

In the June 19, 2013 email below, Earl de Blonville responds to allegations by Ripley Davenport that I, Kent Madin, have been cyberstalking Davenport. Davenport was well aware that I had collaborated with journalists at Politiken, the Danish newspaper on a story about his fantasy career as an explorer, repudiating those allegations and that much of the story relied on my research. The Politiken article appeared on August 18, 2013, two months later. Mr. de Blonville was also aware that I had stated, from the outset of my communications with him, that my interest was in writing a story about fraudulent explorers. In several emails on August 19 and 20, de Blonville tries to convince the article's author, Lasse Rahbeck, that he has it all wrong and that Earl has special knowledge to prove that point.

Rahbeck responds:

From: Lasse Rahbek Petersen <rahbek.petersen@gmail.com>

Date: 20. aug. 2013 10.54.57 GMT-05.00

To: Earl de Blonville <deblonville@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Ripley Devonport article

Earl,

Madin contacted me as a leg in his own investigation. He did not know I was a journalist at Politiken. I took interest in the story myself and decided to write the article.

The article is meant to be a fascinating look into the world of a patheological liar and fantast. It is a testament to how easy it is to tailor a false reality in cyberspace. When you invite the press to you wedding they are going to be there at your funeral. Ripley should know this. I believe the article needs no further justification. As for Madins persuit of other self-proclaimed explorers. I too think there is a culture of embellishment and even falsefying in the adventure world. If Madin wants to expose this, that is his right and I say go for it. I cannot speak for his methods, but surely no respected media would run a dirty article made by a mad man. I have known Kent Madin for a year now and I must say your allegations and assumptions sound absurd to me. Lasse Rahbek"

Note that Earl's email below is consciously addressed to Ripley AND me even though Ripley's end of the conversation is not included. Earl paraphrases it because the real audience is me.

On page 4, in yellow highlight, Earl makes it clear he has not one but two lawyers who he has previously employed.

Also on page 4, in blue highlight, Earl states that he intends to write and broadcast widely, a "story" about me, Kent Madin, as a cyberstalker. Presumably he will include his bizarre "analysis" of my personality and motivations. No mention of journalism, but much wild speculation regarding my psyche.

This all begs that question of whether Earl actually understands what legally constitutes cyberstalking. One can only assume that if he consulted with his lawyers they would have set him straight. He certainly has no understanding of how his proposed actions would constitute defamation. He states clearly that he is going to construct a story based on his own speculation and pseudo-scientific insights which names me as a criminal and a creepy one at that. And he plans to distribute it to all his contacts in adventure and exploration. de Blonville adds: "There are a number of ways this important information can be broadcast, both online and in publication, and I will have to recruit others who share my concern to get their help in doing it."

This is a textbook example of conspiracy to commit defamation and to do it using electronic means. THAT is cyberstalking.

And he went through with it. :

<https://web.archive.org/web/20140421150321/http://www.kentmadincyberstalker.com>

Anyone with a Domaintools.com whois account can search the history of ownership of that URL. They will find that Earl de Blonville purchased it on January 12, 2014. And while there, you can search ownership history of kentmadinstalker.com and kentmadinstalker.net. These were also purchased by Earl de Blonville though never deployed. They were purchased on July 3, 2013. In other words de Blonville purchased those last URLs BEFORE the Politiken article went to print. Earl planned to make a website alleging cyberstalking of Ripley Davenport before even reading the information in a respected national newspaper.

Subject:	Astonishing
From:	Earl de Blonville (deblonville@gmail.com)
To:	mail@ripleydavenport.com; rett139@yahoo.com;
Date:	Wednesday, June 19, 2013 1:44 AM

Hi Ripley

The amount of detail you just sent, added to the last lot, regarding that bloke, is truly astonishing. In fact it makes my stomach churn as I read through and try to make sense of it all.

By your count, he has harassed 60 of your friends, associates, sponsors and so on. Presumably some of them several times, and as you report, often late at night so as to heighten the scare factor.

Now he is threatening your wife. Your children are suffering stress. Your wife could lose her job and you're so spaced out you have cancelled all plans for future trips. You are receiving medical help for the accumulated stress from four years of sick harassment.

I imagine he must be gloating over what a terribly clever chap he thinks he is.

Well, only if he has absolutely no empathy, integrity or human decency at all.

And as I first suspected, a lot of those Hare 20 boxes are being ticked here.

Bottom line is, for me anyway, is that I don't care if you exaggerated your journey stories or not. Basically, no one gives a tinker's cuss as you're simply not that important on the world stage. Anyway, what a man does and how he does it - good, bad or otherwise - is nothing to do with anyone but him and his conscience. Show me a man with no regrets, no unfilled dreams and I'll show you a fool. The actual issue here is not you, but the

unconscionable behavior of another person. Nobody on earth deserves what you and your family have been put through over the last four years.

Reading through his letters, what emerges clearly to me is a cruel triumphalism. He is enjoying every minute of his high-handed, overpowering self-righteousness: relishing his imagined power to engage so many, so easily, for so long.

If he's appointing himself as the seeker of fraud, he need look no further than two of his fellow Americans - Cook and Peary. But I jest. They were entertainers.

According to my friendly psychologists, this prolonged attack on you is nothing to do with your claims in adventure, it's purely to do with his self-gratification. He enjoys hurting people, causing them the most pain possible without drawing blood, and getting away with it by doing it at a distance. Doing it remotely as he does, and so smugly, reveals his cowardice. I'll bet London to a brick he would never say or do such things to your face, or anyone else's.

