

# Man serves on a jury, is horrified of seeing how baseless accusations can ruin men's lives

May 20, 2022 | 195 upvotes | by [BCRE8TVE](#)

---

Isn't [this a lovely thread on r/TrueOffMyChest](#).

I don't really have much to add, I just find it interesting how this is basically a live demonstration of what MRAs have been talking about, the man is horrified, and half the comments are basically defending the woman and condemning the man, *proving MRA points and showing exactly why the man should be so terrified of the US justice system*.

I don't have much more to add beyond that, just odd to see this validated so viscerally and so many people still being so blind to it.

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](https://www.theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

springy • 43 points • 20 May, 2022 11:04 AM

Society is set up for protecting "woman and children first" even if that means sacrificing men. Of course, deluded toxic feminists still insist that the world is built around "male privilege". Yeah, the privilege to go down with a sinking ship, while women and children climb into the lifeboats.

[deleted] • 17 points • 20 May, 2022 11:18 AM

I'm surprised they aren't more explicit with that saying and say 'women and girls first'.

Greg\_W\_Allan • 7 points • 21 May, 2022 12:24 AM

That is happening. All global agencies are gradually changing their agendas from "women and children" to "women and girls".

BCRE8TVE[S] • 11 points • 20 May, 2022 01:25 PM

To be fair there are male privileges, it's just that feminists ignore the reverse side of the medal, where those privileges come with expectations and punishments for failing to uphold those expectations.

Feminism far too often only looks at the benefits men have and demand women have the same, while simultaneously ignoring the disadvantages and obstacles that men face, and also ignoring the benefits that women have and men don't.

So there ARE male privileges, but there are also male disadvantages that feminists simply don't care about. There are female disadvantages, but there are also lots of female privileges that feminists will deny to their dying breath and try and frame as oppression instead.

DavidByron2 • 9 points • 20 May, 2022 06:47 PM

there are male privileges

Name one.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 3 points • 20 May, 2022 06:52 PM

People often think men are more competent than women.

The flipside is that men are punished harder if they are incompetent or fail.

Another male privilege is that having lots of sex is seen as macho or desirable. On the flipside being a virgin is heavily punished.

There ARE male privileges. It's just that feminism thinks that there are no downsides to male privileges, and very incorrectly thinks that anything that even slightly inconveniences women must be because of male privilege and female oppression.

Just because they're wrong 99% of the time, doesn't mean they can't be right once in a while. Even a broken clock tells the right time twice a day after all!

DavidByron2 • 12 points • 20 May, 2022 06:57 PM

People often think men are more competent than women

Didn't you say this before? What's the evidence for this? For example give me evidence people

think men are better at childcare than women.

I'll wait.

Another male privilege is that having lots of sex is seen as macho or desirable

Not only false but -- how exactly the fuck is that a privilege???? There's countless young men who are maligned expressly because they can't get sex. What you're describing is a huge penalty for men not a privilege. Many kids commit suicide over this.

Just because they're wrong 99% of the time, doesn't mean they can't be right once in a while

So name a real male privilege instead of this fucking bullshit

BCRE8TVE[S] • -1 points • 20 May, 2022 07:34 PM

Didn't you say this before? What's the evidence for this? For example give me evidence people think men are better at childcare than women.

Don't think I said this before, but it's more with say jobs and technical stuff than childcare.

It's funny because feminists actually see that as a different privilege, that men are cheered on for doing even basic child care tasks, instead of seeing it how it really is, that society thinks men are actually incompetent at childcare and that doing better than the bare minimum is actually patronizing. It's a perfect example of their hypocrisy and double-think.

Not only false but -- how exactly the fuck is that a privilege???? There's countless young men who are maligned expressly because they can't get sex. What you're describing is a huge penalty for men not a privilege. Many kids commit suicide over this.

I'm not disagreeing with you, I'm just pointing out what feminists think is male privilege. Like you correctly pointed out, feminists completely ignore the reverse of the medal, only looking at the "good" stuff some men get, and completely ignore and dismiss the crap hand most men are actually dealt.

So name a real male privilege instead of this fucking bullshit

Being perceived as being more competent can help men get promoted, in contrast to women who are just as competent and who are not promoted since they are not noticed.

It's not a hugely beneficial thing like they try and portray it as, but it is a small benefit that can and does happen to some men.

DavidByron2 • 8 points • 20 May, 2022 08:49 PM

it's more with say jobs and technical stuff than childcare

So you don't think childcare is a job? At any rate what's the **privilege** here? It's not (for example) hiring. Some guy on /r/offmychest said he got 8-9 times more callbacks if he put a female name on his resume for programing jobs. Quit bullshitting and tell me where my privilege is.

I'm not disagreeing with you

OK so we agree you were wrong then.

I'm just pointing out what feminists think is male privilege

I don't care what feminists think about it. You said that objectively it was true that men had privileges.

