

Man faces 6 months in prison for disagreeing with feminist on twitter (No joke..)

July 16, 2015 | 774 upvotes | by [\[deleted\]](#)

<http://news.nationalpost.com/full-comment/christie-blatchford-ruling-in-twitter-harassment-trial-could-have-enormous-fallout-for-free-speech>

What's believed to be the first case in Canada of alleged criminal harassment-via-Twitter is just a judge's decision away from being over.

After hearing closing submissions Tuesday from Chris Murphy, who represents 54-year-old Greg Elliott, Ontario Court Judge Brent Knazan is expected to rule on Oct. 6.

In the balance rides enormous potential fallout for free speech online.

Elliott is charged with criminally harassing two Toronto female political activists, Steph Guthrie and Heather Reilly, in 2012.

Allegations involving a third woman were dropped.

The graphic artist and father of four lost his job shortly after his arrest, which was well-publicized online, and if convicted, could go to jail for six months.

These are astonishing repercussions given that it's not alleged he ever threatened either woman (or any other, according to the testimony of the Toronto Police officer, Detective Jeff Bangild, who was in charge) or that he ever sexually harassed them.

Basically.. these 2 feminist retards were publicly shaming a young guy who did something they thought on twitter.. and this older guy tweeted them, saying that its wrong to publicly shame ppl.. and then these 2 feminists turn on HIM and eventually charge him with harassment...

Not sure yet if this has been posted here, sorry if it has..

I just feel that the word needs to get out..

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Discomposure • 285 points • 16 July, 2015 01:31 AM

He never threatened or used any sexual related terms towards them. All he did was disagree with them politically. The girls just "felt" that they were being harassed and filed a case which caused the man to lose his job.

"The graphic artist and father of four lost his job shortly after his arrest, which was well-publicized online, and if convicted, could go to jail for six months."

KungPaoEllenTheFist165 points 16 July, 2015 03:35 AM **[recovered]**

"The graphic artist and father of four lost his job shortly after his arrest, which was well-publicized online, and if convicted, could go to jail for six months."

Which ironically gives him a case against his accusers for the very charges he is facing.

ObservantOmega • 291 points • 16 July, 2015 04:19 AM

Which will bring him nothing, since women are not expected to be responsible for their actions.

Yay feminism!

through_a_ways • 123 points • 16 July, 2015 10:16 AM*

Just going to repeat this because it's important:

Women are treated like children. We inherently like women, want to care for them, and don't expect them to take responsibility for anything.

Women physically resemble children. Women have fuller lips, bigger eyes, rounder faces, flatter foreheads, less pronounced nasal bridges, lighter skin/hair/eyes, and more subcutaneous body fat.

The retention of infantile traits is called neoteny. Women are physically neotenous.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Women_are_wonderful_effect

You can't expect an impartial punishment for a woman any more than you can expect it for a 5 year old. No matter how bad a crime a 5 year old commits, the kid will always get off easy because he/she is a 5 year old. This would be true even if there were no official laws concerning age and legal punishment.

mscleverclocks • 29 points • 16 July, 2015 01:36 PM

Yet teens are tried as adults in court, 8-year olds are tased, and babies blown up in their cribs by police raids. Smh. What the hell has happened to society? Why are we treating selfish women better than innocent children?

[deleted] • 62 points • 16 July, 2015 03:21 PM

Yet teens are tried as adults in court

Male teens.

8-year olds are tased

Male children.

and babies blown up in their cribs by police raids

Moloch demands it.

mscleverclocks • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 10:26 PM*

No, wait, the 8-year old was a girl.

Edit: although i'm sure that's probably not the only instance

holytrpbatman • 12 points • 16 July, 2015 03:23 PM

Because selfish women and their mangina minions have been allowed to dictate the terms of their victimhood status. Because the political juggernaut wants us divided in every way possible, globally, so we continue to believe we are not already ruled by one entity. Because we have collectively allowed it to happen.

[deleted] • 8 points • 16 July, 2015 04:57 PM

You mean like the 8 year old boy that was raped by a woman and tumblrinas were trying to say he enticed her and he raped her and she was just confused is all?

mscleverclocks • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 10:30 PM

That is absolutely horrid, but yes, these kinds of things baffle me. I will never support my gender in anything. I think the right to vote should be taken away from women and they should be kept in the kitchen, at least the worst that can happen there is the house gets burned down. That's not even close to how terrible most of them treat men and children.

CrazyGrape • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 08:39 PM

Numerous (usually male) teens have been tried as *adults* for "<mature action> as a *minor*."

