

The Truth About The Brockhampton Allegations

Hello! If you're here I can assume that you either like Brockhampton and are concerned about the Google Doc going around, you have read the Google Doc and don't know what to believe, or you have read the Google Doc and hate everyone in Brockhampton. No matter what reason, I hope that you take the time to read this Google Doc.

Here I will be debunking all of the false allegations made against members of Brockhampton and anyone associated with them, and also letting you know which ones are 100% in fact true.

I have taken my time and have been very careful as I created this. I wanted to make sure that anything I have written was true, and that I am giving you the most correct information that I can provide.

I would like to give a huge thank you to anyone who has spent their time helping me plan this all out and fact check everything I have written. If anyone is upset about this Google Doc, all fall should lay on me — the writer — I am the only one responsible for writing this doc and no one else should be harassed because of it.

I know that you may have seen a few different types of docs, carrds, or twitter threads going around similar to this, but I wanted to address everything that the Google Doc talked about, not just bits and pieces of the original. Everything, all of the false allegations and the ones that are in fact true.

Also, the "*Everything Wrong With BROCKHAMPTON*" doc will be addressed as the Google Doc, or the original Google Doc.

Every allegation has been split into two categories, false allegations and true allegations. Some of the allegations have been put in the false category that still have true aspects to them, please remember that. Some of the situations surrounding a few allegations make them cloudy and hard to fit into a category. If that was the case, the allegation was placed into the best fit category.

*Note 1- In this doc I will be referring to Kevin Abstract exclusively as Ian, apart from in titles, to avoid confusion between him and Kevin Doan.

*Note 2- While I was writing this doc, the original Google Doc was deleted. So for the last few allegations I had to use a copy I had saved to my computer. I have read all 130 pages of the Google Doc, so I did my best to remember exactly what they said in every allegation.

The Allegations Being Explained/Debunked

1. Kevin Abstract “reclaiming” the d-slur
2. “Remaining friends” with a rapist
3. The Jim Jones sample
4. Kevin Doan’s “silence”
5. Kevin Abstract being a predator
6. Nick selling t-shirts of murdered black people
7. “Keeping contact” with Ameer
8. Merlyn Wood being a predator
9. Bearface being a predator
10. Matt Champion’s “manipulation”

The True Allegations Being Covered

1. Bearface saying the r-slur
2. Kevin Abstract saying a slur against Mexicans
3. Romil saying the n-word
4. Joba saying the n-word
5. Nick Lenzini stealing art
6. Nick Lenzini being predatory
7. Defending Ameer’s abuse

The Allegations Being Explained/Debunked

Here is a compiled list of every allegation that has been debunked in some way. I would like to remind you again to read these very carefully, some do have some truth to them while also being false.

Kevin Abstract “Reclaiming” the D-Slur

Back in October of 2018, Ian retweeted a tweet with dyke in it. I just want to reiterate the fact that he retweeted the tweet, he himself did not tweet it. The original Google Doc states that the d-slur is not a slur a gay man can say or reclaim, but Ian was not saying nor reclaiming the slur. He simply retweeted a tweet, which was made by a fan account by the way.

The original Google Doc says that the writer dmed Ian and told him that him retweeting the tweet made them uncomfortable, and they asked him to unretweet it. He apologized, which the writer called weak, and he unretweeted the tweet. The apologies that the writer had screenshotted both seemed like Ian was sorry, and he even said that he felt bad in the second screenshot.

The writer states again that the d-slur is not something that a gay man can reclaim, which is true, but again Ian was not reclaiming the slur. He simply retweeted a fan’s tweet.

I myself am a wlw who never was offended by Ian retweeting that tweet, and neither were any other lesbians or wlw I talked to about the tweet. Of course, you have every right to be offended by what Ian did. Going as far as saying that Ian is lesbophobic is extreme though.

Going as far as saying that people who can’t reclaim slurs shouldn’t interact with any sort of media that contain those slurs is a bit ridiculous. You shouldn’t say the slur if it doesn’t apply to you, but not interacting with things that contain that slur

is excessive. That would be like saying white people can't listen to Brockhampton because they say the n-word, or that straight people can't listen to Brockhampton because Ian says f*gg*t in some songs.