Being perceived as being more competent can help men get promoted

I think the reverse is true. Where's your evidence? You're saying men get promoted more simply for being male. The reality is that companies these days are under enormous pressure to promote women to look woke - or to fulfil legal quotas - and whether those women are any good is irrelevant. Except in so far as promotion often means doing LESS of the job you say men are perceived as better at which would logically count AGAINST them being promoted. But that's theorizing. Show me your data.

it is a small benefit that can and does happen to some men

Being a millionaire is also a benefit that can and does happen to "some" men. Don't you need to show it happens because they are men? Not merely that it "can" happen to "some" men?

Am I privileged as a man because some other men are rich?

Stop bullshitting me and tell me where my fucking male privilege is. You know perfectly well either one of us could list of dozens of significant legal and institutional benefits for women. Where's that for men?

unsure-quote • 1 point • 23 May, 2022 03:48 PM

Childcare isn't a job for women, it's what they've evolved to do.

It's like saying swimming is a job for a fish.

DavidByron2 • 1 point • 23 May, 2022 06:49 PM

I meant actual paid by a capitalist day care worker work. Men are routinely refused work in such places because they're seen as pedophiles. Whoever I was replying to seemed to think men are preferred workers or some bullshit.

Having said that obvious stay at home parent or whatever is another "job" men don't usually get to do because of their sex.

TitanicPat • 21 points • 20 May, 2022 09:41 AM

I don't consider myself mgto but It so very hard to argue with that position, when its clear, that once a man is accused of something, the system will crush him. It won't be interested in justice or fairness. A man, once accused has NO agency, once the he's fed to that system.

The path of least resistance and the area in which you have the MOST agency to protect yourself is in deciding how much contact you have with women PRIOR to being accused.

Whitified • 18 points • 20 May, 2022 09:03 AM

I used to work for the Manhattan District Attorney. I can tell you, very matter of factly, the criminal justice system is fucked up. Domestic violence victims having their lives uprooted because cases were pled down to a violation of harassment, rape cases in which the defendant was exonerated, etc. I would be interested in knowing all the details of the case for this particular situation. DA's decline to prosecute all the time unless they know there's at least a chance of them winning the case. There must have been some details in this case,

or some sort of history with this defendant, that made the DA have a feeling they had some sort of prosecutable offense...or some other motive like deportation.

Expert feminist concern troll. Starts off by pretending to agree with OP "yeah the system is fucked up". Proceeds to talk only about sexual crimes. Supposedly, America is this place where sex offenders aren't punished enough. Then ends her comment by implying the innocent man OP described must not be so innocent.

DA's decline to prosecute all the time unless they know there's at least a chance of them winning the case. There must have been some details in this case, or some sort of history with this defendant, that made the DA have a feeling they had some sort of prosecutable offense

BCRE8TVE[S] • 6 points • 20 May, 2022 01:35 PM

See I don't think they're a feminist troll. I think they're genuinely a good person trying to make sense of a horrible abuse of the court system. I think they are just deluded, they've been fed feminist lies for so long and never had them challenged, so that's just their worldview. It's natural to form an attitude like that when that's the only information you've had.

Now they saw something that went against all those years of feminist lies, and they can't reconcile the two. It's creating massive cognitive dissonance between how they've been told the world works according to a feminist perspective, and how the world ACTUALLY works, and they can't square the two.

I don't think the OP was a feminist troll because a feminist troll wouldn't even bother to bring this up, except to complain that sexual crimes aren't punished enough. Instead they were genuinely horrified at how biased the courts were against men. I think OP was just someone who was fed lies for a very long time, and is starting to see how those lies don't match up with reality.

teenagewitch97 • -17 points • 20 May, 2022 10:50 AM

Sure, label this poster a feminist and completely ignore all their reasonable arguments. That's the way to constructive debates ☐

ImplodedPotatoSalad • 13 points • 20 May, 2022 11:39 AM

which reasonable arguments? "Feeling" based criminal system?

Whitified • 8 points • 20 May, 2022 12:25 PM

Said /u/teenagewitch97 calmly as she proceeds to ignore whitified's arguments

BCRE8TVE[S] • 3 points • 20 May, 2022 01:36 PM

I don't agree with Whitified there, but you do realize that you're using passive aggressive comments without a reasonable argument, right? By all means we should focus on reasonable arguments, but you're not doing that either.

DavidByron2 • 43 points • 20 May, 2022 04:07 AM

Please don't bring any misogyny/misandry to this. This isn't about this it's about. It's about fundamental flaws in a system I thought was supposed to fair and keep us safe

ROTFLMAO. What an idiot. He's really learned nothing at all.

2137gangsterr • 18 points • 20 May, 2022 06:54 AM

Maybe. Or perhaps he's aware where the wind of banhammer blows

Whitified • 6 points • 20 May, 2022 09:00 AM

Why can't misogyny/misandry be the fundamental flaw? He's contradicting himself lmao

Qantourisc • -3 points • 20 May, 2022 10:44 AM

They are both the issue.

ImplodedPotatoSalad • 3 points • 20 May, 2022 11:38 AM

misogyny is not our issue, tho. Therefore, its not an issue at all, from our perspective - which should be THE only thing that matters to us.

