



HOW TO

DESTROY

A

MAN

NOW

A HANDBOOK

ANGELA CONFIDENTIAL PSY.D.

How to Destroy A Man Now (DAMN): A Handbook

How to Destroy A Man Now (DAMN): A Handbook

Angela Confidential, Psy.D.

Lemons to Lemonade Publishing
2018

© 2018 Angela Confidential, Psy.D.
All rights reserved.

ISBN-13: 9780999820322

ISBN-10: 099982032X

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018900514

Lemons to Lemonade Publishing, LLC, Wilmington, DE

Dedicated to the underestimated

damn

/dam/

verb

past participle: **damned**

1. (in Christian belief) be condemned by God to suffer eternal punishment in hell.
2. condemn, especially by the public expression of disapproval.

—*Google Dictionary*

CONTENTS

	Introduction	xi
Chapter 1	The DAMN Fundamentals	1
Chapter 2	The DAMN Online Method	15
	Crafting Allegations	18
	Leveraging Media	29
	Leveraging Authority	35
Chapter 3	The DAMN at Work Method	38
	Crafting Allegations	42
	Leveraging Media	46
	Leveraging Authority	50
Chapter 4	Why These DAMN Methods Work	54
	Works Cited	59

INTRODUCTION

As women, we have been oppressed by men's physical advantages over us since the beginning of humankind.

But now, in today's modern societies, the tables are *finally* turning.

Especially with the advent of the Internet and social media, and the economy's transition from manufacturing to information, women are leveraging their natural advantages (e.g., social skills, emotional intelligence, and communication) to gain power.

You've probably utilized these advantages to some degree already, in one form or another. For example, as a child in school, I recall the boys using physical strength and aggression (e.g., punching) to bully girls. That was their power. Girls, on the other hand, used communication and accusation (e.g., spreading rumors) to undermine boys. This is our power!

The purpose of this handbook is to be a resource: a collection of tools and techniques that have proven

powerful in women's struggle against patriarchy. I did not invent these methods; I only describe them.

Be advised, however, that the methods outlined in this handbook were chosen for their utility, or their ability to achieve results, rather than for their legal or ethical merit. In other words, the information presented herein does not purport to be legally or ethically sound. What is considered to be "right" or "legal" often changes with time, the prevailing culture, and the evolution of law.

This handbook is a work of free speech. How the content is used, misused, or not used is at the sole discretion of the reader, and I (as the author) retain no responsibility. Similarly, I'm publishing this book under the pseudonym of Angela Confidential to protect from backlash.

Enjoy!

THE DAMN FUNDAMENTALS

Let's begin with some introductions. We have three key friends, or fundamentals, that make it possible to destroy a man now (DAMN). To DAMN well, it's important to know them well.

Our first ally is Allison **Allegation**. Allegation can be so simple, effective, and easy to employ that it's elegant. An allegation is a claim, usually without proof, that someone has done something illegal or wrong. A claim, at minimum, requires nothing more than an assertion. For example, if I yell from a rooftop that the world is flat, I have successfully made a claim. Similarly, identifying wrongdoing requires only observation, recollection, or a minimal amount of imagination. From lying to murder, any behavior that you've heard of, seen, experienced, or can think of that violates an ethical or a legal standard can suffice for an allegation. However, it's the last part of what constitutes an allegation that makes it uniquely useful: *no evidence is required*. This independence from

proof allows you to make an allegation about any man doing anything without being encumbered by a need for facts.

But how can something as intangible as the spoken word, without evidence, have enough merit or *power* to DAMN? Admittedly, if left completely on her own, Allison Allegation has relatively little power. That's where our other two friends, Mary Media and Arthur Authority, assist.

Mary **Media**, our second ally, encompasses just about any means of communication. Media can be as elementary as whispers of gossip, although nowadays the term most often refers to mass communication platforms such as television, the Internet, or mainstream media networks. Of course, it also includes social media, such as Twitter and Facebook, which you will soon see are especially well suited to DAMN.

So how does Mary Media help Allison Allegation? Well, interestingly, they help each other. You've probably heard the philosophical question, "If a tree falls in the woods, and no one hears it, did it make a sound?" Although the answer to that question is still debated, it's certain that if an allegation is made and no one knows about it, it has no power. Fortunately, however, the opposite is also true: the more people who know about an allegation, the more powerful it becomes.

Thankfully for Allison Allegation and for our purposes, the modern mainstream media excel at spreading information far and wide. They do it to make money—lots of money—from advertisers. Yet advertisers need more than just a way to reach people; they also need a way to get people to pay attention to their advertisements (and ultimately buy products). This is where media content comes in. Media content can be videos, website posts, “breaking news,” and so on—anything that garners interest. And it’s no secret that scandal attracts people’s interest especially well. “Sex sells,” as the saying goes, and so does violence, injustice, misconduct, and anything else outrageous. That’s why scandalous content in mainstream media has increased over the years. That’s also why Mary Media helps Allison Allegation: scandalous allegations attract people’s interest, interested people watch advertisements, advertisements sell products, and it all makes Mary Media money.

However, fascinatingly, while the mainstream media profit from proliferating allegations, they bear little responsibility for doing it! Apparently, as long as the media mention that the scandal is an “allegation,” they are relatively safe from legal repercussions. This is because, in free-speech societies, people can voice opinions and unsubstantiated claims. Further,

the media can always attest that they are not *making* the allegation; rather, they are just *reporting* it.

But, in truth, the media actually *do* help “make” the allegation by how they report it. You probably know that *how* you say something can convey greater meaning than *what* you say. For example, I could say, “I’m happy,” but if I scream it angrily, people are much more likely to believe I’m upset. With that in mind, try listening carefully to how mainstream media say the word “allegation” when reporting a story. Either they say it in a positive tone, as though it’s something good, or they say it quickly, as though it’s insignificant. They also use the word “allegation” or “alleged” instead of using terms such as “unsubstantiated claim” or “accusation without proof” to deemphasize that evidence is lacking. Even more cleverly, after the media make an allegation popular by broadcasting it far and wide, they then circle back later and broadcast how “so many” people are talking about it. Further, they support people who make allegations by promoting them as courageous for “coming forward.” These tactics get even more people interested and encourage others to make similar claims. Finally, the media then cite the increasing number of allegations and growing public outrage (that they helped create) as being “too numerous to be ignored” or as “evidence” of truth. In a court of law, a man is considered innocent until

proven guilty, but in the court of media-managed public opinion, a man “serially accused” of a scandal is guilty until proven innocent. In this way, an allegation does not require evidence to DAMN because, through media manipulation, *it becomes its own evidence*. Thousands—even millions—of people can become organized against one man.

Likewise, the “evidence” and public perception of guilt created by Allison Allegation and Mary Media’s synergy can become so prominent and powerful that our third ally, Arthur **Authority**, has a duty to step in. And it’s authority that really helps us put the “destroy” in DAMN!

Authority is defined as any person or organization that has the power to control, direct, punish, and so on, which is exactly the kind of power we need to DAMN. Examples include police, judges, bosses, human resource departments, boards of directors, teachers, professors, university councils, licensing and regulatory agencies, and so on. Ultimately, it’s authority that plays the final role in condemning a man.