“Remaining Friends” With A Rapist

This is one of the allegations the Google Doc covers that is very cloudy, and almost seems like a stretch on their part. The writers say that someone has come forward saying that Brockhampton has remained friends with their rapist, Sage Williams.

If you don't know who Sage Williams is, he was in AliveSinceForever, which was the band before Brockhampton. He was also featured on Ian's album MTV1987. AliveSinceForever was formed in 2012 and only active until 2014, and Sage Williams was never in Brockhampton.

I do not want it to sound like I am saying the victim was never manipulated or abused. It was talked about very publicly, but this was in 2017 and 2018.

Since Sage Williams was in a band with a few members of Brockhampton so far before that, we have no idea their relations with each other now. The Google Doc uses screenshots of Sage Williams replying to their tweets and the fact that a few members still follow him as evidence that they are still friends.

In the screenshots, no Brockhampton member has ever replied to Sage's replies to their tweets. Using this as proof that some of the members still talk to him is kind of ridiculous. They cannot control who replies to their tweets, or even who replies to tweets about them.

Also saying that following someone means that they talk to them is a stretch. Sage was in the band with them in 2012 to 2014, who knows if they even remember that they follow him. This whole situation shouldn't have been included in the Google Doc at all in my opinion.

In part of this, the person asks the victim in the screenshots if Brockhampton was aware of what he had done while they were in a band together and the victim says yes.

Again I do not want to sound as if I am trying to discredit or blame the victim, but the victim says earlier in the screenshots that what happened to them happened in 2016 and was made public in 2017 and 2018. If the boys were in the band with Sage Williams in 2012 to 2014, they would have no idea about these accusations back then.

It's a stretch to say that any of the boys are still friends with him while only using evidence of him replying to tweets and that some members still follow him on instagram.

The Jim Jones Sample

In the beginning of the song *1998 Truman* a sample of someone speaking is used. The man that is speaking is Jim Jones. The original Google Doc is right about one thing in regards to Jim Jones, he was an awful man. Nothing can excuse what he did, and I'm not here to defend him at all.

What I am here to do is defend the use of irony and explain why context is such an important thing, especially in regards to songs and music in general.

The reason why I say defend irony is because of who he was. I'm sure no one in Brockhampton, or anyone affiliated with them, agrees with Jim Jones or even thinks remotely like him. That is where the irony is. Jim Jones is awful and what Brockhampton is against, which is why it would be ironic to use a short clip of one of his speeches at the beginning of one of their songs.

Context is extremely important in music, especially if you aren't educated on the background of the song, or the title in this case. In most cases with music, artists

put stuff in their songs deliberately, and context is always important in knowing why an artist did a certain thing.

Context is very important when we are talking about this allegation. We all know that the song the speech clip is used in is *1998 Truman*. If you didn't know, this song is named after the movie *The Truman Show*, which was released in 1998. *The Truman Show* is a movie starring Jim Carrey, it follows a man's life but he doesn't know that his entire life is being broadcasted for the whole world to see. The creators of the show that follows Truman's life try to control him, his mind, and his every move.

If you're wondering why this is important, I promise that it has a reason. The way that Jim Jones controlled people and was essentially a cult leader is almost parallel to how the people controlling Truman and everything about his life act.

Since the song *1998 Truman* is based on *The Truman Show*, and Jim Jones was a very controlling and evil person which the people controlling Truman mirror, it makes sense that a clip of his speech would be used at the beginning of the song.

Kevin Doan's Silence

Believe it or not, Kevin Doan is not an official member of Brockhampton. He may be affiliated with them, but he is not an official member. The members of the band's actions should not be reflected onto Kevin.

Kevin is his own person and does his own things, he should not be dragged into the drama around the band. The things he is doing currently, like Twitch streaming, are not linked to Brockhampton whatsoever. He has a right to block words from his chat if he chooses to do so.

Kevin should not be made to address allegations against the boys, they have nothing to do with him. Not to mention, the people these allegations are against are

his friends. It may make him uncomfortable to see people spamming in his Twitch chat and in his Twitter replies about the allegations.