Paltry\_Poetaster • 14 points • 20 May, 2022 06:54 AM

Criminal defense is extremely expensive--all law is. Financial ruin is guaranteed, meanwhile the woman snickers to herself with her little revenge, while dating other men who don't know or care or understand the past history.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 9 points • 20 May, 2022 01:44 PM

Not even that financial ruin is guaranteed, financial ruin is guaranteed *for men*. Women can have their fees waived or billed to the man in case of divorce, and it wouldn't surprise me that the same can happen for prosecuting sexual assault. This could mean women falsely accusing men don't even have to pay for their own lawyers.

marks1995 • 9 points • 20 May, 2022 01:48 PM

The metoo movement has been very clear bout this. They are 100% fine with innocent men going to jail if that's what it takes to make sure the guilty ones don't walk away free.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 8 points • 20 May, 2022 02:01 PM

Yep. Metoo has also been rather clear and explicit that it's only for "real" victims of abuse, and apparently men don't qualify.

John\_Savage69 • 5 points • 20 May, 2022 09:37 PM

In another thread some "meetoo" fangirl says to me that "due process and presumption of innocence are 'problematic.'"

Aimless-Nomad • 9 points • 20 May, 2022 06:43 AM

**Oh the justice system is totally fair.**

BCRE8TVE[S] • 9 points • 20 May, 2022 01:47 PM\*

Feminists would be foaming at the mouth if a rapist got out of jail early for good behaviour, but they only seem to care when the rapist has a penis. If the rapist is a woman, well it's not like women can rape men anyways, and if he was raped it's not like it was as harmful to him as it would have been to a woman, and even if it was harmful the woman didn't mean it to be, so she should get a shorter prison sentence anyways.

Funny how they go on and on about a non-existent pay gap but don't give a damn about the sentencing gap.

tenchineuro • 3 points • 20 May, 2022 02:15 PM

and if he was raped it's not like it was as harmful to him as it would have been [to] a woman

Tell me more about this...

BCRE8TVE[S] • 5 points • 20 May, 2022 03:08 PM

Thanks for catching the mistake BTW, gonna edit that it!

But yeah, funny thing that, menslib, which is supposedly the single best feminist sub for men, invited a guy to talk about sexual assault of men. Turns out the guy was an actual rape apologist and said precisely that, that while rape is hurtful to men it's worse for women. Actually, on finding the link it seems I misremembered, it was about domestic violence not rape, but it's pretty clear the sentiments go along the same lines for rape as well.

If you want more examples of just how off the rails menslib is, I recommend r/menslibwatch, it's not terribly active but it's good at documenting the absolutely fucking nuttery going on in a sub that calls itself pro-male.

We have the feminist Mary Koss who changed the FBI definition of rape to make it so that a husband could be charged with rape if he raped his wife (which is a good change), but then deliberately crafted the new definition of rape to deliberately exclude male rape victims from female perpetrators, and invented the made-up "made to penetrate" category. I quote:

"Although consideration of male victims is within the scope of the legal statutes, it is important to restrict the term rape to instances where male victims were penetrated by offenders. It is inappropriate to consider as a rape victim a man who engages in unwanted sexual intercourse with a woman. p. 206"

So yeah. Feminists care about rape victims, but only if the victim doesn't have a penis.

You'll definitely hear empathetic people who are sorry for individual men who have been raped, but as a movement feminism goes out of its way to erase male victims of female perpetrators, and pretend like they are the exception to the rule that 95% of rapes are committed by men on women, when the truth is that for rape and domestic violence it's far closer to 50/50.

knucklz74 • 6 points • 20 May, 2022 05:32 PM

I 100 percent understand. This happened to me 100 percent COMPLETE False allegations and arrest and conviction. Changed my life forever.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 06:29 PM

I am sorry to hear. It's really disgusting when this kind of perjury and perversion of justice is carried out. I hope things will get better for you.

knucklz74 • 2 points • 20 May, 2022 07:33 PM

Oh I'm married now. I have a incredible wife. But one thing it did do. I NEVER EVER DATED ANY WOMAN from this country EVER AGAIN. THEY ARE VERY DANGEROUS. My wife is from Brazil

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 07:42 PM

There are some good women I'm sure, the problem is finding them.

I'm in Canada and I am appalled at what I hear from the US, I hope things are better in Canada. I don't know, I've never really been in the dating market, I just hope things are better up here.

knucklz74 • 2 points • 21 May, 2022 04:43 AM

Wish you the best Goodluck with that.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 21 May, 2022 01:21 PM

Thanks, and I wish you the best as well!

Jbr74 • 4 points • 20 May, 2022 02:07 PM

If I ever find myself on a jury on a DV case.

Let's just say there better be overwhelming proof of significant physical injury.

With that said, I probably got a lifetime free get-out-of-jury duty card.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 3 points • 20 May, 2022 02:10 PM

I mean that's how juries are supposed to work, for the prosecution to present evidence beyond a reasonable doubt. "She said so" isn't and shouldn't be enough, but apparently it is.

Per getting out of jury duty, there is a video from CGPGrey on the subject if you want to look it up.

