// THE FAST LETTER

FAST, False Allegations Solutions Team
A newsletter about false allegations of child sex abuse

Publishers: Bob and Elaine Lehman ~ August, Issue #2, 2007 ~ Editor: Elaine Lehman
Email: elaine.lehman@earthlink.net

Contents

Page

1... Prosecutors must stop charging people with child sex abuse, with no evidence, based solely on the word of a juvenile! *(And judges and juries must stop convicting them!)* *Elaine Lehman*

3... Our duty to free the wrongly convicted *(Daniel F. Conley is a rare person; a good prosecutor, who says good things about honesty regarding innocence. Please share this article with other prosecutors!) Daniel F. Conley*

5... The real child abuse...! *Elaine Lehman*

5... When is it best to give the defense opening statement? *Allen Cowling, Question by Julia Miller*

6... Attorneys MUST do what clients want! It's the LAW! *Elaine Lehman*
6... The Taint Hearing. *Was the accuser in your case interviewed several times? You need to know about the Taint Hearing. David O'Hara insisted that his attorney follow through. David O'Hara, with comments by Elaine Lehman*
10... Expert witnesses for the defense - A MUST for false allegation cases! *A Canadian FAST man, and Elaine Lehman*
11... Background Information, **Bob and Elaine Lehman**, ***Educators, co-authors, co-publishers, co-hosts of radio show, activists***

Prosecutors must stop charging people with child sex abuse, with no evidence!

(And judges and juries must stop convicting them!)

Elaine Lehman

Prosecutors must start searching for the real truth, again,
and stop sending innocent people to prison with no evidence!

Judges and juries must stop convicting innocent people based on the word of a juvenile accuser, when there is no evidence to support the claims of the juvenile.

Unethical prosecutors: I am really tired of having new people approach FAST, charged with child sex abuse with no evidence. Prosecutors are routinely charging innocent people with child sex abuse, based solely on the word of a minor child. Prosecutors are going ahead with cases that are obviously and blatantly based on false allegations. The false allegations are easy to spot in the documentation of interviews with the lying juveniles. Not only that, but prosecutors suppress evidence, lie, and will literally do anything at all, to win.

If I, who am not even an attorney, can read the documentation on a case, and see the conflicts, discrepancies and illogic in the accuser's allegations, they can, too. They know very well when someone is innocent, but they move ahead with charges, anyway. They know that juries and judges are heavily influenced by the current (understandable) child abuse hysteria. They know that juries are convicting people for the sole reason that a child said something happened. In no other kind of felony would juries convict, this way. It's an incredible situation, all over the western world.

Look at the infamous Duke LaCrosse team prosecutor, Mr. Nifong, who was recently disbarred for his conduct. He was only the tiniest tip of the iceberg of unethical prosecutors. Prosecutors all over the country are doing what Nifong was doing, and getting away with it on a daily basis. They aren't likely to be exposed by the media as Mr. Nifong was, so no one realizes what is going on.

Judges and juries: The current child sex abuse hysteria has influenced judges and juries to make backwards, illogical verdicts. They do not use common sense, or apparently care that they are sending obviously innocent defendants to prison for very long sentences. The defense can present excellent, hard evidence, but the juries completely disregard it. They convict innocent defendants based on nothing but the word of a minor. Never mind that the older child or teen has a history of lying, or that a younger child was obviously led by a vindictive ex-wife or girlfriend, or even by a caseworker or psychologist.

Never mind that dates, times, places and even incidents change each time the juvenile tells his or her story. (Girls make most false allegations against male adults in their lives to get rid of them or get back at them, or simply for the attention, excitement and power.)

Never mind if two accusers' stories conflict with each other. Never mind if the accuser recanted at some point. Never mind if witnesses stated that they knew that the juvenile was lying, with anecdotes to prove it.

Ie: In a recent FAST case, the juvenile told two other adults in authority that she had made up the story, prior to the trial. The prosecutor ignored the recantings. When the two adults testified that the girl had recanted, the jury disregarded them.

