

# **Woman from Norway sentenced to pay \$50.000 for false rape accusations, after the man recorded their whole date.**

November 19, 2014 | 1555 upvotes | by [united\\_fan](#)

---

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

Jaereth • 505 points • 19 November, 2014 02:40 PM **[recovered]**

While this feels like justice porn and I know it feels good to hear, I think a lot of people are missing a key point here: Short of recording their *entire fucking interaction*, his ass would have still been toast.

We shouldn't have to record every interaction. This scares me a bit more of the precedent it sets (I know not here but still). "Oh, she's saying you raped her now? Do you have any evidence you *didn't*?"

Scary stuff.

anonymouse • 85 points • 19 November, 2014 03:38 PM

There's more good news. Recording wasn't illegal.

Sterflekker • 25 points • 19 November, 2014 04:42 PM

Recording conversations like that don't tend to be illegal. It could be the case if the police or DA used illegal recordings to get you convicted, but inadmissible recordings of a defendant is never going to be waved. These rules exist to protect against government officials

anonymouse • 31 points • 19 November, 2014 04:44 PM

There was a post a while back by a lawyer speculating on that, saying that in some cases they would be, but in that case an illegal recording charge would be preferable to a rape conviction.

alpha\_n3rd • 17 points • 19 November, 2014 05:39 PM

It's not a sex offense for one thing.

cover20 • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 12:16 AM

Certainly, and if asked about it say on a job application, if the interviewer is sympatico you can explain exactly why you recorded it and took the hit for illegal recording.

alpha\_n3rd • 11 points • 19 November, 2014 05:37 PM

If you plan to record telephone calls or in-person conversations (including by recording video that captures sound), you should be aware that there are federal and state wiretapping laws that may limit your ability to do so. These laws not only expose you to the risk of criminal prosecution, but also potentially give an injured party a civil claim for money damages against you.

<http://www.dmlp.org/legal-guide/recording-phone-calls-and-conversations>

Police have been abusing these laws to try to suppress citizens' right to record them.

I'm not saying don't do it, I think you should do it. But don't fucking tell anybody and if you do get accused of rape talk to your lawyer about how to use the recording without getting busted for it.

grewapair • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 10:41 PM

Demand a jury trial and as long as there is at least one man on the jury they'd never convict. The prosecutor would realize this from the start and never even bring the case to trial. Record away, I don't care what the laws are, if the only reason you use it is to prove your innocence against some crazy bitch, no one is going to care.

cover20 • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 12:14 AM

The jury doesn't get to hear inadmissible evidence. At least they're not supposed to, and the system usually works to cover it up. If the defense tries to introduce it into evidence, recall that first the evidence has to be shown to the judge and opposing counsel. Opposing counsel will object and ask for a conference with jury out, jury will be sent back to jury room, evidence will be thrown out and judge instruct defense lawyer not to mention it, jury comes back none the wiser.

I've been on a jury. There's lots of stuff we were not allowed to know during the trial.

alpha\_n3rd • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 01:41 AM

I do tend to agree. And as somebody else mentioned, better to get convicted of wiretapping than rape.

Newdist2 • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 05:58 PM

inadmissible recordings of a defendant is never going to be waved.

You say that now. Just wait.

ThePedanticCynic • 12 points • 19 November, 2014 06:23 PM

Yet. The feminists are trying.

anonymouse • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 06:25 PM

And a case like this would help prevent that from happening. That it was used to prove a false rape accusation was made would be a solid reason to fight getting a law like that passed, and if it were passed, would give a right wing party a significant boost.

infernalsatan • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 06:59 PM

SJW has found another conquest in the name of privacy and something

Eloni • 101 points • 19 November, 2014 03:07 PM

No he wouldnt. He had already beaten a rape case before, which was the reason he was recording this time in the first place. The recording wasnt needed to prove him innocent, it was to prove her Guilty.

fortrines • 53 points • 19 November, 2014 04:47 PM

that's crazy how someone can be false rape accused twice. I honestly thought that type of stuff was pretty rare

Pornography\_saves\_li • 93 points • 19 November, 2014 06:26 PM

That's probably because you don't have daughters in high school. Teenagers refer to 'my rapist' like a merit badge these days.

lord-denning • 51 points • 19 November, 2014 06:50 PM

Bingo - this is the cultural shift among women that men only see a small piece of, and that TRP exposes. The solipstic line of thinking goes "only hot girls get hit on be creeps and have stalkers, thereford I must also complain about these things"...complaining about a dude forcing himself on you is part of being in the "cool" club.

ShitArchonXPR • 8 points • 20 November, 2014 04:07 AM

"I need feminism because when I hear about street harassment, I feel INADQUET because it never happens to me."

SJWs: making light of actual rape and harassment, one blog at a time.

[deleted] • 3 points • 20 November, 2014 04:46 AM

This is a very true statement. Nowadays, for a girl to admit she's supposedly been raped or sexually abused, automatically gets her lots of attention and puts her in a "club" of others who can justify hating men.

It's really sad for females who actually ARE raped.

CUNTBERT\_RAPINGTON • 32 points • 19 November, 2014 08:49 PM

This. Recently something has shifted to the point where nearly every woman that I've dated has been "raped" in the past.

Either rape has shot way up in the past five years and every study has failed to account for it, or being a victim is becoming "trendy".

RedPill115 • 16 points • 19 November, 2014 10:23 PM

Also, another additional explanation is that girls have been socialized to only have sex with aggressive guys who do so called "rapey" things. Just look at girls derision towards being upfront with them, going on dates, or the "nice guy".

A "non rapey" guy comes along and she feels an obligation to string him along, she treats him like she doesn't like him, or does the "perfectionist fantasy" where he's never quite good enough. Eventually she meets a guy who's "rapey", she sleeps with him, is relieved that someone else took the guilt of decision making for her. Later she loses interest in him, they break up, now she describes the actions that are the only way she actually sleeps with anyone as negative.

I'm only saying this is one aspect of the whole picture, but I see this a lot. The girl is bizarrely surprised that guys who she acts like she wants them to get lost actually get lost, the pushy asshole is the only one she actually sleeps with.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 04:50 AM

I knew a girl for years and years, eventually even dating her for months. We spoke about everything in great length, including her childhood and also her family life, etc. She ended up cheating on me, so I left her.

Fast forward to the present and, after attending a seminar by a woman named Teal Swan, she supposedly uncovered "repressed memories" of being sexually abused by her father, again and again, for a lengthy period of time.

Ok, maybe she did have this happen to her. But is the brain really THAT good at completely blanking out multiple memories that span decent lengths of time? Perhaps I'm simply uneducated on the subject, but I think she was brainwashed by Teal - a woman who herself claims all sorts of bad things occurred to her from men in her past.

I know this woman to be a big fat liar, btw, after conducting a little simple research.

Nathan\_Flomm • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 09:54 AM

It's not just a badge of honor. It's a fucking hashtag

thisjibberjabber • -7 points • 19 November, 2014 05:05 PM

At risk of sounding like victim-blaming, I wonder if he could have been nicer to the women afterwards, so they would have felt less vindictive.

It reminds me of studies showing that doctors who are assholes (probably not the term used in the study) to patients are much more likely to pick up malpractice lawsuits, even when both are equally at fault.

redkick • 17 points • 19 November, 2014 05:19 PM

At risk of sounding like victim-blaming

Uh, you're in TRP here, not some feminist subreddit. Victim blaming is one of its key points, although usually it's called self-improvement.

pl23117 points 19 November, 2014 06:48 PM [recovered]

it's not victim blaming. the dude didn't rape her. she isn't a victim. self-improvement is pretty easy to understand the meaning of- you improve yourself. I didn't know women were oppressed when I lift, get my hair cut or study.

Since she wasn't raped, yet tried to have the guy convicted of rape (essentially ruining his life for ever) it's pretty strange you're asking for him to be nicer to her. he literally did nothing negative to her. she did negative things.

TheDuckOnQuack • 9 points • 19 November, 2014 07:16 PM

When he said "victim blaming", he was referring to the male as the victim. And his point was that it's possible that the false accusation was her way of getting back at him for some perceived wrong. That definitely does not justify her actions in any way whatsoever. However, if that's the case it's also possible that if he was a nicer person to her in some way, she may have never done it and he would have avoided the entire situation. The takeaway from this isn't "it's his fault for getting falsely accused", because it 100% the accuser's fault but you might be able to reduce the chances of these situations occurring if you treat people around you well and try not to make enemies

redkick • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 08:25 PM

Yes, I agree. It's very well possible that both parties can be idiots in a conflict.

Zahoo • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 08:28 PM

Don't burn bridges because people might falsely accuse you of rape, got it.

ThePedanticCynic • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 06:27 PM

You're getting upvotes, so I think people don't understand what you just said:

She basically said that TRP actively makes victims out of women and blames them for it. I don't see that as at all the case.

cover20 • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 06:59 PM

She didn't say the victims being blamed are women. What about men who get told they have to lift and be socially dominant and go thru all that self improvement, when a bit of shady game is all they really need?

