages to his hungry dogs, including the first few pages. Why doesn’t he want us to see those? There is a distinct lack of continuity in the pages he does show us - a lot of them are missing or torn. He’ll also skip a page or so out and insert his own write over. For example he refers to the: **“criminal twat’s shaking hand”**, which is obviously all completely made up bollox. This is what the snake says in his 29/3/15 article: **“Indeed, if there was collusion between Coombes, Miles and Robinson that would also explain why his hand was shaking when he went to click on the hidden file, during our interview – a fact that I can clearly be heard asking him about on the taped interview.”**

**It would also explain why in the same interview his partner appeared to not want anything to do with the stitch up and indeed hardly said a word once I had accused them of planting that hidden file.”**

<http://chrisspivey.org/dont-take-no-for-an-answer/#more-25864> It is of course very evident that he's lying about PC Yapp too.

The wanker tells us that he doesn't know what he's been charged with cos he fed that sheet to the dogs too. But he insists he hasn't been charged with the hard core images of young boys in a hidden file or the other more extreme child images. That must mean he has; and also the other extreme pornographic images that he told us about last October - the ones *portraying an act of intercourse/oral sex with a dead/alive animal ...*

I'm obviously not going to comment on all of it – I'll just mention a few things. Throughout the interview Spivey is an aggressive abusive thug, constantly accusing the officers of planting the images on his computer and telling them to “fuck off”. He calls them “snaky fucking bastards” and says: “You're stitching me up, you dirty cunts.” He tells them he can get his tech guys to prove the police planted the filthy images. When asked about Wolfie and Adam [his mate who sold him his computer], Spiv refuses to disclose any info. He won't reveal Adam's surname or Wolfie's identity. I wonder why! The lying shit even says he doesn't know Wolfie's name! He tells the officers that he talks to Wolfie on skype ... but that he doesn't know the skype address. He also tells them that he doesn't have Wolfie's telephone number; that he rarely uses the phone!!! [I hope Wolfie and Adam will be required to give evidence at Spiv's trial whereby their full identity will be revealed. Spivey must also publish the full unedited transcript of his trial if he wants to start working on his completely collapsed credibility.] He tells the officers to find out such information for themselves. When PC Yapp says: “You can't tell us to speak to someone”, cocky Spiv says: “I can do whatever I want mate.” Spiv also asks the officers if they know who he is. Why don't you tell us, Spivey? Who are you? The arrogant prick says the security services had attacked his site “four million times in six days”. FFS. And he reckons over the last 2 ½ years his site is just short of the 8 million viewing mark. When questioned about the prohibited images – of extreme pornography - that was found on his hard drive, he says “You's lot done it”. The officers showed him pictures of a “woman sucking a dog's knob”, a “woman having sex with a dog” ... Spiv tells them he'd looked at bestiality out of research; says he wasn't aware they were on his computer ...

He says his barrister is going to check the hard drives. Yeah ok. Why isn't wonderful Wolfie doing that? In any case, surely those drives are still with the police.

And anyway why has he surrounded himself with a legal team now? Who's paying for all this? I hope he's paying for it out of the donations he scams from the public. As if! Almost certainly, you and I and the rest of the taxpaying mugs are funding it, one way or the other. Just remind me; isn't he always telling us he's an aard man; the fearless warrior in a David and Goliath battle with the mighty Establishment? Aren't lawyers, barristers and the like part of that make up? Doesn't Spivey deride them on a regular basis; calling them "dirty bent cunts"? That being the case, shouldn't he be representing himself as a litigant in person? Where's the courage of his convictions?

I'll tell you why he's got himself a solicitor and a barrister now. He's too scared to be a L.I.P. Spivey realises it's not a game anymore - he's facing real criminal charges that are of a very serious nature, which could mean he gets sent to jail. His team are there to help him avoid that. The last thing he wants is to find himself locked up with and at the mercy of some big beefy bastard who might just know who the nonce-protecting traitorous slime ball Spiv really works for ... and teach him a lesson he won't forget.

