

In Defense of those Falsely Accused



Separation, Edvard Munch, 1896

Persons who commit rape or who (truly) sexually molest a child should be punished and punished harshly. I am stating the obvious right from the start because I know from experience that what I am about to state is going to be misunderstood or deliberately misrepresented.

In the midst of the [Harvey](#) Weinstein maelstrom, as one Hollywood liberal celebrity after another was revealed to be a sexual predator, a story from across the pond was not aired in the American main stream media because it went against the narrative. It involved a young [Brit](#) whose girlfriend frequently emailed him for casual sex, but when he rejected

her, she cried rape; the defense was able to obtain the emails at (literally) the [last](#) minute, *which the prosecutor had suppressed from discovery*. An almost identical [case](#), again from Britain, also surfaced.

Actually, cases like those above are commonplace, they just do not get the publicity that they deserve, simply because they go against the feminist-paranoid [dogma](#) that men are rapists and that “we live in a rape culture.” Occasionally, though, such false accusations blow up in the faces of both the accusers and the accompanying propagandist media. We saw this in the infamous [Rolling Stone](#) hoax, in the [equally](#) infamous [Mattress Girl hoax](#) and, of course, the la [Crosse](#) team case (where the prosecutor and the police *deliberately* falsified facts; see the excellent documentary *Fantastic Lies*).

In regards to the question of sexism and sexual assault, there is a “he said/she said” element—actually, most of it is “she said.” “He said” is usually dismissed contemptuously by the [media](#) and, of course, by the psychotic feminists. Hence the #MeToo bandwagon. But what follows is a list of underreported incidents of alleged sexual assaults by men that, upon investigation, were revealed to have been lies: Facts. This is important, because writing an essay explaining that men are oftentimes victimized by women through false accusations would be automatically swamped by hundreds of essays by feminists countering the premise and pointing to the mythical “patriarchy” and “the rape culture.” But the following cases of fraud are facts. As John Adams once said, “Facts are stubborn things; and whatever may be our wishes, our inclinations, or the dictates of our passions, they cannot alter the state of facts and evidence.”

One can argue endlessly about existence of the delusion of “patriarchy.” Or “the rape culture.” But no one can argue the following cases of fraud existed (and these comprise a *tiny* sample of the cases I have compiled):

- Meagan [Clark](#), a woman in Texas falsely reported that she had been raped by a man posing as a policeman.
- In Miami, [Carla](#) Vasquez called her husband saying she had been kidnapped by two men. Lies. She was having fun with another man. She was arrested.
- A woman had a threesome with two [hockey](#) players whom she later accused of rape. It turned out she lied.
- Black female motorist accused [policeman](#) of rape and solicitation, but body cam video showed otherwise.
- [Nikki](#) Yovino, a Sacred Heart student, had a threesome with [two](#) football athletes, then [later](#) decided to accuse them of rape.
- A USC student was accused of [rape](#). Supposedly, she was too drunk to give consent, but numerous videos showed the woman all over him and leading him to her room.
- A group of girls at [Seneca](#) Valley School District decided to falsely accuse one of the boys in their school of sexual assault simply because they did not like him. He was arrested, then the truth came out. As usual, nothing was done to the girls. They will probably join the #MeToo Movement.
- A woman was having a [sexual](#) threesome when she became furious when one of them started filming the event. Once home, she [called](#) her boyfriend to tell him she had been raped. The boyfriend found one of the men and stabbed him to death.
- Brett Kavanaugh was accused of rape during his SCOTUS confirmation hearing by [Judy](#) Munro-Leighton, who later admitted to lying in order to derail his confirmation. You may remember the [hordes](#) of hysterics during the confirmation hearing. Among other frauds, Christine Blasey Ford has not yet admitted to having lied. She is probably too busy enjoying the one million dollars raised on her behalf to do so.
- Breana Harmon [Talbot](#) of Denison, Texas, had an argument with her fiancé, then went elsewhere where she proceeded to cut herself and afterwards claimed that three blacks

had raped her, which turned out to be a lie. Naturally, as so often happens when the defendant is a woman, she got a slap on the wrist.

- In Portland, Oregon, teacher Dan Domenigoni was accused of the usual by a group of junior high school students who later recanted. They apologized, but he sued them and got \$70,000. [Similarly](#), in Maryland, Ronald Heller, another teacher, was falsely accused by a group of students who later admitted to having lied. The students were criminally charged.
- At James Madison University a student had been dating a [girl](#) who later accused him of sexual assault. The investigation cleared him. She appealed. He was suspended. He took it to court and ultimately won and the university forked over almost a million dollars.
- And, if all of the above is not enough to make one sick, this [one](#) will: a 16 y/o girl in Logan, Utah, called her brother and told [him](#) that a 62 y/o man had molested her on the bus. When the bus stopped and the accused exited, the brother attacked him. The old man [died](#). The camera on the bus proved that she had lied and the man had just been minding his own business.