So what do we need to know about authority to DAMN? Well, to begin, it’s important to understand that Arthur Authority is an artifact of patriarchy and chivalry. As “Daddy Knight,” he takes pride in his role as guardian and savior, especially of the weak, mistreated, violated, and so on. He strives to be the

hero who saves the damsel in distress. In other words, authority caters to *victims*, and nothing gets Arthur Authority's attention more than a call to action to save victims.

To be considered a victim, or a damsel in distress, authority first needs to perceive you as weak. Surprisingly, a great illustration of this is how authorities usually relate to men in distress. Can you imagine what typically happens when a man walks into a police precinct and requests a restraining order against a woman? Officers roll their eyes, and immediate disbelief ensues. This is because they simply do not perceive a man to be weaker than a woman, and for that reason, they are unwilling to provide assistance. In contrast, in patriarchal societies, women are perceived as weak by default, and therefore deserving of help and protection in the eyes of authorities.

Second, for the weak to attain victim status, authorities also need to perceive them as harmed or violated. In other words, authorities require a credible claim that a legal or an ethical standard has been broken in order to take action (because it's their duty to enforce standards). As we now know, we can look to Allison Allegation to make the claim and to Mary Media to make it credible. Nevertheless, it's still important to emphasize that authority is most likely to help us DAMN in instances that entail an apparent violation

of specific laws or codes of conduct—the more egregious, the better. Examples are numerous, including rape, sexual harassment, discrimination, physical assault, child abuse, substance abuse, and dishonesty in its many forms (e.g., lying, cheating, fraud, etc.).

Also—and this works surprisingly well—keep in mind that with the media’s help, *allegations against authorities* can be used to motivate authority to take action! Just about any widespread allegation about an authority being remiss, ineffectual, or *negligent* in its “guardian and savior” role will suffice. For instance, a televised allegation about a company ignoring sexual harassment in the workplace is enough to motivate the company’s human resources department to hunt the accused man *and* anyone who failed to report his scandalous behavior to HR!

Once authorities decree that there is a victim of a violation, they can take punitive actions against the perpetrator (i.e., “destroy” a man). Punitive actions usually entail substantial loss, such as termination of employment/loss of income, loss of education or certification (e.g., dismissal from school or revocation of credentials), loss of social status or good reputation (e.g., public shame and humiliation), loss of financial savings (e.g., payment for legal settlements), and loss of freedom (e.g., imprisonment). In addition, the combined actions of Allison Allegation, Mary Media, and

Arthur Authority generally result in *ongoing* loss or the loss of future opportunities. In this way, a man is truly damned. With a smeared reputation or record of alleged misconduct, no one will want to be associated with him, no one will want to employ him, no one will want to help him, and no one will even *believe* him. Further, the subsequent long-term stress frequently results in loss of physical and mental health. When I say these methods can destroy a man, I genuinely mean it.

Moreover, these methods actually *do* destroy men, even powerful ones. There is no better testimony to how effective Allison Allegation, Mary Media, and Arthur Authority can be than the growing number of men they've destroyed (regardless of allegations being true or false). The following is just a *partial* list from one year (2017) of renowned men (in no particular order), the allegations made against them in the media, and the authority-driven consequences:

Harvey Weinstein, Hollywood producer and cofounder of the Weinstein Company: accused of rape, sexual assault, sexual harassment, and sex trafficking; fired from the Weinstein Company and expelled from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences

Roy Price, Amazon executive: accused of sexual harassment; resigned days after being suspended

Chris Savino, Nickelodeon producer: accused of harassing women; fired

Lockhart Steele, editorial director of Vox Media: accused of sexual harassment; fired

John Besh, celebrity chef and chief executive of Besh Restaurant Group: accused of sexual harassment; stepped down from the Besh Restaurant Group

Terry Richardson, fashion photographer: accused of sexual misconduct; banned from working with *Vogue* and other Condé Nast publications

Leon Wieseltier, *New Republic* editor: accused of sexual harassment; removed from the masthead of the *Atlantic* and fired from Emerson Collective

Knight Landesman, *Artforum* publisher: accused of sexual harassment; resigned from the magazine

Mark Halperin, MSNBC political analyst and coauthor of *Game Change*: accused of harassment while at ABC News; dismissed from MSNBC and NBC News, book contract

terminated, and upcoming book's HBO adaptation canceled

Ken Baker, *E! News* correspondent: accused of sexual harassment; removed from TV while NBC investigates

Kevin Spacey, actor: accused of sexual misconduct and assault; fired from Netflix series and replaced in upcoming film

Jeremy Piven, actor: accused of sexual misconduct; CBS dropped his show

Hamilton Fish, *New Republic* president and publisher: accused of sexual harassment; resigned from the magazine

Michael Oreskes, NPR chief editor: accused of sexual harassment while at the *New York Times*, NPR, and the Associated Press; resigned

Andy Dick, comedian: accused of sexual harassment; fired from film

Jeff Hoover, Kentucky House speaker: accused of sexual harassment; stepped down from position

David Guillod, co-CEO of Primary Wave Entertainment: accused of drugging women, sexual assault, and rape; taking a leave of absence

Ed Westwick, actor: accused of sexual assault; the BBC canceled his show

Jeffrey Tambor, actor: accused of sexual misconduct; not returning to his Amazon series, *Transparent*

Matthew Weiner, *Mad Men* creator: accused of sexual harassment; canceled appearances

Roy Moore, Alabama judge and politician: accused of sexual misconduct and sexually assaulting teenagers decades ago; lost financing from the Republican National Committee and lost US Senate election

Louis C. K., comedian: accused of sexual misconduct; release of new film halted, Netflix special canceled, and FX and HBO cut ties

Andrew Kreisberg, executive producer of *Arrow*, *Supergirl*, and *The Flash*: accused of sexual harassment and inappropriate touching; suspended by Warner Bros. Television Group

Eddie Berganza, editor of DC Comics: accused of sexual harassment; fired by Warner Bros. Television Group and DC Entertainment

Gary Goddard, CEO of the Goddard Group: accused of sexual assault of minors; took leave from his company

Al Franken, US senator: accused of sexual misconduct; resigned and cut from a PBS TV special

John Conyers, US senator: accused of harassment; resigned

Glenn Thrush, *New York Times* White House reporter: accused of making drunken, unwanted advances on multiple women; suspended from the *New York Times*

Charlie Rose, PBS and CBS television network host: accused of making unwanted sexual advances, groping women, exposing himself, and making lewd phone calls; fired from CBS, and PBS cut ties

John Lasseter, Pixar and Disney Animation chief: accused by several women of unwanted touching; taking a leave of absence

Matt Lauer, NBC *Today* show host: accused of inappropriate sexual behavior in the workplace; NBC News terminated his employment

Garrison Keillor, author and the creator and former host of *A Prairie Home Companion*: accused of inappropriate behavior with a woman who worked with him; Minnesota Public Radio is terminating his contracts

