



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 19, 2018

Ford, Fantasies and Facts: Does Kavanaugh Accuser's Story Make Sense?

Some have called today's lib radicals the "alt-Left" — but they're really the alternate-universe Left. The majority of what they say not only isn't the truth but is its polar opposite. A prime example is the handling of the case of Christine Blasey Ford, the California psychology professor accusing SCOTUS nominee Brett Kavanaugh of sexually assaulting her when he was a teen. While constituting a monkey wrench thrown into his confirmation process, her allegations smack of monkey business.



But however credible they may or may not be, and I'll get to that momentarily, wholly incredible are Ford's political allies. Left-wing senator Mazie Hirono (D-Hawaii) not only said Wednesday that men should just "shut up and step up," but insisted that women such as Ford "need to be believed" (video below). Chuck Schumer, a man who sadly only takes Hirono's second piece of advice, said he believes Ford.

Curiously, Hirono and Schumer don't take this position with Keith Ellison (D-Minn.), credibly accused of physically abusing ex-girlfriend Karen Monahan. In fact, not only does Monahan [complain](#) that Democrats don't believe her, but she says, "I've been smeared, threatened, isolated from my own party."

Note, too, that her case isn't 35 years old but recent and that she has [far more evidence than does Ford](#). Perhaps when Hirono said we need to believe women such as Ford, she meant leftist women whose accusations would damage conservatives.

Nor did the Democrats display this female-alleged-victim-is-always-right attitude regarding Bill Clinton, who was credibly accused of rape. Moreover, they lionized the late Senator Ted Kennedy (D-Mass.), a notorious philanderer who drowned a woman in his car and then tried to cover up the crime.

Yet they're in a phalanx with Ford, despite the most striking thing about her case being that she doesn't have one. The professor was offered the opportunity to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee on Monday, but the latest word is that she won't do it until there's an FBI investigation into Kavanaugh's alleged crime. It smacks of gamesmanship.

Of course, the FBI already, understandably, declined to look into the matter. Not only is a case of teen groping not within its jurisdiction, but what's to investigate? The statute of limitations is long past on the 35-year-old alleged crime. Ford is fuzzy on details (the letter with her account is [here](#)), not knowing the location, the house, or even exact year in which the alleged act occurred, and she has no corroborating witnesses. The only other person she claims was present is Kavanaugh's old buddy Mark



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 19, 2018

Judge, who backs up his judge friend's story.

So it's she said, they said. The court of public opinion will decide whom to believe, no doubt breaking along partisan lines. But the case is simply unprovable either way.

Yet much about Ford's story raises questions. What is the story? In brief, she says that, perhaps in 1982, she was at a teen "gathering" in a suburban Maryland home. After shoving her into a room, a very drunk Kavanaugh jumped on top of her, groped her, and tried removing her clothes. The incident ended when Judge leapt on them both, sending them tumbling. Then, as the two boys "scrapped with each other," she was able to get away and went home.

Now, Ford made no mention of this, at all, until she was in couple's therapy in 2012. Her husband reported that at this point she expressed concern about how Kavanaugh might be appointed to the Supreme Court.

Curious. Note that Ford is a radical leftist who has attended anti-Trump events, even wearing a pink p***y hat at one. In other words, she's a highly political person. This doesn't disprove her allegations, but it does strongly suggest political motivation.

Another issue is that Ford sent her accusations to a "local government representative" on July 6 and to Senator Dianne Feinstein on July 30, but did not contact the FBI. Yet she now makes an FBI investigation a prerequisite for her testimony.

Moreover, there are inconsistencies in Ford's story. As *American Thinker's* J. Marsolo [points out](#), she "said there were [only] four boys at the 'gathering.'" Her attorney, Debra Katz, now says there was [a girl present](#) [as well]."

Additionally, Ford just revealed that she remembers the name of another student at the gathering, Patrick J. Smyth. But Smyth says [he was never there](#) and, furthermore, that he never saw Kavanaugh engage in any "improper conduct" anywhere.

Then there are some interesting points from commenters under Marsolo's piece. One writes:

Blasey-Ford said:

The therapist [Ford's] was wrong to omit Kavanaugh's name.

She said the therapist was wrong on the number of boys.

She said Kavanaugh is wrong.

She said Judge is wrong.

Her lawyer NOW says another girl was there (conveniently can't be found)

So was Blasey wrong?

So HOW many people are WRONG before we question...her story?

Another opines, "I've known psychologists. They psychoanalyze themselves constantly. It's impossible that she hasn't been dealing with this in therapy for decades, unless, of course, she just made it up."

Then there's this: "If she ran out of the house and, was at 15 unable to drive, how did she get home?"

Excellent point. If the house in question was within walking distance of her home, it's not believable that she doesn't know where it was.

Note also that Senator Feinstein just [admitted](#) regarding Ford's story that she "can't say that everything is truthful." Consider the implication. "'Being truthful,'" [points out](#) blogger T.K. Coleman,



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on September 19, 2018

“means we are honestly expressing how we perceive or feel about something.” In other words, Feinstein may be questioning Ford’s honesty.

I question a different thing: her rationality. I don’t doubt that something bad happened to Ford at some point; there’s a reason why she’s a p***y-hat-wearing radical leftist, after all. But that’s partially why I don’t find her credible. It’s slightly reminiscent of the Duke University lacrosse rape-frame-up case, where the powers-that-be treated stripper Crystal Mangum as if she was an unimpeachable source. This was before she was sent to prison for murdering her boyfriend, of course.

As for Ford, she also stripped — her social media of information. Why? What’s she trying to hide? Most curiously, Ford’s two pages at the site Rate My Professors are [void of student reviews](#). What are the chances, after all her years teaching, that not one was ever left? And if they were scrubbed, as seems likely, what would they have revealed about her? Everyone understandably wants Kavanaugh’s life to be an open book — but Ford’s book has mostly erased pages.

And now, on the basis of what she claims are mostly erased memories, the Left wants to erase a SCOTUS nomination. What an abomination.

Photo: [Clipart.com](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.