There's an anti-game culture here that seems upstanding, but it's actually a disservice to guys who could be getting laid TOMORROW as their current skinny-fat, smelly selves. Sometimes I think the emphasis on self-improvement here is to provide the women with a better product, to increase competition among men.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 06:56 PM

Thisjibberjabber was referring to the man when talking about victim blaming, hence saying:

At risk of sounding like victim-blaming, I wonder if **he** could have been nicer to the women afterwards

So obviously redkick's response was about encouraging responsibility on the part of men who are victims of society to get their act together instead of submitting. No one is saying, or alluding that we should "make victims out of women".

bonnsai • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 06:09 PM

It's not doctors being assholes, the study looked at intonation of their voices, not at all what they were saying.

lord-denning • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 06:53 PM

Being "nice" doesn't help, particularly if there is a risk that some third party might know something went down. I'm nice, but mostly to get a couple of text messages back to confirm I obtained consent.

DonRP • 12 points • 19 November, 2014 04:55 PM

I see your point about the first case, but I think it makes his conviction for this case even more likely.

If it's a "he said she said" case and the guy has been accused of rape before, it's definitely going to sway a judges decision. They will be thinking "what are the chances of this guy being falsely accused twice".

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 05:58 PM

The jury wouldn't know about the first rape accusation until the second trial was over.

Syberr • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 07:49 PM

What jury? It wasn't a capital crime judgement

cover20 • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 12:19 AM

In most US states you can demand a jury trial for any felony charge. Some misdemeanors in some states, I think. And if I recall correctly, all Federal criminal trials (not civil trials) are before a jury.

Syberr • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 03:05 AM

And the USA is very distinct from most countries of Earth in that, in almost everywhere else minor cases like this are decided solely by a judge, and that includes Norway(well,

technically 3 judges there).

cover20 • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 12:18 AM

Not sure if that would matter. If the guy had been convicted before, that would indeed be prejudicial. But that information is not given to the jury during a trial.

[deleted] • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 01:21 AM

Not really, it was used in his defense. Unless she didn't accuse him and he was just providing evidence for no apparent reason. Which wouldn't make sense.

mercury • 29 points • 19 November, 2014 11:59 PM **[recovered]**

The guy in question apparently realized this too.

On this DB article it says he's faced a false rape accusation once before, that case made it to district court where he was acquitted (it doesn't say how). And that since then he started recording dates when he met women he didn't know (he met this one online).

There's more to this case though, check this article, apparently this woman is bat shit crazy, and this guy has game. (i know norwegian so i'll save you from google transhiltate)

It's mostly her (hamstering) statements about what "happened", how she felt, how it felt like he manipulated her, how she felt pressured and so on. How she doesn't remember this or that, but he definitely took her by force, but she's not sure if she fought back physically. After she left his apartment she apparently texted her friend and said "...he took me by force and i fought back fiercely".

She went to her friends place, threw herself to the ground and told her friend how the guy had grabbed her by the neck and raped her. They went to the rape shelter together, where she told them how he tore her clothes off and raped her two times.

The guy was arrested and he gave them his recording. And this, gentlemen, is the good part. On the recording one can clearly hear the woman laughing and taking the initiative for sex by asking the guy if he had any prevention (do u have condoms?). One can clearly hear them having sex two times, with a break where they're having a conversation on the guys balcony.

Before leaving she said to him "it was nice meeting you, but this was a bit unexpected for a first date" (i'm not a slut), and the guy answered that dates don't always happen how you plan them to (shit test passed). Then she said **"but it was good, and that's what's important"**, then she walked out the door, and texted her friend "i was raped".

But it gets better, when she heard this recording herself she apparently had a mental breakdown, and ended up in the hospital, i don't understand the hospital part either but it says so in the article, clear as day. It also says now she's in psychiatric treatment (probably just therapy, not a mental hospital).

When confronted with the recording she just said "i wasn't myself". When the prosecutor asked her "don't you think the treatment is good for you, so that what happens inside your head corresponds with reality?", she apparently just answered "i just want to say that, to me it was rape".

So yeah, bitch is crazy.

ShitArchonXPR • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 04:22 AM

(i know norwegian so i'll save you from google transhiltate)

Can you give a translation of the article instead of a summary?

It's mostly her (hamstering) statements about what "happened", how she felt, how it felt like he manipulated her, how she felt pressured and so on. How she doesn't remember this or that, but he definitely took her by force, but she's not sure if she fought back physically. After she left his apartment she apparently texted her friend and said "...he took me by force and i fought back fiercely".

The fact that it managed to get that far in court despite signs that the witness is obviously lying--for example, she can't keep major parts of her story straight--speaks volumes.

alternate\_me • 6 points • 20 November, 2014 01:41 PM

Here you go! Some things are a bit hard to translate directly, so I added some comments in brackets.

Headline: It was nice to meet you, said the woman and reported the man for rape

**The woman is accused of falsifying a report of rape, but in court she told about her rape experience with terror in her voice.**

To me this was rape, because I felt the enormous reactions that came - fear and shock, the woman in her 20 told in [The name for the court in Oslo].

The womans story stands in sharp contrast to the audio recording that exists from the meeting between the woman and the man she thinks raped him [sic]. This audio tape now means that she is accused of falsifying her explanation [/falsifying her report].

The woman is now accused of giving a false rape report as well as having applied for rape victim compensation on a false premiss. The victim [the man] was jailed for two days before the police got the audio tape that caused them exclude that a rape had occurred.

Without that evidence, he would've probably been jailed until the trial, said the prosecutor. [This isn't a direct translation, but the word for jail is like "safe keeping imprisonment". They already said that he was in there for 2 days, so I assume this means that they would keep him until the trial.]

The woman denies any (punishable) fault [basically, she pled not guilty].

I reported him so that nobody would have to go through what I went through, said the woman.

The womans defense attorney, Kai Roger Vaag, recognized in the Oslo court that the video-tape [another mistake by the journalist i assume?] testifies that there was no rape, but says that the woman can't be held guilty because she thinks that a rape had happened.

**Told about the tape** The woman told her story monday morning about how she had met a man through the dating site Sukker [translation: sugar], and how they had met at Grünerløkka [a neighborhood] in Oslo, and how she lost control over herself after drinking a glass of wine.

In court she told that she was not looking for a relationship, but Sukker was only used to find friends.

We went home to his place, and already then, things were very distant [/unclear] for me, the woman said.

Then she continued explaining how she experienced that she was pushed towards intercourse, both physically and mentally.

He sat down next to me [in such a manner that they were physically touching], I remember. In the living room. It was so empty there. One couch and a TV. I felt like I was under a lot of pressure, and was very nervous. Incredibly uncomfortable. Like I just knew what was going to happen. I got this feeling like it was "too late". I felt ambivalent, scared and at the same time nervous.

**"He took me by force"** The woman was unable to tell about the actual rape that she thought had happened.

*Did he pressure you physically or mentally? The judge asked her.*

Both. To me it was very manipulative, because I felt pressured to it, also physically, because he held me down at one point. I was held down. That's how I experienced it. I can remember resisting it, but if I just felt it, or if I physically resisted, I don't know, the woman explained.

After she left the apartment, she sent an SMS to her [female] friend and said the following:

"he took me by force, and I hit and tore at him [sort of a Norwegian idiom, but it's an important distinction from just saying that she fought him, because explicitly means physical violence]"

When she met her friend she was clearly distraught. She threw herself to the ground and told her friend how he had grabbed her by the neck. The same night she and her friend went to the [emergency services for rape victims, basically just the ER]. Where she told them how he had tore off her clothes and raped her twice. Later she also told the police.

She has in earlier explanations described how he had raped her, something she doesn't remember today.

**Hears that the woman is ok** The man that woman had met was arrested and charged with rape. The case took a turn when the man could submit the audio recording of the entire encounter. In the recording you can hear the woman laugh. She also helped take initiative for sex by, among other things, ask if he had condoms. You can hear them have intercourse in two segments, with a break where they have a conversation on the balcony.

When she leaves the apartment, you can hear her say:

"It was nice meeting you, but it wasn't exactly this I expected from the first date"

The man answered that dates don't always develop as you might initially imagine they would. Then the woman answered.

But it was delicious [weird in english, but makes sense in Norwegian. This is a stronger statement than just "good"], and that's what matters.

Right after she left the apartment, she sent an SMS to her [female] friend and said that she had been raped.

**- To me it was rape** When the woman first heard the audio recording, she had a mental breakdown and was sent to the hospital.

Today [nowadays] she's under psychiatric treatment.

Isn't it good for your treatment that what's happening in your head alignes with reality? Prosecutor Sturla Henriksbø asked.

I just have to say that to me it was rape, the woman answered.

Confronted with the details on the tape, the woman answered "I wasn't myself".

[deleted] • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 04:52 AM

That is downright terrifying to read. Thank God I'm married to an awesome woman. Haitian girls, ftw.

[deleted] • 21 points • 19 November, 2014 08:40 PM\*

This is why I secretly record all my sexual interactions with women and then upload them to amateur porn sites. You know, for backup.

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 04:25 PM

[permanently deleted]

Transmigratory • 6 points • 19 November, 2014 11:22 PM

Fucked up because we know this only happens if us lads are being accused.

