

**Response to letter from Chief Executive Officer John Mothersole.
Reference JM/DC/2897 Date 17 March 2009
Corporate, Institutional, Council Corruption – Sheffield – Part 2**

Author Martin Brighton 1 April 2009

Press embargo, 1700 010409

Conclusion

The letter from John Mothersole dated 17 March 2009 further confirms the corruption that is rife throughout Sheffield City Council, lead from the top down, and out of control. Because John Mothersole has signed the letter, he shall be held accountable.

This part two shows how Common Purpose is associated with council corruption. The abuses of the Freedom of Information Act, not least by blatant lies, are also described. The frauds of Harry Hunter are demonstrated. There is also reference to the lies of Council Leader Paul Scriven.

Summary of Response

The letter signed by John Mothersole is a series of lies, deceits, and fabrications consistent with the cover-up of crimes that include harassment, systematic abuse, forgery, fraud, corruption, and conspiracy to pervert the course of justice. As a device, this light response is as though written to John Mothersole.

Cheating when dealing with complaints.

It has been explained to you how council officers whose unacceptable behaviour has lead to complaints have ghost-written letters containing lies in the name of other officers. The legal department is the worst offender. What has happened is that, when a complaint is made about that person's behaviour, the person dealing with the complaint is the same person that is being complained about. This is corrupt practice. In addition, and again from the legal department, especially Elizabeth Mary Bashforth and Peter Harrow, letters designed to frustrate the Freedom of Information Act, lying and deceiving, are used to cover up council corruption.

Cheating when dealing with Fol requests.

It is also noted that, for example part D in your letter of 17 March, your ghost-writer makes deliberately unnecessary requests for 'clarification' as part of the policy of obfuscation and secrecy. The requests are clear, as are the contemporaneously provided details provided. These constant and ongoing attempts at unlawful delay and deceit are interpreted as being nothing more than a stupid game by your officers. Why do they think they are so safe?

Common Purpose.

It is necessary here to describe some aspects of the practices of Common Purpose, and how association with Common Purpose (CP) is integral to the corruption in this council.

CP is a networking organisation. There is no networking carried out by council officers, or council associated organisations, that could not be carried out without CP. You, John Mothersole, said to the Audit Commission that CP was good for promoting the city, yet there is no promotion that could not be done without CP.

The question must therefore be, why have CP at all?

CP's own literature boasts that CP can control a major city if it has the right people in place.

CP graduates are chosen among leaders and potential leaders for their benefit to CP, and trained at ratepayers' expense, for which the council has conceded is of no demonstrable financial benefit to the ratepayer.

According to this council's protocols, CP is a secret society, and all those associated with CP have a statutory duty to declare. This council unlawfully refuses point blank to release a list of CP graduates, officers, members, or associates. Those in receipt of training, according to CP, agree that their names, company position and employer details may be published. Yet this council still refuses to comply with the law.

CP holds its meetings, in ratepayer time, in ratepayer funded premises such as the Town Hall, under 'Chatham House' rules, i.e. secrecy. These meetings include but are not limited to including CP graduates from Yorkshire Forward, Voluntary Action Sheffield, OFFER, Primary Care Trusts, Police, Government Office of Yorkshire and the Humber, etc.

There is no meeting that could not be held by these people and organisations that could not be held in an open and transparent manner.

To rub salt in this festering wound, CP, having trained its graduates at ratepayers' expense, CP then enjoys the unwitting ratepayers' hospitality at its meetings.

So we are back to the question, why CP?

The answer is mind-numbingly simple – power !

CP graduates are taught to lead beyond their authority.

CP meetings facilitate exercising influence, interest and control upon the graduates' employers, whilst unlawfully bypassing statutory democratic processes, avoiding transparency and accountability, and imposing the pre-set agenda of top-down controlled social engineering.

To add insult to ratepayers' injury, these meetings coach on how to avoid compliance with the Freedom of Information Act, promote their own 'services', and unlawfully elicit financially binding arrangements upon the host authority whilst avoiding scrutiny.

Meanwhile, the vast majority of elected members are kept blissfully unaware. To quite a large extent, CP is running this council as a government agent.

