

VICKY HAIGH written by SHARON ZAKI

Another well-known 'victim' that I used to support is **Vicky Haigh**. I supported her mainly on the basis that Sabine [who I thought was trustworthy] was/is a strong supporter, and I just assumed she had the evidence that Vicky is truthful and genuine. Now, I'm sceptical because she is another high profile 'victim' and is closely associated with the shells - Sabine, Belinda and **John Hemming**. Further she is supported by Butlincat.

According to **Ian Josephs**, publisher of 'Forced Adoption' there were two police interviews, whereby Vicky's daughter complained of sexual abuse by her father David Tune. A psychiatrist saw the child, and there are medical records and reports from school teachers. According to Josephs, all these professionals reported that Vicky's daughter had been sexually abused. See the [Ministry of Truth](#) site and [UK Human Rights Blog](#). I'd be interested to read the documentation to support this i.e. police reports or transcripts of recordings, reports by teachers and the psychiatrist, medical notes; also if any of these professionals are named. If there isn't any firm evidence, then nuff said! There is mention of these professionals' involvement in the court judgement; however nothing to back up the claims of Vicky Haigh, and nothing to suggest her daughter had been abused. [This](#) is Sabine's idea of 'evidence'! It includes 'MY DADDY IS A **PAEDOPHILE**' which is an uncorroborated, biased version of events. I wonder if David Tune has read this. Looks like he has strong grounds to sue Sabine for defamation. I would love to see her trying to prove what she says is true. She also says "medical and school reports are further evidence of actual abuse." But she doesn't publish these reports; we just have to take her word on that! And she says, "I have copies of the two police videos on which the girl describes how her father has abused her. I could publish them by replacing her name with X, but that's a lot of tedious work of scanning and uploading." Well Sabine has got enough time on her hands to do such a job. Perhaps she'd rather not because there just might be, in amongst all the revelations of abuse X was primed to repeat, something in the police records which could reveal an inconvenient truth for Sabine and co-horts. For example in Vicky's letter to her daughter's guardian, one of the things she says is, "My innocent daughter has had you worked out all along especially when she totally ignored your presence in a contact session last year. How can you possibly be her guardian when she obviously has no respect for you for being totally biased in her father's favour when you were entrusted to be her voice in court. She

even told the police this in her evidence to them that you “are on daddy’s side”. No wonder you were anxious to keep these interviews hidden in the secret family court.” Well if we could see these police interviews we’d soon know who’s telling the truth!!!

Vicky says at the [House of Commons](#) meeting [January 2013] that three teachers had examined her daughter's 'privates', had logged findings of 'soreness' in the accident log book and had not informed the Headmistress. I find that hard to believe; it is not the job of a teacher to examine a child. Vicky doesn't produce evidence to back up what she says, for example none of these teachers are named and she hasn't published the log entry. She also says that she was told by the police and social workers that the evidence given by her daughter was such that it was too detailed to be the result of coaching; again there is no evidence to support what VH says. [Here](#) she is speaking at the June 2011 Anti-abuse rally, Trafalgar Square, London. Interestingly, Vicky Haigh, whilst giving her suggestions on family court improvements, doesn't mention the corrupting force of Freemasonry [nor does any other speaker at the H.O.C or rally. Well, not as far as I am aware; then again my stomach could only take so much of watching and listening to these odious pretenders; all of whom are freemasons themselves or are controlled and protected by freemasonry.]

The [court judgement](#) is very revealing. It states: "Although it has been held that supervised contact between Ms. Haigh and X is in the latter’s interests, Ms. Haigh has **declined to take up the local authority’s offer** of such contact and has thus not seen X since X was removed from her care. The absence of any contact between X and Ms. Haigh is thus **entirely the mother’s choice** and is an illustration of her inability to act in the child’s best interests." On reading that I began to question Haigh's sincerity. Genuine, desperate mothers do not refuse contact; even if the only thing on offer is supervised and in a contact centre. Distressed mothers take anything offered in the hope of it leading to more. Genuine mothers who are fearful of losing their kids go along with the authorities even if it is all unfair or seemingly going against them.

Another thing that makes me suspicious is the fact that Vicky was rude and [aggressive](#) towards X's social worker/guardian. A desperate mother does not attack the very people who can help her. Also, it is very revealing that Vicky boasts about her fame in her letters to her daughter; for one thing, why would she be proud of such negative publicity in the

newspapers? And isn't getting her daughter back more important than herself?