DonRP • 16 points • 19 November, 2014 04:54 PM

I came here to say this. How is it normal that we have to record our interactions permanently? What other area of interaction/social meetings do we have to record the entire thing so that we do not get thrown in jail and/or have our lives ruined?

Imagine how many guys are falsely accused and have no evidence to fight the assumption of guilt.

Tqbfjotlds • 14 points • 19 November, 2014 05:16 PM [recovered]

Imagine how many guys are falsely accused and have no evidence to fight the assumption of guilt.

Considering that accusing a man of violence/rape/assault seems to be the first reaction (and not an after-thought) when a woman feels threatened or let-down, it is likely that 99% of all accusations are false.

mtersen • 6 points • 19 November, 2014 10:26 PM

Definitely, its a legal superpower only reserved for women, and its obvious its over abused, but feminists will fight to tooth and nail to keep that power to throw innocent men in jail on a whim.

That's why they need to keep the rape culture and the victim praising going so everyone thinks its much bigger problem than it really is.

Xbitz10 points 19 November, 2014 06:26 PM\* [recovered]

buy a recording device for \$10

use it when hooking up with a new girl

for peace of mind it should become a habit

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 November, 2014 10:27 PM

You likely already have a smartphone and a laptop with you in your bedroom, both of which can easily be used to do this.

ShitArchonXPR • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 04:29 AM

Laptops need a microphone input to record sound. A step higher in difficulty than using a \$10 recording device.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 05:48 AM

do they even make laptops without mics anymore?

ShitArchonXPR • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 05:51 AM

In both laptops I've owned, and every computer I've seen so far, there's a port for the microphone right next to the headphones/audio port. A built-in microphone would probably be impractical.

a-orzie • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 11:19 AM

They ball have inbuilt mics these days

rafalfreeman • -2 points • 20 November, 2014 01:02 AM

And NSA will have a copy of it.

People what are you doing with your privacy, next time invite a notary too.

jroddie4 • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 11:45 PM

The burden of proof should always be on the accuser.

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 05:41 PM

The government does? Why can't we?

lovely\_red\_snow • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 07:15 PM

I think it's illegal to record anything without the person's consent.

[deleted] • 9 points • 19 November, 2014 07:30 PM

I live in a one party consent state. As long I consent, then it's legal. And I don't think the law applies to the NSA

rockumsockumrobots • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 06:12 AM

I know it's wrong that the kangaroo courts handle rape completely backwards, where it's "guilty until proven innocent," for a man. However, I'm still going to record any interactions I have on a date. CYA

tedted8888 • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 06:19 AM

USA is literally the only country where you are innocent until proven guilty. Unless you rape a white woman, or kill a black man.

alclarkey • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 09:04 PM

I hope you are wrong. I imagine the reaction being that if men start recording their dates and the courts start seeing enough of these bullshit accusations for what they are, either one of two things will happen: 1. Women will stop making them for fear of going to jail. or 2. The courts will move back to the innocent until proven guilty ideology for rape cases as they should have been the whole time.

Roshnar • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 10:43 PM

Or more likely, they'll begin throwing out hidden recordings as evidence once feminists catch on and cite it as invasions of privacy to be secretly recorded during dates

alclarkey • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 12:34 AM

I'd like to add that even if they aren't admissible in court, they would be awfully embarrassing for the woman in question, should the truth come to light.

The\_Psychopath • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 01:05 AM

Unfortunately you have to record everything. There's a guy in California who was accused of rape by his ex-girlfriend and would have been convicted if there hadn't been video evidence of him, on the other side of town from her, in line at a bank at the same time she said the rape occurred.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 10:25 AM

WTF is wrong with these people

[deleted] • 338 points • 19 November, 2014 01:52 PM

Wasn't Norway also the country that removed all federal funding from its "Gender studies" Institute after a documentary proved that it was a complete waste of space?

[deleted] • 122 points • 19 November, 2014 02:29 PM

The name of the Documentary is "Hjernevask" - literally brainwash, by comedian Harald Eia. The first episode covers what's bullshit about gender studies. Watch it online on Vimeo or Dailymotion.

Jaereth • 29 points • 19 November, 2014 02:42 PM **[recovered]**

Is there an english translation of it? I'd like to watch.

[deleted] • 127 points • 19 November, 2014 02:46 PM\*

<http://vimeo.com/34465046>

Norwegian Audio, English sub.

No screencaps for some of the text on screen though =(

Edit: Just got to the end, short tl;dw if anyone is interested: Basically he talks to a few gender studies/social sciences scientists who tell him that there is no biological difference between children and that their preferences are only cultural. He then proceeds to talk to biologists who did experiments like showing a face and a mechanical object to newborn babies with the result that the boys looked more at the object and girls looked more at the face. When he confronts the social scientists with these studies they are basically tripping over their excuses because apparently these studies are "weak" and that there is no biological proof yet which is why their theoretical basis is that there are no differences. (that's only part one though)

primordialbeast85 • 35 points • 19 November, 2014 03:58 PM

It is a must watch series. Seriously anyone on this site needs to watch all of them.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 04:04 PM

I started with the second one but didn't find it as captivating...

ThePrince\_ • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 04:45 AM

Maybe try part 5... you know... the one titled 'Sex'? I thought that was the best one, with the worst one being the one on race.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 10:07 AM

I'll make sure to check it out, thanks!

[deleted] • 23 points • 19 November, 2014 06:02 PM

Fuck that is nauseating. Gender studies is like religion. Rationality takes a backseat to agenda and wishful thinking.

If the most gender neutral countries in the world still have a 90/10 gender ratio in nursing and engineering you know for sure that it's all bullshit.

OakTr3E • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 09:40 PM

There's actually a link between a high gender disparity and equality. The more equal the country the more freedom to follow your heart (instead of what opportunities you can get to make a living). And it seems like when women can choose whatever they want they follow the most "traditional" route. Same with men. I think it also was mentioned in the first episode. Is there an interest in getting it translated? I understand norwegian.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 07:37 AM

translated version is already in the sidebar

IVIaskerade • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 08:21 PM

The thing that I was most struck by was how not one of the Gender Studies "researchers" he interviewed was straight. I just found it strange that they didn't have *any* representation from most of the people they were supposed to represent.

[deleted] • -4 points • 19 November, 2014 08:24 PM

Oh? How do you know they were homosexuals, did you look them up?

You'd think that the LGBT community would be the first to jump at any hint that sexuality and gender identity isn't something that is changed by how your parents raised you...

IVIaskerade • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 08:51 PM

Oh? How do you know they were homosexuals, did you look them up?

Actually, I watched the documentary. He asks them.

They're more interested in pushing the "everyone is the same" line. The "born this way" narrative (whilst pretty likely) doesn't benefit their pre-formed conclusions, so they don't want to hear it.

All throughout the documentary, they dismiss out of hand things like MRI scans showing that men and women have slightly different brain structures with phrases like "that's just not correct."

[deleted] • -2 points • 19 November, 2014 09:00 PM

Damn, guess I didnt pay attention during some parts in the middle =P Hope my tl;dw is still accurate tho haha.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 02:12 PM

Oh well. Look at the "gender scientist" body language at 33'00". It summarizes everything. Priceless.

Kozen117 • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 03:29 PM

I'm on my phone right now, so I can't watch the video.

Do you happen to know the conclusions of the documentary?

altxatu • 6 points • 19 November, 2014 07:15 PM

Gender studies are pure, 100%, weapons grade baloney.

OakTr3E • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 09:41 PM

The social "scientists" look like clowns compared to the scientists basically. All of them. There's your tl;dw.

Broder45 • -9 points • 19 November, 2014 02:50 PM

Commenting for later viewing. (On phone)

nickojmoore12 • 15 points • 19 November, 2014 04:10 PM

It's on the sidebar, "Gender Studies is Nonsense"

the\_clamper • 15 points • 19 November, 2014 04:25 PM

protip: in the future you can use the save button.

cardevitoraphicticia • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 08:08 PM

Is there a French version? I need to send this to my mother-in-law

[deleted] • -24 points • 19 November, 2014 03:48 PM

To be fair, the fact that babies react to something does not tell us very much about adult behavior. This is always referred to as a proof for the biological difference between men and women, but it does not actually prove anything.

primordialbeast85 • 10 points • 19 November, 2014 03:59 PM

It is a big fucking deal when they are chopping cocks off without that info so yea..

[deleted] • 17 points • 19 November, 2014 03:55 PM

No, it doesn't but there were a lot more studies in the documentary. Originally they took older children and gave them several toys to choose from, stuff like action heroes and dolls. The boys obviously selected the boy toys, the girls the girl toys. That newborn experiment was just to show that there is an inherent difference in boys in girls already before they are being influenced by society/culture (because the basic position of the gender studies people was "society/culture are the only reason for differences between men and women").

[deleted] • -19 points • 19 November, 2014 04:28 PM

I know about these studies, but nonetheless one should rather be cautious not to over-interpret them. There **is** an inherent, inborn difference in boys in girls, no doubt about that, but that *still* doesn't tell us anything about the different *behaviour* in adult men and women.