It's invalid from a logical perspective. 'You're old enough to be responsible for your actions, so we're trying you as an adult; however, we're trying you on the basis that you're too young to make responsible decisions.'

Go figure.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 02:01 AM

It's only gonna get worse before it gets better.

ShitfacedBatman10 points 16 July, 2015 03:51 PM **[recovered]**

^ Yep, neoteny. But also their brains are childlike. I've said it before, but RP says women are the oldest 19 y/o in the house, but I'm going to say the *average* woman behaves like a 12 y/o. And Canada in this case is definitely protecting women like they're 12 year olds.

Every woman that believes men are constantly stalking them has a 12 year old mind. Their inclination to frame most or all men as "dangerous predators" is reflective of juvenile maturity levels, an inability to grow up and be mature enough to see reality.

In my opinion, only submissive women can really get away with neoteny, and feminism is making sure there are fewer and fewer of them. You cannot not-be submissive and eat your neoteny cake too. If these bitches want to be men (like the other half of the world) and be "equal" to men and not-submissive to men, well then, they need to learn to man-up to certain levels on their own, levels like FREE SPEECH. Ironically, submissive women are ahead of them in this

area because they've *submitted*.

Left alone, women are self-corrupting and demand to be treated like 12 year olds. Pathetic. The long arm of the law needs to start telling women to "deal with it" more.

WillWorkForLTC • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 06:12 PM

You make a good point about "manning up". I think an important designation needs to be made between men and women who blame others and demand from others, and men and women who blame no one and take responsibility for themselves. True gender equality is made impossible by feminists. Oh and the irony burns on.

cucaculpa • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 05:20 PM

Heh, I called Guthrie childish once and word got back through other work networks that suddenly I'm an MRA.

But not all women act like 12 year olds. That's why I like farm girls.

sardinemanR • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 08:37 PM

Yeah their maturity stops somewhere around 12/14 years of age when they hit puberty.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 03:32 PM

Haha I havent heard the term neoteny since I bred dogs for a little bit.

RedPillDad • 51 points • 16 July, 2015 04:08 AM

The article infers a lot. This is a respected female writer, and she's clearly sympathetic towards Elliot. The court theatrics should be interesting. The prosecuter will grandstand for political exposure, and these victim-scammers will shed crocodile tears once it blows up in their faces.

RedPillarOfSalt • 58 points • 16 July, 2015 06:49 AM

"I find it an astonishing concept, actually, that just because I feeel a certain way that it would make it so."

That reporter is the most Red Pill woman I've heard since Karen Straughan.

ChairBorneMGTOW • 43 points • 16 July, 2015 07:49 AM

Christie Blatchford is awesome. Met her multiple times, embedded with the CF in Kandahar. She also covered a lot of the native militancy in southern Ontario really well. She is zero Bullshit, logical and discerning.

[deleted] • 17 points • 16 July, 2015 12:53 PM

Wait, have we found a unicorn?

[deleted] • 10 points • 16 July, 2015 03:01 PM

Who the fuck down voted this joke? Pussies.

RemyPrice • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 03:36 PM

You asked the question, then answered it for yourself: pussies.

mryddlin • 10 points • 16 July, 2015 10:46 AM

Nation Post is a pretty good rag imo , it's a 'conservative' newspaper and I use quotes because they are nothing at like Sun/Fox media.

Actually reporters doing actual reporting...CRAZY!! :)

mryddlin • 18 points • 16 July, 2015 11:19 AM*

https://twitter.com/greg_a_elliott

It's a matter of public record still, it's not any different that shit that gets said here in TRP.

Mods, this could be you...that's fucked up...

edit: going through his tweets and I'm just seeing standard anger phase type posts. This is definitely a cautionary tale for any of us going through the anger phase and to be careful.

Rule 38 - Think as you like but Behave like others

Has never been more relevant.

2nd edit: hmm looks like their back and forths are all pulled and it's just some stuff related to it.

Damn I can't find a transcript, I do want to know what both sides said to each other.

Guthrie, like many others online, took exception to the game and used Twitter to protest the game and its Ontario creator, Ben Spurr. "I want his hatred on the Internet to impact his real-life experience," Guthrie wrote on Twitter in July 2012. Elliott felt Guthrie and others were ganging up on Spurr and unleashed a series of tweets saying so. Guthrie blocked him from communicating with her on Twitter, but she could still read tweets that mentioned her user name. Shortly after, Elliott created the Twitter hashtag #FascistFeminists in relation to Guthrie and her friends. One of Elliott's final tweets involving Guthrie was in response to another person calling him a "perv and a sad little man." He answered: "You are wrong on all counts. Go listen to (Guthrie) play her s--- music in crappy bars with your loser faux-feminist friends." The tweets from Elliott didn't stop until his arrest in November 2012.

from the Star: <https://archive.is/4Ge3q>

Seems like he just called them out on their crap and didn't stop, basically he used their tactics against them and they ran to the police but cannot see the irony of their actions.