DavidByron2 • 7 points • 20 May, 2022 04:02 AM

Yeah this is why you have to always (or almost always) vote for not guilty in a case where a man is accused of some sort of sexual crime by a woman. The fact is as a juror you will never know what really happened because of the fact of feminist laws on evidence that bans evidence tending to prove a man's innocence. Since you can't know if such evidence exists or not, and since you have to vote on the basis of giving the defendant the benefit of the doubt, you must assume such evidence does exist but has been excluded by the judge and banned from being presented to the jury because of feminist hate laws. Not saying that the evidence 100% exists. Just saying it might or it might not.

It might or might not be true that everyone in the court room knows the man is innocent because of evidence that's banned from being presented to the jury. Since you don't and can't know, you must return a not guilty verdict.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 9 points • 20 May, 2022 04:08 AM

I disagree that you always have to vote not guilty if men are accused. There absolutely are men who are guilty.

The thing is, there are just as many women who are guilty as well, because men get raped at the same rate as women. It's just that women tend to get away with it far more often.

So again not to say one should automatically vote guilty or not guilty, one should always based oneself on the preponderance of evidence, to see if the accused is guilty beyond all reasonable doubts based on the evidence.

The fact is as a juror you will never know what really happened because of the fact of feminist laws on evidence that bans evidence tending to prove a man's innocence.

Do you have a source for this? That would be pretty damning if that was the case.

tenchineuro • 2 points • 20 May, 2022 01:11 PM

The thing is, there are just as many women who are guilty as well, because men get raped at the same rate as women. It's just that women tend to get away with it far more often.

Name a woman in prison for raping a man.

Do you have a source for this? That would be pretty damning if that was the case.

Think rape shield laws.



Name a woman in prison for raping a man.

I mean there are some, but female rapists have a far greater chance of getting away with it.

Think rape shield laws.

I've never heard of those before, what are they?

tenchineuro • 4 points • 20 May, 2022 01:47 PM\*

I mean there are some,

But you can't name any? If you don't know of at least one woman in prison for raping a man you have no basis for claiming they exist.

I've never heard of those before, what are they?

There are several aspects, the first is that the female accuser be kept anonymous, the name of the accused is made public. Next the judge becomes responsible for vetting the evidence that the jury can be shown to remove anything that might make the woman look bad. In many places this includes evidence of past false rape accusations, although it is unlikely the defense could have this evidence as rape accusers are kept anonymous.

In the UK in an attempt to get the rape conviction rate up, the Crown was hiding exculpatory evidence and putting men they knew were innocent in prison.

In Canada after a man kept every text and was able to prove he was innocent they came up with laws designed to prevent an accused man from raising an affirmative defense, bill C-51, now also known as the Ghomeshi laws.

Here's Karen Straughan on C-51.

---

The bill, when it passed, effectively changed the entire nature of sexual assault cases. In any criminal case, the prosecutor's client is the people (or in Canada, the head of state--the king or queen of England). The complainant or "victim" has no legal standing. They are not a party to the case, and therefore have NO rights as a party to the case. They are nothing more than a witness for the prosecution.

C-51 gives the complainant a right to a publicly funded personal attorney, and grants the complainant and or their counsel legal standing during rape shield hearings. I can't stress how important this change is. Even in states in the US where disclosure goes both ways, NOTHING like this exists.

As a prosecutor, you are not allowed to prep your witnesses, other than to give them a very basic idea of what to expect procedurally ("if cross examination gets rough, take your time, I'll object when I can, and you can always ask for a break"). They are forbidden from sharing ANY of the defense's evidence or strategy with their witnesses, because it risks tainting their testimony.

Even in civil trials where only a few thousand dollars is on the line, it's routine to exclude ALL witnesses (other than the parties to the case) from the courtroom until after they've given testimony, so they're not influenced by any evidence led prior to their turn on the stand.

C-51 effectively mandates the tainting of witness testimony. The fact that a civil court is more

careful about this problem, even regarding uninterested witnesses, in cases where someone is accusing his neighbor of planting a tree too close to the property line, than the criminal law is in cases that often hinge entirely on witness credibility, is insane. If the complainant knows in advance every piece of evidence that's going to be brought to bear by the defense, she and her publicly funded personal attorney (who IS allowed to prep her) will certainly tailor her testimony to not disagree with that evidence.

Having to disclose directly to the complaining witness the existence, nature and implications of documentary evidence that may be led at trial to impeach her (as happened with Ghomeshi) is a fundamental violation of a defendant's right to a fair trial. In the Ghomeshi case, the defendant had scores of documentary evidence--texts, letters, a card from a bouquet of flowers, photos, emails--that completely contradicted the complainants' testimony. He was acquitted solely on the issue of the credibility and reliability of complainant testimony.

Keep in mind, the judge in his ruling said that the complainants' behavior (continuing to pursue Ghomeshi romantically after the alleged assaults, and even conspiring with each other) was not inconsistent with the behavior of genuine victims of sexual assault (more on this at the end). The only matter to be decided was whether he could rely on the veracity of their testimony, given that it did not match the only physical evidence led at trial.