Any time someone talks about people being "hardwired" or similar, I cringe a bit. It's a nice and somewhat plausible narrative we tell each other, but it's almost impossible to prove anything.

cover20 • 11 points • 19 November, 2014 04:40 PM

It does tell us something. It destroys the assumption that men and women are identical except for the obvious physical differences.

From there, one has to look at data when it shows that there is also a difference in adulthood, rather than dismissing it because there cannot really be a difference.

You want an impossible standard of proof because you are shilling for the idea that if

there are less women engineers, for example, someone is at fault and women deserve lots of extra help and opportunities (at men's expense of course) to overcome this problem.

getomc • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 04:52 PM

It's not impossible. The guy is asking for results this study was not designed to produce while claiming the lack thereof means that the results the study does produce are meaningless.

Fortunately, hamsters are small rodents and easily stepped on.

manslutalt • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 04:47 PM

Different behavior is exactly what studies like these tell us. They give babies stimuli and measure their response. That's pure behavior.

It doesn't prove that there is a link between the differences at birth and the differences later in life, but it *disproves* the notion that there are no differences in behavior at birth.

[deleted] • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 06:13 PM

You can repeat the same experiment with monkeys without any human social conditioning, the results are the same.

Corkfire • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 06:13 PM

Oh yeah? So you're fine with gender academics "proving" that we are born as blank slates? The research you are talking about is biology 10-fucking-1, and if you know anything about the scientific method you probably understand that this is not some stone tablet handed out from a burning bush, this is conclusions drawn from extremely complicated research methods from different areas. And also, there isn't some underlying political fulfillment strategy behind it either, this is what we find if we look into the nature of human beings as organisms.

In the animal kingdom, males and females differ in practically every type of organism. In some cases the female is bigger and stronger and even KILLS the males that they've mated with. And this is not just by observing different patterns that they find this, it's by studying the levels of different hormones within the organisms bodily system which differs HUGELY between males and females and regulates certain behaviors. It's possible to regulate the behavior of any type of organism just by increasing or lowering testosterone, oestrogene, serotonin, dopamine etc. Behavior and mood is directly connected to the levels of the hormones within the system.

What the sciences can't explain is "why" this is. But that's not even the correct scientific question to ask. This is "what it's like" when we look into it. Not over-interpreting, not taking anything for given, studies show the same things over and over.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 05:07 PM

On the other hand it's not something that can be ignored - which is basically the whole point of the video.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 04:35 PM

Babies have the same genes affecting their behavior as adults, so I don't really see a problem here for the study.

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 02:46 PM

A good 50% of it is in English and the remaining parts have subtitles

tedted8888 • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 06:20 AM

check the sidebar. 4th down from "new here?"

Lolumaria • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 10:53 PM

what is gender studies? i suppose its all in Norwegian but does it have subtitles perchance?

Corkfire • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 01:36 AM

Gender studies is a faction within sociology/philosophy (pseudoscience if you ask me). They believe society is pushed down by a patriarchal structure, and they also believe genders don't exist. That's the basis of research, and it's not even proven that such a structure exist. Imo, feminism and gender studies is pretty much the same thing. It's like a new really conservative moralist puritanist movement to extinguish male and female from earth. Gender studies alongside feminism is ridiculous movements if they're really looking for equality.

caelum19 • -5 points • 19 November, 2014 05:24 PM

Did you have a typo in "brainwash" or is it literally about washing a guy named "Brian"?

[deleted] • 61 points • 19 November, 2014 02:19 PM

Official word is that the documentary had no bearing on the decision, but the timing is curious to say the least.

anonlmouse • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 03:36 PM

It's possible some questions were being asked about the validity and Harald did his show while the govt was doing its investigation.

[deleted] • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 05:05 PM\*

Probably. But it's nice to imagine that investigative journalism that actually affects change is still around.

Newdist2 • 9 points • 19 November, 2014 06:09 PM

Though called "comedy" now. Just like in the old days, if you're the jester, you really can speak truth to power.

smile\_e\_face • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 01:50 AM

I completely agree that it was inspiring. That said, you meant "effects change" here. It's bullshit, I know, but "effects" means "to bring forth" in this context.

redpillbanana • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 02:44 PM

According to Wikipedia (which is not an unbiased source by any means):

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nordic\\_Gender\\_Institute](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nordic_Gender_Institute)

Certain journalists[who?] have speculated about the decision to restructure NIKK, and its relation to the public debate that followed the 7-part documentary series "Hjernevask" ('Brainwash'), by the comedian Harald Eia, which aired in spring 2010 in the Norwegian broadcasting service NRK. However, the Norwegian Research Council has denied that this program had any influence on its decision not to renew the Norwegian research program on gender in 2011. The Research Council of Norway has no influence on the Nordic Council of Ministers, therefore these speculations seem to have nothing with NIKK to do. The gender researcher Marit Aure speculates, however, that the discussions on gender research, following the program, might have influenced the decision indirectly, by presenting gender research in Norway as a more established field than actually was the case. Anders Hanneborg, involved in the Norwegian Research Council's committee that evaluated the Norwegian gender research program's renewal application, explained that the program was not renewed in order to decentralize and strengthen gender research in Norway. He also denied directly that the TV-program "Hjernevask" was any part of their discussions on the issue. The Norwegian research program on gender had received funding in 2008 for a period of 4 years, which expired in 2011. The Norwegian research program, funded by the Norwegian Research Council, was not related to NIKK, which was funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers. [2][3] The Norwegian Parliament, by a direct question from Tord Lien, from the rightist Progress Party (FrP, by its initials in Norwegian), addressed these television programs. The core of his criticism concerned the scientific neglect of the biological to the social component. The then Minister of Research and Higher Education, Tora Aasland, from the Socialist Leftist Party (SV, by its initials in Norwegian), discarded such criticisms, adding that multidisciplinary gender research in Norway has been evaluated positively, not by TV-programs, but through external scientific evaluations of Norwegian research on the field[4][5] The Norwegian network for Gender Studies states correlations between "Hjernevask" and increased discussion on the gender studies in its Annual report 2010.[6]

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 03:55 PM

It's weird that the article refers to FrP as rightist. Just about every party in Norway, like the US are defenders of the Status-quo. All political discussion, between politicians and pundits in the media is rarely about anything but small aspects of the system. Should this thing be increased or decreased a bit? Should we lengthen that? Should we raise this tax and lower another? And to be in favor of the status quo in Norway is to basically equal to a liberal progressive in the US.

wickedstag • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 05:03 PM

The system in general in Norway works fantastically. There is a reason they top pretty much every important world league table.

Pornography\_saves\_li • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 06:24 PM

Yeah, the criteria for 'excellence' basically mirrors the criteria for 'progressive'. Ergo, the more progressive the country, the 'better' it is.

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 November, 2014 05:09 PM\*

It doesn't work fantastically. We're not special. Our government is as inefficient as any other. I'm not a huge fan of the gigantic, bureaucratic, paternalistic state sucking away purchasing power and choice. If we're the top in "pretty much every world league table", whatever that means, we're not setting the bar that high. Though I know that a lot of the data simply relies on simplified aggregate data that doesn't distinguish between government and private spending and wealth, which means that even if the government taxed 95% of my income, I would still be wealthy on paper.

fiat\_lux\_ • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 07:43 PM

He might be referring to popular indices like the HDI, which Norway often tops. It shows. You guys are smart motherfuckers. I've talked to and played chess against Norwegian middle schoolers that would embarrass the average American high school student in terms of breadth of knowledge and critical thinking.

themasterof • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 12:23 AM

Magnus Carlsen got a lot of people interested in Chess, so much that stores ran out of Chess sets.

Corkfire • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 01:41 AM

Thats great, maybe people are getting tired of their apps finally.

Eloni • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 01:01 AM

When the party with the most overall votes (4% or over 110 000 more votes than the second most voted for party) isn't included in the government, then it doesn't really work fantastically. I'd liken it to how George W. Bush got one million less votes than Al Gore in the presidential election in the year 2000, and still became the president.

Eloni • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 12:51 AM

It's weird that the article refers to FrP as rightist.

It's rightist compared to most other parties. In fact, of any "real party" (by that I mean any party with more than 1%) they're the most extreme right of them all (more so even than the party named Right). Though maybe not so much rightist as just corrupt as fuck.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 02:06 AM

But to call them extreme right is insane. Look at Norway. Look at the amount of government control in the economy. Look at the amount of farm subsidies, and subsidies everywhere else. Look at the education system. Look at the VAT's, and the insane tariffs and the general protectionism. Look at the unions and the price controls. Look at the central bank and economic policy. They're only right in some classical liberal rhetoric, but as their march to freedom has amounted in little more than me not having to worry about the stepping ladder of consequences when I enjoy a licorice shaped like a smoking pipe, or riding around on a segway, I don't really think I can call them anything but status-quo pushers and defenders, like just about every other big party.

Eloni • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 02:07 PM

I agree it hasn't amounted to much of anything - yet. They haven't really held much power until they won the last election. Now they have power though. What is happening?