Russell Simmons, entrepreneur and cofounder of Def Jam Recordings: accused of

rape and harassment; stepping down from his companies

Warren Moon, NFL Hall of Fame quarterback and the cofounder and president of Sports 1 Marketing: accused of sexual misconduct and discrimination; taking a leave of absence from his job as a member of the Seattle Seahawks' game-day broadcasting team

Mario Batali, TV star and chef: accused of sexual harassment; stepping down from his company, Batali & Bastianich Hospitality Group, and his daytime TV job on *The Chew*

Ryan Lizza, correspondent for the *New Yorker*: accused of sexual misconduct; fired from the *New Yorker*

Alex Kozinski, California federal court judge: accused of sexual harassment; abruptly retired

Jerry Richardson, owner of the Carolina Panthers: accused of sexual harassment; selling the team he founded

Blake Farenthold, politician: accused of sexual harassment and gender discrimination; withdrew from reelection and retired from Congress

Tavis Smiley, talk-show host: accused of sexual misconduct; PBS suspended his show

Carl Sargeant, cabinet secretary for communities and children in the Welsh government: accused of sexual misconduct; suspended from his job and committed suicide

THE DAMN ONLINE METHOD

With the fundamentals as our foundation, we can now shift our focus to tools and methods. The technique outlined in this chapter, called the DAMN Online method, is so easy to do yet so powerful that it's truly phenomenal. Allow me to illustrate with the following vignette:

It's Valentine's Day, early morning. Sam Mann awakes abruptly to his cell phone ringing at his bedside.

Normally, he'd ignore such an early call, but his cell rings incessantly. Knowing that people rarely blow up his phone with good news, especially before dawn, Sam braces himself for an emergency and answers the call. What happens next, however, is something he could have never imagined.

"Hello, this is Sam."

"Hi, Sam. It's Sarah."

Sam is a seasoned business consultant, and Sarah's company is his biggest client.

“●h, hi, Sarah. What can I do for you?”

With a gasp, Sarah exclaims, “You haven't seen what's on the Internet about you?”

Sam has no idea what she's talking about. Sarah explains that her company received an anonymous e-mail via their website's “Contact Us” page accusing Samuel Mann of being a woman-beating, alcoholic, drug-addicted alcoholic and rapist, among other similar things. The e-mail also instructed the company to “Google Samuel Mann, MBA, to see it's true.”

Blindsided and still on the call with Sarah, Sam reaches for his laptop and Googles “Samuel Mann, MBA, business consultant.” He is shocked by what he sees.

His LinkedIn profile promoting his business, credentials, and accomplishments no longer appears at the top of Google's search results. Instead, there is a post on a website called CheaterReport with the headline “Samuel Mann, MBA, is a woman-beating, alcoholic business consultant.” Immediately below that search result is another listing on a website called ReportMyEx with the headline “Business consultant Samuel Mann, MBA, is a

psycho rapist pedophile,” followed by a similar post on RipoffReport, and it goes on and on.

In total, the allegations spanned the first four pages of Google’s search results for Sam’s name. Any positive information about him, including endorsements from clients, was now buried farther back in Google than anyone would typically look.

Alarmed, Sam defends himself. “Sarah, this is literally unbelievable! I have no idea why this is happening. You’ve been working with me for over ten years. You know none of this is true!”

“I’m sorry, Sam, it doesn’t matter if it’s not true; it’s all over the Internet. It looks bad for our company to be associated with you, and our lawyers say it makes us vulnerable. We have to cut ties with you.”

And with that, Sam suddenly loses his biggest client—a relationship that took a decade to build and was continuing to grow. Hundreds of thousands of dollars in annual revenue, gone. Literally just the day before, business was going wonderfully. Sam hangs up, bewildered and in disbelief.

As soon as he puts his phone down, it begins ringing again. This time, the caller’s

name appears on the caller ID; it's Sam's second-biggest client...

You're probably thinking at this point, "Wow, yeah, that's powerful! And it'd be awesome to destroy a man by ruining his reputation across the Internet, but I don't have the resources to do that!" Yet, you do. That's the beauty and genius of this method. With as little as an Internet connection and minutes of your time, you can destroy a man *worldwide, overnight*.

Certain types of media such as "complaint websites" and Google's search engine are key to enabling the DAMN Online method. Nonetheless, to maximize results, it's still important to tailor all three fundamentals, beginning with allegations.

Crafting Allegations

Keep in mind that the allegations you craft for the DAMN Online method will be presented as listings on Internet search engine results pages (SERPs)—the results you see when you search for something via Google or Bing. For example, here are just *some* of the many real listings/crafted allegations that Google serves up at the time of this writing (January 4, 2018) for the name "Darren Ambler" (who apparently has been a target of the DAMN Online method):

DARREN SCOTT AMBLER—NEW JERSEY: STALKER-PREDATOR...

<https://cheaterland.com/darren-scott-ambler-new-jersey-stalker-predator-sociopath.html>

Apr 3, 2017—DARREN SCOTT AMBLER RESIDES IN THE DELRAN SECTION OF SOUTHERN NEW JERSEY. **DARREN AMBLER** IS A PHARMACIST BY TRADE AND IS THE SNEAKIEST, LIAR, SEX ADDICT.

Darren Ambler—Pervert: Sex Addict: Sociopath: Con-Man: New Jersey...

<https://pervertreport.com/darren-ambler-pervert-sex-addict-sociopath-con-man-new-j...>

May 20, 2017—**Darren Ambler** is a 39 year old Sex Addict: Pervert: Con-Artist: Liar: Internet Addict and Former Drug Addict: Darren is dangerous because he really believes there is nothing wrong with him and that everyone else is either “Crazy” or “Out to get him”! Typical Sociopathic sick demented behavior.

DARREN AMBLER, New Jersey | Liars Cheaters and Bastards

cheatersandbastards.com/darren-ambler-new-jersey/

Jul 9, 2016—PLEASE STOP **DARREN AMBLER**...HE IS A WOMANIZER, CON MAN, CHEATER. LIAR, SEX ADDICT AND HE SUFFERS SERIOUS MENTAL PROBLEMSBEWARE...HE ONLY WANTS SEX AND POSSIBLY MONEY...HE IS A PROFESSIONAL LIAR...HE IS AN INTERNET STALKER...HE PREEYS ON...

Darren Ambler, Riverside Twp, New Jersey—
Hey Cheater!
www.heycheater.com/darren-ambler-riverside-twp-new-jersey.html

Nov 4, 2017—Hey **Darren Ambler**, Riverside Twp, New Jersey, is now on heycheater.com! **Darren Ambler**...is a sick mentally ill sociopath who preys on lonely old ladies for dirty sex—oral sex and pornographic acts. **Darren Ambler** also latches on to women that he can use for use of their home—free food—and the bedroom...

Darren Ambler: Stalker-Pervert-Con-Man-Sexual Obsession...

community.allwomenstalk.com/p/58acced997746621618b456b

Darren Ambler age 39 years old. BEWARE—Stay away from this mentally ill sexual pervert. **Darren Ambler** is a big zero from Southern New Jersey: He is obsessed with sex—Dating sites—compulsive lying to others—Stalking his prey for his next sexual encounter: Darren is a former drug abuser turned into Sexual Addict and...

