



# PIE & Chimps

## The Daily Chimpanzee

Well, the Chimp has firmly got its teeth into this Harman PIE news story by looks of things, although it isn't what you would call news to those who read the Alternative media.

Anyway, it seems now that Hopeless Harry has responded to the Chimps incessant requests for her to answer their questions on hers and her houseboy, Jack Dopey's involvement with the Paedophile Information Exchange.

And in typical politician fashion, she answered in the only way she knows how... She lied through her back teeth.

I'm now more convinced than ever that her and Jack – already in trouble over another matter – are for the chop. Sadly, it goes without saying that they will be well looked after for taking one for the team... Perverted cunts.

# But they still won't say sorry: Labour's Harman and Dromey finally break their silence over links to paedophile group

- Labour's deputy leader Harriet Harman finally broke silence
- Mounting pressure to explain link to Paedophile Information Exchange
- Came while holding key roles in the National Council for Civil Liberties
- Miss Harman said revelations were 'politically-motivated smear campaign'

By [MICHAEL SEAMARK](#) and [GUY ADAMS](#)

**PUBLISHED:** 22:41, 24 February 2014 | **UPDATED:** 23:24, 24 February 2014

Labour's deputy leader Harriet Harman finally broke her silence yesterday over her links with a paedophile group.

Miss Harman, her MP husband Jack Dromey, and former Health Secretary Patricia Hewitt have been under mounting pressure to explain the connections to the Paedophile Information Exchange while holding key roles in the National Council for Civil Liberties.

The pressure group granted 'affiliate' status to PIE, a notorious group of predatory paedophiles.



+6

The BBC was accused yesterday of keeping the growing paedophilia scandal from the airwaves in order to protect the Labour Party

Last night Miss Harman dismissed the revelations as a 'politically-motivated smear campaign' and offered no apology over the NCCL's extraordinary relationship with the PIE.

That is despite the fact that Shami Chakrabarti, current director of Liberty – the new name for NCCL – has previously issued an apology for the links with PIE.

In a statement Miss Harman said: 'They have accused me of being an apologist for child sex abuse, of supporting a vile

paedophile organisation, of having a relaxed attitude to paedophilia and of watering down child pornography laws.

## More...

- [Not one hint of remorse: Harman and Dromey's statements, and the Mail's replies](#)
- [Harman wasn't so quiet on Savile scandal: Deputy Labour leader toured TV and radio stations](#)
- [How much longer can paedophilia apologists stay silent? Even Left demands answers from senior Labour trio over links to child sex group](#)
- [BBC's censorship of paedophilia scandal 'reveals its left-wing bias': Corporation accused of refusing to report story to protect the Labour party](#)

'These are horrific allegations and I strongly deny all of them.'

The Mail discovered that during the 1970s and 80s, Miss Hewitt described PIE – granted formal 'affiliate' status from 1975 to the mid-Eighties – in glowing terms as 'a campaigning/counselling group for adults attracted to children'.

NCCL archives showed how the pressure group lobbied Parliament for the age of sexual consent to be cut to ten if the child consented and 'understood the nature of the act'. It also called for incest to be legalised in what one MP called a 'Lolita's charter'.



+6

Silence: Until now Miss Harman has said only that the Mail's story is 'untrue and ridiculous' but has refused to answer any questions, as have her husband, Jack Dromey (pictured), and their Labour colleague Patricia Hewitt

The NCCL – now the respected Liberty – filed a submission to Parliament claiming that 'childhood sexual experiences, willingly engaged in, with an adult, result in no identifiable damage'.

Miss Harman, as NCCL legal officer, tried to water down child pornography laws. NCCL lawyers acted for PIE members who were questioned by police over their disgusting behaviour.



+6

Former health secretary Patricia Hewitt was general secretary of the NCCL from 1974-83

Miss Hewitt was general secretary of the NCCL from 1974-83, Miss Harman was a newly qualified solicitor when she became its legal officer in 1978 until 1982, when she entered Parliament. Mr Dromey sat on the NCCL executive committee for almost a decade from 1970 to 1979.

Police are investigating PIE as part of Operation Fernbridge, launched after the Jimmy Savile affair, with one source saying there is evidence that PIE members were abusing children 'on an industrial scale'.

The Home Office is also carrying out a 'thorough, independent investigation' into shocking claims that the Labour government of the 1970s may have helped finance the notorious group.

Ever since December, when The Mail first investigated the

NCCL's links to the paedophile lobby, we have been sending detailed questions to Miss Harman, Miss Hewitt and Mr Dromey about their links to PIE and whether they now regret supporting such a group. Miss Hewitt has still to respond but Miss Harman – after initially dismissing the story as 'untrue and ridiculous' – and her husband finally issued a statement via the Labour Party yesterday.