You're right in that they don't do much for my current 35% income taxes, and they're increasing VAT alcohol, and basically not doing anything "for most people" the way their slogan claims. But who believed they would? That's never been what the right *does*, only what they *promise*. I still wouldn't call them status-quo pushers when they propose to give the 10 wealthiest an average of over 12 million tax relief each.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 09:33 PM

A lot of people believed they would. And now they're going to vote in the opposition, because they will change *something*, they will keep their promises. My dad think this, my grandfather thinks like that, most of my friends think like this. Election after election, like goldfish. The left is just as bad. It's politics, it's democracy. Dishonesty is encouraged. Say what you need to get elected, play the PR game.

jolly--roger • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 03:25 PM

I think that's stated even here at TRP in some of the all-time best posts.. or, at least, that's how I got to watch that fabulous doc

Zephyrkills • 188 points • 19 November, 2014 03:09 PM [recovered]

He was facing a much longer prison sentence, not to mention the consequences of being branded a rapist and the ramifications that entails. He'd never pass a background check, and every person he knew would think he was a rapist.

50k and potentially 8 months doesn't seem...equal. It's almost as if her gender grants her certain...privileges

united\_fan • 53 points • 19 November, 2014 03:10 PM

Couldn't agree more, but it's a start though

Norwegianbrah • 23 points • 19 November, 2014 04:30 PM

The dude lost his job after being put in custody. It says so in the article (I am Norwegian).

Grasshopper21 • 29 points • 19 November, 2014 03:32 PM

The false accusation of rape should carry an equal penalty. A list of women that have falsely accused men, make it a felony because of the potential harm such accusations do. The trouble becomes how do we legally differentiate between a false accusation and a non conviction. Absent direct evidence of perjury, it is difficult to prove a false accusation vs. a dismissal due to lack of evidence. This is an easily solved problem in single party recorder states, record everything gentlemen. But in two party consent states, you have to get permission to record.

Tqbfjotlds • 21 points • 19 November, 2014 05:11 PM [recovered]

The trouble becomes how do we legally differentiate between a false accusation and a non conviction.

That's easy - it is differentiated with evidence.

A false accusation is where there is evidence to prove that she consented. For example - video, audio, emails, text messages, the accuser's diary etc.

A non-conviction is simply the result of the accuser not able to prove that there was a rape. The accuser does not get penalized for it simply because there is no evidence.

Grasshopper21 • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 06:31 PM

In some states both parties must consent to recordings. What then? You can't use emails and texts as proof of consent because consent can be revoked, at least in America.

The9thMan99 • 3 points • 20 November, 2014 12:01 AM

consent can be revoked

Wait. So you can consent to have sex with guy, then 2 months later decide that you actually didn't want to, and then accuse him of rape?

Grasshopper21 • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 04:27 AM

In the sense that emails, texts, and other written confirmation won't hold up in court against a woman saying "I changed my mind and said no"

ioncloud9 • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 03:52 AM

yep. retroactive withdrawl of consent. "oh yeah i invited him back to my place but thinking about it, he seemed kinda not hot and creepy. I think it was probably rape."

ioncloud9 • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 03:51 AM

false rape accusations should put you on the sex offender list. And yes there is a difference between being guilty of lying about being raped and making a claim of rape that cant be substantiated.

Grasshopper21 • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 04:30 AM

I don't think it should put you on the sex offender list. It should be a kind of permanent perjury list, where you are obligated to tell your neighbors you are not a trustworthy human being, stopped from holding any form of office, and registered as a felon.

primordialbeast85 • 15 points • 19 November, 2014 04:01 PM

How she can just pay a fine is a crime. She should be in jail for as long as she could have had him locked up. Fair is fair.

aman27deep • 9 points • 19 November, 2014 07:20 PM

I'm from India and can tell you 60%+ of the rapes reported here are FAKE. Girls/Women THREATEN men with rape charges. It has happened to my best friend.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 09:33 PM

I imagine once the parents find out or their SO, they cry rape so they're not at fault

aman27deep • 7 points • 19 November, 2014 09:56 PM

Mate, it's so common, it's not even funny. Believe me everyone i know definitely knows *someone* who's been falsely accused of rape. I knew three, my best friend, a person whom I hired as a driver for a week and my uncle.

Indian laws are so bad, if you're accused of rape, whether proven or not you will go to jail for around a month unless you get bail, and it'll be on your permanent record UNLESS you've been proven innocent. That means you will get NO PROPER JOB.

Crazy women can easily ruin lives here. I have seen that first-hand.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 10:22 PM

Fuck. I'd stay a virgin or fucking move. Jesus lol

SingAlong\_Original • 69 points • 19 November, 2014 01:55 PM\*

For all those unfamiliar with Norwegians and how they count.

This is actually a \$50,000 fine. Not \$50.

The Norwegians (and allot of other Europeans) switch their commas and periods in counting, this is actually a step forward.

Edited, i don't think the counting method is a step forward i was implying the fine is.

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 03:23 PM

[permanently deleted]

ibuprofiend • 17 points • 19 November, 2014 04:32 PM

I think he meant it's a step forward for men's rights.

Claiming that Europeans' arbitrary way of writing numbers is better than Americans' arbitrary way of writing numbers would just be plain stupid, though we know most of Reddit thinks Europe = socialist paradise and America = redneck hell, so it honestly wouldn't surprise me.

SingAlong\_Original • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 05:09 PM

Fixed to mean what i meant

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 03:30 PM

[permanently deleted]

martypete • -20 points • 19 November, 2014 02:24 PM [recovered]

so stupid, when I see someone write 1,000,000 as 1.000.000 I want to pull my hair out.

SingAlong\_Original • 24 points • 19 November, 2014 02:34 PM

I'm sure the Norwegians say the same thing vice versa

TheRealMouseRat • 7 points • 19 November, 2014 02:34 PM

here it's common to write 3.14 (pi) as 3,14. So "," separates full integers and decimal numbers, thus "." is left for other things like writing millions and such. It's most common to just have a space between the zeros like so: 1 000 000.

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 02:58 PM

so stupid, when I see someone write 1.000.000 as 1,000,000 I want to pull my hair out.

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 03:28 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 02:14 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 03:31 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 03:33 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 03:55 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 04:17 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -4 points • 19 November, 2014 06:37 PM

The Norwegians (and allot of other Europeans) switch their commas and periods in counting, this is actually a step forward.

I totally agree, it's just a superior way of writing and it makes a lot more sense

cover20 • 93 points • 19 November, 2014 01:28 PM

Where's my pussy pass? I demand my pussy pass!!

SingAlong\_Original • 45 points • 19 November, 2014 01:59 PM

Its a \$50,000 fine.

Pretty hefty, and it teaches women that if they're going to false accuse people they're gonna have to pay.

redpillbanana • 38 points • 19 November, 2014 02:53 PM

The \$50k fine is a good start for civil compensation.

I'd also like to see her do hard time for her criminal act just like he would have if he had been convicted.

Hopefully she's not able to weasel (or hamster) her way out of serving time during her appeal.

Grasshopper21 • 15 points • 19 November, 2014 03:21 PM

That she has been sentenced at all is a good start.

cover20 • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 04:53 PM

Yes it's not as much as it should be, but it might be enough to scare some other women away from trying this.

1quickdub • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 06:02 PM

Punishment should suit the crime. If she's accusing a man of rape, the punishment should be equal to what the man would have gotten if falsely convicted. Lock her up with some real rapists for a while.

Eloni • 27 points • 19 November, 2014 01:31 PM

An because we all know DB is an unreliable tabloid at best, here is their source as linked in the article OP posted.

cover20 • 46 points • 19 November, 2014 01:37 PM

This article is even better than the one in DB. I love the judge's reasoning. (translated by Google Translate)

"Sentencing for false accusation must be based on the seriousness of the act accusation applies. Penalties for rape are significantly increased in recent years. The seriousness of the violation and a false accusation of rape has therefore been greater "writes Oslo District Court in the judgment.

squiremarcus • 21 points • 19 November, 2014 07:40 PM

of course she is shocked by the conviction, she is used to the pussy pass immunity

[deleted] • 15 points • 19 November, 2014 07:01 PM

Heads up gents, this post hit /r/all

PlatosPlatypus • 22 points • 19 November, 2014 06:43 PM

*spins the hamster wheel* This guy is such an asshole for recording the date! Recording dates should be illegal! How dare he invade her privacy like that! She's the victim!

redpillbanana • 48 points • 19 November, 2014 02:49 PM

I'd like every prominent feminist in the world to line up in front of this guy and do one of two things:

1. declare straight to his face that false rape accusations are so rare that we shouldn't really worry about them, and prosecuting false rape accusers will cause real rape victims to fear coming forward, OR
2. profusely apologize

cover20 • 18 points • 19 November, 2014 04:33 PM

They'll do #1. They already do.

JabberJaahs • 16 points • 19 November, 2014 06:00 PM

And I keep hearing that "No woman would EVER falsely report a rape!!"

cover20 • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 12:07 AM

Well now there's legal proof that this woman did. Useful to link to this.