I will now turn to your letter of 17 March. This is what you wrote:

“C: Senior Council Officers Lying to me to Avoid FOIA Compliance

No recorded information exists that you made a previous request in respect of Common Purpose; the misunderstanding for which I apologise, arose because of confusion with the numerous other requests that you have made for information featured in the Annual Accounts.

The Council annually funds one corporate place on a Common Purpose training scheme, and the cost of the most recent course for the most recent complete financial year was £3,084, including VAT.”

Well, not only does this ghost-written response repeatedly lie, it even lies about its lies!

There was no confusion. A legitimate request for information was unlawfully refused on the false grounds that the same requests had been made to other council officers. This type of behaviour has become Common. Both Elizabeth Mary Bashforth and Peter Harrow have copies of my reply to this lie, and my copy of the request to Peter Harrow requiring him to name these officers, and reveal what they said about me. No confusion, just a lie. My letters, as is so often the case with Elizabeth Mary Bashforth, were simply ignored. As for the FOIA request for the names and details, this was also ignored, thus again showing that this council has nothing but contempt for the law. The audit commission has criticised Elizabeth Mary Bashforth for refusing to respond.

Now let us look at what you, as signatory, wrote about Common Purpose Training for last full accounting year: Cost: £3084 Number: **ONE**

After the intervention of the Audit Commission, I was given the following figures for council expenditure on Common Purpose training, in a letter dated 16 September 2008:

2007 / 08 £8250 Officers attending: 3

2008 / 09 £3125 Officers attending: 3

Oh dear! What is it about Common Purpose that, whenever there are requests for information, it is either denied, or the council has lied.

Note also that the council has refused to identify who receives Common Purpose training at ratepayers' expense. What is there to be so ashamed of? Why the secrecy?

The answer to this is also simple, Common Purpose graduates in Sheffield City Council are involved with corruption, cover-up, and systematic abuse.

Here is what you wrote in your letter of 17 March 2009:

E. Failure to reply with information to correspondence of 16 March 2008

In your letter of 16 March 2008 you requested: *(i.e. I requested of the council) "Could you please arrange for the provision of the relevant documents showing that Harry Hunter was supporting the Community Annexe with a small lottery bid, and that he was doing so with the prior consultation with, and consent from, the elected management of the Annexe."*

Mr Hunter's role was to explore additional sources of funding of the service at the Annexe, so supporting a lottery bid on behalf of the Annexe fell within that remit. However his role was supporting, not making the application, so that if the Community Annexe did not proceed with a lottery bid, as appears to be the case, then no recorded information would have generated in the first place."

The above statement from the council, for which you are the signatory, is by far the worst collection of blatant lies in your letter of 17 March 2009.

Firstly, you are responding to a FoI request of 16 March 2008 – and which no doubt you would have continued to ignore but for the reminders. This is but one way in which this council treats the FoIA with contempt.

Looking now at the lies of your reply:

Mr. Hunter had NO remit whatsoever to interfere with Lowedges Community Annexe. His fraudulently Eurofunded remit was to push through the council's agenda for Lowedges on behalf of the corrupt Lowedges Forum. What is more, Harry Hunter was required to make regular reports, which this citizen now has. Harry Hunter said he was working with Lowedges Annexe. He was not. He was, with council support, supporting a bid for the Cabbage Patch, which was created with council support through Christopher Dean as part of the council's campaign to remove Sheila Brighton.

There are many council records available.

A complaint was made about the behaviour of Harry Hunter to Peter Moore. As was so often the case, the complaint was ignored.

Paul Scriven was also given full details in 2002. He ignored the facts.

The Cabbage Patch asked to extend its sessions. Details were not given.

When they were given, they were replacements for the sessions already provided by Lowedges Playgroup, run by Sheila Brighton, i.e. the original remit, as supported by Councillor Chris Tutt. The Annexe refused. The council threatened sanctions. The Cabbage Patch conceded that the application and funding had been sought before even informing the Annexe. However, the Annexe was already aware of this, as the council had approved the flyposting of Lowedges three months earlier with an announcement of the new forthcoming arrangements for the Cabbage Patch. The forum, with council support, tried to force through the scheme. They failed. Councillor Tutt eventually conceded that the application for funds for the Cabbage Patch was flawed. It was at this time that Michael Bowles and Councillor Tutt announced that 'The Annexe was finished!' Councillor Tutt had said something similar earlier, when the corrupt woman abuser Don Henderson was asked to leave the Annexe after lying about his status and attempting to force through the forum's / council's plans.