Prosecutors are going ahead and charging innocent men, even when the defense has powerful exculpatory evidence that the juvenile is lying. FAST has several cases in which a medical exam was performed on the accuser or accusers. The girl accusers were all claiming rape with penetration, but the medical exams showed that they were virgins, with no evidence of penetration. In other words, they had intact hymens. An ethical prosecutor would have dropped those cases before they started, with evidence like that. Instead, she went ahead and prosecuted.

At trials, prosecutors employ widely-used "junk science" to try to say that many girls' hymens remain intact, even with penetration. Any reputable OB/GYN will tell you that is not true, but the prosecution goes ahead, anyway.

Juries completely ignore reasonable doubt, and convict "just in case" the defendant MIGHT have done it. In other words, they give all reasonable doubt to the accused minor. They convict in order to get home for the weekend, and so forth.

Judges can recognize strong reasonable doubt all through the defense case and still convict. They are afraid for their political careers, and they don't want the public to think they are soft on child sex abusers.

We know all too well that juveniles DO lie about sex abuse, and are sending record numbers of adults to prison. An adult can easily lead, coach, coerce or bribe little children to make claims of sex abuse that never happened. Many of our FAST cases involve vindictive ex-wives or girlfriends who are behind the false allegations. In a few cases, an outside adult steps in to support the child. And, the adults in the various bureaucracies, also support the juvenile.

Prosecutors and our courts simply must return to following the two basic premises on which our justice system is supposed to be based:

1. An accused person is innocent until proven guilty. (Currently, it is the other way around in child sex abuse cases.)

When a child sex abuse case is based on one person's word against another's (she said…he said), **with no evidence,** there is built-in, automatic reasonable doubt, and **it is not possible to prove innocence or guilt.** So, the case de-evolves into a personality contest between the accuser and the accused. The young accuser, who might very well be lying, or was led, coached or coerced by adults to make the false allegations, almost always wins because of the child abuse hysteria that has swept the western world for the last thirty years. If the youngster can produce tears on the stand, it's all over for the defense. This is obviously unfair to innocent defendants.

2. It is better to let ten guilty people go, than to incarcerate one innocent person.

But, what about cases in which the accused person really is guilty, but there is no evidence? What do you do, then?

We believe that when there is no evidence and therefore, no way to prove guilt, the truly guilty people must be handled legally and privately, **outside** of the justice system. This kind of case might be well suited to a civil lawsuit.

> Parents can ensure that the child and the adult are never together, again.
> Families can confront and shun incestuous adults.
> Families can get family counseling.
> Parents can get counseling for a truly abused child.
> Adults who really were abused as children, can get counseling.
> Use common sense. Prison is not the only solution.

This article is by the District Attorney of Suffolk County, Massachusetts, Daniel F. Conley:

Our duty to free the wrongly convicted

Daniel F. Conley

ELAINE LEHMAN: Honest, caring prosecutors are out there, but from our experiences in FAST, they are few and far between. I am including this terrific article by a good, honest prosecutor, in the hopes that other, more dishonest prosecutors will read it, and change their attitude and approach toward child sex abuse cases in which there is no evidence.

Please share this article with other, less honest prosecutors.

BOSTON POLICE Commissioner Kathleen O'Toole and I recently announced that a man was erroneously convicted of rape in 1991 and wrongfully imprisoned. New evidence conclusively established that he did not commit the crime and should be freed. This was the fourth instance in the last two years in Suffolk County in which individuals were freed from prison because new

evidence demonstrated that they were either factually innocent of the crimes for which they had been convicted or because we believed they did not receive a fair trial.

As district attorney, I believe that the act of freeing one innocent person wrongly imprisoned is profoundly more important than all the criminals we arrest, prosecute, and convict. On behalf of the criminal justice system, I have expressed sorrow and regret at what these individuals have lost, but this is not enough. So the Suffolk County prosecutors and I rededicate ourselves to upholding the highest standards of professionalism and integrity to ensure as best we can that the mistakes that happened in the past are not repeated.