Miss Harman denied allegations that she supported lowering the age of consent to ten or opposed the law on incest – despite the Mail investigation never having made such a claim. Instead this newspaper stated that the NCCL, which she joined in 1978, had controversially lobbied on these issues two years earlier.

She also said that an allegation that she sought in 1978 to water down a proposed ban on child pornography was untrue.

Responding to the NCCL's decision to grant 'affiliate's status to the notorious paedophile group, Miss Harman said: 'The Mail have tried to make me guilty by way of guilt by association.

'When I was at NCCL there were around 6,000 members and nearly 1,000 affiliated organisations of which PIE was one.

'I was aware that because NCCL opposed censorship and supported gay rights, paedophiles had sought to exploit that and use NCCL as a vehicle to make their arguments. But by the time I came to work for NCCL this vile organisation had already been vigorously challenged within the organisation.'

Please quote this reference  
on all correspondence HH

BRIEFING PAPER ON PROTECTION OF CHILDREN BILL

1. The NCCL deplors the exploitation of children, whether in the form of use in commercial pornography or as victims of sexual assaults. It is a proper function of criminal law to deter those who would entice or influence children to participate in activities which may occasion them psychological harm. Although this harm may be of a somewhat speculative nature, where participation falls short of physical assault, it is none-the-less justifiable to restrain activities by photographers which involve placing children under the age of 14 (or, arguably, 16) in sexual situations.

2. The NCCL equally deplors moves for greater censorship which aim to deprive citizens of reading or viewing material which is demonstrably harmless, and may have an educational, therapeutic or entertainment value. Action to limit public affront to sexual modesty, and commercial exploitation by sexist pandering, sometimes proceeds from the worthiest of motives, but it may simply be inspired by a bigoted attempt to destroy proper sex education programmes or to restrain artistic endeavour. Any legislation in this area must strike a careful balance, and ensure that improper censorship does not result from loose drafting and conceptual inadequacy.

3. After careful scrutiny of the Protection of Children Bill and bearing the above principles in mind, we have come to the conclusion that the looseness of the Bill's statutory language could permit damaging and indeed absurd prosecutions, and encourage an increase in censorship in areas which could not possibly be for the public interest.

4. The Bill is based on the word "indecent". But case law defines "indecent" as highly elastic.

"An offence against recognised standards of propriety at the lowest end of the scale."

"Indecency is not confined to sexual indecency: indeed, it is difficult to find any limit short of saying that it includes anything which an ordinary decent man or woman would find to be shocking, disgusting and revolting."

(R.V. Knuller, 1973 AC 433)

This judicial definition reveals how extraordinarily and unacceptably wide could be the net to be cast by the new Bill: "ordinary modesty

+6

1978 briefing: The NCCL legal officer Harriet Harman wrote this briefing paper on the Protection of Children Bill, which sought to ban child pornography. She argued that it would lead to an 'increase in censorship'

of the average man" is probably "offended" by pictures of war casualties, by many "Private Eye" covers, by criticisms of the monarchy and a great deal of political writing and social speculation, which although controversial, has never before had its free dissemination threatened. In sexual matters, the Lord Chief Justice has made it quite clear that the naked human body is considered "indecent" in judicial eyes (see R.V. Stanley 1965) and his comments were applied by the trial judge in the Oz case when directing his jury on the question of whether sending the magazine to its subscribers constituted an offence against the Post Office Act:

"Indecent means unbecoming and immodest, and indecent is at the bottom end of the scale ... If you are on the beach with your children and a woman takes off her clothes, that is indecent. We just don't do that sort of thing in this country. Or let us say that you were attending an athletic or sporting event and the athletes, beautiful physiques though they may have, have not got clothing which fits properly, and as they perform you see their private parts, this is indecent."

The last occasion on which Parliament considered the term "indecent" was the ill-fated Cinematograph and Indecent Displays Bill of 1973. There was wide discussion during the Committee stage of the Bill as to whether it would include page 3 pinups in The Sun newspaper, "raspberries" blown at public meetings, contraceptives, public safety films of road accidents, or television documentaries showing naked and starving victims of the famine in Ethiopia. In answer to Parliamentary questioning on 9th May 1973, the then Home Secretary, Roy Jenkins, gave his reasons for the Labour Government refusal to re-introduce the Bill. He said: "The Bill came apart in the Committee ... The term "indecent" has no meaningful definition and should not be part of any criminal statute."

We therefore suggest that the term "indecent" be qualified as follows:-

"A photograph or film shall not for this purpose be considered indecent (a) by reason only that the model is in a state of undress (whether complete or partial); (b) unless it is proved or is to be inferred from the photograph or film that the making of the photograph or film might reasonably be expected to have caused the model physical harm or pronounced psychological or emotional disorder."