Robert Kerslake supported the fraud, corruption and abuses. He refused to deny that the corrupt forum had a power of influence, interest and control over the Annexe. He personally supported the abusers.

Jan Wilson did deny that the forum had rights of influence, interest and control over the Annexe (and later over the tenants and residents association (TARA) , which the forum falsely claimed was a forum member) but supported Don Henderson and his take-over attempts throughout.

The council supported the forum and its now effective successful control of the TARA, following a cowboy trial / kangaroo court, arranged by Sheffield Homes and supported by the council. The council's personnel now head up the LibDem devolution project!

GOYH agreed that there was no basis for saying that the forum could claim community support, but urged, rather menacingly, that 'primacy' be acceded to the forum.

Peter Moore made it clear that he thought the take-over of the Annexe by the corrupt forum was fair game.

Councillors Moore, Tutt, Ross, Smith, among others, supported the forum, even when they were presented with the documents showing the corruption. Ross was an original forum management committee member. Tutt signed the knowingly fraudulent application to the Charity Commission as a trustee.

It has already been shown earlier how the council's plans for the forum to control the Annexe and convert it to a commercial forerunner of a SureStart Centre required the removal of existing provision, and the council has this documentation – which in many cases it generated itself.

The original application for the Cabbage Patch, prepared by Harry Hunter for his alleged niece, was for £3800. (It was instructive to receive copies of his applications!) The Cabbage Patch leader attempted to state that she had the permission of the Annexe. This was untrue, and was a lie on the application. Indeed, in Harry Hunters own report, approved by the council, he writes: "Accommodation difficulties may jeopardise a substantial outcome."

In terms of council records, we can now refer to the Early Years Development Plan (EYDP) , and the falsified documents submitted on behalf of the Cabbage Patch, which claimed:

- Claimed that funding was needed to increase child attendance – LIE – the proposed funding was to replace the sessions provided by Lowedges Playgroup

- Claimed that Lowedges Annexe had a lettings policy in place that allowed the Cabbage Patch to operate – LIE – the terms of the lease did not permit sub-letting (when the Cabbage Patch was told of this council officers threatened the Annexe if it did not agree to the sub-letting, whilst at the same time threatening that if the Annexe breached the terms of the lease it would take over the Annexe and cede control to its nominated group (i.e. its forum)
- Claimed that the Cabbage Patch had permission from the management of Lowedges Annexe – LIE – the only permission was from Sheffield City Council, supporting its corrupt forum, of which Cabbage Patch was a member and the Cabbage Patch leader was a trustee (and alleged niece of Harry Hunter)
- No mention that Lowedges Playgroup was already operating in Lowedges Annexe (another unlawful and fraudulent omission)
- The DfEE had ALREADY APPROVED the EYDP application.
- This council had ALREADY approved the application from Harry Hunter.
- David Blunkett, at the time head of the DfEE, who supported the corrupt forum imposter chair and chair of Dore Labour Party, Don Henderson, was one of the major players in a failed attempt at imposing a national ban on this citizen's access to Freedom of Information requests throughout the civil service, citing that he had the authority to do so on the grounds that this citizen was a constituent of his (WOW ! – how big do the lies have to get?) and that this citizen was the chair of an organisation (WOW, another massive porky !). After he was sacked for the second time GOYH released the documents, e-mails, correspondence, false statements, etc.

The Cabbage Patch, having already received ERDF money, when it failed its take-over attempt, despite the corruption, abuses of Sheila Brighton and constant sabotage of Lowedges Playgroup, moved to the local park pavilion, and from there went to Heeley for a short while, amid publicity in The Star showing support from Meg Munn, MP.

Similar lies are also contained within the ERDF applications made by Harry Hunter for Eurofunds, i.e. council sponsored corruption. The recorded input of Common Purpose graduates is integral to this corruption.

Therefore, in this regard as the others, the letter you signed lied about the status of corrupt council agent and saboteur Harry Hunter, and lied about the implication of there being no records.