Also the claim in the Google Doc about Kevin allegedly being an abuse apologist has no proof. They briefly mention the fact that he is allegedly an abuse apologist, but leave it at that. If they were not going to provide evidence, why bring the allegation up in the first place?

Kevin Abstract Being A Predator

One of the most well known “predator” allegations against Ian is the Rich Brian situation. These allegations spread from a joke thread on twitter that the two had back and forth. The original Google Doc says that Ian knew Brian’s age, but fail to provide any evidence besides a blacked out anonymous post that just says Jade knew Ian knew his age. This isn’t enough evidence to rule out the fact that Ian may not have even known his age until after he had already tweeted, which again was a joke. Sure, maybe it was a tasteless joke, but a joke nonetheless.

In the original Google Doc, the writers put a screenshot of someone saying that their friends met Ian and Jaden at a Reading show and got pictures with them. The person in the screenshot also said that Ian and Jaden got their number and invited them out to dinner while they were in London. The writers try to use this as evidence of Ian being a predator. Firstly, the fan that this happened to was an adult over 18, not with a minor.

Secondly, what Ian and Jaden chose to do in their relationship is none of our business. Whoever they were talking to was over 18 and that’s all that matters. Their private business should not be brought up, especially when trying to claim that Ian is a predator.

All of the screenshots they use as evidence just talk about people being victims of Ian’s “predatory behavior”, no real victims have actually come forward. I myself have been in the fandom for a long time (since 2017) and I have never heard any

real predatory allegations against Ian, and neither have any of the others that I have spoken to who have also been in the fandom as long as I have or even longer.

Anything expressed in the screenshots are merely hearsay. The Google Doc even states that some of the allegations are just rumors. There hasn't been one person to come and say that they are explicitly a victim, and until they do it's hard to believe that the things they're trying to say are true. Some of the timeline's don't add up either, like saying Ian was asking underage boys for nudes in 2015. Ian wasn't out until very late 2015/early 2016, why would he risk something like that, especially when he was closeted.

Nick Selling T-shirts of Murdered Black People

I would love to agree that what Nick did was wrong, and I understand that many people are disappointed and upset with Nick, but not everything that was said in the Google Doc was correct.

It is correct that Nick did sell t-shirts with Breonna Taylor, George Floyd, and Ahmaud Arbery on them, pictured in a traditional black style that is mainly used by families. But Nick is not the creator, or at least the sole creator, of the t-shirts.

The shirts were a collaboration with two other artists, who were both black artists. He was just one of the three distributors of the t-shirts. It may not have been his place, but he was not the only person to create them and he did it all with good intentions. He was trying to spread awareness and donated all of the proceeds to charity.

People are allowed to be upset over this, I'm not saying they can't be, I am simply stating that not everything stated in the Google Doc was true.

“Keeping Contact” With Ameer

In the Google Doc, they mention that Ameer says he has “kept in contact” with Jon and that he and Ian had started talking again. Here they credit the Sway in the Morning interview Ameer did at the end of 2019 in December. (16:20 timestamp)

While it is true that Ameer said he had been in contact recently with Jon, he never said that him and Ian were talking regularly. In the interview he said that he had texted Ian once or twice recently, that was all, no mention of them talking regularly.

If you were a fan of Brockhampton when Ameer was removed from the group, you’d know that everything was really hard on everyone, especially Ian. He would have no reason to want to talk to him again. Also, there is a major difference between talking regularly and texting once or twice. Saying that he texted Ian once or twice in late 2019 does not mean that the two of them talk regularly, that’s quite a stretch.

I think “keeping contact” is an odd word choice to use in this situation. Everyone knows that the boys have known Ameer for a long time, it’s understandable that they may text each other every now and again. That doesn’t mean that they have full out conversations or text each other regularly like the Google Doc states.

Based on how hard Ian took everything, and how much anger Dom holds, I think it’s very unlikely that they’ve kept close ties and talk to each other on a regular basis.