There is nothing more critical to the public trust and the integrity of the criminal justice system than our ability to objectively and openly weigh information that speaks to a person's guilt or innocence. We have no more important responsibility than to follow the facts and law wherever they lead, regardless of popular passions or political consequence.

The job of police and prosecutors is not merely to make arrests or seek convictions, nor is it to preserve an indictment or a conviction at all costs. Rather, our job -- at all stages of the process, from investigation to arrest to indictment to trial to appeal and to the review of new information that surfaces after a conviction -- is to seek the truth.
When we determine that justice has not been served by an indictment or a conviction, we have an obligation -- legal, moral, and ethical -- to act decisively to correct the injustice. This is a sacred trust that this office has embraced.

Even in the best system mistakes can happen. While I am satisfied that we have policies and practices that ensure that my office responds affirmatively and appropriately to any potential miscarriage of justice, my obligations go beyond even this. That is why, together with Commissioner O'Toole, we have created a working group of police, prosecutors, and defense attorneys to recommend new practices and tighter controls in the investigation and prosecution of cases, particularly as they relate to eyewitness identification procedures.

The Suffolk County District Attorney's Office and the Boston Police Department already have policies designed to reduce mistakes. We conduct DNA testing on biological matter at the beginning of a case. The Boston Police Crime Laboratory has a DNA section that is accredited and renowned for its accuracy and scientific excellence. My office does not oppose requests for relevant post conviction DNA testing, and we have a DNA Working Group to review cases and case law where DNA is at issue.

Our investigations into possible wrongful convictions have gone beyond any steps requested by defense counsel. Not once have we stood on the sidelines. In every case, police and prosecutors have made significant contributions in establishing the evidence that freed the defendant. We have used the grand jury to investigate alleged wrongful convictions as well as teams of our most experienced prosecutors, police detectives, and the resources of the Crime Lab. In all these cases we have acted decisively and professionally in discovering and disclosing potentially exculpatory evidence.

The recommendations of our working group will take these and other efforts to the next level, ensuring that from beginning to end, our pursuit of justice is transparent, objective, and resolute.

These efforts to constantly improve police and prosecutorial practices will further strengthen public trust and confidence in the criminal justice system.

The real child abuse…!

In false allegations of child sex abuse cases, the real child abuse happens when people in authority believe the lies of juveniles, or the stories of little children, when there is a vindictive ex-wife or girlfriend in the picture.

Based on our own observations in the field of antisocial juveniles since 1977, and on simple common sense about human behavior in juveniles, if the lying youngster wins, it is emotionally and psychologically destructive to him or her. Winning reinforces his lack of respect for all adults, and adds power to his antisocial characteristics.

When is it best to give the Defense opening statement?

Allen Cowling
Question by Julia Miller

Julia's question for Allen Cowling re: opening statements:

I don't know if it is the same in other states as in California, but in CA, the defense has the option of making an opening statement in one of two ways:

1. The defense can make an opening statement right after the DA's opening statement, before the presentation of any evidence by either side, (which is what you normally see)

or,

2. The defense can wait and make an opening statement after the close of the DA's case, but before the defense starts. (According to what we have read, waiting has it's advantages.)

We've read some pro's and con's for both. In his Allen's experience with the trials, does he has any thoughts or experience with this?

Allen's response:

Every state differs. Some do not even allow opening statements. They go right to evidence presentation.
There are pros and cons to each time frame that Julia presented. Personally, I would rather wait until the completion of the State's case. The judge, or jury in most cases, will have heard the entire State's case and they might be more receptive to listening. Oh, they will listen if the defense does the opening right after the State, but most of what they heard the defense say might be lost during the presentation of their case. Of course, if it is, then the defense can actually "remind" the jury of what it promised, or intended to show in opening.

Personally, if given a choice, I would rather let the State open and present their case. Then, I would have the defense make their opening at the beginning of their case. However, that is just me and, most states will not give a choice. It is simply the State gives it's opening statement, the defense gives it's opening statement, and then the State begins presenting their evidence.

Attorneys MUST do what clients want!

Elaine Lehman

Attorneys MUST do what the client/defendant wants, even if the attorney doesn't agree. It's the LAW!

