

Helping Women Get Away With Murder



CRIME FEATURED GNEWS

NEWS

By Alexander Baron



128
SHARES

What do you call a man who commits murder? A murderer, of course. So what do you call a woman who commits murder? If you were thinking murderer or murderess, think again, because according to *Justice For Women*, the correct term is victim, abused woman, battered woman, anything except a suitable synonym for killer. You see, when it comes to evil, be it a single wanton act or even serial murder, women have no agency. This is the **feminist narrative** as endorsed by Alyce LaViolette and Phyllis Chesler in the US and by Elizabeth Sheehy in Canada. In the UK we don't have such illustrious names, but *Justice For Women* more than compensates for this.

In March 2010, Stacey Hyde was given a **life sentence** with a 9 year tariff for the murder of Vincent Francis. Hyde was only 17 when she made what was called a frenzied knife attack on the victim, stabbing him 17 times, including in the back. Shades of **Jodi Arias**?

At her trial, Hyde pleaded not guilty claiming self-defence. At the time, the victim was said to have been having a fight with his girlfriend Holly Banwell, so self-defence was a tall order, and the jury rejected it. Hyde was said to have been very drunk, and it appears that in spite of her youth, overindulgence in the demon drink was a long standing problem. She did not live with Francis and Banwell, but had been invited back to their place for a drinking session.

Like the jury, most people would have considered this a clear case of murder, but not *Justice For Women*. According to them, poor Stacey was the victim; she had mental health problems (ie she was a headcase); a victim of abuse who had been “self medicating with alcohol to dull her pain”, and of course the dead man was the perpetrator; he was said to have had a history of violence. This appears to be a half-truth, his relationship with Holly Banwell was six of one and half a dozen of the other. At any rate, Miss Banwell didn't believe he deserved to die, and testified for the prosecution.

It is clear from contemporaneous reports that Hyde was the aggressor, because initially she had attacked him, the fight had spilled out into the hall, then she went back inside, came out with a kitchen knife, and stabbed him in the back. Can any reasonable person read self-defence into that scenario? *Justice For Women* took up Hyde's case in 2011, and according to their own boasts were instrumental in securing an appeal, which resulted in a retrial being ordered, and this month in her total acquittal. No one should be too surprised if this deranged female goes on to inflict serious damage on or to murder someone else, maybe even a woman. Then perhaps *Justice For Women* will be satisfied. Most of the other killers they support are no less unsavoury, like Jane Andrews, a high profile murderess on account of her position as a Royal dresser. Andrews murdered her lover Tom Cressman as he slept. She battered him with a cricket bat, then stabbed him. After that she fled the scene of the crime, and texted friends to give the impression she knew nothing about it.

According to *Justice For Women* they supported her appeal “as there was fresh psychiatric evidence to show that memories of her early child abuse were triggered by the sexual abuse she sustained at the hands of Cressman, causing significant psychiatric disturbance.”

The Court Of Appeal refused to hear this fresh evidence because it was a crock. Like Hyde, Andrews is another headcase, a physically attractive woman with a toxic centre – a jelly baby laced with strychnine. Andrews was born on April Fool's Day, but Lords Justice of Appeal are not fooled easily; in its 49 paragraph dismissal of her 2003 appeal, the Court pointed out that “In the spring of 1999 she told him that she had been sexually abused as a child, and he arranged for her to see Christine Yawetz, a chartered psychologist and psychotherapist, who saw the appellant on three occasions in April and May 1999.”

Do these sound like the actions of an abusive partner? She tells Mr Cressman she was sexually abused as a child, this abuse is still bothering her, and this quite wealthy man seeks out (and pays) for professional help.

These allegations of childhood sexual abuse like those she made against her lover were totally self-serving. Incredibly, after she was charged with Mr Cressman's murder and in spite of both the

mass of evidence against her and her clearly unbalanced mind, Andrews was granted bail. Would any man have been granted bail under such conditions?

The Court Of Appeal continued: there were five issues for the trial jury to consider, namely: accident, self-defence, intent, provocation, and diminished responsibility. How many bites of the cherry did she take there?

I killed him by accident (striking him with a cricket bat) or failing that in self-defence (while he was asleep), I didn't intend to kill him (that's why I stabbed him in the chest with a kitchen knife), he provoked me (by snoring too loud?) and anyway, I'm nuts, so my killing him doesn't count.

The bottom line is that Andrews wanted to marry Tom Cressman, and he didn't want to marry her, which is hardly surprising. Would she still have wanted to marry him if he had been the monster she claimed? She went on to accuse her ex-husband of violent behaviour towards her, the man she had cuckolded in the five years they were together. Do you see a pattern here? Everyone is responsible except poor Jane.

Now guess what, Andrews is to be paroled. Prisons are not the holiday camps it is sometimes claimed, but women's prisons are cushy in comparison with men's prisons. In 2009, Andrews absconded from an open prison, so after less than a decade behind bars for an heinous murder (for which at one time she would surely have been hanged) she was being groomed for release, she does a runner, and now, a mere 6 years down the line, she is still being released. *Justice For Women* should be ashamed of themselves, but on the contrary they seem proud. Where though is the justice, for both Vincent Francis and Tom Cressman?

128
SHARES