

Capturing the friedmans essays example

[Law](#), [Criminal Justice](#)



“ Capturing the Friedmans” is a movie based on a true story. Jesse Friedman had been in jail for 13 years for committing dreadful sexual crimes against young children. Initially, he had pleaded guilty only to change his mind later and he is out to clear his name for innocence on the act. It would only take a critical eye on the events as they unfolded to determine whether he was guilty or not. Facts on the movie would be fundamental in making concrete conclusion on whether Friedman was innocent or guilty of the alleged offence.

Judgments are usually made with the facts that have been provided. The movie begins with Friedman visiting his father’s school where he meets students who were studying computer. The young boys look young approximately 10 years of age. During his stay in the school, Friedman was found around those young boys most of the times. He can be seen teasing them and there seemed to be a closer relationship between Friedman and the boys. The closeness that he had developed with the boys could have been the platform that he used to sexually abuse the children.

Friedman says " I never touched a child in an inappropriate way. I never harmed a child. I never molested a child. I never sexually abused a child. I never sodomized a child." This is an indication that Friedman touched the children in the process of interaction. This is an extremely sensitive statement from him since he had no permission to touch the children as he was not their teacher and he was not a student in the school. This point would be extremely influential in defining how the judgment would have been made.

In passing judgments, history is extremely useful. It defines what may be

expected on you in present moment. For Friedman, history could not have favored him. The movie shows a moment when he was found posting a pornography magazine. This would have been used as a platform to judge his character. Exposure to extensive pornographic materials means that the individual may have had his mind spoiled by the negative materials.

Matching this to how he interacted with the boys, the judge had no option rather than to sentence Friedman as guilty.

Also, the innocence of Friedman would have been defined by the testimonies that were given by the children. The children had confessed that Friedman had molested them. They demonstrated how the man touched them to the judge. This was a point to prove that Friedman was innocent and nothing could have been done to prove it otherwise. The children seemed confident in their testimony and nothing could have made anyone doubt whatever they said to the judge.

Lastly, Friedman had already pleaded guilty of the offence. Therefore, the court had no other way to define his innocence. It is the role of the defendant to prove his innocence. In this case, Friedman was unable to do it. Therefore, he remains guilty of the alleged offence.