



**doublylinkedlists** promoted by SubvertAPar...

What you call "minutiae" are actually the reasons why so many mentally challenged people are put to death, and why so many rapists walk free, and why so many nonviolent offenders are in prisons, and why so many prisons are terrible terrifying environments, and why rich people don't serve the same sentences are poor ones, and a million other things.

You want to sit there and talk about "legal this" and "legal that" as if there's some sort of "law" separate from what actually happens in the real world, and that this separate "law" is more relevant than observations about who is really subject to violence from the state and who isn't.

I say that any discussion of "the law" and what's "legal" is incomplete when we pretend that we can talk about it "neutrally" (ie: from a white male perspective). And I say that referring to this important critical legal discourse as "minutiae" completely misses the point of having a justice system.

Otherwise, we just have another system where the "neutral" rich white male view of the world dominates, and other experiences are marginalized.



**SubvertAParadigm**

dominates, and other experiences are marginalized.

 **SubvertAParadigm**

Oh please, you really have an agenda that is dealing with something completely beyond the realm of the story at hand. This isn't about who gets a fair trial and who doesn't. We all get the social injustices that happen to people for various reasons in the legal system. This isn't news to anyone here. It's like you didn't even read my reply. I'm not invalidating what you're saying, but in the realm of *what I was actually talking about* versus *what you decided to rant about* they are two completely different things. It is completely irrelevant whether or not the guy, according to popular opinion, raped someone. He was acquitted, and now he's suing a blog for misrepresenting him...WHILE BEING MISREPRESENTED ON THE BLOG THAT'S EXPLAINING THE STORY. Spare me the sociological context of law, because I already understand it. It doesn't change what's actually happening at this exact juncture.

Edited by SubvertAParadigm at 05/12/11 5:53 PM

 **doublylinkedlists** promoted by SubvertAPar...

It's obviously relevant because you don't give any reason other than "X is illegal. You shouldn't do X" as why Jezebel shouldn't have published the title the way they did. Maybe they didn't give a fuck. Maybe their lawyers told them they would get away with it. Maybe they realized the risks but are actually making a stand. Regardless of their intentions, all of these reasons are also valid

 **SubvertAParadigm**

Obviously none of that reasoning is true though for Jezebel, because the title of the article was changed by this afternoon. I honestly have no faith in our justice system whatsoever, frankly. It doesn't mean we aren't all subject to the same set of rules, old dead rich white guy rules, shitty as that may be. It's not that I think you shouldn't do X because X is illegal. It's that X will get you sued because X is technically false by the laws exist to protect the not guilty people from being defamed. If it were legal to just slander everyone and anyone based on what we assumed was the just vs the actual outcome for a case, witch hunts would ensue and innocent people would also be targeted.

Edited by SubvertAParadigm at 05/12/11 9:04 PM

**Hide 8 replies**

 **thePrototype**

Wed 11 May 2011 7:28 PM ↻

I know someone that is prepping his libel case. His criminal case has not yet started, but he has a tort lawyer on speed dial, and from the sounds of it his case might get dropped before it gets to a judge.

Edited by thePrototype at 05/11/11 7:29 PM

 **tomsomething**

Wed 11 May 2011 7:28 PM ↻

 **SubvertAParadigm**

Obviously none of that reasoning is true though for Jezebel, because the title of the article was changed by this afternoon. I honestly have no faith in our justice system whatsoever, frankly. It doesn't mean we aren't all subject to the same set of rules, old dead rich white guy rules, shitty as that may be. It's not that I think you shouldn't do X because X is illegal. It's that X will get you sued because X is technically false by the laws exist to protect the not guilty people from being defamed. If it were legal to just slander everyone and anyone based on what we assumed was the just vs the actual outcome for a case, witch hunts would ensue and innocent people would also be targeted.

Edited by SubvertAParadigm at 05/12/11 9:04 PM

**Hide 8 replies**

 **thePrototype**

Wed 11 May 2011 7:28 PM ↩

I know someone that is prepping his libel case. His criminal case has not yet started, but he has a tort lawyer on speed dial, and from the sounds of it his case might get dropped before it gets to a judge.

Edited by thePrototype at 05/11/11 7:29 PM

 **tomsomething**

Wed 11 May 2011 7:28 PM ↩

judge.

Edited by thePrototype at 05/11/11 7:29 PM



**tomsomething**

Wed 11 May 2011 7:28 PM ↩

I know you're going to get a million comments like hits, but the phrase "acquitted rapist" probably won't fly for a person who has already demonstrated his letigiousitousnicity.

Edited by tomsomething at 05/11/11 7:29 PM



**mohamedzv2001**

Wed 11 May 2011 7:22 PM ↩

So now to Jezebel, even if someone was acquitted, they're still a rapist, because ya know, an accusation is 100% true 100% of the time.



**HeartRateRapid** promoted by onestrawplz



Yea, all those crazy bitches going to the cops and lying about being raped. Except that false reports for stolen cars are more common. False rape reports make up less than 3% of all reported rapes, and as I'm sure you know, it horrendously underreported.