This is what the git says of PC Yapp: "But just to clarify, those photos of little lads were planted so as to make me appear to be a danger to Clayton, so as they could steal him... Personally, I think that the snake eyed, perverted, slug slime should be kicked to death but I will settle for him getting a long prison sentence... Where the inmates can kick the sick-fuck to death."

Sick-fuck Spivey should be living in fear of what someone – maybe an inmate ... who knows ... who cares ... is going to do to him one day ...

Spivey reminds me of another scum of the earth spineless sell out – Sabine McNeill. She's now wanted by the metropolitan police. What does she do when it's not a game anymore; when the law catches up with her and she's required to account for her actions? She runs away – back to her native Germany, goes into hiding and consults solicitors! See 'Sabine you bloody hypocrite'

<http://victimsagainsthoxes.co.uk/sabine-you-bloody-hypocrite/>

Christopher Fullofshit wants you to believe that, after a six month search, he could only find one solicitor who would help him <http://chrisspivey.org/if-you-believe-they-put-a-man-on-the-moon/> The prolific narcissist says: "I also have it on 100% reliable authority that the

Solicitors and Barristers that I have approached are subsequently told not to represent me, hence the 15 requests that I have made to law firms in the fast approaching 6 month anniversary of my first arrest have all been either refused or met with total silence... Bar one, who only finally agreed to represent me yesterday after 2 months of umming and ahing whether or not to take me on despite this solicitor writing to tell me that a Barrister had told her – and I swear on all that is dear that this is a direct copy & paste here:

***Dear Mr Spivey,  
The barrister whom I asked to consider your case has now replied.  
He has said that, on your account and the documents he has seen so far, you would have a claim for wrongful arrest, false imprisonment and trespass.”***

Barristers are not approached directly; they are employed via solicitors. Tell us how many solicitors have refused you Spiv and show us their letters. Show us the letter that you say you've copy/pasted from. Name the barrister.

This is what the fibeyite says in his 5/5/15 post: “as my solicitor Assad quite rightly stated whilst beckoning to the court papers in regard to the harassment case – which is full of easily provable lies in witness statements, which I believe is called errr... Perjury – “You haven't harassed anyone Chris, this comes from the very top”.

And as my Barrister rightly pointed out, more to himself rather than to me: “Hmmm, there is something very sinister going on here”

Now, I doubt that Assad and my Barrister will be willing to take legal action against the police and social wankers, because it would have to be on a no win no fee basis.”

Assad is a male name. What happened to your female solicitor, Spiv? Spiv knows he couldn't get any lawyer to take legal action against police/social workers, for the simple reason there are no grounds on which to proceed. As for what the no-named barrister and Assad the solicitor are meant to have said, yeah ok Spiv, show us the evidence for that ...

As for social services, he tells us on 16/1/15 that “Stacey has just been told that the Social Services case for stealing Clayton is now CLOSED”

<http://chrisspivey.org/it-aint-over-it-cant-be-over-until-its-done-dusted/> but, once again, doesn't provide the evidentiary documentation.

Then in his 12/2/15 article he shows a letter from Jan Dankin, social worker, saying "Following the work undertaken with yourselves under the Child in Need Plan there is no further role for Social Care at this stage. Therefore the case will be closed."

<http://chrisspivey.org/letters/#more-25123> Spiv says:

"And the reason that the 'work' wasn't done (5 x 1 hr sessions) was because Jan Dankin for some inexplicable reason objected to having what she said recorded... Very strange and very sinister if everything was above board."

Spiv is spinning again. There is no evidence that the work wasn't completed. The following is a conversation between Stacey and Jan on 22/12/14 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LlepHXqXDKg> However it is extremely difficult to hear what Jan Dankin is saying. It seems that Stacey did not understand what the sessions were about; she thought they were part of the SS assessment. Jan explains that the assessment done by Nicole under Julie's stewardship has been completed. What came out of that assessment was a recommendation that Stacey could benefit from some *general* guidelines on keeping her child safe. Hence why Jan doesn't think there was a need for their conversations to be recorded. The meeting ended with Jan saying that she would refer to her manager about how best to take things forward.