My mind was made up on reading the following [near end of judgement]: "Social Services considered that it was important to try to promote the relationship between X and her mother and provided contact facilities with that objective in mind. Inevitably, in the light of the Court's findings, that could only take place with a Social Worker present. It requires little imagination to recognise that contact for parents in such circumstances may be very difficult and artificial. From the child's perspective, however, it may prove to be reassuring and comforting. Parents who are able to appreciate this can, even within these limitations, contrive to ensure that contact is an enjoyable experience. Ms Haigh was unable to do this and decided that she would not see X at all in these circumstances. The Social Services wrote to Ms Haigh informing her of X's wish to see her mother and her concern that contact was not occurring but Ms Haigh's view was fixed and contact ceased." **That tells me everything I need to know about Vicky Haigh. Her credibility is shot right there.** This mother is a despicable, lying, self-centred, child-abusing woman. Sabine, Hemming and co have further undermined their own credibility by supporting her. They should have done the right thing, given her a wide berth and exposed her.

Further signs that VH is NOT genuine are, "The mother did not seek permission to appeal against Judge Robertshaw's order. The second key judgment is that given by Judge Peter Jones on 22 November 2010. By this time Judge Robertshaw had retired. Like Judge Robertshaw, Judge Jones gave a long and careful judgment. At its conclusion he decided that X should be the subject of a full care order and that she should move to her father's care. Once again, the mother did not seek permission to appeal against that order." Mothers desperate to see their children appeal court decisions as many times as they can.

More evidence of Haigh's insincerity are presented further down the judgement, where it is stated, "In addition, Ms Haigh was invited, on three occasions, to present evidence for her allegations to be investigated by the court but on each occasion she either did not attend or did attend but produced no evidence" and "Ms Haigh has, however, not always been consistent as to her own beliefs". Also "In terms it was submitted, on the mother's behalf, X was saying things "she thinks the adults want to hear". By the adults, this, of course, could only have meant the mother. The Judge at that hearing gave Ms Haigh every opportunity to present a case that X had been abused, if that was what

she believed, but **Ms Haigh chose not to.**" And "The mother advised the Court that she had sought out and received extensive therapeutic counselling, though **no evidence of it** was placed before the Court on her behalf."

If Sabine, Hemming and other VH supporters had read the court judgement[s] they would realise that in this case [as in the Hollie Greig case] there is no evidence of Establishment corruption because Vicky Haigh is unable to produce *any* such evidence; in fact all the evidence points to *her* as being a liar and a schemer and of emotionally abusing 'X'. If VH and supporters are saying that the court *judgements* are a pack of lies, **where is the evidence** for that? It is right that 'X' is now living with her father. VH and 'investigator' Liz Watson **deserved** to go to prison. As for Liz Watson, she foolishly bought into the 'freeman on the land' nonsense and paid the price - quite right too. Anyone who goes along with this 'freeman', 'lawful rebellion' rubbish is a gullible fool and is just asking for trouble. Be very suspicious of the publishers of these 'rebel' sites [Lawful Rebellion, Freedom Rebels, TPUC, BCG ...] as they are ALL wolves in sheep's clothing and they will lead you down a slippery slope. They advocate common law and strawman stuff to encourage members to evade debt or other liability. However F.M.O.T.L fools often find they end up incurring huge fines or threats of imprisonment and a massive headache to boot; which is in fact the intention of the wily ones leading the 'rebellion'; their job being to criminalise the people who call themselves 'rebels'. [The ruling elite want to pass us all off as:- rebels, anarchists, criminals, conspiraloons, tin-foil-hats ... as such people are easier for them to manage. Criminals are not considered serious and credible opposition.]

The fact that **Ian Josephs** supports VH and her version so robustly now brings *his* credibility into question as well. Josephs, who prides himself on doing "a **rigorous** cross examination" of mothers who ask him for help, does himself a disservice when there is *no evidence* to support anything he states **here**. He and all the other so-called 'Truthers' of the T/M cannot grab hold of stories with the flimsiest of evidence, present them as true and mold them into something that suits their purpose. Credibility is all we 'truthers' have. David Icke, Brian Gerrish, Sabine McNeill and all the rest of them can bang on about child stealing by the State but they need to present the EVIDENCE i.e. they need to publicise the cases that are TRUE. Why don't they??? Why do they insist on publicising stories which can be proven to be UNTRUE??? I think we know the answer to that. People like Vicky Haigh, Nigel Cooper, backed up by BG and the gang are traitorous, freedom-hating, paedo-protecting

pieces of human filth. It is easy to see how we who are a real threat to the PTB are getting no-where in our efforts to expose corruption and the NWO agenda and to make the world a better place despite all the seemingly massive exposure of the truth from the so-called 'alternative media'.

I have often thought that Ian Josephs is too good to be true. It looks like he probably is! He even declares that "Nobody died of emotional abuse" [see above link]. Well people *do* die of anorexia, and anorexia can develop in children who have been emotionally abused. I should know, my two youngest children both now suffer from that very sinister mental illness. Emotional abuse is the WORST form of abuse because you cannot see it and therefore it can't be measured. Both J & M have often said that they wished they'd been badly beaten, such that they were hospitalised, because then they "would have been listened to". I'm not so sure of that even, when you have the likes of Baby P being tortured to death - with the full blessing of the State.