The supporting documents to the above fraud and corruption involving Harry Hunter are already with South Yorkshire Police. SYP have confirmed that they have this evidence. However, as the local police constabulary is itself institutionally corrupt, there is no possibility of a prosecution.

Returning to the issue of contempt for FoIA, please refer to the letter to Elizabeth Mary Bashforth, dated 5 February 2008. It was ignored.

Here is an extract from that 10 page letter:

“Would you please arrange for all material that comes under the purview of the FoIA, and within your Legal Department, with respect to me, to be provided without undue delay.”

Needless to say, the letter was not even acknowledged, let alone answered. Later, Paul Scriven, at Full Council, when asked to explain why FoIA requests were being ignored, directed that Mary Elizabeth Bashforth dealt with the outstanding requests. There was absolutely no possibility whatsoever of such happening. When this citizen, again at Full Council, complained about the lack of response and his failure to keep to his word – which resulted in a complaint against him being raised – instead of identifying Elizabeth Mary Bashforth as the source of the trouble, merely lambasted this citizen and suggested that this citizen contact the Information Commissioner. In this case it was the same department that was responsible for processing the complaint that was the underlying cause of the complaint, i.e. another corrupt stitch-up.

On 12 March 2008, at Full Council, the question was asked, “Why can’t Lowedges have a SureStart Centre in Lowedges?” The reply did not answer the question. In May 2008, there was a change in administration. The question was asked again. It has now been made clear by Andrew Sangar, after a lying written ghost-written response from Peter Harrow, that he has no intention of answering the question. Please ensure that this question is truthfully answered without any further delay, as the required answer is unlawfully late.

The following principle applies:

Those who fail to act appropriately when faced with corruption, or condone in any way those known to be corrupt, become, by definition, corrupt themselves.

Consistently, it has been shown that:

This council is corrupt. The corruption is absolute, lead from the top down, and out of control. Being rotten to the core and from the core, everything it touches it taints. Having neither the will nor ability to change, outside intervention is indicated.

Please ensure that the outstanding Subject Access Request upon the Office of the Leader of the Council is now processed immediately. It is already unlawfully late.

Could you please ensure that, where applicable, questions put to Cabinet that are also unlawfully late for a response, are answered truthfully in full and without any further delay.

May I take this opportunity of thanking you for insisting that my positive contribution to the Full Council was directed to Councillor David Baker on 1 April 2009. The squirming and flailing of Paul Scriven was noted when the following statement was made:

“There would be many advantages, not least the public seeing the futility of the denial that this citizen was falsely accused of making allegations of child abuse when a third party was exposed, followed by the council’s blocking of access to the film, from the department whose director is a member of that third party.” (The ‘third party’ is Common Purpose)

As you aware, this referred to the incident on 5 November 2008 when the leader not only abused his position to bully this citizen, but publicly lied about this citizen. You are also aware of his continued, clumsy and futile attempts at written denials and further untrue public denial at Full Council in February. The formal complaint is therefore upheld, and the tawdry and amateurish attempts to cover up the complaint, and pervert the process, has now become a national disgrace. The Star accurately quoted Paul Scriven, and the accuracy of the quote was confirmed, yet The Star documents were NOT included – deliberately when the complaint was presented by the legal department for pre-assessment. What was presented were the recorded minutes, which at best a paraphrased summary, and in any case do not constitute evidence of something NOT having been said or done. This is another clear case of corruption on the part of the legal department. There is absolutely nothing stopping you from making a public statement that the complaint is upheld, and indeed your own probity may be questioned should you fail to sack the current Monitoring Officer / City Solicitor.

However, thanks are due to you for your action yesterday, which was seen as a kindness so as to prevent the Council Leader from making a further embarrassment of himself in front of the Council Chamber, his colleagues, the public and the press.

It is expected that, because of his bullying and lies, and attempts at cover-up, he shall not be allowed to continue to be a liability to his party, or an embarrassment to the council. He has let his party down. He has let the council down. Worst of all, he has let himself down.

I look forward to the imminent provision of ALL outstanding information, along with confirmation that you have taken the appropriate actions as indicated in this and the previous correspondence, including the return of the money still owing. It shall be assumed that you shall not permit any of the identified corrupt individuals to be a part of this process.

Yours sincerely,

Martin Brighton