Well it is clear Stacey hasn't got a clue what is going on. The poor girl is completely and utterly brainwashed and confused by her vile father. Is there no-one out there who actually cares about her and Clay and has the spine to stand up to Christopher Spivey and help them escape his evil clutches? They are completely at his mercy; mere pawns in his insidious and sinister game.

Stacey, if you're reading this you need to know that your dad works for and is friends with some very powerful psychopathic untouchable paedophiles and that he's putting you and Clayton in grave danger. He doesn't care one iota about you. You and Clay are mere tools aiding him in his sordid agenda. You need to get away from him, for your own health and sanity. Just take your son and leave. If you don't, he will head fuck Clay too. You don't have to grass him up; just get away and don't have anything to do with him – or his sick scumbag mates – Dogman, Wolfie, Danielle La Verite, Pongo ... You should confide in Jan Dankin and ask her to help you; or ask Nicole for help. They're not the

wicked witches your dad wants you and everyone else to believe. He's feeding you a pack of lies about social workers.

Back to the article, Spivey hasn't shown anything strange and sinister about Jan or about any social worker. The only thing strange and sinister is him. Spiv is the one twisting things. He says: "I also find Dankins wording: *"at this stage"* to be very sinister and since they read this site I will take this opportunity to remind them that we have all of our dealings with the SS on film & tape. This stash includes all meetings (including their admittance of lying to us), nearly all phone calls and 2 x recordings of Jan Dankin trying to coerce Stacey into not recording their meetings."

There's no point you *telling us* about all this shit hot evidence you have against these lying scheming social workers Spiv. You need to share it with us.

Look what the deeply loathsome degenerate says in his 24/12/14 post <http://chrisspivey.org/proof-that-the-social-workers-nicole-miles-julie-robinson-blatantly-lied-in-a-bid-to-steal-clayton-spivey/>

"Course the implication is obvious and quite unnecessary. I mean, so what if I am talking in the background? Am I not allowed to advise my daughter when she is fighting for her sons safety against a criminal gang of child kidnappers then?"

The truth is Stacey was fighting to keep her son because - and only because - her bloody loathsome and perverted father put her in that situation.

Also in the same post he continues in his pathetic attempt to discredit the social workers. He shows us Nicole Miles' case note, but again he either shows part documentation or photographed and **blurred** documents. [He makes sure that he holds the document far enough away from the camera so that the typed notes are unreadable!]

The sleazebag continues with his disgusting threats and in the doing reveals that he has **very powerful people** who can help him out. He also lets us know that his mates in high places will not let him down as he has enough shit on them that he can expose: "And let me tell you Ms Miles – since I know you will be reading this – if you think that you will get away with trying to snatch my grandson, whether by promises that you have been made, or by your past successes, you want to start

worrying because the people you are in collusion with, or indeed acting for, have absolutely no concept of integrity and will hang you out to dry quicker than look at you.

And I say that in the knowledge that *'certain people' I know, having taken 'certain steps'* to ensure that in the event of your masters going down the bent judge route to bring your sick fuck task to fruition, will in turn mean that some very powerful people will have no choice but to intervene on my behalf or be publicly outed as being complicit in the kidnapping of my grandson – something that they will not risk... Indeed, if you have been promised that I will never get you into court, then you really need to start worrying.”

Spiv better understand that those very powerful people he speaks of can just as easily hang him out to dry too.

Also in his 29/3/15 article he says: “But as I say, that is totally irrelevant because the proof is there in plain sight and even if it wasn't, I have Julie Robinson on video tape categorically stating in the presence of a senior, registered Social Worker; that the police had told her not to raise the case from a Section 17, meaning that the assessment was NEVER A SECTION 47, so why are the scheming baby snatchers presenting the assessment as being such?

And since that fact alone made Clayton being removed from a loving stable home a very real prospect, I believe that both Miles and Robinson should be up on criminal charges.

Deliberately Marked Clayton's Grandfather down as being a SIGNIFICANT & LIKELY RISK to Clayton.”