The attorney can stand up in court and say that he wants it to go on record that he advised against doing whatever it was, but he still has to do it. So, if you have a gut level feeling that your attorney should do something, INSIST that he do it. You have that right. People have ignored those gut level feelings, and deeply regretted it, later. One person who ignored a gut level feeling to fire his attorney the day before the trial was FAST person, Jim Satterlee. As most of you know, the attorney did a terrible job, Jim lost, and is in prison, today. Jim also had a gut level feeling DURING the trial, that his attorney should do something in particular they had not agreed on beforehand. The attorney refused, and the attorney was dead wrong. Jim didn't know he could insist.

Tell your attorney that you know that he has to do what you want. Document that meeting! Tape record it, have somebody video tape it, or write everything in a notebook. If he still refuses, that can be included as grounds for a lawsuit, and in the Habeas Corpus Writ trial or a new trial, later.

The Taint Hearing

Was the accuser in your case interviewed several times? You need to find out about the Taint Hearing!

David O'Hara, with comments by Elaine Lehman

ELAINE: Different states call this hearing by different names. In Pennsylvania, it is called the "Suppression Hearing." The Taint Hearing is used to get a case dismissed prior to trial. It is based on the fact that a child accuser was interviewed several times, which "tainted" her testimony. In other words, she could have been easily led by the interviewers.

Many cases in FAST have this situation. If your case is one of them, you can use this hearing to get the case dismissed prior to trial. It is always far better to get the case dismissed before a trial, because judge and juries are making crazy decisions, these days. They are ignoring sound reasonable doubt, and even hard, exculpatory defense evidence. They find people guilty, "just in case they did it." This is due to the current child abuse hysteria that has tainted juries and judges all over the western world.

Dave intends to appeal, if the judge rules against him in this hearing. If your state has no such hearing by any other name, you can bring it in, using case law from other states, along with your own reasons. If a judge in a lower court does not allow it, you can appeal to the supreme court of your state, to bring this hearing into your state.

DAVE: First, in Pennsylvania, a Taint Hearing is called a "Suppression Hearing." My attorney filed what is called an Omnibus pretrial motion for relief. It an action that goes through motions court and a judge will decide if there is enough evidence to have a suppression hearing. (The DA never showed up to dispute mine so it was automatically granted).

ELAINE: We teach our FAST people to take charge of their attorneys. This is absolutely necessary, because even most expensive private attorneys have no idea how to win these false allegation cases. Most Public Defenders do not even try. Dave took charge of his own case very successfully, by insisting that his attorney do what Dave wanted done.

DAVE: My attorney is not the most aggressive, which is OK. I just take control in the courtroom and he asks whatever questions I write down. We established this prior to the hearing. This is a "no give" requirement. You, the defendant, must take control. He works for you. Do all the legwork yourself. Get all the information yourself, and present it to him. Then, quiz him on it as you are talking to him over the weeks before the hearing. I make Doug earn his money. He knows

my case forewards and backwards, as a result.

I have the actual childline reports of 8 accusations. I could not get 3 others, because they were destroyed due to the time frame that Children and Youth Services (CYS) follows when the allegations are unfounded.

1. I had Doug, my attorney, enter each of the 8 accusations into evidence, at the hearing.

ELAINE: By doing this, Dave showed that he understood what it means for the defendant to take the offense, not the defense, in his defense strategy! You have to do that, to win.

DAVE:

2. Then I had the Children and Youth Services (CYS) supervisor (a prosecution witness) explain the process they use with child line reports.

What an idiot! He sat up there and explained that each report is given to a caseworker, who must interview the child within 24 hrs. Then, it is handed to another caseworker to investigate and reinterview the child, so that is two interviews per accusation. That makes 16 interviews for the 8 accusations. Then there were 6 forensic (medical) evaluations in which we pointed out that she was taken by the grandmother, not CYS, so who do you think coached her on what to say? That makes 22. Then, the DA questioned her twice, and the Cumberland township police questioned her once. So now we were at 25!