His tactics are not without precedent and well proven. Here's a true incident I know of from Sydney. A guy was owed money by a bloke. He tried the courts and got a ruling, but still got no payment. Solution? Cause maximum pain. Action? A thug was paid to smash the windscreen of every car in the bloke's street - except his. The neighbors are not happy. One windscreen is saved - so it's owner is implicated in the crime. Then, two weeks later, a repeat. Now, very angry neighbors. Then a third time, and the bloke has to move house very quickly - the neighbors are ready to smash him up.

Your tormentor is using the same tactic. By harassing every one of your friends, contacts, sponsors, etc., he is getting at you through them in order to force the tribe to isolate and punish you. This is insanely cruel behavior.

But more importantly, it is actually without a direct motive. Detectives, looking at any crime (and this is criminal behaviour) are trained to first

detect a motive. Every crime has a motive. Since he started attacking you out of the blue, as it were, making your business his business (by a leap of utter impertinence) and at the time you had never heard of him - and certainly didn't owe him any money - then we have to disregard his story about getting at the your 'truth' and look deeper instead at his 'truth'.

For one male to realize his overriding passion of ensnaring another male in such a grim dance of personal destruction (as you're experiencing), then we have to look for non-logical motivations. In my personal view, I suspect he may be a sexual sadist, as no person in their right mind would do what he has done unless driven by a deep psychological obsession. The need to humiliate another male is sexually based, especially when associated with such a level of control as he has over you. He needs to hurt, to humiliate, to shame and probably to destroy. I believe he is projecting onto you the unresolved pain of his own sexual torment, probably the result of having been sexually abused over a long period by a male who was insidious, manipulative and powerful. He is acting out what happened to him. In proposing this scenario, I am supported by the view of some friends in the business.

I should point out that I have never met this person and have absolutely nothing personally against him, so I have no agenda to follow in offering this assessment of his long pattern of behavior. I only offer you this in the hope that you will see that, despite the cruelty of it and the immense pain you are experiencing, it is not actually aimed at you personally. You are just an unwitting target for his self projection, and your early naiveté prevented you from angrily telling him to go fuck himself at the outset. I think that since that very confusing and disturbing opening, he has been engaged in what psychologists call 'crazy-making' behavior. He confuses, he manipulates and runs around in such a way that everyone just wants to wash their hands of it and go home, because nothing makes sense.

In helping you to look at this awful situation with open eyes, I am well aware that this person will now attempt to target me. He will probably be plotting right now on how to write to everyone he can find on my website, and indeed on the web, to start his crazy-making with them. His warped

thinking will be to get me to abandon you in order to save my skin. If this happens (and frankly, I don't give a damn - I'm too old to worry about whackos and too far removed to care, plus all my friends would laugh him out of town), then it would be additional evidence of his insane obsession with isolating you so as to control you. In one scenario, he will only be satisfied if he causes you to take your own life. Rationale? If you are his projection for all that is rotten within him, then your death would expiate his inner suffering. I know this sounds extreme, but no more so than four years of his Jeckyl and Hyde obsession and your suffering.

When I get back from my next conference I will go through all your material in more detail to see what should be done. **In the meantime, I have two lawyers in Melbourne who will be interested, one of whom is a rottweiler-barrister who bristles at injustice. I've used him in the past - he's awesome.** He will advise me on what your realistic options are, but shaking loose a psycho will not be easy.

What annoys me is that he has, unbidden, hauled me into this, with no purpose in mind other than to polarise me in a dispute I don't understand or care for, against a fellow traveller who's life should rightly be his own. That means that, given what you say is his habit of engaging others and attacking them if they don't comply, I am now placed in a position where I must expect to be bullied, harassed, defamed and personally damaged.

I am therefore now obliged to make contact with all your contacts to share my unwanted experience, and warn them of the risk that his insane behaviour continues to pose to us all. I will also have to communicate my negative experience of him with every one of my personal, professional and adventure contacts, in anticipation of him contacting them (as earlier mentioned). In doing this I will have to write a full story of what he has done to you, in order to explain what he has tried to rope me into supporting. I feel it my duty to also make contact with all the professional associations I'm connected with, learned institutions in particular, to warn of this potential threat. I believe that no adventurer, explorer or professional outdoor person can now feel safe from this predator, and every single one of them should be warned. If he is so willing to attack you

and your polar mate, then it is highly probable he has attacked others and will continue to do so. We are all at risk. What he has created is a binary situation. If, having been dragged in, I avoid taking action, then I will be morally complicit in his attacks on you and your family, and almost certainly enabling him to continue doing it to others. If, on the other hand, I take a stand against what I believe is utterly contemptible behavior, then I will almost certainly come under attack myself. Binary, polarizing and ... well, that's life, isn't it?

There are a number of ways this important information can be broadcast, both online and in publication, and I will have to recruit others who share my concern to get their help in doing it. As I see it, yours is a clear case of massive bullying, assisted by persistent and insidious cyberstalking. It indicates a profoundly sick person who has no fear, remorse or morality, yet has the intelligence to use the internet with impunity. Clearly, the one thing his cleverness is not aware of is what damage he is doing to so many. I think most would agree, no civilised human being would do such a thing.

Stay cool and try to see his obsessive sickness for what it really is.
Speak soon