Course he never shows us this taped evidence. Notice how [even though he has no proof] he accuses both Miles and Robinson of criminal behaviour. One social worker is, without doubt, genuine – Nicole; however I have strong doubts about the other – Julie. My hunches tell me she is 'in' on the scam. A common shill tactic is to mix genuine people in with Masonic puppets - to make a Masonic fabrication believable and to create confusion. If I am correct about Robinson, Nicole almost certainly won't be aware that her boss is in fact on Spiv's side.

As for Spiv being marked down as a significant and likely risk to Clay, that is without doubt.

Here's another article on these awful kidnappers: *"Many of you have now received a letter from the HCPC, confirming that the case against those two detestable excuses for social workers – Nicole Miles and Julie Robinson – has been reopened.*

*And quite rightly so too.*

*However, for some strange reason – unlike the last investigation – correspondence this time is being marked: **Strictly Private & Confidential.***

And since I hold damning evidence on these two criminals, both of whom are most definitely guilty of conspiring to abduct a child, I have no need for secrecy since I most certainly do not have anything to hide or cover up in my quest to see that they both receive the justice that they deserve and can never again ruin decent peoples lives." [11/4/15 post.]

What a particularly nasty and venomous piece of work Christopher Spivey is.

Now take a swift look at the response from Katia Vandembroucke in his 29/4/15 write up:

"I have now had a reply from Katia Vandembroucke of the HCPC in regard to my complaint against the social workers, Nicole Miles & Julie Robinson.

You will notice that Vandembroucke reply has a bit of a 'devil may care' attitude about it.

Yet despite the very serious nature of our complaint, the inference in Katia Vandembroucke's email is that if we don't jump through hoops to provide her with the requested information, then the investigation will grind to a halt and the case closed.

Nevertheless, the following is a copy & paste of her email:

***Dear Mr Spivey,***

***I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your email dated 11 April 2015 and the further information you sent, which was received on 17 April 2015. The further information you provided included screen shots of parts of various documents.***

***I understand from your last email that you are providing further documentation and we will await receipt of that.***

***In addition to any other documents you wish to provide, we ultimately seek a full copy of the:***

***1) Assessment prepared in relation to your grandson.”***

Spiv, you've proved nowt as usual. Nothing zero zilch nada zip. There's nothing at all wrong with her reply. She just wants all the information. Just as we do. Spiv, stop skewing the truth. Show us the full and unedited documentation.

In his 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2015 post he tells us:

“I actually got an Email from the HCPC on Wednesday. And it appears that the case has now been handed to someone else and worse still, Nicole Miles seems to have got lost in the transfer.

***Dear Mr. Spivey,***

***Health and Care Professions Council and Mrs Julie Robinson***

***I am writing further to the concerns you have raised regarding the above named Registrant.***

***Your case has been allocated to me as the Case Manager. I will have conduct of the matter. I will review the information you have provided and write to you to explain what will happen next and if necessary, request further information from you.***

Now I would like to think that Ms Vandewotsits has had the case taken off her because it is so serious.”

If Nicole Miles has “got lost in the transfer” that'll be because the masons have decided to keep her out of their abhorrent games, cos she is genuine and will defend the truth. They certainly cannot risk too much truth emerging.

I really hope the defamed social workers and police officers sue the pants off the lying piece of shill shit Spiv.

**And now some snippets I picked up from his articles over the months since I last commented:**

On 21/12/14 he says:

***“His article – the article in question – is in regard to those self elected champions of the people claiming to be bastions of the truth, yet who are in reality nothing more than disruptive weirdo's, sadcases, fantasists, wannabe's & sick-fucks who peddle dis-information.”***

## Crass hypocrisy. Who elected him then???

“Or put another way, arrogant, cruel, scum of the earth Social Workers are now stealing children, putting them up for adoption, pocketing a nice few quid in the bargain and not even bothering to tell the parents why they no longer have a child:

Child Stealing by the State has now become such an epidemic After all, parents who are powerless to stop their children being stolen by the secret courts have no choice but to break the vomit inducing, twisted, sick fuck gagging laws, in a last ditch desperate bid for justice

Moreover, Hemming is described thus by Wikipedia:

***As Chairman of Justice for Families Campaign Group, Hemming has been coordinating the activities of a number of campaigners and has raised a substantial number of Early Day Motions in trying to reduce the number of injustices where families are damaged by false allegations.”***

There is ref to this disgusting NWO propaganda piece in the Daily Mail shit rag <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2476232/Jail-social-workers-children-telling-parents-says-Britains-family-judge.html>

As usual there is anonymity, no detail and no supporting documentation ...