[deleted] • 12 points • 19 November, 2014 06:08 PM

Forget Police wearing body cameras--all men should wear them!

symko • 24 points • 19 November, 2014 03:16 PM

My car has a anti-theft device that shorted out due to the cold weather and blared the horn for a good ten minutes. No one cared, no one bothered to see what was going on.

Keep yelling false rape ladies because eventually, just like in the fable, the wolf does show up and your crying will be in vain.

jrpta • 10 points • 19 November, 2014 08:39 PM

Keep yelling false rape ladies because eventually, just like in the fable, the wolf does show up and your crying will be in vain.

You know something?

I think it already has, at least to a certain extent.

Here in the UK, stories abound of police forces "failing to get a conviction" for rape. And a female (female!) judge famously said that rape conviction rates will not improve until women stop getting drunk.

The "problem" (if indeed it is a problem), I think, can be summed up in a few sentences:

UK law has no "degrees" of rape. It's either rape or it isn't.

Feminists (and for that matter the media) invariably pick on the worst examples and then use them to define all rape. As far as they're concerned, a masked man breaking into your house at 2:00 am, putting a knife against your throat and raping a woman is exactly the same as going out, getting drunk, meeting a man, going home with him, waking up the next morning and thinking "Oh God. What did I do?". The law agrees with them.

(This last bit's pure speculation, driven by the nominally-terrible crime statistics concerning rape)

The judicial system isn't quite that stupid. So if a girl shows up at the police station to report the second "type of rape", there's every chance a desk sergeant (who's seen it all before and has no intention of wasting his officers' time (at best) or ruining some poor lad's life (at worst) simply because some girl can't go out for a few drinks without her knickers falling off) will say "Don't be so silly. Go home, have a bath and don't drink so much in future". He writes it down because he's legally obliged to, but it doesn't go any further.

ShitArchonXPR • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 04:51 AM

How much does immigration factor into it? I ask because of the Rotherham coverups. There seems to be a lot of political correctness regarding the kind of men who commit most of the rapes. I have yet to hear of feminists in Sweden giving a damn about the Somali men, for example. They save all their hate for the civilized, liberal white guys who are unlikely to rape them.

jerpta • 2 points • 21 November, 2014 08:07 PM

That's an extremely good question, and not one I'd considered.

ISTR a low rape conviction rate has been a problem for decades - at least that's how it's portrayed in the media.

Maybe it's not so simple you can point at one thing and say "There. That's why there's a low rape conviction rate".

[deleted] • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 04:24 PM

I want to like the sentiment but actually it all points to an increasingly sensitive public to rape issues to and beyond the point of neuroticism. The pendulum is slowing down but not swinging our way and the day when people say "Huh? Prove it " to someone claiming rape is at least a decade away.

Tqbfjotlds • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 05:08 PM **[recovered]**

You are right about the current state of society. The reason people in the past (say 100 years ago) were cautious about believing women, was that they had experienced the fact that women lie about rape/assault/ or anything for that matter, when they feel that they need to. Almost every society learned to be suspicious of women crying rape. To balance this out and to protect women from actually getting raped, society made rules asking women to be careful and teach men that it was their duty to protect women.

randarrow • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 10:35 PM

Not to mention nearly complete segregation of sexes even in otherwise coed workplaces, to the point women and men worked on different floors and wouldn't share elevators. The glass ceiling has a lot of different reasons behind it.

And the protection wasn't just against false abuse claims, was against attempts at husband hunting among already married men the ensuing rumor mill. Back before certifications, when all men had were their reputations, rumors about infidelity could be career ending if not a big just a big waste of time.

Anxian • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 04:30 PM

Why did he record anything? Who does that and why?

I mean it's obviously good for him that he did, but is this a thing now?

Cunnilingus\_Academy • 16 points • 19 November, 2014 04:57 PM

There's a different article from Nettavisen where it says that he had been accused for rape before and had made it a habit to record all encounters with women after that just in case

<http://www.nettavisen.no/nyheter/kvinne-dmt-for-falsk-voldtektanklage/8510925.html>

[deleted] • 10 points • 19 November, 2014 07:45 PM

Wow, not once. But TWICE this guy has been accused.

That's just fucking depressing.

TRPsubmitter • 10 points • 19 November, 2014 08:50 PM

Can you imagine his dating life from now on? He's gonna set up cameras all over his apartment, car and maybe a go pro.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 11:10 PM

He'll have a Go Pro on his bell end by the end of it xD

cover20 • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 04:32 PM

It's good for all of us that he did. I'd say it's even good for women who actually are raped, because it will get rid of some fakers.

REALheimdall • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 05:17 PM

The guy was accused once before apparently.

kinklianehoff • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 09:58 PM

This is very interesting as a Norwegian TRP'er. I've always felt the common view here of the extremely radical feminist scandinavia was somewhat oversimplified.

The social democratic policies we have are frowned upon by many red pillers, but most of them are really not that bad for the average man.

Generally our politics always lean towards being more sober. Feminism for example is moderated quite a bit more before it reaches legislation. Divorce rape is not as bad here. Child support can be rather high when it is forced, but you are free to make a private deal without the state interfering.

Feminism is alive here, just like in the rest of the west, but it has slightly less hair armpits and it can often keep a coherent conversation without foaming at the mouth.

Conversely, men are servile and increasingly beta, but there are undercurrents of trp knowledge still whispered in corners or belched in drunken stupor.

All in all it remind me more of the first waves promised egalitarianism. However, this is not worthy of praise. The complementary roles of the sexes are not distinct enough here either. It's a state of the medium, the mediocre and it is becoming increasingly mediocre.

I predict that the backlash against feminism in anglophone countries will be comparatively sober and modest here, like it always is.

And this court decision may be the start of something very sober.

kinklianeoff • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 10:10 PM

forgot to mention. we recently had a debate about "blue feminism" or "liberal feminism". It is basically about returning feminism to "equal opportunities" and more focus on the individual being able to make its own choices. Sounds alright imo. However, this got a thorough beating by the usual suspects in the left leaning media matriarchy.

They felt threatened by the truth, feminism is outdated.

TheRealMouseRat • 12 points • 19 November, 2014 02:37 PM

I'm proud to be Norwegian. Too bad it required sound to avoid him being judged guilty. "he said she said"-cases can be hard to determine though.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 02:59 PM

Surely you just can't make a determination in such cases? The penalty for being wrong is a persons life.

TheRealMouseRat • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 03:14 PM

Yea, that's why I thought it was bad, as stated by my "too bad". the last sentence of mine is to explain some of the reason why someone can be sentenced based on an allegation and that they knew that they had sex. someone might say: "but if an allegation and proof that they had sex isn't enough to convict, then rapists will walk free most of the time". I don't agree with the argument, as I think it should take more evidence to remove a person's life, but the argument does have some points to it as well.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 09:35 PM

It's a perennial problem. You can prove they had sex (and many times the accused will confirm that yes, they had sex), but the only way they can prove it was rape is... well actually they can't really, not in most cases. Even bruising and tearing of soft tissues is not proof. Witnesses are better but one must be very careful with witness testimony, it can be incorrect, unreliable, biased, or cause unwarranted assumptions.

There was a way people used to understand that helped reduce women getting raped and being unable to convict later because it is ambiguous whether there was consent or not. This technique has nothing to do with the legal system and was used - and still is today by some - as a measure to prevent the situation from coming up in the first place.

It could be called the reasonable person rule. Or being prudent. Or just not getting drunk and naked with a guy who isn't likely to take no for an answer, and being able to predict (with their much vaunted 'social intelligence' and 'intuition') what guys they should not get into situations where so-called date rape could happen with.

Imagine how many rapes, real and retconned, could be prevented with a little prudence.

cover20 • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 12:27 AM

When a woman's vagina is sending urgent messages, women no longer have much social intelligence.

That's the foundation of much game strategy, and while some may consider it unfair, it's simply the rules of the battle of the sexes. Nothing legally actionable about a man obtaining consent in such circumstances.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 05:01 AM

Aye, there's the rub. "Nothing legally actionable about a man obtaining consent in such circumstances" is and should be understood as not only the default position, but also necessary as part of the foundation of the very concept of freedom of the individual. Not just for men, but for everyone, because the the general principle behind it is transferable to many circumstances and situations.

Yet, "but if an allegation and proof that they had sex isn't enough to convict, then rapists will walk free most of the time" is where it gets hard for a lot of people, because in order to maintain our foundation of freedom of the individual, due process, presumption of innocence and all that, we must let some real rapists walk free. Simply because the word of one person saying that someone else did something bad is often not going to be good enough to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that the accused actually did something bad. As we all can see, that holds true for all forms of crime and wrongdoing, not merely rape and sexual misconduct. It requires special pleading to make the claim that in this one type of wrong act, we should abandon our principles of fairness and blind justice and presume the word of one person carries more weight than the word of another, all else being equal. (Of course, deep down, all else isn't equal when a woman accuses a man of sexual misconduct, even if we think and feel it should be.)