Had this law been in effect when he was tried, all the complainants would have had to do is make up some plausible, feminist approved way to explain away the evidence--"I was confused. I wanted to convince myself that what happened didn't really happen, and pursuing him in that way was kind of part of that... I was trying to make it normal because I didn't want to admit I'd been victimized, blah blah blah..." and he would have been convicted.

There are other problems with C-51, but this particular section of it has come under scrutiny from two judges now, who have both said it violates a defendant's right to a fair trial.

And here we come to the "more on this" part. The Canadian Judicial Council (a non-governmental professional agency) offers voluntary training on sexual assault "myths" to judges. Bill C-337, currently stuck in Senate limbo, aims to make that training mandatory.

This enactment amends the Judges Act to restrict eligibility for judicial appointment to individuals who have completed comprehensive education in respect of matters related to sexual assault law and social context. [emphasis mine]

Which is why the judge in the Ghomeshi case based his entire decision on the reliability of complainant testimony. He literally said (paraphrasing), "Just because she chased this guy for a year and a half, and even danced around the idea of getting married based on one weekend in each other's company in which they didn't even have sex, all while he did his best to give her the polite brush-off... and just because she sent him a handwritten love letter and bouquet of flowers just days after the alleged assault... and just because the next day she was photographed with her arms draped around him gazing adoringly up at him... none of that means she wasn't sexually assaulted. In fact, everything she did after the fact, including conspiring with a fellow complainant in 100s of text messages after they'd both been told by police and the prosecutor not to talk with each other about the case, is consistent with the behavior of a woman who was actually victimized. In fact, genuine victims may even go so far as to lie on the witness stand in order to bolster their case against the defendant, and this is perfectly understandable and cannot be used to determine no assault took place. Be that as it may, I cannot deprive a man of his liberty based solely on testimony that has been demonstrated to be unreliable."

Yep. I'd bet dollars to donuts that Judge Horkins attended the CJC training on the "social context" of sexual assault. Training that may become mandatory for anyone aspiring to the bench.

Even worse. In Alberta a few years ago a defense lawyer applied to a court to compel the CJC to disclose the contents of its training materials so he could determine if that training would prejudice a judge against his client. The court ruled that unless the attorney could demonstrate the training materials were prejudicial, it would not compel the CJC to disclose them.

I kid you not. Defense attorney says, "I'd like to look in the box to see if there's something dangerous in there." Judge says, "Unless you can prove to me the contents of the box are dangerous, you have no right to look in the box."

This is insane. The CJC's training materials--the research, ideologies and methods by which some Canadian judge's have been trained, and to which ALL judges may be subjected in the future--should be available to the general public. To ANY CITIZEN OF CANADA who cares to review them. Yet not even defense lawyers have a right to view these materials.

And all of this is happening with the complicity of the general public because of the social consensus that sexual assault is horrible. Because, as you all know, we live in a rape culture.

queen\_of\_england\_bot • 0 points • 20 May, 2022 01:47 PM

queen of England

Did you mean the Queen of the United Kingdom, the Queen of Canada, the Queen of Australia, etc?

The last Queen of England was Queen Anne who, with the 1707 Acts of Union, dissolved the title of King/Queen of England.

## FAQ

*Isn't she still also the Queen of England?*

This is only as correct as calling her the Queen of London or Queen of Hull; she is the Queen of the place that these places are in, but the title doesn't exist.

*Is this bot monarchist?*

No, just pedantic.

I am a bot and this action was performed automatically.

tenchineuro • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 01:49 PM

bad bot

should not apply when the text is quoted or bulleted.

mikesteane • 3 points • 21 May, 2022 03:09 AM

Can I suggest you research the case of Christina Heaslet who wrote in her diary that she had made up accusations against Nathan Lewis. Her diary was excluded from the evidence because rape shield laws protected her from having to produce information that would have described her previous sexual activity. As a result, Nathan Lewis spent 5 years in prison before his case was overturned when the diary was allowed as evidence.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 2 points • 21 May, 2022 01:21 PM

That sounds enormously fucked up, I'm definitely going to read up on that. Thanks for the suggestion, this sounds like the extremely unfortunate kind of thing that nobody hears about, but that needs to be common knowledge.

DavidByron2 • 6 points • 20 May, 2022 04:18 AM

if men are accused

by a woman, of a sexual crime.

There absolutely are men who are guilty

Oh well it's obviously more important that they be locked up than innocent men go free so why not just say all men are guilty without a trial and then you're guaranteed to be right? Plus it saves money. You're a feminist then?

based on the evidence

Based on the evidence you're allowed to see you mean? Not based on all the evidence. For example if the woman who is accusing the man also accused 10 other men in the last 3 months but you weren't told that evidence and you found the man guilty how would you feel afterwards?

Do you have a source for this?

What planet are you living on? There's a whole raft of laws referred to as "rape shield laws" generally, that change the rules on the admission of evidence specifically for crimes where a woman accuses a man.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 0 points • 20 May, 2022 04:31 AM

Oh well it's obviously more important that they be locked up than innocent men go free so why not just say all men are guilty without a trial and then you're guaranteed to be right? Plus it saves money. You're a feminist then?

I just realized it's you again, and again you are putting words in my mouth. You are assuming I hold a position that I do not.

