

Talk:Satpal Ram

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

This article must adhere to the policy on **biographies of living persons**. Controversial material about living persons that is unsourced or poorly sourced **must be removed immediately**, especially if potentially libelous. If such material is repeatedly inserted or if there are other concerns relative to this policy, report it on the living persons biographies noticeboard.



This article is within the scope of *WikiProject Biography*. For more information, visit the project page.



??? This article has not yet **received a rating** on the Project's quality scale. [FAQ]

Cleanup

Completely rewrote this article and tried to NPOV it as well as make it a servicable wikipedia entry. Added sources, links and cats as well. If someone else could give it a lookover, I'd be quite appreciative. --Lendorien 14:57, 25 April 2007 (UTC)

This article is a tissue of lies, more so than the original lies that were posted here and which were removed after I pointed them out. I would refer you in particular to <http://www.geocities.com/satpalramisguilty/>

First though: Ram was not assaulted, attacked or even verbally abused by "six drunken caucasian men" - this is a total fiction. The altercation - such as it was - was purely between Ram and his unarmed victim, whose name you have misspelled.

Second: The Stanley knife is likewise a fiction; Ram's original claim, which he stands by, is that he used a pen knife. That being said, this claim too is a lie, and I would refer you to both the autopsy report and the extremely detailed 1995 Court of Appeal judgment; the murder weapon was a flick knife.

Third: Clarke Pearce did not refuse medical treatment; when he arrived at the hospital he was in no condition to make any such judgment; his sister signed the consent form for the operation, but his injuries were too severe and he died on the operating table.

I could go on but if the above isn't enough you are probably braindead. - A Baron —The preceding unsigned comment was added by 78.86.8.234 (talk • contribs) 13:28, 26 May 2007.

Seeing as you vandalized my user page, I cannot entirely assume good faith here. You should have done so with me. I have no agenda with this article. I don't live in the UK, nor do I care that much about the incident. The previous version that I edited was far worse than this as far as being a supporter of Satpal Ram. I simply edited it to be more neutral with what information was available. You'll note that certain words are used, "alleged," "claimed", etc.

Your webpage, while interesting, lacks verifiable sources. If you can provide them, you are welcome to present them in the article. Please do try to present a neutral point of view if you do so and maintain that both sides of the issue are presented. Your personal point of view would not be appropriate for an encyclopaedic article. --Lendorien 18:38, 29 May 2007 (UTC)

You are a total moron to make such an imbecilic claim; the website I set up about this callous murder - not a webpage - contains THE most important documents about the case, in particular the transcripts of both Court of Appeal judgments and the autopsy report. These are legal documents of unimpeachable integrity. The site also contains contemporaneous press articles as well as a deconstruction of Ram's lies. And the lies cretins like you parrot incessantly.

Read the site then come back and apologise. Either that or get a brain transplant. There is NOTHING controversial about Ram's conviction. NOTHING. This was a straightforward case of murder. There are not two sides to this case; as somebody once said, there is no middle ground between common sense and lunacy, or in this case easily verifiable facts and crass lies.

For the record, Ram has been back in prison for sometime. I notice the braindeads haven't been screaming for his release this time. - A Baron -- —The preceding unsigned comment was added by 78.86.8.234 (talk • contribs) 18:59, 29 May 2007.

Seriously. Chill out and calm down. You assume I have an agenda here. As I said before, I do not. I don't appreciate the attack, and frankly, it's misplaced anyhow. Wikipedia is a collaborative effort.

I edited the article in passing because it was written like a supporter page for the guy and I felt that was inappropriate. I simply made the tone more neutral based on what information was there. Again, I built on what was already there. My goal was to make it a good article. If it's inaccurate, I have as much interest as any good wikipedian to have it fixed. If you feel the article needs to be fixed due to inaccuracies, then fix them. You clearly know more about the case than I do. Just be sure to cite your sources and use non-inflammatory language. And please, for goodness sakes, try to assume good faith when you deal with people on talk pages and have a little decorum!--Lendorien 19:08, 29 May 2007 (UTC)

Are you for real? You've edited the page to make it even more biased in favour of Ram. You accuse me of using unverifiable sources; as stated, my sources - scans of what are on the site - are both legal and unimpeachable. What are your sources? The "Guadian" newspaper; the grandly styled National Civil Rights Movement, and a black propaganda outfit. You're the one who should chill out. Check out the scans of official documents on my site, then I will graciously accept your apology for championing the cause of a drunken thug who stabbed an innocent man in the back then spent years spitting on his corpse. - A Baron -- —The preceding unsigned comment was added by 91.84.43.97 (talk • contribs) 19:17, 29 May 2007.

For the third time, correct the article if you feel it has errors, just be sure to cite your sources and not use inflammatory language. --Lendorien 19:30, 29 May 2007 (UTC)

Errors continue

I really don't believe you Len Moron, asking me to cite my sources. Haven't you read the satpalramisguilty website? Obviously not, okay, just for you:

- The "six drunken caucasian men" – where did they come from?

- If you refer to the full judgment of Ram's 1995 Appeal, you will see at page 2 that the victim's party was made up of three white couples. There is no suggestion that any of them attacked Ram.
- At pages 21-2 of the same judgment you will see that the Court of Appeal rejected Ram's claim that he had used a pen knife – not a Stanley knife – and gave cogent reasons for doing so.
- The sick, twisted, evil lie that Clarke Pearce refused medical treatment and went home where he died – blaming the victim instead of the murderer – is refuted by several documents.
- On the website you will find his death certificate, which gives the time and place of death as November 16 at Birmingham General Hospital. Clarke Pearce was attacked in the small hours of November 16.
- The post mortem/autopsy report, which is also located on the site, gives the time of examination as 10.10am and states too that “he died before surgery could be undertaken”.