3rd edit: <https://twitter.com/hashtag/FascistFeminists?src=hash> haha! this is the hashtag he started, just reading through it to see how the information is presented.

[deleted] • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 02:16 PM

The guy still lost his job, and this was back in 2012 and hasn't been judged on yet. Will he get his job back, even if he is found innocent? Probably not.

RemyPrice • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 03:37 PM

The court of public opinion is usually worse than actual judicial court.

IronMeltsinmyHands • 10 points • 16 July, 2015 06:59 AM

its Canada. Fucking wasteland. It's better than australia but... not by much.

Surf_Or_Die • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:07 PM

Canada is wasteland? Are you retarded? They are packed with natural resources. Now the US. We have a lot of wasteland. We have a lot of deserts whereas the Canadians have forests and lakes.

CharlieIndiaShitlord • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 05:31 PM

He's not referring to Canada's geography, he's referring to the social structure.

IronMeltsinmyHands • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 10:09 PM

Let me say this in clear terms.

Fuck Canada.

chinawinsworlds • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 09:22 AM

Wait, Australia is bad? I've never heard that.

[deleted] • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 09:50 AM

The majority of it is uninhabitable desert and the entirety is infested with deadly animals, there is a reason Steve Irwin could handle our 'deadly' animals with ease.

through_a_ways • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 10:21 AM

Deadly animals (outside of things that kill you with brute force) are pretty much nonexistent in cold climates.

All the most venomous/poisonous animals live by the equator, and arctic climates have literally zero of them.

mryddlin • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 11:13 AM

FEAR ALBERTA'S SUN SCORPIONS!

<http://people.uleth.ca/~dan.johnson/htm/solpugids.htm>

... and that's about it, Canada is the land of snow and cold while Australia is definitely the land of Monsters!

WillWorkForLTC • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:56 PM

Sue them at least. Sue them at least. Sue them at least. !BING! The magical lawsuit fairy has been summoned. These bitches are going down!

Derzu_Uzala • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 03:43 PM

In fact the only one bullied and harassed seems to be Greg Elliott himself.

DuncanMonroe • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 08:17 AM

I'm curious, what did he say? Not getting much information here.

mryddlin • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 11:19 AM

https://twitter.com/greg_a_elliott

it's all still there it seems, trying to find a transcript of all the tweets

RemyPrice • 14 points • 16 July, 2015 03:34 PM

There was recently a post about keeping your opinions to yourself.

He gains nothing by disagreeing with them.

Don't comment. Don't like. Don't retweet. Don't agree. Don't disagree. **Unless you're running for public**

office, don't engage in any debate period. KEEP YOUR FUCKING OPINIONS TO YOURSELF.

NecroticFury • 17 points • 16 July, 2015 04:49 PM

meh, then the brainwashing continues. Fuck that, ill fight to the death if the situation calls for it.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 05:28 PM

The vast majority of people are brainless, it's a waste of time.

ActuallyARaptor • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 10:12 PM

It's not always to convince the person you're arguing against. Sometimes you may gain support from or inform a 3rd party who was previously oblivious to the matter.

It's like what brought most of us to TRP. seeing it mentioned in a comment directed towards someone else. Not all arguments are fruitless

mistah_michael • -21 points • 16 July, 2015 05:59 AM

This came up in another thread. Can't find the article but supposedly he didn't stop harassing them. Not sure that makes him deserve jail but he isn't an angel either.

PowerValve19 points 16 July, 2015 06:14 AM **[recovered]**

To avoid the "harassment" they could have logged off, blocked him, or ignored him.

sophisting • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 04:44 AM

They did block him. He was tracking conversations the women were having with other people on twitter and then jumping in on those so the women who blocked him could still see it -- bypassing the block in a way. Also, one of the women had a restraining order against him, which had included an order not to contact them via twitter, but he ignored it. Also at one point the women went out to a bar and he tweeted the name of the bar for some reason. Not sure how he knew where they were.

cucaculpa • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 05:29 PM

They had to search for their names to find it. They could have used Tweet deck for filters. This is more of 'Don't tell me to row away from the rocks, tell God to move them!' mentality. One of the Slutwalk organizers was, of course, an airline stewardess. All fake plastic hipsters with no historic knowledge or media savvy beyond how to generate click bait.