Based on the evidence you're allowed to see you mean?

And I am asking for how you know that there is evidence that one is not allowed to see. You're saying some forms of evidence that would allow to show men's innocence, is not being accepted in court and the jury is not allowed to see that evidence that would show innocence.

How do you know this? What proof do you have of this?

For example if the woman who is accusing the man also accused 10 other men in the last 3 months but you weren't told that evidence and you found the man guilty how would you feel afterwards?

This is totally fair but why would this not be allowed? It would be relevant to the trial no?

There's a whole raft of laws referred to as "rape shield laws" generally, that change the rules on the admission of evidence specifically for crimes where a woman accuses a man.

I have literally never heard of them. I am not terribly familiar with court cases in general, and even less for rape specifically. That's why I'm asking what that is, and if you have a source or a link I can read.

OldEgalitarianMRA • 8 points • 20 May, 2022 10:00 AM

*What do rape shield laws do?*

*rape shield law, statute or court rule, introduced in the late 20th century, which limits the ability of the defendant's counsel to introduce the accuser's sexual history as evidence during a rape trial and therefore can prevent the accuser from being discredited by information that is not relevant to the defendant's ...*

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 01:31 PM

Well that sounds messed up. I agree that it's not good to discredit someone by information that is not relevant to the trial, but this seems rather more purpose-built to help the accuser, which in our times heavily favours women. I doubt the same kind of rape shield laws would protect a male accuser against a female defendant. That's messed up.

Thanks for informing me.

DavidByron2 • 2 points • 20 May, 2022 06:53 PM

Right. General rules of evidence ALREADY ban the introduction of evidence that's not relevant to the trial. Feminism comes along and says "the judge shouldn't get to decide that - instead ALL information broadly about a woman's sexual history - or whatever it is - should be deemed inadmissible by default". In other words it's more important to not "re-victimize the victim" as they would characterize it, than to have a fair trial, because the first is a "rape victims" rights and the second is merely a "rapists" rights. Of course this presumes the defendant is guilty from the get go.

teenagewitch97 • -10 points • 20 May, 2022 10:49 AM

The accuser's sexual history, just like what they were wearing, has fuck all to do with whether they were raped or not. Stop victim blaming.

ImplodedPotatoSalad • 8 points • 20 May, 2022 11:44 AM

its not about what they were wearing. It was introduced specyficly to make men unable to provide evidence in i.e. form of communication logs with an accuser, that prove him being not guilty.

Because everything related to sex, in any way, is "Sexual history". Everything can be put under that law, and in effect, if she is not consenting, you might just as well not provide ANY evidence of you being innocent - because it will not be accepted anyway.

Neat, eh?

Stop defending liars, false accusers, and other feminist scum.

OldEgalitarianMRA • 6 points • 20 May, 2022 12:46 PM

But it's OK to bring a man up on charges of sexual abuse 20 years later with no evidence and just a woman's word. And you can add them up.

Imagine if a woman accusing a man was subject to #metoo laws. Men she accused 10 years before can be made to testify against her.

DavidByron2 • 2 points • 20 May, 2022 06:21 PM

This is totally fair but why would this not be allowed? It would be relevant to the trial no?

Not necessarily. Even for regular cases there's a complex set of rules for deciding if evidence will be admissible or not. Even for normal cases the defence can't just say anything it wants and the same for the prosecution. In particular you can't just present evidence to make someone look bad or look bad by association if the law says OK that makes them look bad but really is it relevant to this case? The decision as to what is admissible is complicated and already can look unreasonable to the layman.... and that's before we bring feminism into it. At least in general the rules of evidence protect the accused mostly and are fairly applied to everyone.

But now here come the feminists and they claim that when a woman accuses a man you need to use entirely new rules of evidence. They claim this must be done because otherwise the female witness will feeeeeeeel under attack and so she won't want to go to the police. They also say that the defence will try to malign the female witness by saying things like oh she was a slut which shouldn't make a difference. In some cases the new feminist rules say the accuser doesn't have to face the accused for example. Others say well you can't bring up her sexual history (like if she has a habit of having sex with men and then accusing them of rape, or even that she continued to have sex with the man she says raped her after the rape). These laws vary by a lot from state to state and country to country and in addition they usually have a sort of "common sense" exception allowing the judge, if they are inclined that way, to override the usual rules.

Now of course feminists defend these laws with the usual motte and bailey tactics. If you criticize them then they say "oh so you must think if a woman wears a short dress she should be raped?" stuff like that. But at the end of the day the fact remains that cases where women accuse men of sexual crimes have a completely different set of standards of evidence and that standard is designed and has the effect of making it harder to defend the accused as compared with other criminal cases. If feminists genuinely thought the rules of evidence needed changing then why not change them for ALL criminal cases?

Because the woman is basically presumed innocent in these cases the defendant ends up presumed guilty. There's a tendency (sometimes explicit) to reverse the usual presumption of innocence for the accused because feminists have argued that in these cases (alone) the witness for the prosecution is "the real person on trial" even though they are not. They're just a witness. But as a result of this perspective feminists have successfully promoted the "rights" of a witness in a criminal case over the rights of the male defendant. This doesn't happen in other criminal cases.