Needless to say, that some [men](#) have adopted a [hostile reassessment](#) of [women](#).

The question may arise as to why women would consent to sex with a man then later have him arrested for rape. Psychologists have begun studying a curious phenomenon called "[sexual](#) regret." Sexual [regret](#) is manifested in [men](#) by declining the opportunity to have [sex](#) and, what is relevant here, by women regretting having [sex](#) with someone, particularly someone that they just met.

Other such exonerations have taken place in [local](#) areas, which have received scant publicity. Whenever these things happen, we shake our heads in pity at the falsely accused, or in anger at the perpetrators, *but what about those poor souls who have*

been falsely accused (and convicted!), but the "victim" has not recanted and there is no DNA evidence and no emails to disprove accusations? Then, instead of pity or sympathy for the accused, we show anger, disgust and scorn. We snarl, and we insist in persecuting them—even long after they have been punished by the legal system.

Their [numbers](#) are far from few, as can be seen in reading *The Child Abuse Industry* by M. Pride, *The Myth of Repressed Memory* by E. Loftus and *Victims of Memory* by M. Pendergrast, *The Campus Rape Frenzy* by Johnson & Taylor, *The Day Care ritual abuse Moral Panic* by Mary de young, among others. This started with the infamous [McMartin](#) preschool hoax that sparked the whole child abuse hysteria.

The reader may object to showing any consideration, or sympathy, for someone *convicted* of a sex crime. After all, there was a trial. How could an innocent person possibly be found guilty? The justice system is perfection itself. No mistakes are ever made. Witnesses in trials never lie.

Well ... the prosecutor could have destroyed or falsified evidence. The defense lawyer could have been incompetent. The State-appointed appeal lawyer could have been an idiot, or apathetic. Crucial evidence could have disappeared, or suppressed. Witnesses could have lied under oath. The journalists and feminists could have created a climate of hysteria. The jurors may have been composed of morons. The defense lawyer could have pressured his client to plead guilty for a lesser sentence to avoid a possible long prison sentence (so the lawyer could get back to his office). Crucial evidence was not allowed to be introduced at trial under Rules of Evidence. The judge was hostile. And so on.

It is important to understand, though it may be counterintuitive, that truth and especially justice are *irrelevant* in a court of law.

As a forensic psychologist I can assert that, contrary to what you may have constantly heard, or seen in stupid Hollywood movies, convicted criminals rarely claim to be innocent. Before trial, they may not admit guilt as they look for a loophole to get them off. But after being convicted, far from claiming innocence (as some hack writers like Stephen King would have you believe), they *brag* about their crimes. And when a sociologist comes slumming around to prisons to do what sociologists laughingly call “research,” convicts have learned to use sociobabble to say that they made “poor choices” in order to get sympathy, or even privileges.

On the other hand, persons who have been *falsely* convicted of any crime are noted in prisons and jails for driving other inmates and staff up the wall by continually insisting that they are innocent—even long after the trial—and by their constant visits to the institution’s law library. And they even persist in their innocence after they are finally released from incarceration on parole, or after finishing their sentence. At times, when their appeal is sent back to court for another trial and the prosecutor offers them a plea deal of “time served” for a guilty plea (i.e., they can go home), they will opt for a new trial instead of leaving the hellhole that they are in—and, tragically, sometimes they will lose again. An instance of insisting on innocence even when it is counterproductive involved the case of an imprisoned woman (eventually exonerated) in Texas who was sent to solitary by her [quack](#) prison therapist for refusing to admit her “crime” during “therapy.”

The problem that persons accused of a sexual offence find is that from the moment that they are accused to long after they are released from incarceration, no one wants to hear what they have to say.

No one wants to listen.

No one wants to believe.

And in the very, very, rare cases of their retaining a white [collar](#) job, (instead of being relegated to jobs limited to the Untouchable caste) any position or viewpoint that they take (political, vocational, legal, social) is undermined by their legal/social status.

Now, for those individuals whose outlook is black and white with no grey in between what I have written so far has been disturbing, even stressful. They are comfortable—if not happy and self-righteous—hating “sex offenders.” Understandable. It is very stressful to change one’s deeply held opinion on a subject, particularly when strong [emotions](#) are involved.