ELAINE: Other FAST people need to go through their documentation, and do what Dave did. Count the interviews. Leave nothing out.

DAVE: I have a letter from the grandmother's attorney telling the DA that the little girl is tainted. I have a response to that from the DA, telling her not to tell the DA how to do her job.
(Yeah! They actually gave me that in my Discovery request)

I have documents from previous caseworkers stating the little girl is not credible and she lies. I have therapy records from 1 of her 7 counselors stating the little girl has a problem telling the difference between fact and fiction, and often lies and tells stories.

I got all of this stuff on my own. My attorney would not even begin to know where to get it from. It is very time consuming and frustrating at times.

ELAINE: Even if attorneys know how to get the information, most will not bother. Most do very little to prepare for a trial, in fact, and very rarely have hearings to get the case dismissed prior to trials. They expect to "wait until the trial, to see what happens!!!!" And then they wonder why their client lost. You have to prepare, prepare, prepare, ahead of time.

DAVE:

3. Next, we had him read the name of who was accused and the date of each interview, to show the multiple interviews with different people.

4. Then I had Doug ask him what the results of the investigations were. He just says "unfounded."

This guy doesn't want to come off with anything damaging to the DA, so

5. I had Doug ask him to read their reasoning as to why the accusations were unfounded.   I had Doug do this one at a time so the repetition of this got across to the judge that she was unclear, inconsistent, and not credible on all 8 accusations.

Now it is strange, but on my report it states she was clear consistent and credible. Why just on mine???

The DA asked him if there are many kinds of child line reports.   As he babbled about how there are many kinds of child line reports, he was trying to make it seem as if these were not all sexual abuse.

ELAINE: He was trying to imply physical abuse, too, which would have compounded the defense's problem.

DAVE:

5. So again, I had Doug ask him one question: Could you please tell me the nature of every report filed concerning this little child?

It about choked him to say "sexual abuse." The DA never called another witness, and they had brought 6 with them to testify!

6. I also had Doug ask who signed all the unfounded reports and who signed mine. They were all his signature. (This will play a role later in the Civil Court lawsuit I plan to file.)

7. I had Doug ask about training for the caseworkers. He said all caseworkers were given 120 hours of special training for questioning children who made sexual abuse accusations.

8. I had Doug ask him if they were given certificates.   He stated, "Oh yes." and used all these big words.

9. I had Doug ask him if he could present documentation for the training of the 8 CYS caseworkers involved with these accusations.

He realized he had lied and said he only knew of 2 that had it and could only produce those 2!

Perjury is such a wonderful thing when you are not the one doing it!

These are just some examples of how to help your attorney. In court, he's listening to answers not thinking of the next thing to ask. Sometimes witnesses babble and get him off track from

where he was going.   It is your job to keep your attorney on track, and you are permitted to sit directly behind him (or beside him in some courts) and pass notes.   Your questions have to be good, relevant questions. The judge is not going to want to see you handing him 50 notes and him just tossing them aside.

My best advice is to take things into your own hands. Follow what Elaine and/or Allen Cowling tells you.

ELAINE: Allen cannot help everybody, personally, unless you pay him. If you don't know an answer to something, ask me, and I'll ask Allen. Doug paid Allen to act as a consultant with his attorney.

DAVE: I have made 24 inch binders since January of 2007. I keep everything. I make copies for my attorney and I keep the originals. I research it. I go through it, because my attorney knows nothing of this case unless I bring it and explain it. He doesn't know the players involved or who to get the information from.

For Instance, I got the little girl's mother to sign a waiver for me, for all medical records.

ELAINE: In this situation, the little girls' mother is fighting the grandmother for custody of her daughter, so she wants Dave to win. Dave and his fiancee were helping her, before all this happened. That is unusual, though. The point is, use whatever leverage you have, or can create, to get your documentation. Everybody has some leverage. You just have to be smart about using it wisely.

For instance, you, the defendant, have a legal right to your entire Child Protective Services (called by various titles in different states) file, AND everything the prosecutor has on your case. In most situations, your attorney will have to get the prosecutor's documentation from him or her, but you can prod your attorney to do it, and MUST. Do not believe him when he says he cannot do that. He is too afraid of rocking boats to win your case.