Wiki are controlled opposition. So is the millionaire Hemming. He can shove his EDMs up his arse.

As for the ‘Child Stealing by the State’ hype, I’ll be covering that in my site update. Watch this space.

As for ‘gagging laws’, that’s utter bullshit too.

On 25/1/15 Spiv says:

“Ms Fell (in what to me seemed like a concerted effort to get me to plead guilty) also told me, and my companions; Dogman, Pongo and Paul White, that *“I wouldn’t be allowed to win, no matter what”*.

**NO EVIDENCE THAT SHE SAID THAT OF COURSE!**

He whinges:

"In fact to date there have been 9,094,418 visits to this site in 3 years, 3 weeks and 3 days. Yet only 5 people turned up on Friday."

That'll be because everyone knows you're a lying lowlife shower of shit. People are taking the piss out of you Spivey. Get used to it. There's lots more to come.

The ever extreme egocentric and narcissist continues:

"Indeed, what with the MIT's monitoring my every move I can't help but think that they have postponed to try and disrupt the huge number of people who were planning on attending on the 20th."

That might be the grand total of one then, Spiv!

And [10/3/15]:

"the fact that all three of the above mentioned have to a man largely ignored the huge public outcry on my behalf, thus making the trio a party to the sustained insidious harassment"

Public outcry my arse. Laugh out fuckin loud.

On 29/3/15 Spiv says:

"Giving money to the NSPCC is on a par with funding paedophilia. The only problem is, the 'charity' is fronted by paedophiles, is a supply line for paedophiles and has in the past had untold numbers of paedophiles in their employ and no doubt still has."

Spiv would know. Read the rest of that article re the HCPC. All fucking theatre.

On 5/5/15:

"You see, aided and abetted by the equally government owned Kent Freedom Movement – who are coming to bea ... hang on, just let me stop laughing ... Who are coming to beat me u... Sorry, just give me another second ... Who are coming to beat me up – he has now gone to the trouble of building a website about me which apparently exposes me as a proper wrong un."

Not Government owned, Masonic owned. Spiv is under no threat of being beaten up by his fellow NWO agents. He obviously knows who they are. I will be thoroughly exposing 'team Spiv' in my site update.

The twat continues:

“Sadly, their evidence is based on an email that shows my high level of integrity which I sent to Jimmy

Course, these people are not usually controlled by the MIT’s for monetary gain. They are controlled because they have no fucking choice usually due to them having a nasty little, sordid secret that they are desperate to keep quiet.”

Integrity! L.O.L. As for nasty little sordid secrets, you’d know all about that, wouldn’t you Spiv. So would your filthy fellow supertrolls Jimmy and the Lavatory ...

On 7/5/15:

“Sure, they have scared my daughter half to death and she now lives her life in dread of someone knocking at the door until she knows who it is, but scaring a teenage girl is a piece of piss and the actions of a bully and I fucking hate bullies with a passion.”

Says the bully who gets his henchman Jimmy Jones to try to intimidate me into shutting the fuck up with his nasty threats. And the only person bullying your daughter is YOU.

6/6/15:

“In the meantime, I am prevented by a court of law from showing you conclusive evidence of the governments, the security services and the Metropolitan police’s involvement in a major crime used to hoodwink the nation.”

What major crime arsehole?

Spiv goes on to talk about Roger & Dorothy, saying they are “absolutely fuck all like they would have you believe. They can be aggressive. Then again most criminals are. However, when you work for MI5 like Roger you are protected .... As long as you play their game which involves taking on false personas.”

You’re actually working for the masons, not MI5. Spiv’s describing himself to a tee. As he does when he says:

“moronic thugs who work for the Government Department of Hooliganism.”