I'm also uncomfortable with the way the article was titled, but please don't bring in the rape apology bingo by relving on the old idea that most women lie about it.



**HeartRateRapid** promoted by onestrawplz

Yea, all those crazy bitches going to the cops and lying about being raped. Except that false reports for stolen cars are more common. False rape reports make up less than 3% of all reported rapes, and as I'm sure you know, it horrendously underreported.

I'm also uncomfortable with the way the article was titled, but please don't bring in the rape apology bingo by relying on the old idea that most women lie about it.



**zegota**

Regardless of the statistics, calling someone an "acquitted [thing they were acquitted for]" is kind of stupid. Unless it's OJ, cause fuck him.




**mohamedzv2001**

I don't see where I said, "Oh derr, everyone crying rape is lying". What I said is not all rape accusations are true, and you know what, THAT'S KIND OF TRUE.

And really, you assumed that I was saying that most women lie about it, I said no such thing.

I don't see where I said, "Oh derr, everyone crying rape is lying". What I said is not all rape accusations are true, and you know what, THAT'S KIND OF TRUE.


And really, you assumed that I was saying that most women lie about it, I said no such thing.

 **HeartRateRapid** promoted by onestrawplz

You didn't have to bring up false accusations of rape at all, as it has nothing to do with the story. This guy was acquitted but obviously there was a strong enough case to bring it to trial. Most rape cases don't go anywhere, partially because of the perception that women lie and make false accusations. Or that they have 'buyer's remorse' which seems to be part of what happened in this case. A bartender said she was smiling and drinking? Clearly that means consent for everything.

I'm just sick of reading variations of "ya know, an accusation is 100% true 100% of the time" every time I read an article with the word rape in it.

Edited by HeartRateRapid at 05/11/11 7:52 PM

 **HeartRateRapid** promoted by onestrawplz

Yea, I'm not okay with that either, I just don't see how "well sometimes women lie about being raped" really adds anything.



**HeartRateRapid** promoted by onestrawplz

Yea, I'm not okay with that either, I just don't see how "well sometimes women lie about being raped" really adds anything.

[Hide 5 replies](#)



**AndPreciousLittleofT...**

Wed 11 May 2011 7:11 PM

Running terrified and barefoot through a cornfield doesn't fit my definition of a place "to go to have fun."

ED: Two seconds of proper Googling will get you to Mr. Huon's firm webpage, complete with his phone number, should you want to call and offer any critiques.

Edited by AndPreciousLittleofThat at 05/11/11 7:14 PM



**cool\_as\_KimDeal**

Wed 11 May 2011 7:08 PM

Well shit! I didn't know kicking back at a bar and asking where I should go to have fun meant that I hereby consent to any and all sexual activity, with anybody, with this bartender here as my witness. Can I sign away my right to consent here on my bar tab? Okay, great.



phone number, should you want to call and offer any critiques.

Edited by AndPreciousLittleofThat at 05/11/11 7:14 PM

 **cool\_as\_KimDeal** Wed 11 May 2011 7:08 PM ↪

Well shit! I didn't know kicking back at a bar and asking where I should go to have fun meant that I hereby consent to any and all sexual activity, with anybody, with this bartender here as my witness. Can I sign away my right to consent here on my bar tab? Okay, great.

 **taylvie3** ↪


Don't forget to tip at least 20% for the waiver.

**Hide 1 reply**

 **zegota** promoted by Roo sez BISH PLZ Wed 11 May 2011 7:03 PM ↪

"Acquitted Rapist"

Um, is my understanding off, or is this man not (legally) a rapist? It seems calling him an "acquitted rapist" paints a target on Jezebel's back. Might wanna change that heading.

 **zegota** promoted by Rooo sez BISH PLZ wed 11 May 2011 7:03 PM

### "Acquitted Rapist"

Um, is my understanding off, or is this man not (legally) a rapist? It seems calling him an "acquitted rapist" paints a target on Jezebel's back. Might wanna change that heading.

 **Rooo sez BISH PLZ**

It might be worth at least a fact check. 8 figures is a mighty big number.  
**#corrections**

 **Pär Larsson** promoted by BettyCrockerPun...


Nah. This is Jez, man. Men are presumed guilty of original sin, until proven otherwise due to gayness or having been previously a woman - alongside some actually noteworthy news and commentary.

"Alleged rapist..." or "Aquitted man..." would have been, you know, responsible almost-journalism. Can't have that around here. People will get their unmentionables all in a twist.

 **zegota**

commentary.

"Alleged rapist..." or "Acquitted man..." would have been, you know, responsible almost-journalism. Can't have that around here. People will get their unmentionables all in a twist.

 zegota

And see, then you went too far in the other direction. ಠ\_ಠ

 BettyCrockerPunkRock...

I find that comment to be sub-Par.

Hide 4 replies

Show all discussions

