

Political Jack In The Box – Modern Slavery, Women and Child Exploitation, Grooming – Force, Fraud, Coercion

Blaming Rape Victims, Modern Slavery, Victimization, Rape as a Weapon of War, Exploitation, Coercion, Grooming, and Fraud, Smear Campaigns, Blame-shifting, Making an Argument Against Women's Autonomy and Ability to Be Independent – Simply Advocating Sex Slavery – Not the Best Idea.

Source: <https://thefederalist.com/2026/09/30/dear-women-your-bad-life-choices-at-cornell-frat-parties-shouldnt-be-national-news/>

→ This is a journal that we are choosing to block moving forward.

Cornell Fraternity Case

Facts, Missing Context, and Logical Fallacies in the Federalist Article

1. Documented 2024 Record

The woman gave Cornell police a statement in November 2024, shortly after the incident. Commenter describes the statement as a **six-page typed statement**, not a nine-page handwritten statement. Police reportedly prepared the statement from her interview, read it back to her, and allowed her to review and correct it before she signed it.

The 2024 account included voluntary alcohol and drug use. It also described consensual sexual activity during part of the evening, including her agreeing to an initial sexual encounter involving more than one person.

The statement also reportedly describes circumstances that were not simply consensual throughout the evening. She said no to particular sexual activities, including a proposed foursome, and reportedly described circumstances in which men stopped after she refused.

She also described becoming increasingly intoxicated, experiencing memory gaps, and becoming unable to make decisions. She reportedly described the situation as feeling like coercion.

2. Important Information From the 2024 Police Interview

A later-released transcript of the 2024 police interview contains additional information that is important when evaluating the case.

According to CBS reporting, she told investigators:

“I can say with 100% confidence I was raped.”

She also reportedly described herself at a later point as “completely and totally incapacitated.”

This is significant because the district attorney has said he did not receive the complete police interview transcript when the original charging decision was made.

Therefore, the 2024 record cannot accurately be summarized simply as:

“She told police everything was consensual.”

The record contains descriptions of both consensual activity and later alleged coercion or incapacitation.

3. Voluntary Choices

The record does support several facts emphasized by the Federalist article.

She voluntarily:

- consumed alcohol;
- used drugs;
- attended the fraternity setting;
- participated in some sexual activity;
- and consented to at least some sexual conduct.

Those facts are relevant to evaluating the circumstances and her account.

However, they do not logically establish that she consented to every subsequent sexual act.

The fact that someone voluntarily consumes alcohol or drugs does not, by itself, determine what sexual activity that person subsequently consented to.

4. Saying “No”

The available reporting indicates that the 2024 statement included instances in which she refused specific sexual activity.

For example, she reportedly said no to a proposed foursome. The account also describes another instance in which she backed away from a man who was kissing her.

This creates an important distinction:

Consent to one act is not automatically consent to every other act.

The existence of some consensual sexual activity therefore does not, by itself, resolve the question of what happened later.

5. The 2026 Civil Lawsuit

The 2026 lawsuit presents a more severe account of the events.

It alleges that she became incapacitated and that multiple men sexually assaulted her. It also alleges that men were summoned through fraternity communications.

These are **allegations in a civil lawsuit**, not established facts merely because they appear in the complaint.

The district attorney has characterized the 2024 and 2026 accounts as substantially different. Her attorney disputes that characterization and maintains that the accounts are consistent in their essential description of the events.

This is therefore an unresolved factual dispute.

6. Snapchat Evidence

Another important piece of evidence reported by CBS is a fraternity group Snapchat conversation from the night of the incident.

According to CBS, the messages included a statement referring to a woman being available upstairs, followed later by:

“Shop still open?”

and:

“Yea.”

The civil lawsuit describes an earlier message as:

“free pussy upstairs”

The existence and content of the Snapchat messages have been reported independently.

However, the legal meaning of those messages remains a matter for investigators and prosecutors to determine.

7. Was She Unconscious?

The wording here matters.

The later lawsuit alleges that she eventually became unconscious or severely incapacitated during the alleged assaults.

The available 2024 account, however, describes different stages of the evening, including conscious participation, refusal of certain acts, increasing intoxication, memory gaps, and later inability to make decisions.

Therefore, it would be inaccurate to state without qualification that she was unconscious throughout the entire encounter.

A more precise description is:

The later lawsuit alleges that she became incapacitated during the encounter, while the 2024 account describes both earlier conscious participation and later severe intoxication and incapacity.

8. The “Guy Who Found Her” and the Snapchat Message

There is an additional claim that the person who found her unconscious was the person who sent the message advertising “free pussy.”

