

# Exaggeration, DEI, and the Bar

by [Sean Bw Parker](#) (November 2024)



The Reluctant Bride [detail] (Auguste Toulmouche, 1866)

When you criticise a progressive ideologue they can get depressed, aggressive, then might cry. It seems increasingly the same for politicians and establishment organisations. Whether it's Jess Phillips, Caroline Nokes, Leyla Moran or Emily Thornberry, their confidence in the rightness of their own progressive opinions brooks no dissent or criticism, increasingly conflating the two.

This dissent may come in the form of humour, snark, satire, or frank messages reframed as 'abuse,' but the constitutional fact of having been represented to listen to and voice the opinions of the people appears to have been lost in

Parliament. Charity bosses and spokespeople, usually trauma-informed (damaged themselves) ideologues have mastered the same tactic, which is essentially antagonise the 'other,' then cry bully when any criticism comes back over the fence.

Many people involved in false allegations have experienced the trauma of being falsely accused or wrongfully convicted themselves. Many who are bureaucratically responsible for those allegations and convictions are themselves carrying trauma—either true, invented or excavated in therapy—so being trauma-informed as a professional virtue cuts both ways.

Diversity, equity and inclusion policies, now mandated and incentivized across all of culture, brings its own challenges in the shape of neurodiversity (ND). ND covers the autism spectrum and attention deficit and hyperactivity disorder, whose diagnoses have led to an 'epidemic' of mental health in youth over the last few years.

The professions, social media and Asperger's Syndrome—high-functioning autism—are in a kind of awkward stand-off, where newly moralistic black-and-white thinking lawyers call out others in their profession online rather than doing it professionally in the courts. This has led to a sort of online bloodbath in front of everyone, where all profits go to Silicon Valley rather than Temple chambers.

Journalists and doctors seem just as liable to bite—or to build up large followings—from expounding on everything from the Lucy Letby case to endlessly bemoaning Brexit, and show an astonishing lack of impulse control in their online reactions to what is essential professional rhetorical rivalry—but with a grim, troll-like, technological edge.

As of Summer 2024, the UK appears to have media-justice ideologues in charge of its Ministry of Justice, using the rhetoric of the radical feminist of the ages. The MoJ seems determined to keep the message all about Violence Against

Women and Girls, even when most reliable studies show a 50/50 liability for domestic violence, with women starting more of it—even if men do more damage when they do it/respond to it. The Victims Commissioner's near-constant non-acknowledgement of male victims is deafening.

The majority of reported sexual abuse takes place in the home, but you wouldn't know it from the proliferation of *Ask For Angela*-type messaging all over Transport for London and in every pub across the land. Exaggeration as media-justice strategy used to be a tactic of pressure groups and tabloid editors, but now it is the strategy of the elite legal-political class, pretending they are a minority (women of colour) when they hold pretty much all the power. There are now numerous articles pointing out that it is men and boys doing worse in every metric, with young white working-class males doing worse of all.



Rhetorical extrapolation is the name of the fame in online discourse—which is answering a point with ad-hominem insults, or points unrelated or narrowly related to the point being made, as a debating tactic. Oxford House rules are out, only winning is in, and then even only the appearance of winning,

as that will be reported first. If the winner is wrong and apologises, that is not hot news, so will be relegated to the bottom of page five, or be a tweet that gets only five 'likes' and shares as opposed the million garnered by the original story.

Justice reform organisations are mostly part of the charity sector, so rely on progressive cause funding from government, whose civil service is preoccupied with things like DEI, VAWG etc, and distributes monies accordingly. This means wages and associated gifts, which may not be why the actors got involved in the first place, but makes the staying in the game much more attractive. Their training has also been soaked in gender studies—which is entirely one-way—since at least the 1990s.

However their vision of justice reform—based on rehabilitation, kindness to prisoners, reducing numbers of women in prison, getting men to admit to ways they didn't realise they had—is in opposition to maintaining innocence stances, which necessarily attack the structures of the justice system itself. These organisations claim they are trying to help men—95% of people in prisons, with one third of the UK population of such having a criminal record—'be better,' without acknowledging core realities of masculinity and maleness.

The 'offender-centric' system, currently operated by probation, makes no allowance for maintaining innocence unless the 'nominal' is under appeal—and then only grudgingly. Unnecessary scrutiny is based on 'crime prevention,' but there will obviously be less reoffending if the person didn't commit the index offence in the first place, and preventing much normal life activity will obviously lead to less recidivism (actual or invented).