Darren Ambler: / New Jersey Sex Addict: Sociopath: Liar/ Gave me...

stdcarriersdatabase.com/darren-ambler-new-jersey-sex-addict-sociopath-liar-gave-chla...

Sep 10, 2017—**Darren Ambler**...aka...Damen Ambler...Is a Liar-Sociopath-Demented-Sex Addict-Predator: I met the creep on line and he cheated while he was having sex with me and he lied repeatedly about everything. Darren is an Internet Predator: Internet Abuser among other things:

DARREN AMBLER: SEX ADDICT/ STD
CARRIER-SOCIOPATH: NJ...

<https://badboyreports.com/darren-ambler-sex-addict-std-carrier-sociopath-nj/>

Sep 10, 2017—**DARREN AMBLER**
IS A KNOWN WOMANIZER-
MENTALLY ILL SOCIOPATH WHO IS
ADDICTED SEX ACTS AND PORNO:
HE WILL SCREW ANYONE OUT
OF DESPERATION. DARREN HAS
SCREWED PROSTITUTES—OLDER
WOMEN DESPERATE AGES 65–80 AND
ANYONE STUPID ENOUGH TO...

You'll notice from these rudimentary examples that each SERP listing/crafted allegation begins with a post title or "headline" that has a web address underneath and a "snippet" that provides a sample of the content. We'll talk about how and where to post the allegations online in the media section of this chapter, but first, it's important to highlight what makes a crafted allegation work best for search engine listings and for our DAMN purposes.

Although formats vary somewhat, most of the websites you'll be leveraging will require your allegation/post to have a title and content. Above all, both the

title and content need to name the “AM” in DAMN; in other words, they should clearly identify (in multiple ways) the man you seek to destroy. If the man has a relatively unique name, that’s great—the search results Google returns will likely refer to him. But if the man has a common name, such as “Joe Smith,” search engines may return some results you didn’t craft, which could get in the way. In either case, it’s best to make the post title and content as specific as possible by including a man’s full name *and* any titles he has (e.g., doctor, pilot, or president), credentials (e.g., MD, MBA, or PhD), and affiliations (e.g., a company, business, or organization), along with other identifying information such as his address, phone number(s), and age. For instance, “Dr. Joe Alan Smith, MD, ENT specialist, forty years old, at Buffalo General Hospital, 585-555-8585, 321 Sweethome Rd., Amherst, NY” is far better than just “Joe Smith.” The more identifying information you include, the easier it is for Google to serve up allegations about the specific man you’re targeting. And let’s not forget about the power of pictures! Pictures are worth a thousand words, as the saying goes, and Google appears to agree since it provides images related to search queries near the top of their search results. Thankfully, many of the websites you’ll be using allow you to include pictures with your posted allegations. To maintain your anonymity,

you can use pictures of the man that are already public, like ones posted on his social media profiles or other places online (e.g., copy and paste them from Facebook, LinkedIn, and other sites).

Next, in order to attract the proper attention, the post title and content you craft need to include scandalous allegations about the man victimizing others by violating legal or ethical standards. Anything shocking can work, but crimes of a sexual and violent nature against women and/or children seem to work best. A few examples include rape or sexual assault, physical assault (e.g., beating women), and pedophilia. Other vices, such as alcoholism and drug abuse, can also work but appear less effective (perhaps because victims are less apparent). Either way, both approaches are even more effective when phrased as helpful warnings to the public, most likely because they appeal to authorities' "guardian and savior" role by implying that "weak" people are presently at risk. For example, a post title could read as follows: "Warning! All women beware of rapist Dr. Joe A. Smith, MD, ENT specialist..." Further, while the post content requires more detail, it needs to be only about a paragraph in length for search engines to detect it, index it, and rank it highly in SERPs. Nevertheless, longer content is typically better in the eyes of search engines. As always, it's helpful to keep the fundamentals in mind and ask

yourself, “What will get the attention of Mary Media and Arthur Authority?” As you can probably guess, crafting stories or sharing anecdotes with allegations chock-full of scandalous details, sex, violence, victims, and potential victims works well. While most people won’t actually click on the listings (seeing the post title and snippet is enough), search engines appear to rank listings linked to voluminous content higher in search results, and that’s important because we want the public, media, and authorities to notice them.

Also, it’s obviously best to make the allegations anonymously if you want to protect yourself from any negative repercussions. You can refer to yourself simply as “a victim” or “a friend of a victim” in your posts. You can also help maintain anonymity by using a public Internet connection, like at a café or a hotel lobby, or a virtual private network (VPN) connection if you’re familiar with how that works to mask your home IP address. Further, some of the websites you’ll be leveraging may ask you to register with a username and/or e-mail address. You can still guard your anonymity, however, by creating a generic username (e.g., “karma princess”) and a throwaway e-mail account through Yahoo, Guerrillamail, Hotmail, and the like (e.g., karmaprincess321@hotmail.com). Frankly, the websites do not seem to care who is actually posting.

Additionally, although it's important to make the allegations scandalous, it's counterproductive to go overboard and make them ridiculous. For example, an allegation stating "he's a doctor who rapes patients" is enough to do serious and lasting damage, whereas "he's a doctor who drinks twenty bottles of wine per week, smokes crack, hires prostitutes, and rapes his patients" sounds over the top and could undermine the credibility of your claims and lose authorities' interest.

Moreover, the DAMN Online method relies on multiple allegation postings across the Internet to get the attention of search engines and work most effectively. Because Internet search engines tend to ignore duplicate content, you'll need to craft various written versions of your allegations to be posted on different websites. However, the versions don't have to vary much; changing a few words and moving some sentences around should suffice. Here are three examples:

Version 1

Warning! Sexual predator Dr. Joe Alan Smith, MD, ENT specialist at Buffalo General Hospital, NY, 585-555-8585, 321 Sweethome Road.

I'm a former patient/victim of Dr. Joe A. Smith, MD, ENT, and I'm posting my

experience here to protect other victims from what happened to me. He works at the hospital in Buffalo and lives at 321 Sweethome Road in Amherst, New York. While examining me for an ear infection, he repeatedly touched my breasts. He even said he was excited to see me while gesturing toward his crotch! I could see his erection through his pants! He also kept insisting I see him outside the office, no matter how many times I tried to say no to dating him. I was violated and harassed, and I don't feel safe knowing he has my personal information! Why does Buffalo General Hospital allow this sexual harassment and assault? I heard that Dr. Joe Smith, MD, ENT specialist, does it to other patients too! Don't trust Dr. Joe Alan Smith!

Version 2

All women beware of forty-year-old pervert and rapist Dr. Joe A. Smith at Buffalo General Hospital and his home at 321 Sweethome Rd!

I was Dr. Joseph Smith's patient, and now I'm his victim. I saw him for a throat infection. After he persisted relentlessly, I gave in to the pressure and power he had over me and agreed to go out with him. Then he raped me!