The existence of the message is reported, but the currently available reporting does not establish that the particular person who allegedly discovered her unconscious was definitively the person who sent that message.

That specific connection should therefore be treated as unverified unless supported by additional evidence.

9. Information the Federalist Article Leaves Out or Gives Less Attention To

The Federalist article emphasizes:

- voluntary drinking and drug use;
- consensual sexual activity;
- personal responsibility;
- inconsistencies between the 2024 and 2026 accounts;
- and the consequences of the woman’s decisions.

Other reporting has highlighted additional information, including:

- her 2024 description of the encounter as coercive;
- her reported statement to police that she was “100%” confident she had been raped;
- her description of becoming incapacitated;
- her refusals of particular sexual acts;
- the fraternity Snapchat messages;
- the allegations concerning prolonged sexual assault;
- and the reopening of the criminal investigation.

The omission of information does not automatically mean the Federalist article is factually false. It does mean that its presentation is **selective**, and the omitted information can materially affect how a reader interprets the case.

Logical Fallacies and Reasoning Problems

1. False Dilemma

Presenting personal responsibility and possible victimization as though they cannot coexist.

2. Hasty Generalization

Using one disputed case to make broader conclusions about women generally.

3. Equivocation

Treating different kinds of “choice” as though they are the same: drinking, attending a party, sexual participation, and consent to subsequent acts.

4. Non Sequitur

Assuming that consent to some sexual activity establishes consent to subsequent sexual activity.

5. Slippery Inference

Moving from voluntary intoxication to responsibility for another person’s subsequent conduct.

6. Begging the Question

Assuming the encounter was consensual in order to conclude that the later allegation was false.

7. Appeal to Ridicule

Using humiliating or mocking descriptions of the woman’s conduct to influence the reader’s judgment.

8. Ad Hominem

Focusing on the woman’s character or personal decisions rather than evaluating the specific allegations.

9. Victim-Blaming Fallacy

Treating risky or irresponsible behavior as though it establishes responsibility for another person’s conduct.

10. Post Hoc Reasoning

Using an earlier decision, such as drinking or taking drugs, to establish what happened afterward.

11. Appeal to Consequences

Arguing from the consequences of delayed reporting toward a conclusion about whether the allegation is true.

12. Whataboutism

Using an unrelated case to influence the interpretation of this case.

13. Overgeneralization

Extending conclusions about one woman to women generally.

14. False Equivalence

Treating a person’s poor decision-making as equivalent to responsibility for another person’s independent conduct.

15. Confirmation Bias

Emphasizing evidence that supports one interpretation while giving less attention to evidence that complicates it.

16. Straw Man

Reducing the opposing argument to the idea that women should never be responsible for their own decisions.

17. Moralistic Fallacy

Moving from the judgment that someone's behavior was irresponsible to a conclusion about what actually happened.

18. Genetic Fallacy

Potentially dismissing an allegation because of the claimant's behavior or circumstances rather than examining the substance of the allegation.

The Central Logical Issue

There are several separate questions that should not be collapsed into one:

1. Did she make risky decisions?

The 2024 record supports that she voluntarily drank, used drugs, attended the party, and participated in some sexual activity.

2. What did she consent to?

The record indicates consent to some activity and refusal of some other activity.

3. Are her accounts consistent?

There are disputed differences between the 2024 account and the 2026 lawsuit. Those differences are relevant to credibility but do not automatically establish that either account is true or false.

4. What did the other people involved do?

That is a separate factual question requiring evidence concerning their conduct.

The key logical error is treating the first question as though it automatically answers the other three.

Concise Summary

The available record supports the Federalist article's assertion that the woman made voluntary choices involving alcohol, drugs, the fraternity setting, and some sexual activity.

The available record also contains information that complicates the article's presentation: she reportedly refused particular sexual acts, described increasing intoxication and memory loss, characterized the situation as coercive, and told police during the 2024 interview that she was "100%" confident she had been raped.

The later lawsuit alleges that she became incapacitated and was sexually assaulted by multiple men. Separately reported fraternity Snapchat messages provide additional contemporaneous evidence that was not a central part of the Federalist article's presentation.

None of those facts, standing alone, establishes the complete truth of either side's account.

The strongest analytical point is that **bad decisions, consent, credibility, and responsibility are separate questions**. Voluntarily drinking or using drugs may be relevant to the circumstances, but it does not logically establish consent to every subsequent sexual act. Likewise, inconsistencies in an account may be relevant to credibility, but they do not automatically prove that an allegation is false.

The complete evidentiary record should therefore include both the information emphasized by the Federalist article and the additional evidence reported from the police interview, lawsuit, and Snapchat communications.