Merlyn Wood Being A Predator

In the Google Doc it is stated that Merlyn had allegedly slept with minors across Europe, yet there was no solid evidence for it. The only “evidence” that they had was someone telling them that they heard Merlyn had allegedly slept with minors. They also said that the said minors had signed NDA’s. If you are unsure what an NDA is, NDA stands for a Non-Disclosure Agreement and is a contract that states

the parties that signed can not talk about what happened for a certain amount of time that is specified in the contract.

Here I would like to debunk some mis-information that has been floating around since the original Google Doc was released; minors can technically sign NDAs. A lot of people are saying that minors are not able to sign NDAs, but that would be false.

What is true is that an NDA that a minor signs is not technically legally binding and cannot be used against a minor in court if they were to sign one. You can find that out with a quick google search, so Merlyn having minors sign NDAs would do virtually nothing.

Again the only evidence we have for this allegation is hearsay, and then in the original Google Doc they state that Merlyn made minors sign NDAs, which makes no sense. The allegations are very vague, just rumors and hearsay, and just doesn't add up. If actual victims did come out against Merlyn, maybe it would be a different story, but since none have we can only believe that these are false.

Bearface Being A Predator

Back in February an account tweeted that Bearface had been talking to them when they were a minor and he was 23. Also sidenote, a lot of people refer to this person using the wrong pronouns when talking about the allegations, please remember that they use they/them pronouns. Anyways, they tweeted that Bearface still followed them, which was in fact true until they blocked him. The fact that Bearface followed them isn't weird in itself, because sometimes celebrities follow fans' accounts, but we shouldn't discredit what they said.

It would be a lot more helpful if they provided screenshots of dms, to help solidify their claims, but they did not. The only true part we can confirm was that Bearface did indeed follow them before they blocked him. The victim's claims should not be

pushed aside, but we should take them with a grain of salt since they deleted them and haven't spoken up since.

The most well known predator allegations come from an already debunked twitter thread. They said that Bearface had done similar things like message them, and even provided screenshots. The screenshots were all fabricated, and a few days later the two people who started it said that it was all false and they only made it up to see how quickly people would believe lies.

Matt Champion's "Manipulation"

In the original Google Doc, the second topic covered is what they call Matt's "manipulation". In the short brief explaining that part of the document, the writers say "When this situation initially came up, Kevin Abstract and Dom subtweeted fans talking about it, Kevin saying "mind your business."" (everything wrong with brockhampton, 2020). That is what I would like to address first.

Anything that happened between Matt and his ex-girlfriend is none of our business, it should never have been brought to light in the first place. Anything that happens in a relationship should stay between both parties, no matter how famous someone is or how messy something gets.

But since it has been brought up and used against Matt, I have no choice but to discuss it and bring light to what actually happened between the two of them.

The first thing I would like to point out is that Jade, Matt's ex-girlfriend, was allegedly known to lie. Like quite a lot, and she would lie about anything. Coincidentally the only side of the story we really have is Jade's. Even if she wasn't lying about this whole scenario it still seems weird that we only have Jade's side of the story, it's almost as if Matt didn't want his private life broadcasted across social media.

Although people may think that this whole story is fake, saying that it was just a pregnancy scare, that is actually false. Jade did provide evidence for the fact that she was pregnant by giving pictures. One thing she did lie about though was being on birth control. The pictures of dms used in the Google Doc show that when Jade ran out of birth control, she didn't tell Matt and had unprotected sex with him anyways, but of course the original writers gloss over this.

Of course Jade has every right to tell her story if she felt that she was being emotionally abused. But we should still take everything with a small grain of salt seeing as we only have one side of the story, and one side of the story is not enough to really form an entire accurate opinion as to what happened. Only Matt and Jade know what truly happened, and none of us should have ever been made aware of this.

There may be some truth to what Jade said in Twitter dms or forms online, but not everything she said should be counted as 100% accurate.

In the Google Doc and the screen shots of the dms that they use, Jade says that Matt would ghost her consistently. While it is true that Matt would ghost her, Jade would ghost him occasionally as well. Matt did tell her parents without consent, and he did tell her to get an abortion. Matt was also in town when Jade had the abortion, but didn't show up to the appointment.