The bar for becoming an Andy Malkinson, Brian Buckle or Postmaster in terms of exoneration is incredibly high, and

requires patience, determination, ingenuity and a good dose of obsession—it would be much easier and cheaper to throw hands in the air and say ‘I did my best, I give up.’ But this exhausted reaction is exactly what the Ministry of Justice works and relies on.

Granting appeals and exonerations is expensive, embarrassing and reputationally damaging. Better to make sure the system is as vague, bureaucratic and blame-culture-ish in the first place, thus inuring as much as possible to criticism. These same legals will be on X by the evening, moralising for clicks if they’ve won a case—or are preparing to do so—because, as in the professions now as in politics, all is ‘optics.’

Let’s talk about (alleged) sex (offences). There is now no overt persecution of gays in the British system, but there is persecution of being ‘in the closet,’ as seen in the cases of Kevin Spacey, Philip Schofield, and Huw Edwards. These are high profile men with secret appetites and habits, sometimes going through various levels of breakdown on different networks, so their PR companies could also settle old scores with each other.

Whether it’s drunkenly propositioning someone, going down an ‘images’ rabbithole, or having an affair with a younger colleague, no human frailty will go unpublished by a moralising media that can near end lives. The nature of crime and intent have shifted dramatically through the 21st century to being often interchangeable. If questioned, accusations of victim-blaming start to fly and the lawyers themselves being accused of being ‘bullies,’ in the same way as the lone nutter sending drunken death threats/allusions on Facebook.

Mohammed Fayed joins Jimmy Savile, Lucien Freud, and Picasso in the new power dynamics of rape and/or abuse allegations from beyond the grave, untried but demonised as if ‘do not speak ill of the dead’ was just a toxic, centuries-old truism.

The term 'nonce' is thrown about as if it's the worst insult in the world on social media—its origin in prison slang 'Not On Normal Courtyard Exercise,' for fear of being attacked—leading to the barmy 'Bike Nonce' trend for presenter Jeremy Vine, pilloried in this rhetorical extrapolation way for winning a harassment case (and possibly as social punishment for Covid-era messaging).

A potential Kamala-Keir future bodes badly for free speech, as both leaders share a smiling enthusiasm for woke authoritarianism, the virtue-signalling end of postmodern totalitarianism. A century of feminist and civil rights progress culminating in a Kamala Harris Democrats presidency would be a fitting conclusion to a process that has done more to harm the west than any other—from within, as white male heterodox masculinity has been steadily demonised for the latter fifty of them.

All that said, nothing in this world is as black and white as the Spectrum Moralists would like to pretend from behind their keyboards, so in keeping things objective, here are Ten Post-Feminist Women to Follow:

1 Janice Fiamengo—Canadian academic, pitch perfect reports of feminism-gone-wrong on her Studio B YouTube channel.

<https://www.youtube.com/@StudioBrule>

2 Joanna Williams—British Times, Spectator, Mail writer, founder of CIEO think tank, voice of rationality against the wokerati media. <https://cieo.substack.com/>

3 Bettina Arndt—Ferocious Australian truth-teller to one of the world's most femi-captured social systems.

<https://bettinaarndt.substack.com/>

4 Claire Best—Anglo-American documentary filmmaker, researcher and journalist, motivated by identity-political corruption and Title IX abuses.

[https://medium.com/@claire\\_22581](https://medium.com/@claire_22581)

5 Charlotte Housebunny—British men’s rights activist and influencer, fitting in to no one’s box but regularly calling out ideological hypocrisy.  
<https://x.com/mensrightsbunny>

6 Debora Montesoro—calm and measured deliverer of sex-war statistics on X, dismantling femi-myths one false claim at a time. <https://x.com/DeboraMontesoro>

7 Elizabeth Hobson—active in the Justice for Men & Boys party/organisation for some years, proudly media-visible.  
[https://x.com/anti\\_fembot](https://x.com/anti_fembot)

8 Odette Van Rensburg—South African documentary filmmaker, director of Bonfire Of Agreed Terms, MenToo and chronicler of legendary (and ousted) Women’s Aid founder Erin Pizzey.  
<https://x.com/DogsontheRunDoc>

9 Elizabeth Yeld—strident voice of the falsely accused and wrongfully convicted on X, member of False Allegations Forum. <https://x.com/lizyeld>

10 Paula Wright—evolutionary biologist and academic, pricker of hubristic balloons, interviewer of Dilbert creator and commentator Scott Adams.  
<https://paulawright.substack.com/>.

## **[Table of Contents](#)**

Sean Bw Parker (MA) is an artist and writer on justice reform. His ninth book, [A Delicate Balance Of Reason](#), is available here.

**Follow NER on Twitter [@NERIconoclast](#)**