He's also a raging alcoholic! He drank so much on our date that he became a violent monster! I also think he drugged me with prescription medication. DO NOT TRUST DR. JOSEPH ALAN SMITH! And watch out for any calls from his phone, 585-555-8585! Don't even be alone in the same room with him! Google his name, and you'll see I'm not the only victim!

Version 3

Public Service Announcement! Rapist ear, nose, and throat doctor Joseph Smith lives at 321 Sweethome Road in Amherst, New York! Phone # 585-555-8585!

I smelled alcohol on Dr. Joe A. Smith's breath during my last appointment with him. This alcoholic sex addict also slurred his speech and tried to grope my breasts while examining my nose at Buffalo Hospital! I had to leave his office when he wouldn't stop and started to get violent, but I was too embarrassed to make a scene or tell anyone. No one else should be made into a victim like I was! Spread the word so there will be no more victims of Dr. Joe A. Smith. Tell every woman you see and post on social media to avoid this man! And to all the other victims I know are out there, please,

please, please complain to Buffalo General Hospital and share your story with police. We have to stop Dr. Joe Alan Smith, ENT specialist, before he hurts more women!

Finally, periodically posting different versions of allegations (like the examples just shown) to websites over time can help keep scandalous listings for the man you're targeting at the top of Google's search results. As few as one post per week on a website (ten minutes of your time) is enough to keep your allegations fresh and trending in Google's headlines indefinitely.

Now let's move on to discussing the websites where you can post the allegations you've crafted.

Leveraging Media

As you know from chapter 1, it's difficult to DAMN without Mary Media's help. This is especially true for the DAMN Online method because it relies on help from specific types of media, mainly websites and Google's search engine.

Complaint websites are the most crucial type of website to leverage for the DAMN Online method. You've probably come across them while searching online for a business or product review, but if you're not already familiar with them, they depict themselves

as websites for people to voice opinions and share their experiences publicly. Basically, they make it free and easy for people to post their reviews and complaints on the Internet for all to see. Examples of complaint websites include the infamous and long-standing RipoffReport, along with ComplaintsBoard and PissedConsumer. In addition to websites like these that are geared to attract *consumer* complaints (e.g., about businesses, products, and services), there are also a seemingly endless number of *dating* and *relationship* complaint websites, such as ReportMyEx, Beware, and CheatersAndHomewreckers, where you can easily post allegations. For your convenience, here's a list of over fifty complaint websites available online at the time of this writing:

badbizreport.com	cheatersandhomewreckers.com
badboyreports.com	cheatersblacklist.com
beware.org	cheaterscatcher.com
blacklistreport.com	cheatersregistry.com
cheaterdirectory.com	cheatersrus.com
cheaterland.com	cheatingcomplaints.com
cheaterreport.com	complaintsbureau.com
cheaterreports.com	complaintsbureau.org
cheaters.website	crappybossesreport.com
cheatersandbastards.com	datingcomplaints.com

datingpsychos.com	predatorswatch.com
erratica.com	private-complaints.com
evilcheater.com	reportbadbiz.com
exposehomewreckers.com	reportscam.com
exposingcheaters.com	ripoffreport.com
heycheater.com	scamboard.com
homewreckerreport.com	scamwire.org
incomplaints.com	scumbagged.com
infidelitiesucks.com	shesahomewrecker.com
liarsandcheaters.com	sneakeeme.com
liarscheatersrus.com	stalkerreport.com
lovefraud.com	stdcarriersdatabase.com
network54.com	stdregistry.com
pervertreport.com	thejohnsreport.com
pissedconsumer.com	theygotbusted.com
playerblock.com	usacomplaints.com

These websites profit tremendously from using public complaints as a legal form of extortion. As alluded to in chapter 1, media of this kind shield themselves from legal repercussions by attesting that they do not *create* the content published on their websites (i.e., the complaints); rather, they are just providing a forum for people to *convey* it. In that regard, complaint websites can hide behind free speech laws and other statutes pertaining to freedom of expression on the

Internet, such as the Communications Decency Act, Section 230. Similarly, many complaint websites actually promote the fact that they do not monitor, censor, or verify the content posted on their platforms, saying they are *providing an open forum* while at the same time absolving themselves of responsibility for said content. What invariably happens, however—and what these websites bank on—is that users post complaints that damage reputations and result in substantial losses for people and businesses. Then the websites *refuse to remove the complaints unless they are paid* to do so. And the payment they demand for removal is exorbitant, ranging from hundreds to thousands of dollars per post. Moreover, many of these websites make it exceedingly easy to proliferate complaints across the Internet by offering users the ability to instantly publish copies of their complaints on multiple affiliated websites. They *want* your posts to appear everywhere online so people will notice them and pay to have them removed. (This process is akin to blackmail.) In other words, by simply clicking a button on a complaint website, the DAMN allegation it took you only minutes to craft is published to numerous affiliate complaint websites across the Internet, which helps make it possible to DAMN worldwide, overnight.

However, this moneymaking scheme that capitalizes on free speech, the reach of the Internet, and

reputation ravaging could not be successful without the help of Internet search engines like the aforementioned Google and Bing. Similar to complaint websites, search engines absolve themselves of responsibility for the search results they serve up by attesting that they do not *create* the content; rather, they just *convey* information already on the Internet. But, in true Mary Media style, search engines actually *do* influence the impact of Internet content on the public by choosing which content to promote at the top of their search results. For example, there may be thousands of listings on the Internet associated with a search for “Dr. Joe A. Smith, ENT specialist,” yet the listings on complaint websites seem to be served up first in Google’s search results. This works so well that a complaint posted on RipoffReport, for instance, about a company or a person typically ranks higher in Google’s search results than the company’s website or the person’s Facebook profile! And Google does deserve special commendation in this regard, as it is the most popular search engine *and* appears to place a greater priority on serving up scandalous content in comparison to other search engines like Bing. In other words, a search for “Dr. Joe A. Smith” through Google is more likely to return allegations on complaint websites than the same search conducted through Bing. Moreover, if a person pays a complaint

website to remove allegations that appear on the first page of Google's search results, Google quickly elevates another complaint website allegation from lower in their search result rankings to take its place. I've seen allegations ranking on page 3 of Google's search results jump up overnight to replace an allegation removed from page 1! In this sense, Google seems to operate like a newsstand that places tabloids on the front and center display rack to attract customers, whereas Bing tends to position credible sources more prominently. Make no mistake, however: Bing still *does* serve up scandalous complaint website listings in its search results, just lower down in their rankings.

In addition to complaint websites, social media like Twitter also play an important role in making the DAMN Online method so effective. Once you've posted allegations on complaint websites, social media can be leveraged to draw even more public attention to them. This is as easy as posting, liking, and retweeting or sharing links to the allegations you published on complaint websites. Posting something as simple as "Wow, look at what people are saying about Joe A. Smith, MD! He's a doctor I was thinking of seeing. I could have been raped!" on Twitter along with links to supporting posts on complaint websites is enough to broadcast the allegations to potentially *millions* of

people and increase Internet traffic to further elevate listings in search results.