We know that when the two of them broke up, Jade said that Matt was emotionally abusive. According to multiple sources though, Matt allegedly also said that Jade was emotionally abusive to him.

Aside from the pregnancy, Jade has done more than the original Google Doc says she did. When they broke up, Jade sent Matt's nudes to group chats, and even went in depth about their sex life.

Not only is that a total invasion of someone's privacy, but most Brockhampton fans are minors and the groupchat she sent them to was all minors, which is illegal. She should have never sent those pictures, or even talked about those things in the first place, but it's even worse that minors have seen those pictures.

Neither of them were innocent or in the right and both of them were toxic, but this was three years ago and happened in a relationship that wasn't any of ours. Any of the things that happened is none of our business, and should have been left like that in the first place.

The True Allegations

Here is a compiled list of every true allegation, but again I would like to point out that some, or more so one, of the allegations here are cloudy. Please take your time and carefully read every allegation listed below.

Bearface Saying The R-Slur

During one of the Technical Difficulties live-streams, the boys played a Pop Smoke song. The original Google Doc states that Bearface mouths the r-word that is said in the song.

This is the only situation that is sort of cloudy. In the video, Bearface's head was down the first time, and the second time it doesn't clearly look like he is actually saying any words to the song at all. To put it in the wise words of someone who I talked to about this situation, it "looks like he was chewing air".

I would never defend the use of this slur, ever. In this case, it's hard to tell what he is mouthing or not mouthing. There is not much else to say about this allegation because it's kind of a hard thing to call.

Kevin Abstract Saying A Slur Against Mexicans

In February of 2018, Bearface went live on Instagram. During this Instagram live, Ian said a slur that is used against Mexicans that live in the United States. When

this allegation is brought up, people like to bring up the fact that Ian was comparing it to wet wipes and that he may not have known what it meant at the time. Even if that was true, that does not excuse Ian from saying it. He can not reclaim that slur and should apologize for using it.

Romil Saying The N-Word

This allegation is true, but what the Google Doc originally said wasn't. The writers said that Romil had said the n-word in comments in 2017. That part is not true and it was actually over six years ago, in 2014. But it is true that Romil did say the n-word, and he should apologize for it.

Joba Saying The N-Word

Again the writers say that this happened "a few years ago" when in reality this happened 10 years ago. But, this allegation is true and there isn't any reason that Joba should have said the n-word. He should apologize for saying it.

Nick Lenzini Stealing Art

This is a very well known thing that Nick has done for years, and has even defended himself on doing. These allegations have been around a long time, and he even blocks people that talk about them. He doesn't care and probably will never care.

Nick Lenzini Being Predatory

In 2017, Nick publically dated a minor. He was 21 while she was 17. There really isn't much more to say other than the fact that the allegation is true. Although this relationship was technically legal.

Defending Ameer's Abuse

Like all of the true allegations, there isn't much more I can say about this one. Jon, Merlyn, and Romil all defended Ameer when victims started to come out and none of them ever apologized for it. I know and understand that the band apologized as a whole, but the three of them individually could have apologized for the things that they said about the victims, or the situation in general.

An Outro

Thank you to everyone who took the time to read this, I just want to address a few things here at the end.

Yes, a few of the members have said very offensive slurs and they should be held accountable for those things. But, they should not be canceled because of them. Canceling any of the members means that they can never grow from their mistakes, which they can do. This is why they should just be held accountable, and apologize for the things that they have said.

Yes, they have made mistakes, but most people do. Thinking that someone you idolize is perfect is unrealistic. People make mistakes, and they should be held accountable and apologize for them.

And you as a listener or a fan should not be expected to apologize for them. And you as a listener are not accountable for their actions. Something that people tend

to forget is that fans are not reflections of their favorite artists, and fans are not responsible for their favorite artists actions.

Anyways - thank you so much for taking the time out of your day to read this. Please share this doc with anyone that you can, post the link on twitter, share the post on your story, put the link in your bio, send the link to friends. Just any way that will help the word get out.

A special second thank you to anyone that read this, proofread, or provided me with any information that I needed. Please keep yourselves safe, and don't tell anyone that you helped in any way. I am the only one personally responsible for this doc.