This could form a new subsection 1(1)(ii) and the present section 1(1)(ii) should become section 1(1)(iii) and so on.

Not only is "indecent" an extremely low test, but "production" is very widely defined. The combination of these two terms means that a prosecution could be brought under the Bill as at present drafted:-

- (a) against a married couple who take a photograph of their child in the nude and later show it to a friend, who puts it on display in his room;

Argument: The second page contains a paragraph saying that a picture should not be considered indecent if the model was not harmed

GAEL PAPERS 2/25 3

- (b) against those who use photographs of nude children in legitimate sex education material. Many textbooks contain pictures of young people showing reproductive organs in the course of explaining sexual hygiene. It is difficult to understand how sexual development can be properly explained to young people without photographs of people of their own age, and these photographs could, on present legal authority, be characterised as indecent.
- (c) against the makers of films designed to expose and eliminate corruption and exploitation of children. Films like 'Johnny come home' which revealed how young boys are preyed upon in London inevitably include some indecent elements. The purpose of this type of documentary film is to shock, to jolt members of the public out of their complacency by showing scenes which should disgust and revolt ordinary decent people. The Bill as presently drafted would permit such film makers to be prosecuted because a popular television documentary could not be described as 'learned study'.

If the Bill is amended to qualify indecency along the lines we suggest, such prosecutions would not succeed unless the child was actually harmed.

As at present drafted the Bill places the onus of proof on the defendant to show that the film or photograph was possessed with a view to "scientific or learned study". Our amendment places the onus of proof on the prosecution to show that the child was actually harmed. If our amendment was accepted, Section 4 should be deleted altogether.

5. We consider Section 3 (seizure and destruction powers) to be far wider than is necessary. A court can order the forfeiture of material seized by the police even it has not formed part of the evidence that has led to the conviction. We understand that the Home Secretary has proposed an amendment which would replace this section with provisions similar to those in Section 3 of the Obscene Publications Act. NCCL has criticised Section 3 of the Obscene Publications Act and could not endorse the inclusion of similar provisions in this Bill, because:

- (i) The defendant would have to prove his/her innocence, i.e. when the police seize the material it would be for the defendant to prove that it was not indecent;
- (ii) The defendant would have no right to call for a jury to decide whether the material was indecent;
- (iii) The operation of destruction orders would vary from area to area, depending almost wholly on the police attitude.

We would therefore suggest that only material which has formed part of the evidence leading to a conviction should be subject to a destruction order. We would propose that the Bill be amended by deleting "whether or not it has formed part of the evidence which led to the conviction" and substituting "if it formed part of the evidence which led to the conviction".

Recommendations: Miss Harman's briefing went on that the NCCL would argue that the Bill to protect children should be amended

She added: 'The reason I decided to go to work for NCCL was because I actively supported the work they had done and in particular the work of their women's rights committee on the Equal Pay Act, on the introduction of the Sex Discrimination Act and for greater protection of victims of domestic violence and against race discrimination.'

Mr Dromey said: 'During my time on the NCCL executive, I was at the forefront of repeated public condemnations of PIE and their despicable views.'

'The accusations of the Daily Mail are untrue and beneath contempt.'

Labour leader Ed Miliband defended his deputy. He said: 'Harriet Harman is somebody of huge decency and integrity. I know she has a long and proud record of being on the right side of all of these issues.' Last night the Mail said: 'For ten weeks now the Mail has repeatedly asked three leading Labour figures to answer questions about the involvement of the NCCL, a body in which they played leading roles, with a vile paedophile group whose actions are currently being investigated by the police.'

'The belated statements today of Miss Harman and her husband – full of pedantry and obfuscation – failed to answer the Mail's central points and deny allegations the Mail has not made.'

'More pertinently they have failed to utter a word of contrition or sorrow about the NCCL's closeness to the notorious Paedophile Information Exchange, an organisation that validated the activities of a monster like Jimmy Savile. Nor do they utter a word of apology to the victims of PIE.'

'In stark contrast, Shami Chakrabarti, the director of Liberty, which took over the NCCL's mantle, has condemned the historic links with PIE as a "source of continuing disgust and horror".'

'As for smears, it is a newspaper's job to ask awkward and controversial questions – questions that in this instance are still awaiting a satisfactory answer.'

Read

more: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2567054/But-wont-say-sorry-Labours-Harman-Dromey-finally-break-silence-links-paedophile-group.html#ixzz2uJ6t0HnP>

Follow us: [@MailOnline on Twitter](#) | [DailyMail on Facebook](#)