But let me stir the pot further. When one hears “sex offender,” one immediately interprets that term as being applied to firstly, a repeat offender and, secondly, to rapists or child molesters.

In actuality, “sex offenders” (real and otherwise), contrary to what you may have heard, have *the second lowest recidivism rate* (the reverse is often falsely stated).

Secondly, the term “sex offender” is a catchall term that includes a range of behaviors from the laughable to the repulsive to the criminal. What complicates matters is that in the American legal system, each law is given a title whereas, in other countries, it has a number from the penal code. In America, the title may be descriptive, misleading, or bombastic (in at least one state, the [term](#) Sexual Abuse of Children is a catchall term.). Thus, the term “sexual assault” or “sexual assault of a child” implies rape, or rape of a child, whereas in reality both statutes could include consensual sex between a 16-year-old and her 19-year-old boyfriend.

Who later married.

Which has happened.

In fact, a [third](#) of sexual offences were committed by [minors](#), 7% of them being females.

To make matters worse, sex offender registries exist, which some [professionals](#) have constantly advocated be eliminated, or at the least reformed. Why should you care? Because every state had the bright idea of having a sex offender registry, where convicted “sex offenders” (but not murderers!) could be identified by name and address and be monitored by officers (and persecuted by [vigilantes](#)). Registries were initially meant as a tool for law enforcement and it immediately became an out-of-control Frankenstein monster.

Originally, this seemed a very good idea because neighbors could be aware of potential danger. Unfortunately, all bureaucracies by their nature have a tendency to expand like cancer and instead of exclusively focusing on individuals who were *truly dangerous* (serial rapists and actual pedophiles), the registries now include relatively inoffensive individuals—like someone who got exceedingly drunk once and exposed himself, or someone who “goosed” a girl at a party, or an octogenarian whose offense was 50 years prior, or an 18 y/o who had consensual sex with his girlfriend, or a teenager who [sexted](#) someone. All of these are treated identically and classified the same as a recent pedophile or a serial rapist, or a rapist-murderer. By excluding such chaff, over-extended authorities could concentrate monitoring *the truly dangerous*, thereby making society safer for all of us while simultaneously giving some slack to the relatively inoffensive individuals (over 95% of all sexual offense [arrests](#) were committed by *first-time* sex offenders and there is *no* evidence that [registries](#) reduce [sex](#) offences).

But there is also the other side of the coin. People who are in such registries are essentially on a hit list. Their families are [also](#) severely affected, including their children—collateral damage.

Several murders, [arsons](#), and attempted murders of persons in the registries have been carried out by self-righteous [vigilantes](#). Sometimes, those acts have been perpetrated on individuals simply suspected of an offence. In addition, local politicians have seen it their duty to outdo each other by stacking restrictions through statutes on people on these registries to the point of [absurdity](#) (cannot visit parks, cannot live within city limits, cannot be out in Halloween, cannot marry without permission, cannot take a vacation on cruise lines, etc.). A person being labeled an SO can be thought of as being soaked in gasoline, surrounded by people flicking lit matches at the SO.

And even nullifying their Constitutional rights. If there is one thing that we should know by now is that some people will eagerly throw the Constitution and the Bill of Rights right out the window if fear and panic and anger are utilized for that purpose. The present COVID [fiasco](#), here in the [US](#) and in other countries like [Australia](#), [Italy](#), [Austria](#) and [Canada](#) has proven that.

The irony, of course, is that “rehabilitation” is one of the pillars of the criminal justice system, yet [rehabilitation](#) is the farthest thing in the mind of all concerned when it comes to SOs and all the rules and conditions and registrations are counterproductive. How is “rehabilitation” going to succeed when a [child](#) is in a [sex](#) offender registry is one of the topics that is never brought up.

Unfortunately, any time that there is a chance of calmly examining the issue of “sex offenders,” and registries, an instance of an actual, disgusting, sex offense crops up that gets instantly hyped up by the media, exacerbated by vitriol spewing out of feminists’ mouths, and all calm and rationality is swept away. Unless, of course, the disgusting sex offense happens to be committed by a [Somali](#) savage (the newest, bestest, [minority](#) in America), in which case no mention will be made in the main stream [media](#) and those same feminists will

become mute.

So, the important thing to understand if you are a man, is tread carefully because it is open season on [men](#), and obsessively document every step of a relationship. Do not be so naïve as to think that it cannot happen to you. .

And trust no one.