DAVE: The DA still has not given me her forensic (medical) evaluations, but I have them.

ELAINE: Dave got the forensic reports by getting the mother to sign a waiver. However, in most cases, the prosecutor will release medical reports to the defendant's attorney. Make sure that your attorney gets the medical reports, though. Attorney drag their feet, and you don't want to wait until the last minute to get things in order.

DAVE: Stick to the basics. Do not try to explain every little thing, because it will take away from what you are trying to get across. My biggest problem is that I want to talk about everything I have in my binders. It waters down the facts.

ELAINE: But you don't want to leave any doubts, either. Leave no dangling questions the jury might have. This kind of dangling question can arise any time at all, even during the trial. If you aren't sure if something is important, ask me! Always remember that a confused jury convicts.

Expert witnesses for the defense -

A MUST for false allegation cases!

Elaine Lehman

We have a list of components to include in a winning defense strategy. It is in several of our newsletters. See our website for the lists of what attorneys must do to win a false allegation case. **www.false-allegations-team.com**

One of the items on that list is "expert witnesses." Every false allegation defense should include an expert witness. Experts WIN false allegation cases. In fact, if you do not use one, you will

probably lose. At the very least, manage to turn a prosecution expert into YOUR expert with cross examination at hearings or trials.

ELAINE: A FAST man in Canada gave me some very valuable information. (This man apparently has access to special software.) After emailing back and forth with me about how to win, he did some impressive research on child sex abuse convictions in Canada.

He said that in almost all of the cases, the defense lost, and very few of the defendants had expert witnesses!

FAST man: I have researched recent Canadian case law pertaining to sexual assault and child sex abuse and in almost all of the cases the accused was found guilty. I also noted in my research that in very few of these types of cases did the accused use expert witnesses.

ELAINE: I was very interested, because we have seen that same thing in our more limited number of cases, and in the cases I worked with ever since 1989. Allen Cowling strongly recommends using expert witnesses, too. Our FAST man's amazing research sounds almost like a study! I am positive that if it is true in Canada, then it is also true in the USA and all over the western world. This FAST man in Canada might have finally found a way to show that we are absolutely correct!

In today's climate, you must do EVERYTHING on our list of what attorneys must do, to win, and that definitely includes using expert witnesses. In fact, using an expert witness is right up there with proving that the accuser is lying by finding all of the discrepancies that show lies. And, in cases where it is very difficult to prove that the accuser is lying, an expert witness becomes even MORE important.

Every innocent defendant falsely accused of child sex abuse MUST have an expert witness as part of his defense. **Attorneys will disagree with this, but they are dead wrong.** They will tell you that having an expert witness will make the jury think you don't have a case, you have something to hide, or your case is weak. This is a legal "old wives' tale," among attorneys, and it goes back to having guilty clients. This is not true when the defendant is innocent.

YOU MUST have an expert witness or even more than one, to win a false allegations of child sex abuse case.

The current public attitude toward child sex abuse is so powerful and hysterical, that you have to fight back in every way you can. You have to cover all of your bases, and expert witnesses can answer many different kinds of unanswered questions that the judge and jury might have.

Expert witnesses must be used to dispute or rebut prosecution expert witnesses, as well.

Expert witnesses make the difference, when all the defense has is reasonable doubt. (Reasonable doubt is not enough, in today's courtrooms.)

Expert witnesses impress and influence juries and win cases for the defense.

They are a crucial and vital component of the very complete defense strategy that is needed, these days, to win a false allegations of child sex abuse case. Remember that confused juries convict. Each time you add more logic and information to the defense strategy, you are clarifying issues. Experts always add logic and information. That is their purpose, in fact.

Expert witnesses add weight to the defense.

This weight is absolutely necessary, because the legal scales are already so heavily weighted in favor of the child.

