Subject: YOUR POTENTIAL MEETING WITH DAVID CROMPTON - VIEWS FROM A FORMER SYP PRINCIPAL INTELLIGENCE ANALYST AND WHISTLE-BLOWER



Subject: YOUR POTENTIAL MEETING WITH DAVID CROMPTON

VIEWS FROM A FORMER SYP PRINCIPAL INTELLIGENCE ANALYST AND WHISTLE-BLOWER From: "Tony" <Tony@JAHTruth.net> Date: Sun, August 31, 2014 2:45 pm To: alexis.jay@strath.ac.uk

Priority: High

To Professor Alexis Jay,

I write with reference to the Chief Constable David Crompton's intentions to meet with you over the Rotherham child-abuse, as reported on in the press recently.

My name is Tony Farrell. I worked as the Principal Intelligence Analyst of South Yorkshire Police from the early 2000's until September 2010, working under the Director of Intelligence. D/Superintendent Adrian Teague was my last boss. That was until I was dismissed for speaking the truth to him, about the bogus terror threat construct, and the inside jobs of 7/7 and 9/11.

I have read the Rotherham report with interest and sadness, and I am mindful that the current Chief Constable, David Crompton says publicly that he wishes to urgently meet with you. That is why I am writing to you, as I think you should be alerted to certain issues from a former whistle-blower's perspective in the field of intelligence analysis. I did not work under David Crompton's leadership, but I had a useful vantage-point on intelligence gathering processes.

I note that your report makes reference to a number of individuals who at one stage or another worked for South Yorkshire Police. Most notably, these include Dr. Angie Heal and former Detective Superintendent Matt Jukes (now Deputy Chief Constable in South Wales), who I recall was a very hard working Director of Intelligence, in charge of public protection unit issues about ten years ago. I wish to highlight a number of concerns I have about strategic intelligence systems in place by my former employers. Firstly, I recall that Dr. Angie Heal who, from recollection, worked on secondment in Community Safety, was raising very serious concerns about the issues of Child Sexual Exploitation in the mid 2000's. Dr. Heal seemed to be somewhat of a bit of a lone voice, and so she struggled to get any of her reports and messages taken seriously. I got the distinct impression that the intelligence she held in her possession was seldom, if ever, processed on the Operational Intelligence System, and so it was nearly always conveniently ignored, and because Dr. Heal was neither a police officer, nor working in the intelligence field, her insight and intelligence was never properly processed or understood by key decisionmakers in the organisation.

At that time, I put this down to a police culture of institutional snobbery, which existed between police and civilian support staff, during this era. In hindsight, it could well have been a deliberate methodology to cover up institutionalised paedophilia by people in high places, even within the police-force and judiciary. Are the Muslims now being used as scapegoats, to divert all attention away from their friends and colleagues?

Later on towards the end of my service as an analyst, management ignored very good business-cases to have a dedicated analyst in the public protection unit in order to better identify the serious and complex issues related to child sexual-exploitation. Lisa Thompson was the name of the most informed analyst in this area. I don't know whether she still works at South Yorkshire Police. To my mind, the subject of Child Sexual Exploitation demanded dedicated intelligence analysts, which it never got. Instead, there was an unfathomable reluctance on behalf of the Director of Intelligence Adrian Teague and the then head of the Public Protection Unit Peter Horner, to divert appropriate analytical resources directly into this area of work. As such, intelligence analysis was always diluted and shallow in this area, and the scale of the problems nearly always suppressed, misunderstood and understated. The structures and climate was not conducive to effective intelligence analysis and problem definition.

The force was also full of police officers clamoring for their next promotions. In my opinion, this created a somewhat dysfunctional climate. Managers were all too often, far more interested in controlling the news, doing damage limitation, rather than identifying the problems. The dominant culture was one where the force was performance management led, rather than intelligence led. If that wasn't bad enough, most of the performance management systems in place were at best nonsensical, at worst misleading. Preserving police reputations before partners was always a key consideration, and the dynamics were complex. Intelligence played second fiddle to flawed performance management practices.

Performance management information was driving business decisions in a perverse way, where the priority for District Tasking and Co-ordinating Groups was for middle-managers to tell of their good news stories, and hide their dirty-linen in their own neighbourhoods, at all costs. It was awful to see. Community Tension Assessment systems were farcical, but there was a fear of being critical of force and Home Office imposed systems.

Managers became obsessed with looking "good on paper" before they moved on to their next promotionboard interview and few, if any, had appetites for "rocking the boat", by bringing the serious problems to the surface. Everything seemed superficial. The performance culture was driven from the top down by the Home Office, and their ill-conceived Regional Government Offices made matters worse. It was a question of count everything, but know the value of nothing. Public reassurance was always deemed important, but that led to police covering up bad news and putting their own paternalistic spin on community problem profiles. If it meant courting controversy, most police officers would sooner turn a blind-eye, rather than open up a can of worms. Reputation management almost always came before problem solving, and any sense of a duty of care to the vulnerable. Culturally, it was sickening to see.