Leveraging Authority

Even with your allegations published across the Internet and ranking at the top of search engine result pages, it's sometimes necessary to drop them into Arthur Authority's lap, so to speak, to get him to take action. Social media like LinkedIn and Facebook are particularly useful in this regard. For example, as LinkedIn profiles are essentially online résumés, they can be used to find information about a man's current and previous places of employment, his professional affiliations, and the names of important people in his professional network (such as his boss or his biggest client). Similar information can be found in Facebook profiles. With that information in hand, you can then message allegations to the most important people/authorities in his networks via social media applications (e.g., Facebook Messenger), anonymous e-mails, or the "Contact Us" page of employers' websites. Through the same means, you can also provide authorities with links to posts on complaint websites and encourage them to "Google his name to see it's true." Likewise, you can send similar "alert" messages to regulatory associations (such

as the American Medical Association) encouraging them to revoke any licenses or certifications a man has. As illustrated in the vignette about Sam Mann at the beginning of this chapter, when authorities are directly alerted to allegations, there is an implied duty for them to take action (e.g., terminate employment).

Even more in our favor, Arthur Authority makes it nearly impossible for a man to have any recourse against the DAMN Online method. As already mentioned, the media we leverage use authority (e.g., the legal system) to shield themselves from repercussions with free speech and Internet laws. Similarly, social media giants like Twitter fight hard with their attorneys to protect users' right to express whatever they want. Moreover, if you maintain your anonymity, whom can authorities take action against? It can be impossible to prove who made the allegations on the Internet. Besides, as taking legal action is ridiculously expensive, and winning defamation cases is notoriously hard, it's usually prohibitively difficult for a man to fight back. And keep in mind that, with the swift loss of income, social support, and so on that typically occurs as a result of Allison Allegation, Mary Media, and Arthur Authority's collaboration, most men will not have the resources to even pay for allegation removals from complaint websites, let alone hire a legal team to chase after accusers. Even if a man did

have the money, very few lawyers, courts, and laws are equipped to deal with the new tactics and technology underpinning the DAMN Online method. The legal system is already far behind the times and too slow to catch up. In other words, there isn't much most men can do to recover from the DAMN Online method.

THE DAMN AT WORK METHOD

In comparison to the DAMN Online method outlined in the previous chapter, the DAMN at Work method relies less on mass media and more on leveraging workplace allegations and work-related authorities. And while it's not quite as easy as posting allegations across the Internet, the amount of effort required for remarkably destructive results is still surprisingly small. I'll illustrate with the following vignette:

Kathy Clique was a new hire. A recent graduate with a master's degree in marketing, she was happy to finally leave the academic world and hit the ground running at her first "real" job.

Socially outgoing and chatty, Kathy related to her colleagues as though they were personal friends. She started a company bowling team, went to happy hour with coworkers, and was

devilishly excited to engage in office gossip. Upper management liked her energy, initiative, and “people-person” personality. It wasn’t long before she developed a close-knit group of followers at work.

Eric Introvert, however, tended to keep to himself. True to the many stereotypes about engineers, he was more comfortable working with data and things than with people. A long-time employee of the company, he had worked his way up over the years from an entry-level position to senior engineer.

It didn’t take Kathy long to discover that she disliked Eric. He was reserved, had few friends, and did not participate in company social activities. Likewise, he consistently declined Kathy’s invitations to join the bowling team and other such things. Worse, when she expressed new ideas about how to market the company’s products, he often criticized her for “overselling” the products’ technical capabilities. In sum, Eric got in her way and made her look bad.

So, true to her nature, Kathy began to communicate her dismay to her large circle of friends at work. She complained that Eric stifled her ideas by interrupting and criticizing

her during meetings. She said Eric discounted her perspectives because she was female. To be supportive, her work friends echoed her sentiments and reinforced her negative views of Eric.

Empowered, Kathy then took her complaints to human resources. She stated that Eric did not acknowledge her contributions because she was a woman. She said that he spoke “aggressively” and that she did not “feel safe” during meetings with him. When IIR asked if there was anything else about Eric that made her feel uncomfortable, Kathy added that perhaps he didn’t listen to her ideas because he was sexually attracted to her. And now that she thought more deeply about it, she recalled instances when he stared at her breasts rather than making eye contact while she was speaking. Further, when asked if there were any witnesses, Kathy said she had been sharing her concerns with coworkers for quite some time, they agreed with her, and they would vouch for her.

IIR confronted Eric. Blindsided, he said that he had no idea what Kathy or her friends at work were talking about and that he related

to her no differently than any other employee. He also said he had not violated any company policies, no one else had ever complained about him during his years with the company, and HR had no tangible evidence to support allegations of sex discrimination.

Nevertheless, in order to maintain a safe work environment, promote diversity, and avoid further complications, HR mandated that Eric formally apologize to Kathy and refrain from criticizing her. They also threatened to terminate Eric if he did not comply, informed his manager of what had occurred, and added documentation about the incident to Eric's permanent personnel file.

Rumors traveled fast around the company about Eric's apology and about his disrespect for women. Fearing termination, he no longer voiced his opinions during meetings and retracted his views whenever female coworkers took issue with them. He was eventually passed over for promotion.

Kathy was applauded for having the bravery to voice her concerns and stand up to sexual discrimination. She advanced quickly in her career with the company.

You may be thinking at this point: “Is that all it took to destroy Eric’s career?” As the vignette is derived from real incidents, I assure you that it really can be that easy. While leveraging work-related authorities is key to enabling the DAMN at Work method, crafting “appropriate” workplace allegations and utilizing the correct channels to convey them is required to get those authorities involved. That said, let’s review how to tailor the three fundamentals to destroy a man now at work, beginning with allegations.

Crafting Allegations

Money matters most to companies, and that’s what’s most important to keep in mind when crafting workplace allegations. Making money is a company’s main purpose; it’s why companies exist. Profits grow them, and financial losses lead to their death. Even companies who strive to make the world a better place couldn’t do so if they didn’t make money to fund their efforts. Likewise, the same is true for a company’s functions or departments. And it’s easy to see how functions like product development, sales, and marketing exist to make a company money. However, it’s less easy to see how money is also the guiding star for functions like HR and legal departments. Make

no mistake: those departments *do not* exist to protect or help employees (despite portraying themselves that way). Rather, their primary function is to protect companies against financial losses that can arise from personnel matters, lawsuits, and the like. For example, companies invest in diversity and sexual-harassment training for employees not because training creates a better workplace (many studies show it has little effect) but because it helps protect the companies from lawsuits (e.g., companies can argue that they are not responsible for employee misconduct because they provided training on proper conduct). In sum, companies fully recognize the massive damage Allison Allegation, Mary Media, and Arthur Authority are capable of, especially in terms of generating the kind of scandal and public outrage that results in boycotts, costly legal action, tarnished brand reputation, and other huge financial losses.