If you have a trial coming up, and your attorney tells you not to hire an expert witness, as he probably will, **you must take charge, and insist. The attorney is wrong, and we are right. It is your call, and you must MAKE that call!**

Background Information
Bob and Elaine Lehman

Educators, co-authors, co-publishers, co-hosts of radio show, activists

Elaine Lehman is a former teacher from Baltimore, Maryland, with nearly 20 years of teaching experience with all ages, including adults.

Bob is a former rocket engine engineer, who worked for 21 years on the Delta Satellite Program at Cape Canaveral before he and Elaine started their two schools for antisocial teens, in 1977. After the schools closed in 1983, Bob became an airplane mechanic, and did that work from 1983 until 9/11, which cut jobs for airplane mechanics, dramatically.

1977–1983, Elaine and her husband, Bob Lehman, co-founded and directed two schools for antisocial teens. Elaine and Bob developed their own successful courses of study.

The Lehman's two schools ended up with a documented 100% success rate of the graduates, and an 80% success rate of those who did not complete the program. (See "Baltimore Sun" and Carroll County Times, MD, feature articles on our website.)

1989 -1992, Bob and Elaine Lehman co-founded a state-wide organization in Oregon, aimed at getting the broad, vague child abuse laws changed to clear, specific laws. BUST also exposed the many dreadful problems of the child service division.

"BUST, Break Up System's Troubles," ended up with 500 members, state-wide. As a result of BUST, the Oregon state legislature had a $200,000 study done, and the study group wrote a scathing report that said all of the same things the Lehmans had said. The legislature changed some of the laws, but not the right ones, due to federal funding problems, if they did. (See "Stayton Mail" article on website.)

1997, Bob and Elaine co-founded a similar national organization, "SOC, Save Our Children," which quickly led to their radio show.

1997 - 1999, Bob and Elaine co-hosted their own radio show, "The Save Our Children Show," which was simulcast on two 50,000 watt stations in Providence, RI, and Phoenix, AZ. The show was all about antisocial children and teens, and included many shows about false allegations of child sex abuse.

1999, Bob and Elaine Lehman were professional "expert" guests on two national TV talk shows, "The LEEZA Show" and "The QUEEN LATIFAH Show." Both shows were about discipline and antisocial children. Elaine has also appeared on several local radio shows and TV shows, and she and Bob have given lectures to community groups about antisocial behavior in juveniles.

1995 - 1996 - The couple co-authored two published books, Petey, the Peacock Breaks a Leg, Winston-Derek Pub. Co., Nashville, TN, 1995, and "BIG K, the Kundalini Story." Hara Publishing Group, Seattle, Washington, 1996.

1978 – Present - The couple co-published a newsprint periodical in Oregon, and several international newsletters. These publications were all about antisocial juveniles and false allegations of child abuse. (See "Newsletters" on our website.)

2001 – Present, Bob Lehman's son, Craig Lehman, created and maintains a website, www.beanswers.com There are several categories about antisocial juveniles, the FAST, False Allegations Solutions Team, false allegations of sex abuse, and more.

2004 - Present: Bob and Elaine Lehman co-founded, and Elaine directs, the "FAST, False Allegations Solutions Team," an international, email support group for people who have been falsely accused of child sex abuse. FAST is also working toward getting some laws changed that are exacerbating the situation.

NOTE: Elaine and Bob used the educational approach toward antisocial juveniles that Dr. Stanton E. Samenow developed from his landmark study, The Criminal Personality (In 3 volumes), Jason Aronson, New York, Volume I – 1976, Volume II – 1977, Volume III - 1986.

Dr. Samenow is the nation's leading criminologist, has been a professional friend of the Lehmans since 1982, and has contributed several articles to their newsletters. (See "Newsletters" on our website.)

Need help with your false allegations of child sex abuse case?

Contact the FAST, False Allegations Solutions Team

FAST is an all-volunteer, international, email support group for innocent people falsely accused of child sex abuse. We do not charge for our help, and we are good at what we do! We teach you what your attorney must do to win your case, and give you LOTS of meaningful emotional support. We help people at all stages in the legal process. We are activists who want changes made in the laws governing child sex abuse, and feel that the changes will help stop real child abuse, too.