I'm sure you've heard this stuff before maybe under a different set of words?

DavidByron2 • 2 points • 20 May, 2022 06:25 PM

Here's some sort of discussion of the sexual history ban, which is only one type of rape shield law, but it seems like this is the one people usually mean.

<https://www.law.georgetown.edu/american-criminal-law-review/in-print/volume-56/rape-shield-evidence-and-the-hierarchy-of-impeachment/>

Rule 412 reverses the ordinary approach of such rules and prohibits the use of any and all rape shield evidence unless it is explicitly permitted by the Rule. This rigid approach to rulemaking itself poses nearly impossible problems of foresight. As it must, this legislatively created rule recites that it yields in criminal cases where the exclusion of such evidence "would violate the defendant's constitutional rights." To date, the United States Supreme Court has recognized that those rights are implicated only where the exclusion of material pursuant to the rape



shield rule represents a “denial of a defendant’s opportunity to impeach a witness for bias.” Although Article IV of the Federal Rules of Evidence deals with the substantive use of evidence, the Court approved this exception to the exclusion of rape shield material pursuant to a longstanding theory of impeachment, or general attack on the “credibility” or “reliability” of the central witness against the defendant. **In so doing, the Court established a difference in treatment of rape shield evidence that defies both logic and common sense**, pursuant to which one theory of impeachment may be pursued while all others are forbidden

DavidByron2 • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 06:29 PM

If you're interested in the history of these attacks on basic human rights it all stems back to feminism's hatred of men. These days you're more likely to hear about it when a case is prosecuting a terrorist (ie a person claimed to be a terrorist) or if it is otherwise a security state related criminal prosecution. These cases also attack the right of the defendant to a fair trial and they are based on the earlier "successes" of the feminist movement undermining men's rights.

Feminism and the imperial security state (basically fascists) work hand in fist on this stuff. The feminists started with men because they hate men. The imperialist state took up that cause and escalated it for their own purposes. The model for fast tracking the prosecution of any man accused of rape is being used to fast track convictions of people accused of crimes against the security state.

It's a two tier criminal justice system. Normal justice and feminist justice.

DavidByron2 • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 06:30 PM

I just realized it's you again

who are you?

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 25 May, 2022 01:54 PM

We had that discussion about left vs right, Democrat vs Republican, and when I tried to give a definition, instead of disagreeing with it or engaging with it you just said I was authoritarian.

That was on that topic though, and the responses you have given me here have been far more enlightening! Also sorry for the delay, there was an almost-hurricane in my town, and some areas won't have power potentially for another 2 weeks. I have power but no internet, so I'm very lucky and thankful, but won't be spending much time online.

DavidByron2 • 1 point • 25 May, 2022 06:41 PM

when I tried to give a definition

When you leant on an authoritative source that was self-serving and made no sense instead of relying on your own mind and facts, I pointed out that's a quality of the right?

the responses you have given me here have been far more enlightening

Thanks.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 25 May, 2022 07:10 PM

Just because I give a definition doesn't mean I'm not willing to discuss/argue/defend it dude. It's not like I am saying that's the only way to see it and anyone who disagrees with the definition is wrong. I could be wrong and you could give me a better

definition.

Thanks.

We can disagree on topic A, and you can still know better than me on topic B, it would be foolish of me to disregard what you say just because of a minor disagreement :)

DavidByron2 • 1 point • 25 May, 2022 07:20 PM

Just because I give a definition doesn't mean I'm not willing to discuss/argue/defend it

True. Your refusal to discuss/argue/defend it was incidental. But it's kind of hard to refuse without resorting to some sort of trick like an appeal to authority, so it's not entirely incidental.

you could give me a better definition

You mean give you an alternative authority? No thanks.

As I recall I went into some depth about the meaning of the words, the origins, and the scientific research on correlation with psychological traits. I believe I went to the root of the meaning of the concept. Your response was, no, my authority says something else. I think you posted a link to some Libertarian style blog or website.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 25 May, 2022 07:30 PM

I mean, at some point we have to recognize *some* kind of authority, because we can't be the ultimate authority on every topic. Someone else knows about X topic better than I do, I can't be an expert at everything.

I agree on the psychological traits associated with the different groups, but when talking political theory, there are some definitions to words. Those are two separate fields, and they can both be true at the same time.

I will also say that I don't know nearly as much about political theory as I do about science-related topics, mainly because I just don't care all that much about politics.

HectorsRectum9 • 3 points • 20 May, 2022 08:43 AM

'Always vote not guilty for rapists' is possibly the worst advice I have ever seen. Rapists belong in jail and if the evidence supports putting them there, it's your civic duty to do so. Siding with your gender no matter what is some feminist BS.

DavidByron2 • 3 points • 20 May, 2022 06:02 PM

if the evidence supports putting them

You are a bullshitter. The whole point is that the evidence DOES NOT support guilt beyond a reasonable doubt BECAUSE there's (almost) always a reasonable doubt about guilt which is caused by the fact that feminist laws prohibit the defence from presenting some evidence that would tend to prove innocence. As a juror you **don't know** if such evidence was excluded or if it exists. **That's reasonable doubt**. It's doubt that's (ironically) created by the feminist system for shafting men. **You can't know** if the male defendant looks guilty because they are guilty or if they only look guilty because the court system has been fucked



over to help screw over men.