In addition to posing a threat to company profitability, viable workplace allegations also require a *victim* in need of protection. In work contexts, “victims” are generally synonymous with “protected classes,” such as women and minorities. The term “protected class” stems from US federal antidiscrimination law, meaning that companies are held legally liable and can *lose money* from allegations about mistreatment

of people in protected classes. Similarly, people who have less power in organizations due to their position title or status (e.g., “entry-level” employees) can also be considered victims of those who have more power. For instance, because business owners and managers can tell employees what to do and terminate employees who do not comply, they can easily be perceived as misusing their power or mistreating their subordinates. Combined, people in protected classes *and* in lower-level positions, such as female subordinates, make excellent victims for workplace allegations that can destroy a man now.

So, when we boil it down, simple and familiar ingredients for crafting DAMN at Work allegations emerge: claims made about a male employee doing something scandalous to a victim. However, like Allison Allegation dressed in business attire, the claims have to be properly suited to fit the workplace environment and be taken seriously by coworkers, managers, HR, and so on. Fortunately, scandalous yet plausible claims can come from magnifying just about *anything* a man does with a potential victim. For example, a man who hugs women at work can easily be accused of unwanted touching. A man who expresses opinions that differ from those held by people in protected classes can be accused of being aggressive and

creating an unsafe work environment. A man who uses humor that involves protected classes or subordinates can be accused of making inappropriate jokes and creating a hostile workplace. Moreover, a man who engages in a sexual relationship (even a consensual one) or anything even *related* to sexual activity with a potential victim from the workplace (e.g., asking a female colleague to join him for dinner) can easily be accused of unwanted sexual advances, sexual harassment, or other forms of sexual misconduct.

Yet, like the DAMN ●online method, while it's important to make the allegations scandalous, it's counterproductive (especially in workplace settings) to go overboard and make them ridiculous. For instance, accusing a manager of rubbing up against female subordinates and repeatedly asking them on dates is enough to do serious and lasting damage, whereas saying "he rapes women daily in the employee lounge on lunch breaks" borders on unbelievable and could undermine your credibility. Along the same lines, it's generally more effective to make allegations related to a man's character (e.g., he's abusive, a sexual deviant, etc.), rather than to something more tangible like the quality of his work. A man can provide evidence to back up the quality of his work, whereas scandalous allegations about his character are much more difficult

to defend against—and as we know from chapter 1, such allegations can become their own evidence with the media's help.

Leveraging Media

Smear campaigns channeled through companies' internal communication networks are one of the most effective media means for destroying a man at work. Before you can take your allegations directly to authorities like HR, you'll need to ensure they'll find some kind of support for your claims upon investigation. For example, if you were to allege to HR that a manager tries to date female subordinates, but the manager's coworkers say they've never heard anything about it when HR asks, the allegation probably won't go far. However, if coworkers are able to say they've heard about the manager trying to date female subordinates, then further action from HR is likely. The more coworkers can vouch for an allegation, the more effective it is, and smear campaigns can do a great job of spreading claims and cultivating support!

So what's required for an effective smear campaign? Well, first you'll need "internal communication networks," or to put it more simply, work friends. You probably already have a network of friends at work, but if you are new to a company (or you tend to be a

loner), you'll have to develop one. The vignette at the beginning of the chapter illustrated how Kathy Clique did an outstanding job of building a broad network of work friends quickly, but it's not necessary to go as far as starting a company bowling team. And although it's outside the scope of this handbook to detail how to make friends (plenty of other books focus on that), I'll share some important tips about how to maximize your network for our DAMN purposes.

First, it's wise to befriend people in the company who are *informally* influential. These folks are akin to the popular kids at school, who set trends, gain followers, and always have friends to sit with at the lunch table. Other employees respect these people's opinions and follow their lead. In corporate lingo, people like these are referred to as "opinion leaders." Gaining an opinion leader's friendship/trust and sharing your claims with that person is almost like publishing allegations in a company newsletter.

Second, it's important to befriend people in the company who are *formally* influential. These are folks who have power because of their position title or status (e.g., director, manager, etc.). Building relationships with these people is a little more challenging than making friends with "the popular kids" just discussed. However, the obstacles inherent in organizational structures (e.g., an entry-level worker has no

business talking to an executive) can be circumvented in a number of ways, such as company social events and mentoring programs. For instance, there are usually opportunities to strike up conversations with higher-level employees at company-held birthday celebrations, retirement parties, and the like. Likewise, you can join company clubs, such as the event-planning committee or the diversity and inclusion group, that provide opportunities to network with people at various levels throughout the organization. Further, mentoring programs offer great opportunities to build close relationships with high-level people—relationships that are intended to provide support for dealing with sensitive or controversial company matters such as a hostile work environment.

Third, it's useful to have *many* people in your work network. Even if they don't know you on a deep personal level, the sheer number of people who know of you (and think positively of you) can help greatly in terms of supporting your claims and spreading allegations. The rule of reciprocity is also important to keep in mind here: people are more likely to think positively of you and do something for you *if* you've done something for them. So be friendly and helpful to others in the workplace whenever you can, as your favors will tend to be remembered and returned in kind. Moreover, besides being useful for our DAMN

purposes, acting on opportunities to be friendly and helpful can advance your career in general.

With your network of work friends established, you can then begin your smear campaign. Everything we've already covered about crafting allegations applies here. However, I will reiterate that the DAMN at Work method calls for you to be subtle and keep the idiosyncrasies of your work context in mind. For instance, setting up a formal meeting with a random employee to claim you've been raped by your manager will likely cause that coworker to become uncomfortable and pass responsibility on to HR *prematurely*, either by going to HR directly or encouraging you to do so. In contrast, however, saying something more subtly to a work friend during lunch such as "I'm dreading my next meeting with my manager; I always catch him looking at my breasts" is far more effective, especially if the work friend is an opinion leader and/or has high-level status in the company. A comment phrased and delivered in that manner can fuel gossip that will spread your claim and garner its acceptance company-wide. Likewise, similar comments made to multiple coworkers over time (be careful not to overdo it) can create a groundswell, and soon employees will be whispering things like "Watch out for that manager. Everyone says he's a creep who can't keep his eyes off women!"

While internal company communication channels are notably effective for destroying a man at work, media external to the company can also be leveraged to great effect. For example, the DAMN Online method outlined in chapter 2 can easily lead to a man losing his job and can even be combined with the DAMN at Work method. However, if destroying a man's career is your primary intention, it's especially helpful to include scandalous workplace conduct allegations when posting on complaint websites and social media. Similarly, as the examples in chapter 2 illustrate, it's also helpful to post/identify a man's place of employment, his job title, and his work-related victims. Because they are public, those allegations alone can be enough to get authorities like HR and legal departments to take action, especially if they align with the allegations you've spread within the company.

Leveraging Authority

When it comes to the DAMN at Work method, the relationship *between* authorities affords the greatest leverage—mainly the relationship between authorities internal to the company (such as HR) and authorities external to the company (such as the US legal system). As alluded to earlier, companies are fearful of financial losses imposed by external authorities,

and it's a responsibility of company functions like HR and the legal department to protect against those losses by ensuring that regulations are followed and by defending against claims to the contrary. So company authorities still operate as "protector and savior," but it's the company (and not you) they strive to protect most. However, that also means you can leverage the threat of going to external authorities as a way to motivate company authorities to act (e.g., conveying that you'll take your concerns to police if HR does not do something to address your allegations). With all that in mind, the actions of company authorities can be understood in two ways: managing allegations before they reach the public, and dealing with allegations after they are publicized.

