

Roman in the Gloamin' – Polanski's Murky Friends

by Mary Jackson (December 2009)

Anne Applebaum points out. [Read this and weep:](#)

Polanski, who panicked and fled the U.S. during that trial, has been pursued by this case for 30 years, during which time he has never returned to America, has never returned to the United Kingdom., has avoided many other countries, and has never been convicted of anything else. He did commit a crime, but he has paid for the crime in many, many ways: In notoriety, in lawyers' fees, in professional stigma. He could not return to Los Angeles to receive his recent Oscar. He cannot visit Hollywood to direct or cast a film.

A. C. Grayling makes short work of the idea that time erases the crime:

Should the law still seek and prosecute people for crimes committed a long time ago? Let us first clarify one thing about the case of Roman Polanski: the film director was convicted of a crime, and skipped the jurisdiction before he could be made to pay the penalty for it. His is not a case where it is still moot whether he committed a crime or not: he pleaded guilty. Nor therefore is it a case where a "statute of limitations" might apply, that is, a statute saying that a prosecution can only be brought against a person within a certain period after a crime occurred.

In any case, statutes of limitations generally only apply to lesser crimes, called "misdemeanours" or summary offences, as opposed to more serious "felonies" or indictable offences. Polanski pleaded guilty to a felony, namely, the statutory rape of a 13-year-old girl. He is, in effect, an escaped prisoner who has not paid the penalty for a serious crime.

[...]

Rape, murder, child abuse, genocide and crimes against humanity are too serious to allow the mere passage of time to weaken a society's stand against

them.

[..]

Neither fame nor wealth, neither time nor distance, should render anyone immune to laws protecting against serious crimes against other human beings.

Spectator landscape, wins first prize for the most egregious Israel-related non sequitur I have seen in a long time:

say about Israel, their homeland:

In order to get Treasury money for Israel (last year \$5 billion), pro-Israel lobbyists must see to it that America's "the Russians are coming" squads are in place so that they can continue to frighten the American people into spending enormous sums for "defense," which also means the support of Israel in its never-ending wars against just about everyone.

There is a religion that demands that its adherents make war on "just about everyone", but it is not Judaism.

Another defender of Polanski is Woody Allen. Cynics have said this is unsurprising, given his inclinations towards very young girls; however, there is a world of difference between a dirty old man and a child rapist. (Polanski's subsequent relationship with the then fifteen-year-old Natassja Kinski falls into the former category; the crime for which he is pursued is definitely in the latter.) And Woody Allen's views on Israel? Here he is [cured by meditation](#):