These are all legal documents; the facts contained therein are unimpeachable. Now where are your sources Mr Brain Dead? As to your claim that I “vandalised” your page, you should hang your head in shame for giving spurious credence to such easily demonstrable base lies. -- A Baron - —The preceding unsigned comment was added by 217.43.81.163 (talk • contribs) 20:01, 30 May 2007.

I feel I have been very patient with you, but it's starting to run thin. For the last time, I have no agenda in editing this article. If you have sources to back up what you are saying, change the article to be more accurate. Sources are necessary to verify that what is being written isn't simply heresay or libel. My own edits were based on what was there. I had no way to entirely verify it aside from what newspaper articles I happened to find. If they were spurious articles, then I made a mistake, but it was not intentional. Please get this through your head: for the last time, I HAVE NO AGENDA HERE. Now as for your vandalism, the IP address that you used to vandalize my userpage was the same one you used to post your message above. Wikipedia keeps track of edits done by IP addresses. You're also the only person who has been harassing me about Satpal Ram on this page. The vandal edits using YOUR IP address mention Satpal Ram specifically. Given the evidence, I know it was you. Please behave like a gentleman and let this go. Thank you. --Lendorien 09:07, 2 June 2007 (UTC)

First Mr Lendorien, close but no cigar. When you re-edited the article you got the facts right. More or less. Ram used a flick knife, but he never claimed to have used a Stanley knife. His original claim - which I believe he maintains to this day - is that he used a pen knife. This is a complete lie as is evinced from the autopsy report. And just for the record the murder weapon was never recovered.

Be that as it may, while I accept that you are/were a hapless dupe who has no agenda, someone who most definitely has an agenda has re-edited your article and re-inserted the original pro-Ram bias. He has also added the claim that the music was being played on a radio system. My information is that it was on a tape.

This "vandal" (see thfor want of a better word has removed the links to my website on the ludicrous grounds that it is based on my own research and says he will remove any further reference which is inserted - thus perpetuating the lie without giving people access to the truth.

The satpalramisguilty website is indeed based on my own research, but the documents cited in my correction which you cited - available on the site - are all legal documents which are supported by scans.

The judgment in the first appeal was obtained from the Supreme Court Library. The judgment in the second appeal was purchased from the official recorders/transcript writers. The autopsy report was obtained from the Birmingham coroner by the victim's sister Mrs Nadine O'Neill, who was also present when Ram murdered her brother and testified at his trial.

For some reason which so far eludes me there are people out there whose love affair with this murderer is immune to logic, reason and thoroughly documented facts. -- A Baron - —The preceding unsigned comment was added by 86.142.229.180 (talk • contribs) 11:55, 3 June 2007.

Firstly, the edits made to include the links to A Baron's website were made by myself, as I felt the initial article was grossly imbalanced. Having read many many fallacious articles over this case in the past, I was merely trying to balance the details of the case, as it only presented Satpal Ram's side of the story, not the story given by both Mr Pearce's family and the witnesses present on the night. Sadly the case at the time became a media circus, and was notoriously poorly reported in the media in order to satisfy their own agendas. I've further edited the article to remove the information about Mr Pearce attacking Ram with a broken glass, and the fight being 'racially charged', as this was merely heresay - J - -- —The preceding unsigned comment was added by 80.175.233.17 (talk • contribs) 08:05, 8 June 2007.

Unfortunately, biased media sources are all that seems to be available on this. I gathered what I could and tried to tone down the language of the original article. It's been further refined since then. --Lendorien 21:27, 8 June 2007 (UTC)

Link deleted/OR

I deleted references to the geocities website because it appears to be made by one person who bases the content on his own original research, thus it fails WP:RS and WP:NOR I don't know much about this article, but I will remove references to that website if they are added again. Bleh999 22:46, 2 June 2007 (UTC)

Just out of curiosity, if said site contains images of legal documents, do those qualify as OR? While the suppositions made about those documents might be, the actual documents themselves wouldn't be, would they? --Lendorien 13:58, 6 June 2007 (UTC)

I'm not so sure, if the primary sources exist, certainly other published sources must reference them and they could be referenced here instead of the geocities website. I think a website that has an obvious POV title and agenda (satrapalramisguilty) shouldn't be considered a neutral source, especially when the information contradicts what is said in other news articles. We also have to adhere to the wikipedia policy of Biographies of Living Persons. It's potentially libelous to reprint rumors and false accusations as 'encyclopedic' material and present them as facts to readers. Bleh999 04:47, 7 June 2007 (UTC)

If the reason for deletion of links to A Baron's website are purely down to the name of the website indicating a bias then that is a serious problem. Especially given that the links allowed to remain also clearly have some bias in them. As has been said 'It's potentially libelous to reprint rumors and false accusations as 'encyclopedic' material and present them as facts to readers.' This is also true with regards to links which clearly support the defendant's side of the story. - J - -- —The preceding unsigned comment was added by 80.175.233.17 (talk • contribs) 08:33, 8 June 2007.

That's why I included the website in the first place, in order to present an opposing viewpoint given that all the other sources I found were sayign otherwise. I made some effort to make the language neutral, and it's been refined since then. Do you think the reinclusion of the link is warrented? Unfortunately, all we have are biased sources on this.--Lendorien 21:17, 8 June 2007 (UTC)

Retrieved from "http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Talk:Satpal_Ram"

Categories: Biography articles of living people | Unassessed biography articles

- This page was last modified 21:27, 8 June 2007.
- All text is available under the terms of the GNU Free Documentation License. (See **Copyrights** for details.)
Wikipedia® is a registered trademark of the Wikimedia Foundation, Inc., a US-registered 501(c)(3) tax-deductible nonprofit charity.