Companies manage prepublic allegations by acting to quiet them and avoid the financial losses that can result from lowered employee productivity and morale, legal claims, and the like. These actions can take several forms, beginning with coercing the accused to apologize to the accuser(s). An apology by the accused costs the company nothing, is relatively quick and quiet, and can save the company money by retaining employees involved and avoiding the costs of new hires. Indeed, company authorities hope an apology from the accused will defuse allegations and reduce escalation. Likewise, HR may separate people

involved to alleviate tensions by transferring them to different areas of the company, staggering work hours, and so on. Company authorities also document incidents and the steps they took to resolve them to defend against possible legal problems.

Although these actions may not initially appear severe enough to destroy a man, they actually work very well for our DAMN purposes. Most people perceive an apology as an admission of guilt, with the basic thinking being, “Why would he apologize if he didn’t do anything wrong?” While the apologizer usually does it because he fears losing his job, it’s rarely understood by others that way. Similarly, when the company separates the accused from accusers in the workplace, people assume the accused is guilty, with the thinking being, “Why would the company transfer him if he wasn’t a real problem?” And documentation about the incident is a scandalous scar on the accused’s personnel record, hindering favorable performance reviews, promotions, and so on. As shown with Eric Introvert in this chapter’s vignette, these actions are plenty to DAMN; the man’s reputation is ruined, his opinions are discounted, he’s passed over for career opportunities—he is effectively condemned in the workplace.

If, however, scandalous allegations about an employee become public (or it’s apparent that they

will become public), the easiest way for a company's authorities to avoid repercussions from external authorities is to cut ties with the accused. More specifically, when the potential financial losses to a company (e.g., from boycotts, tarnished brand reputation, or expensive legal action) exceed the money that could be saved by keeping the accused employed, the company will terminate his employment or force him to resign—which meets our DAMN intentions. Notice that concepts like truth, justice, or right and wrong are *not* at play here. Rather, when companies are involved, it's all about money.

Finally, it's typically better to leverage internal company authorities before appealing to external authorities. Unless your allegations qualify as violent crimes (e.g., rape), the claims you've crafted and spread through your workplace network (e.g., sex discrimination) will likely matter more to a company's authorities than to external authorities. Moreover, once they are brought into the picture, external authorities tend to coordinate with a company's internal authorities, which can backfire if you haven't already done your groundwork with internal authorities (e.g., HR may not vouch for you).

WHY THESE DAMN METHODS WORK

Having reviewed the DAMN fundamentals, how to DAMN online, and how to DAMN at work, I'm sure you've gotten the gist of how to destroy a man now and can figure out how to apply the same principles in other contexts (like school, divorce, and child-custody battles). With that in mind, I'll finish this handbook on a positive note with a word about *why* these methods work.

In a word, these DAMN methods work because women are *winning*! Moreover, we're doing it by turning male oppressors' own patriarchy against them. Women have gained more power than men while society *still* operates like we are powerless victims. In this way, women benefit from *both* the virtues of victimhood and the power of the oppressor. We also do it openly, hidden in plain sight by patriarchy's selective blindness to women.

It's patriarchal society that forever views us as damsels in distress. It's patriarchal society that laughs

at the thought of a man being a victim of a woman. It's patriarchal society that defines violence as physical, in terms of beatings and broken bones, but never in terms of allegations and broken lives. Even when studies show that women are just as violent as men when "violence" includes things such as verbal abuse, reputation ravaging, and emotional abuse, patriarchal society still cannot perceive women as aggressors. Despite men being *far* more likely than women to be the victims of violent crimes like homicide, men are still perceived as less deserving of protection. Even present-day federal law still requires men, *but not women*, to register for selective service—the military draft. In other words, with women gaining power in politics, we can send men to die for us in war without ever having to go ourselves! Patriarchy's persistent perception of women as weak is so deeply ingrained in society that it's embedded in law.

So, rather than trying to change patriarchy, women have mastered "societal judo" by leveraging the principles of patriarchy against men. We're defeating our oppressors by turning the captain's command of "women and children first" into "men last" while we sink their ship. In 2017 alone, the number of men we've dethroned from high-level jobs in the entertainment industry, politics, and other positions of power is testimony to how well we're winning. Moreover, we're

destroying men's reputations *as men* so they can never regain power. The word *men* has become synonymous with rapists, pedophiles, predators, harassers, and the like.

Women are also winning because certain aspects of modern society have evolved in our favor. Especially with the emergence of information technology, typical female advantages such as communication, social networking, and emotional intelligence have become more important than typical male advantages such as physical strength, size, and emotional detachment. As Richard Whitmire (2010, 28) states in *Why Boys Fail*, "The world has gotten more verbal; boys haven't." Similarly, education is now key to financial success and power, and it's apparent that school is better suited for women. According to *The End of Men and the Rise of Women*, by Hanna Rosin (2013), thousands more women than men graduate from college each year, with women earning about 60 percent of all bachelor's degrees. Likewise, women earn 60 percent of master's degrees and earn more PhDs than men (Rosin 2013).

Even more uplifting, trends like these are continuing, and nothing is being done to stop them. Along with patriarchal society turning a blind eye, Mary Media ensures public condemnation for anyone who even tries to advocate for "men's rights"—even women! And why? Because destroying a man now is

profitable. As we've discussed, mainstream media profits mightily from scandalous allegations against men. Complaint websites make untold sums of money from the "legal extortion" they levy. Lawyers siphon ridiculous amounts of money from men who are trying to defend themselves against allegations. And women profit from scandalous allegations against men in the form of legal settlements, career advancement opportunities, and the like.

Clearly, women's power to destroy a man is stronger than ever, and our time is now!

Works Cited

Rosin, Hanna. 2013. *The End of Men: And the Rise of Women*. New York: Riverhead Books.

Whitmire, Richard. 2010. *Why Boys Fail: Saving Our Sons from an Educational System That's Leaving Them Behind*. New York: AMACOM.



69647661R00042

Made in the USA
San Bernardino, CA
18 February 2018

WANT TO DESTROY A MAN'S REPUTATION AND remove him from power for misconduct? This handbook by Dr. Angela Confidential tells you how.

In *How to Destroy A Man Now (DAMN)*, business psychologist Angela Confidential empowers women with a step-by-step guide for ruining a man's reputation and removing him from positions of power.

In easy to understand terms, the handbook reveals and explains the fundamental dynamics between allegations, the media, and authority as they relate to male misconduct in today's society. It also unveils and details practical real-world methods for leveraging allegations, media, and authorities to dethrone a man.



Angela Confidential has a doctorate in psychology and is an accomplished consultant and human resource professional. She brings a valuable blend of expertise, experience, and practical advice in the areas of social science, thinking and behavior, and allegations of male misconduct in the workplace and other contexts.

ISBN 978-0-9998203-2-2



9 780999 820322 >