That's why I brought up prudence as a positive character trait that can prevent a lot of rape - not getting into situations where it could happen is what a reasonable person does. That can't help everybody all the time, but nothing can. Those who understand the concept of prudence as I'm expressing it here are also less likely to interpret an... ambiguous encounter as an assault. Especially since many men accused of the act are often caught by surprise - she was alone with him, she kissed back, she let her clothes be taken off, *she never said 'no' or 'stop' or tried to physically reject him*. Not really ambiguous, but from her point of view it could be back-rationalised in more than one way. Her interpretation changes based on incentive to see it one way or another, and by the way she is influenced by the society around her.

I'd not go all-out and say women shouldn't be alone with guys they aren't willing to fuck, but at the same time, I consider it damned good sense for a girl to vet her company enough that she has reason to feel safe alone with him and has a psychological handle on any of the things that might possibly happen. Honestly most guys that would fuck a woman who was clearly indicating she does not want to fuck him are both rare and not that hard to spot. (I could imagine some disagreement over this from some corners, but that would be a good debate.) Certainly I expect that kind of prudence of my LTR; if she is alone with a strange guy and he allegedly rapes her, I'd have to wonder what the fuck was she doing alone with this guy? This should be common practice for anyone, but especially women, precisely because they are vulnerable to the rare but still existant sexual aggressor. They can complain all they want about how unfair that is. It's not like there's anyone to blame, except the individuals who knowingly and with intent commit violations of the freedom and autonomy of others for their own gain. Individuals only can bear such blame, not identity groups.

Those urgent messages that the female libido can produce have always made me suspicious of so-called date rape anyway. I hesitate to expand on that thought, though, even here. In any event, I can see no wrong in that game strategy of working to help her hind brain overwhelm her 'good sense' and get her to consent. Consent is consent. People who let their social conditioning get in the way of obtaining consent and have to be 120% sure that she really really wants to do it and will never ever think it was a bad idea are, well, their bloodlines

aren't going to be around when we start landing people on other planets regularly.

In the end, we are all just a bunch of animals. We fool ourselves into thinking we're in control because that's how our brains evolved, that self-deception helps us survive. It takes a lot of self-discipline and even training to really be in control, even for very short periods of time. I'd prefer to avoid both the naturalistic fallacy (that what is natural is better) and the naturalistic fallacy fallacy (that because the naturalistic fallacy exists, it must mean that what is natural is never better). We are not smarter than nature, something I learned from the primal diet and lifestyle, but endlessly debate with some transhumanists. There's a kind of moral transhumanism as well, where people will say 'just because it is that way or evolved that way, doesn't mean it should be that way now.' They will use that to justify criminalising 'game' that takes advantage of the reason-overriding ability of a woman's libido. Hopefully their ideas will die out with their bloodlines.

I might be rambling. The more I write, the more Bruichladdich Rocks I consume, and sometimes the words get out of hand.

manslutalt • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 04:35 PM

You can throw the rape accusation out of court for lack of evidence. That's what should be the standard practice, but for some reason that doesn't always happen.

cover20 • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 12:24 AM

They should be pretty easy to determine. If one can only be convicted when guilt is proved beyond a reasonable doubt (that's the US standard, I imagine you have something similar in Norway), they should almost always result in acquittal.

justskatedude • 10 points • 19 November, 2014 06:03 PM

Isn't his name still tarnished? In the US, we release the names of people BEFORE they even have a trial, so even if you are accused and the case is dropped it already ruins your name, regardless of the crime.

jolly--roger • 9 points • 19 November, 2014 01:52 PM

I had an idea of moving there.. One more reason to do so..

Crushinated • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 02:04 PM

I've lived here for 4 years now. It's pretty great.

jolly--roger • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 02:11 PM

Anywhere nice like Bergen? I took a trip to NOR a couple months back, destroyed my knees by hiking (middle difficulty, yeah, right), but damn, that country's next to perfect.

And all the girls had yoga pants on them. Like it's a national sport.

vagijn • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 03:45 PM

(middle difficulty, yeah, right)

The first time I was in Norway, years before I actually lived there, we did a hike the groundskeeper of the camping called 'easy'.

It was quite a demanding hike, and we thought the guy must have been joking are we must have gotten the directions wrong... then a family with young children of around 8 and 9 years old passed us

in a higher tempo.

Well, at the time I lived in the flattest country of Europe and it turned out 'easy' on a Norwegian level translates to quite demanding for flatlanders. You do adapt quickly however once you live there.

jolly--roger • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 04:05 PM\*

Haha, yeah, that's pretty much what it was with me. I was raised a flatlander and for some reason I agreed to hiking in Norway.

Going through the Norway's Grand Canyon (two days after trekking over Ulriken) I was truly afraid I'd fall. It was rather cold and damp, and my trekking shoes had some hard time getting a grip on those treacherous rocks. After that trip, my quads switched off. Walking upstairs was a misery, downstairs nearly impossible. Next day bike time. My left knee started to produce some funny sounds.

Had a blast though. 10/10 recommended and would do again.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 02:52 PM\*

Bergen is nice if you like rain and insufferable cunts. Oslo or Trondheim is where it's at. Edit: I should clarify, the residents of Bergen will tell you that they should've been the true capital and has an air of superiority surrounding them. The residents of Oslo and Trondheim is much more grounded, in my opinion.

jolly--roger • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 03:40 PM

Yeah, I heard a lot about that rain... when I was there it decided to take a hiatus and the weather was pretty awesome (just a few drops atop Ulriken), same in Oslo a couple days later

Nevertheless, I'm an RP man so I wouldn't have to suffer any cunts everyday. And when the time comes, I can handle them (I had a crazy cunt for a flatmate).

Uzinero • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 05:35 PM

Is Møre og Romsdal a decent area? One of my online friends lives in Alesund and said it's a great area.

Haukie-1 points 19 November, 2014 04:03 PM **[recovered]**

Just dont live in east oslo, it is labeled as a ghetto by the west side, or you could live across the oslofjord and take the "hurtigbåt" directly to akersbrygge, which is downtown.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 04:14 PM

Fucking kek. Sure, it's the less financially sound part of town but a ghetto is a bit much. As a man, you're safe almost everywhere in Oslo. Do you live in Oslo yourself?

Eloni • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 02:54 PM

Why not Bergen? Ill walk you up a Red difficulty ;)

jolly--roger • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 03:23 PM

Bergen IS what I'm aiming for.. and.. red? Sure, just wait till they put me in a coffin first ;)

vengefully\_yours • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 03:46 PM

I would move there but both my friends in the country died, and I couldn't have my cars.

IllimitableMan • 12 points • 19 November, 2014 01:45 PM\*

Oslo District Court believes audio recording shows that there occurred some rape

That there occurred *some* rape? How do you half rape a chick? LOL Furthermore he was found NOT GUILTY of rape and she was found to be making the shit up due to audio evidence. Something lost in translation, perhaps? Reads very oddly in English.

On topic: good to see a woman not get away with trying to ruin yet another man's life. A woman in her 20's in modern Norway? We can assume the psychological maturity of a 16 year old girl in that case. "So like, I'm totes gonna press charges." Ugh, please. **Pussy pass denied, bitch.**

TheRealMouseRat • 41 points • 19 November, 2014 02:48 PM

The correct translation of the sentence is: "Oslo district court thinks that the sound recording shows that no rape occurred, and that the alleged victim undoubtedly gave a wrong testimony during the reporting of the incident."

IllimitableMan • 8 points • 19 November, 2014 04:51 PM

Yeah much more fluid. Sounds good. Makes sense. Got my upvote.

varisforge • 21 points • 19 November, 2014 01:56 PM

It's probably a mistranslation on Google's part.

bioneural • 6 points • 20 November, 2014 12:01 AM

If only this happened in the US.

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 November, 2014 02:12 PM

Oh wow that's amazing, look up the laws in your state/country and record all interactions with strange women, what a life saving play.

And it's the second time this guy has had a false claim pushed on him. Scandinavian countries are kind of fucked but this one is one of the better ones.

ColdEiric • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 02:36 PM

From now on, I will defend Norway in any discussion I overhear, even if I haven't got a clue what they are talking about.

Nicolay77 • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 02:55 PM

Google glass required from now on for both sides of the deal.

whitey\_sorkin • 10 points • 19 November, 2014 02:01 PM

I feel like the English language was just raped.

rpscrote • 9 points • 19 November, 2014 04:05 PM

Google Translate is not a gentle lover

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 07:04 PM

This is a pleasant surprise given Norway's extreme feminist preoccupation with violence against women. Every crime novel from there contains the theme of evil male sexuality and evil patriarchal systemic corruption to protect it. If you formed an impression about Norway just from the fiction they produce, you would think it's like Mumbai or South Africa.

youngbulker • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 07:34 PM

For Canadians - Conclusion regarding the one party consent exception The foregoing indicates that, in Canada, it is legal to record your own conversations, whether they are had on the telephone or in person. However, it is illegal to record a conversation if you are not one of the intend recipients of the communications made in that conversation.

It is illegal to possess surreptitious recording devices in Canada Although it is legal for Canadians to record conversations that they are involved in, it is illegal for them to possess surreptitious recording devices.

Section 191(1) of the Criminal Code provides as follows:

Every one who possesses, sells or purchases any electro-magnetic, acoustic, mechanical or other device or any component thereof knowing that the design thereof renders it primarily useful for surreptitious interception of private communications is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years.

