

The Trump Rape Trial was—of course—Faked



by Miles Mathis

First published May 10, 2023

So Trump is talking about fake news while helping create it.

Hard to believe I am the only one saying this. Of all the people that have allegedly graduated from law school, not one of them can see this trial is a farce? Not just as in rigged, but as in staged in a dummy court by the CIA or some other entity. Fiction.

Mainstream media is giving you all the clues, admitting this makes no legal sense. And I say that not as a Trump supporter. I don't in fact support Trump, as my readers know. I wouldn't vote *either* Red or Blue with a gun to my head. They admit this crazy lady E. Jean Carroll doesn't even know when Trump raped or accosted her, not even the year. They admit the judge allowed the trial to proceed against all law and precedent, when other women were allowed to testify they had similar experiences with Trump, without being cross-examined by defense.

The judge controversially allowed other women to testify that they had similar experiences with Trump.

Typically, such evidence of character — purporting to prove that a defendant committed a specific act based on an alleged propensity to commit similar acts — is inadmissible except in a few very specific circumstances.

Because the case was not a criminal case, the plaintiff's legal team was allowed to comment negatively on Trump's refusal to testify, and the jury was allowed to draw negative inferences from it.

All proof of the fake. If Trump had previously been *convicted* of raping or assaulting one of these women, then that would be admissible as character. It would have been proved and could stand as evidence. But women just coming in and telling stories isn't evidence of anything. It might or might not be true.

Also proof of the fake is Trump being allowed not to appear, only sending in video of his deposition.

You have to laugh. Do you think if someone sued you for rape and it went to court, you would be allowed to blow it off and send in a tape?

Which just reminds us rape is not a tort. It is a crime. A *criminal* offense, which should be investigated by police and processed through the criminal system. See [here](#) for instance, which outlines some of the problems here. After reading that, you may come to understand that the whole idea of civil suits being easier to prove than criminal ones is false in itself, mostly made up to explain how high-profile fake suits like this one are won. Think of OJ Simpson and many others. That is when the idea of concurrent civil suits winning where criminal ones failed comes from. Even this page is spinning the law, telling you that in a civil suit the jury only needs to believe there is a greater than 50% chance the claims are true. Nope, that isn't what "preponderance of evidence" means. Or it didn't in the old days, before the CIA took over the courts and definitions. It is true that a websearch on this now leads with a bunch of places giving you that 51% definition from "some scholars", but in the old days it wasn't defined like that. Those "some scholars" are recent fake scholars paid to say that, but when I was in school there was nothing about 51%. Just think about it: it makes no sense, does it? Would a legal system—criminal, civil, or otherwise—really base itself on something so stupid as a 51% rule? With life as uncertain as it is, do you really think courts or juries are going to award multi-million dollars settlements based on a difference of 2%? What human could even weigh evidence that accurately? It is absurd on the face of it.

Just so you know, Jean Carroll was Miss Indiana University in 1963 and Miss Cheerleader USA. In 1965 she appeared on *To Tell the Truth*. Ironic, that. We then have a nearly 20-year gap in her bio, when in the mid-80s she began writing for *SNL*. In 1993 she landed an advice column in *Elle* magazine. Why? What were her qualifications for giving anyone advice in 1993? Are *SNL* writers or ex-cheerleaders gurus now? Is that where you want to go for your information?

Carroll was married to black journalist John Johnson, though Johnson's Wiki bio has nothing to say about Carroll. But tying into our research here, we find Johnson was the WABC reporter on the OJ Simpson case. He also covered the Attica Prison Riot, where 33 prisoners allegedly died. Oh, the tangled webs these people weave.



His paintings have been shown at the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Because, as you see, he is just that good.

If you still don't think Jean Carroll is an agent, you should know that she titled her 2019 memoir *What Do We Need Men For? A Modest Proposal*, which pretty much says it all. The "modest proposal" bit is an implication that men are good for nothing but being ground up into dog food, the reference being

Jonathan Swift's famous Modest Proposal. So this is a Men-are-Pigs, split-the-sexes thing again. Carroll has been working on this project for most of her life, since they admit her *Elle* column was constantly telling women they didn't need men. If you are a man, maybe you should consider a class-action lawsuit against Carroll and her publishers and CIA handlers for assault, libel, emotional distress, and civil rights violations. Shouldn't be too hard to find a preponderance of evidence for that. I have given it to you in my papers on Men-are-Pigs.