What you are saying is innocent men should be put in prison if the feminist laws screwed them over and that jurists should pretend they don't know the system is sexist.

mikesteane • 2 points • 21 May, 2022 03:06 AM

The problem is that the evidence a jury is allowed to see will never be sufficient to exclude reasonable doubt.

WingsofSky • 2 points • 20 May, 2022 05:53 AM

I would just be very careful about how you look at the evidence. If the woman seems untrust worthy. Then don't believe her.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 0 points • 20 May, 2022 01:48 PM

People being untrustworthy depends on their character, not on what they have between their legs. By all means let's not trust untrustworthy people, but if we start saying that half of the world's population is untrustworthy because of their genitalia, then we'll be just as bad as feminists.

Let's try and be better than them yeah? It's a really low bar so it shouldn't be too hard.

WingsofSky • 4 points • 20 May, 2022 07:49 PM

That wasn't all women. Just one that is on trial. Big difference there buddy.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 08:15 PM

Ah my bad, I misread and misunderstood you, sorry.

HectorsRectum9 • 2 points • 20 May, 2022 08:57 AM

The person on the jury says he honestly doesn't know if the incident happened or not. That's not what a false accusation is. A false accusation is why someone is proven to be lying.

Qantourisc • 7 points • 20 May, 2022 10:49 AM

He's saying he sees a live screwed over before he has been found guilty.

ImplodedPotatoSalad • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 11:49 AM

if you didnt provide evidence of truth, its a lie. If you lied, you falsely accused.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 2 points • 20 May, 2022 01:40 PM

That's not quite how that works. Not providing evidence of truth doesn't mean it was a lie, it could simply be that there is not sufficient evidence to prove it is the truth.

In the case I linked to it seems the evidence was tampered with to better accuse the man, and that sounds fishy as all hell, but the problem is that the evidence that could be used to prove a lie, was tampered with in the first place.

If there's evidence that maybe a lie was covered up, it's not proof that there is a lie, but it does look damn suspicious. OP was horrified to see that none of that mattered, and what mattered to a biased court system was punishing men.

HectorsRectum9 • -1 points • 20 May, 2022 12:16 PM

But you've provided no evidence that she lied. Aren't you currently lying and falsely accusing this

woman?

ImplodedPotatoSalad • 4 points • 20 May, 2022 12:20 PM

If her words had no corroborating verifiable evidence, they cannot be considered as truth. Its on HER alone to provide evidence of truth, not on us to trust and believe without REAL evidence.

Words are not evidence. Words are words.

mikesteane • 1 point • 21 May, 2022 02:01 AM

Prove it.

tenchineuro • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 01:23 PM

A false accusation is why someone is proven to be lying.

If an accusation is false, it remains false whether it's proven false or not.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 01:38 PM

I didn't say it was a false accusation, but what OP was saying was that it COULD have been a false accusation, but all the evidence that would have shown that to be a false accusation, was removed. Evidence seems to have been deliberately tampered to give the woman the advantage, and that the entire judicial machine is more set to punish men than to try and find if they were actually guilty.

We can't know that this wasn't a false accusation, because the evidence was tampered with, and that should have been enough to throw the case, but it wasn't because the accused was a man and men must be punished.

coolboy\_24278 • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 03:12 PM

nah most of the comments are supportiny the guy. the ones critizizing him are downvoted

awhatfor • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 04:13 PM

"" Edit: Removed the part about it being a minor crime. I only meant that in relation to the time the defendant spent in jail, and the likely treatment in jail. I hope I didn't minimize any experience any victims have felt. Certainly want my intent. I do hope any victims of similar or any crime have justice served.

1. It's equally terrifying that this can go the other way. That criminals can so easily go free. That police work can be so shoddy, and that victim can be so easily ignored. "" Also, these others "I'm just feeling like our (America's) justice system is failing sexual assault victims and the falsely accused." "I dont know she didn't. It feels awful not know, but we weren't going to send someone to jail becuase he maybe did it. One thing the justice system got right."

"Please don't bring any misogyny/misandry to this. This isn't about this it's about. It's about fundamental flaws in a system I thought was supposed to fair and keep us safe." This guy has a long walk ahead and its not only in mens rights. No system is perfect bro :(, :).

Dont worry pal, you are not betraying women who got theirs boobs touched.

Paltry\_Poetaster • -1 points • 20 May, 2022 06:58 AM

I like that subreddit, but wish they would get with the new Reddit styling, which looks better than that jarring, pixelated, bright white old style from ten years ago.

BCRE8TVE[S] • 1 point • 20 May, 2022 01:42 PM

I gave a "no participation" link to prevent crossposting and brigading. That automatically gives the old reddit. The actual subreddit itself does go with the new reddit styling, but per subreddit rule #4, cross-linking to another sub must be done with a no participation link.