Section 191(1) of the Criminal Code sets out exceptions to that prohibition for the police and persons holding licenses to possess surreptitious devices.

Thus, Canadian can record their own conversations, but should do so with regular recording devices such as dictaphones, tape recorders, ipods etc.

cover20 • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 12:06 AM

I guess it would be cheapest to run a program on your computer to record microphone input, and leave that running during the interaction at your apt. Run it in the background so she can look casually at the computer and not see that it's running.

Drogoe4 points 19 November, 2014 09:00 PM [recovered]

I made a post here recommending men record their dalliances and a loud contingent of the responses were idiotic claims that the recording wouldn't do any good because it wouldn't hold up in court. Some of you are so socially clueless to basic realities, that I wonder how many have autism or aspergers

gprime312 • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 11:11 PM

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telephone\\_recording\\_laws#All-party\\_consent\\_states](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Telephone_recording_laws#All-party_consent_states)

Infinitopolis • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 04:31 PM

So 8 months and 350k kroner is all she gets for lying about a rape in Sweden, and yet Julian Assange still faces permanent house arrest.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 03:56 PM

So what did the man do to record it? Put on audio recording on his phone at the start of the date, slip it in his pocket, and keep it running for 2 hours?

Would be interesting to actually try this out.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 04:41 PM

Make sure you live in a 1-party consent jurisdiction.

In some places, like California, all involved parties need to be informed that they're being recorded in order for the audio footage to hold in court.

Hairybottomface • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 05:33 PM

What would happen if there's solid evidence that you showed the court you didn't commit an act but was obtained via a secret recording. In a very serious case (like this one where a mans future is at stake) would they still have to ignore it?

Pushnikov • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 06:21 PM\*

This idea of party consent is often repeated, but only applicable in specific situations Two party consent is for wire tapping, such as for phone calls, and private conversations. You'd be hard pressed to say a date is a private meeting or conversation. You are in public, interacting publicly, with no expectation that no one will hear or see you.

You don't need consent from someone video recording a premises for safety, such as a department store or gas station, or your home. In the consideration that someone would expect privacy in your home, a sticker that simply says, "this premises is under surveillance" would suffice. Obviously laws vary by location and you should check your local laws, but wire tapping law does not apply to these situations like this, generally.

RedPill115 • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 11:51 PM

While it's illegal to tape in California without both people's consent, it is still admissible into court. I'd rather be convicted of illegal recording than of rape. The inadmissible part only applies to evidence the state uses to convict you, it doesn't apply to evidence introduced by the defense.

If someone wants to argue, please provide a link to a source that says otherwise.

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 06:12 PM

Exactly. Like searching a home without consent or a warrant.

TisNotOverYet • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 04:28 PM

Oh, this is justice porn. Love it.

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 04:38 PM

Waaait a second. I thought women are gods in skandinavian countries? Does this mean, that skandinavian countries are generally kinda feminist but after all fair, or is Norway special? Or is Sweden that country, that seems kinda rad-fem to me. Or am I totally wrong? Help me out.

RecklessGambol • 7 points • 19 November, 2014 05:58 PM

Sweden is by far the worst of the bunch.

fnordsnord • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 06:00 PM

It means that even a broken clock can be right twice a day.

draketton • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 10:18 PM

Legal savvy and an always-on camera go a long way.

How often do you hear of an american having all those things in order and still getting railroaded? I've never

heard of it happening.

themasterof • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 12:30 AM

It means you dont know Jack-shit about Scandinavia.

MrRexels • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 11:12 PM

Weird, and here I though all of Scandinavia was castrated and brainwashed already.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 11:45 PM

I've been preaching this shit to an almost delusional level over the past year:

Record everything. Take pictures of places you go together. Have her send you videos, pictures, every nasty piece of media you can.

At best it's evidence that she was an active participant, at worst it helps paint her in a salacious light in court.

It's a brave new world my friends, prepare accordingly

Psychedelic\_Leg2 points 20 November, 2014 01:34 AM\* **[recovered]**

Have a hidden camera in your place, when she bangs you, legal or not who gives a shit, 1. Good vid to show your buddies (jk but not jk) 2. Judge/jury would see she consented to a bang sesh. Also, I believe she should get a sentence equivalent to what the guy would get, here we go, pussy pass, wonder what the sentence would be if a dude reported false rape, probably 10 years at least

Burner1701 • 0 points • 20 November, 2014 01:50 AM

Secretly filming a girl having sex with you is dubious. Showing it to your friends, or putting it online, later is well out of line. As the father of a daughter, fuck you for even suggesting it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 November, 2014 02:16 AM

To be honest, I wouldn't show it to my friends, I obviously never mentioned putting it online but I'd rather record it and not be in the pen than not record it and do time because a hoe wants to get revenge for something by filing a rape report. You seem like an over-controlling and paranoid father, you need to relax a bit

Burner1701 • 1 point • 21 November, 2014 07:28 AM

"Good vid to show your buddies (jk but not jk)"

You're a dick.

AngraMainyuu • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 03:29 PM

Wait, wait, wait. I thought false rape accusations never happened?? Imagine if every guy in America was smart enough to do this shit, and how fast feminists would have retreat from the public exchange of ideas and facts.

Ornlü\_Wolfjarl • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 03:58 AM

8 months in jail for her, when the guy could have gotten easily 3-5 years. Justice indeed. If you maliciously accuse someone of a crime, you should get to serve the same sentence they would have served if they were found guilty.

ShekelBanker • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 05:00 AM

Really scary that the only way you have a chance to protect yourself is to go NSA-mode with your life just in

case anything's going to happen. As someone who lived under a communist regime this is shocking.

raceAround126 • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 07:35 AM

RE Legalities of recording... er, this is the fucking internet. If your recording gets thrown out of court, there's youtube, torrents... fuck put that up on bandcamp if you want!

iPCV • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 10:04 AM\*

I choose a dvd for tonight

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 05:24 PM

Huzzah. A country that doesn't have its head up its ass.

emprise • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 08:30 PM

this deserves way more attention. someone post this shit to /r/news let the whole world know of this.

emprise • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 03:29 AM

but we know women. they'll learn from this, and during the whole date, they'll change their voice so it fucks up the recording. and at the trial, she can change her voice. yup. gonna have to VIDEO record now :)

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 04:16 AM

You gotta make it hard on these bitches they know that most men are thirsty dogs and will gladly jump at the chance to get it in as soon as the bitch spreads her legs; she plans on this outcome! She plans on it no differently than some psychopathic coward who would kill his "wife" for insurance money. I never thought women as different but apparently a lot of dudes do. Ultimately its his fault for trusting this bitch so quickly. Guys in western countries put out too easily even before they really get to know a bitch. Its simple just don't put out to a bitch you don't know and if she don't like it SHE CAN GO FUCK HER SELF for all you out to care.

Rougepellet • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 05:01 AM

Good to know there are some countries that won't tolerate the war on men and the bullshit women will pull. Shit like in the post

[deleted] • -1 points • 19 November, 2014 04:31 PM\*

says woman lawyer

Why does it matter that the lawyer is a woman, if you don't mind my asking?

Tqbfjotlds • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 05:03 PM [recovered]

Seems like the article was translated by Google

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 November, 2014 05:06 PM

That....actually explains it. Lol

cover20 • 4 points • 19 November, 2014 05:06 PM

It probably means "says the woman's lawyer".

But female lawyers are sort of famous as bitchy feminists, with the legal skills to catch you out and make you pay, and pay. Not all, but many, and it's a stereotype based on experience.

TimmyBuffet • 1 point • 19 November, 2014 07:04 PM

Could be Anwaltin: Anwalt(lawyer) + in(female).

Meine Sekretarin: Sekretar(secretary) + in(female)

It's just part of the language sometimes to state gender with noun.

night-addict • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 10:37 PM

What devices would TRP recommend to conduct audio recordings like this?

vzhu • 1 point • 20 November, 2014 03:14 AM

echo: time travelling recorder

GenericallyEpic • -2 points • 19 November, 2014 08:33 PM

Only fifty dollars? There should be straight up jail time, the entire costs of both the lawyers, a public apology, and her face should be plastered as a someone willing to call false rape on you... at the minimum. You get hit with a rape charge, innocent or not, and your life is over. I think false rape should be charged at the same intensity as attempted murder.

Syberr • 5 points • 19 November, 2014 08:51 PM

50 THOUSAND dollars and 8 months of jail time

gadelat • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 03:57 PM

Is there one-party consent when eavesdropping in Norway?

-robknows- • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 05:58 PM

Norway is so based. I intend to move there someday, since we're still in the EU.

Transmigratory • 0 points • 19 November, 2014 11:21 PM

I guess this means we should always take the chick back to our place where we have cameras with sound.

[deleted] 19 November, 2014 10:51 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

Sortech • 2 points • 19 November, 2014 11:38 PM

Kai Vaag is a man, dude. And how does anyone's name have anything to do with their ability to do their job?

[deleted] 20 November, 2014 01:46 AM\*

[permanently deleted]