I recall that just before I was dismissed for speaking truth to power, Senior Command Team came out with a new slogan to be enshrined in new force practice. This slogan was entitled: "Enabling the One Truth". The first officer to push this putrid slogan out was Jason Harwin, who is the current Chief Superintendent and District Commander of Rotherham, who has recently apologised for their failings on TV. As head of the intelligence analysis function at the time, I saw this slogan as a sinister attempt to ensure reputation management, and institutional denials of problems remained the real priority for the force, under the authority of Senior Command Team members. It is not possible to reconcile intelligence analysis with an "Enabling the One Truth" slogan.

I do not, as yet, sense any real change from the current leadership, although I hope I am wrong. The rhetoric always remains the same. "We have learned the lessons from our previous mistakes", managers will glibly say when exposed for their deficiencies. The force's attempts to enable the one truth over Hillsborough eventually came unstuck. I know for a fact that the real truth has still not come out about Hillsborough, and other ticking-time bomb subjects like Orgreave, and the bogus terror threat assessment process. This is unethical and I would go so far as to say evil. South Yorkshire Police countenance the perpetuation of the great political deceit and nothing much has changed in Crompton's reign, insofar as I can see. Officers in Senior positions cannot be trusted to tell the truth, and are implicated in lies and corruption, where institutional denials and walls of silence about the levels of corruption still reign supreme, as they all "enable their one truth/lie".

At a strategic level, the Director of Intelligence Adrian Teague, was always nervous about raising issues of ethnicity, at a time when problems in Rotherham were first surfacing in the Force Intelligence Bureau in 2009/10. When I spoke the truth, I was instructed to go to Occupational Health. My boss Teague said this to me: "Tony, you and I will never get 'them' to tell the truth on this. Don't rock the boat. We are just the Government's Foot-soldiers."

I did rock the boat and was duly sacked, without any allegation of misconduct, when I refused to bear false-witness. By 'them', the Director of Intelligence was referring to ACPO and government circles. The Director of Intelligence knew full well that 7/7 was an inside job, but turned a blind-eye to the evil.

At many levels in the police, certain topics such as corruption and ethnicity were totally off-limits. It was politically-incorrect to be critical and loyalty was demanded to the regime. This was the case at both strategic and local neighbourhood levels. Local politicians and members of the police-authority were no better, as they had no appetite to see problems exposed, if they were in their own backyards. Problem solving becomes tricky when the subject matter is always taboo.

At the Force Control Level, police rhetoric was always to afford priority to Public Protection issues, but in the absence of proper strategic analysis it was an uphill struggle to bring about effective process change.

Elsewhere in the force, cultural problems existed and senior officers were not immune to "cuffing the crime" reports. By that, crimes went unrecorded in order to massage crime statistics to protect year-end performance pay-related bonuses. All too often serious and complex issues had to be reduced to simple but meaningless numbers, and the culture was such that almost every problem was reduced to crude

classifications, where invalid scoring-systems served to disguise the true nature of the problems. All sorts of nonsensical risk assessment matrix systems were introduced for many aspects of business, under ridiculous Home Office guidance practice. The end result was to create something which reminded me of George Orwell's 1984. The practice became widespread. This is no exaggeration.

If the likes of Chief Constable David Crompton, Deputy Chief Constable Andy Holt, and Chief Superintendents Jason Harwin and Richard Tweed are serious about rooting-out the problems of child sexual abuse, please ask them about Vicky Haigh. Ask David Crompton how can a police force justify sacking an intelligence analyst, for trying to tell them the truth about monstrous police-state tyranny and treason, over the false-flag attack of the 7/7 London Bombings, back in 2010. Ask him about the hold that Freemasonry has in policing and its relationship with the widespread cover-up of sexual child abuse. Mention Operation Tiberius in the Metropolitan Police and watch carefully how they respond.

For proof of the 7/7 London bombings being an inside-job, that they blamed on Pakistani Muslim patsies, please watch "77 Ripple Effect 2" and "911 Ripple Effect" about 911 in America, where there were NO Muslim hijackers, and the three (not 2) buildings were brought down by controlled demolition, using explosives, especially WTC7.

http://JforJustice.net/77re2.html; https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bwThcdIoufc

I know of several serving officers in the Metropolitan police who secretly tell me, in desperation, that the scale of cover-up of paedophilia within the higher ranks of the police is significant. The levels of corruption are difficult to penetrate. I sense the same applies in South Yorkshire. I have no doubt that the scale of the problem of Child Sexual Exploitation is massive, but the wider problem extends far beyond just the Asian community. Thirty years on from 1984, and there's something dreadfully wrong in British policing and society as a whole.

If I had to put my finger on it from a policing slant, I would say Freemasonry, which is a "Luciferian" construct, turning us all against God's Law and doing what is right, is the poison which flourishes in service and allows Child Sexual Abuse to go unchecked, and remain covered-up for so long by those in positions of authority and influence. This applies to the government, the judiciary and the police, and Rotherham will be far from unique.

The question NEEDS to be asked: how could these Pakistanis act so brazenly, collecting the children in taxis, and threaten to kill people with impunity ("threat to kill" carries a life-sentence), unless they knew they were protected by the police, judiciary and politicians? You state that they trafficked the children, as well as abusing them themselves. To whom were they trafficking them? To the likes of Jimmy Savile, Cliff Richards, Attorney General Michael Havers, Lord Janner, Kenneth Clarke MP, judges and top cops? Is that why there were no serious investigations and it was all covered-up?

I wish you well in your future meeting with David Crompton.

Yours sincerely,

Tony Farrell