You should also realize that the Donald Trump controversy is staged mostly to promote Carroll and help sell this wretched book. She probably gave away copies on the stand. They probably put copies of the book in the jury's swag bags.

But let's return to the jury finding. We are supposed to believe the jury also found Trump had defamed Carroll, by calling her crazy and saying he wasn't attracted to her. Really? I have news for you: the standard for defamation in the US is way higher than that. If the standard were low enough to justify this finding, all of society would collapse under the weight of defamation lawsuits. The late night talk shows would have to give up all commentary, and SNL's *Weekend Update* would be no more. All opinion segments in the news would have to end, *The View* would be defunct, and CNN and MSNBC would be put in receivership.

The jury did throw out the charge of rape, but found that Trump had battered and sexually abused Carroll three decades ago. Really? And how did Carroll's team prove that? With what preponderance of evidence? The stories don't provide even a single stick of evidence, and what evidence could there be 30 years later? Does she still have some old bruises from 1993? Since her story is she was raped by Trump in a BergdorfGoodman dressing room in under three minutes, there can be no possible evidence of that 30 years later. The whole story is ridiculous on the face of it, since how could she possibly find herself in a lady's dressing room with Trump unless she wanted him to be there? She would need tape, pictures, a confession, or eyewitness testimony, and we are not told there was any of that. If there had been any of that, her lawyers wouldn't have had to bring in a bunch of other crazy lying ladies to tell their stories. Which is exactly why those stories aren't normally admissible as evidence: they are exactly as unverifiable as Carroll's story. The courtroom is a venue for verifiable evidence, not for airing old grievances. This is not storytelling hour. One or all of these women may have been raped or abused, I have no way of knowing, but a court cannot take anyone's word for it. There has to be evidence. If there is no evidence, there can be no preponderance of evidence.

But in these new projects, all that is out the window. In these CIA dummy courts, they have completely rewritten all the rules of law, and you no longer have people testifying under cross examination. Instead you have a long line of family members and friends giving emotional speeches, before, during, and after proceedings. You have people involved in the trial giving interviews to the media *during* the trial. You have the judge televised saying ridiculous things—like forbidding mentioning the Constitution in court—while playing monopoly with jurors during recesses. It is an absolute clown show, staged not only for people who have never studied the law, but for people who can't spell “law”. Only an absolute ninny would believe anything now being reported in the news.

Oh, and E. Jean's red hair above? Compare to Phil Spector's hair in my previous article. It is part of the joke. And part of the project. You are *supposed* to hate her. She is the Women-are-Pigs part of the script, while Trump is the Men-are-Pigs part. Both work together to split the sexes and split the country.

And what does Trump get from agreeing to be a part of this fiction? He gets to look straight. He gets to look like a tough guy. But most of all he gets to confuse the Gentiles, guaranteeing the continued hegemony of his people.



Late addendum: I found E. Jean's family of Carrolls in Fort Wayne, IN, but Jean isn't listed by that name with them. Not under Elizabeth or Jean. Also not listed under those names for New York, where I assume she lived while working for *SNL*. So she appears to be living under her mother's name: Elizabeth Jean. Her birthname may be hidden. Her father comes from the Carrolls of Columbus, OH, who were big dry goods merchants there. She is also a Rowlands, coming in that line from Wales, possibly linking her to J. K. Rowling, whose family name was originally Rowlands. Jean's father Thomas was a flight test engineer for North American Aviation during WWII, which was of course Rockwell, now Boeing. He met Jean's mother Betty McKinney in Hollywood after the war, and she may be even more connected. Except that she is fully scrubbed to prevent us from making those connections. She is not linked to any McKinneys in her profile, and the name may be fudged. It could be McKinsey or McKinley, for instance.

My guess is McKinley, linking us to that President. The most likely thing here, based on all my previous papers, is that Trump and Carroll are cousins. In every other case that is what I have found, with the victim and the perp in these theatrical productions being pretty close cousins. They keep it all in the family. I found a possibility of their relationship through the Rowlands of Wales, who married the Bulkeley Viscounts in 1749. This linked them immediately to the upper levels of the peerage in Wales, England, and Scotland. We then link to the MacLeods through the Campbells. Trump's mother is a MacLeod. It is also possible Jean Carroll's mother is not a McKinney, but a MacKinnon, since the MacKinnons are closely related to the MacLeods. [I also found a Betty Jean Carroll](#), 92, of Fort Wayne and Dayton, OH, related to McCartneys, and the MacLeods are related to the McCartneys as well. So it is possible we have links to Paul McCartney here.