Spiv must have a helluva lot of skeletons in his closet. Course if he ever does find the courage to stop 'playing the game', then his skeletons will come crawling out; at which point I'm pretty sure he'll find himself doing porridge for a very long time.

Look what the prick comes out with on his 29/6/15 post. The breathtaking hypocrite describes himself to a tee.

"I haven't had time to stop and think about all of the more remote anomalies, contradictions and continuity errors contained within just about every sentence of the old fanny."

And: "Yet despite my huge audience, the donations have not even covered the £300 monthly site bill."

I've already told him my web host can host his site for around £50 per month.

In his 9/7/15 post the creep has the gall to say: "Indeed, it would certainly appear that as it happens I have been charged rather hastily & without thought for the legalities or public funds in these times of austerity."

Filthy hypocritical dregs of society subversives like him cost us hardworking honest and decent taxpayers an absolute mint. But of infinitely more importance than financial cost is the cost to our freedom.

Chris Spivey is a very important cointelpro agent. The Masonic head honchos will move hell and high water to prevent his demise. His mate Ickie has already slithered into the sewer. They can't let their other main man suffer the same fate.

If Spiv is going to convince us that he was 'illegally' arrested, his computers illegally stolen and that the police planted the incriminating images on his PCs, he must give full disclosure. He must publish IN FULL and UNREDACTED the transcripts of BOTH of his police interviews [including the tape recordings] and he must produce ALL social services reports – IN FULL AND UNREDACTED. He must also show us the FULL AND UNREDACTED transcripts of his court cases re the 'harassment' charges and the 'obscene images' charges when they are available. This is the only way we're going to get to the full TRUTH about what actually happened and what is happening. The most important documentary evidence is the tape recording of the first police

interview; as that holds the key to unravelling this whole Masonic conspiracy.

Finally, who are the Chris Spivey turd team who upload his vids? Who operates behind '[youtype totalcrap](#)'? Who is [ivor bigone](#)? Is that Spiv boasting? Who TF is [GeorgeGreekTrucker](#)? What about [The Truth Seeking Music Makers](#)? These dubious characters all promote Spiv and all the other well known shitty shillbillies. Why the need for anonymity?

During his police interview Spiv says he has 8 people helping him. Who are they? Presumably they include his 4 unidentified site mods. Who are these cowardly scumbag Establishment toadies? Why do they hide behind fake personas?

Who are the Chris Spivey troll team? They are some of the most twisted, spiteful, hateful, manipulative and prolific nonce associated trolls operating behind their own names and behind multiple online pseudonyms. More on that in my site update.

[Tom replied](#): I'll read through all this and get back to you. Thank you. Some other news of significance has just appeared. It is good news that they knew, but the persons involved were retaining information of cointelpros and not sharing, leaving people in the dark. This is almost always wrong, and in this case, it could have been very valuable if they'd spoken. Hopefully they'll learn from this.

Reply ·

[Me](#): No way! Did we finally flush him?

Tom, have you seen Spiv's 31/7/15 post. Looks like he's finally thrown in the towel. Well done you and all the genuine spook busters.

Of course he hasn't really gone - he'll be up to his usual trolling activities hiding behind a variety of fake internet personas.

In case you miss it - what with the time difference - this is his leaving message:

["Thats all folks](#)

This is the last post for this website.

After midnight tonight this site will be deleted as will the Christopher D Spivey FB page.

I have told you for months and months that I can't do this on my own, but apart from a dozen or so people no one was prepared to stand up and be counted... In the end you get what you deserve.

You really are all fucked now and you brought it on yourselves.

I leave with my integrity intact." Err, no you don't Spiv.

As for his dozen supporters 8 of those will be his unidentified paid site assistants. Then there is Stacey and Clay. And a couple of trolls – Danielle, Pongo ...?

As for doing it on his own, did he bollox - he had a gang of supertrolls at his service. Talking of which I must crack on with the task of unmasking those buggers ...

[t0mcahill](#) 2 hours ago

You've done your part. The court issue is secondary. He'll be out before you know it, but his legacy is now worth very little. I saw the message you copied, but thank you.