Some of biggest narcissists and overall sad and damaged people were in #witopoli and #topoli tags.

mistah_michael • -29 points • 16 July, 2015 07:03 AM

So it's there fault? You can't harass people and saying they should have avoided it is not a good enough reason. I enjoy what this sub is trying to do and promote but don't blind yourself because then you become just as bad as an ignorant feminist. I want a world based off reality not one where one kind of person is always wrong

DaphneDK • 25 points • 16 July, 2015 07:14 AM*

It's Twitter. I don't use it. In what way was he harassing them? By posting messages on his own Twitter account? Couldn't they just not read what he wrote?

If they're activists they've already put themselves out there and they're already public people.

Can't really expect other people to not disagree with what they have to say.

In fact reading the article it appears more that he has been the victim of harassment. On (& worse) off the Internet. That even taking it to the law is part of the harassment.

DuncanMonroe • 9 points • 16 July, 2015 08:19 AM

You shouldn't be able to be thrown in fucking *jail* for saying shit on the internet, harassment or not. It's a very slippery slope. Is it wrong? Sure, whatever, I don't care. Is it hurting someone in real life? No. The worst it can do is hurt your feelings, unless he shows up in real life, in which case it's different. He's just expressing ideas. On fucking twitter. Come on, man.

I'm all for not being angry when it involved red pill and anti-feminism, but this goes beyond that. This goes beyond that realm.

SpHornet • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 08:05 AM*

you're in a public square; this is like a religious nut street preaching and getting the guy with 'this guy is an idiot'-sign arrested for harassment.

secondly she simply could have blocked him, it is not the same thing as 'avoiding', because it takes no effort and solves the problem. She just didn't like other people were reading his tweets disagreeing with her. In my analogy; the street preacher just has to push a button and every time he looks in the direction of the guy with the 'this guy is an idiot'-sign he would see nothing and hear nothing. all he knows is that there was a guy there disagreeing with him, but he might have left for all he knows

mrp3anut • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 12:56 PM

You say "harass" and yet harassment should not even be illegal until it involves physical contact. People need to quit thinking that words can hurt them.

PMMeYourBootyPics • 12 points • 16 July, 2015 07:11 AM

Physical harassment is difficult to avoid obviously. But if arguments on Twitter are causing you great amount of stress, pain, and embarrassment, there are a myriad of solutions. Delete your posts, report actual harassing posts, contact a moderator if in a forum, block any users involved, or simply close your computer and walk away. I'm not victim blaming, this is simply a matter of knowing when to stop feeding flames. Of course we should teach people not to steal things, but if someone leaves \$100,000 in a golden Ferrari in the wrong part of town, unlocked in the middle of the night: then we have to put some blame on them. If someone is harassing you online, you can get away. In real life, that is when you press charges if it is extreme. But that is irrelevant, because this man only disagreed with someone. How have we come to live in a world where merely disagreeing with an insecure, but loud, landwhale would get you locked up for 6 months. Jesus

riverraider69 • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 06:22 AM

Yeap. The article doesn't even touch what he actually did - just a list of things he didn't do. I can't really judge based on just that.

mryddlin • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 11:20 AM

https://twitter.com/greg_a_elliott

seems to still all be there, which is really weird. His twitter account hasn't been touched in 3 years.

GrandmasterHurricane • 79 points • 16 July, 2015 04:40 AM

One thing I noticed in these types of cases is that the women who are "victims" always get together with their girl friends before hand to devise a vicious plan to cause as much damage as possible to the man's life. It's sickening. According to what I read, they were planning on sticking him with some pedophilia thing by having a chick pretend she's 13? WHAT?? That's just insanity.

The craziest part is the fact that the man is facing charges based on feelings. And the girl even had the audacity to say that sometimes feelings of fear develop over time in victims and that she's "SORRY" if she doesn't appear like a cookie-cutter victim right now. Like, bitch what? You have powers? You're predicting that you might (might not) end up feeling fear in the future and that even though at the moment fact for fact you're not afraid?? And the court is entertaining this fuckery?

Also notice how the defense lawyer mentions this case being like that of a bunch of high school kids (women are children theory), but they're not, they're actual adults. She couldn't handle a little opposition on Twitter so she retorted to using cyberfeminist witchcraft techniques to destroy the guy, and she's in POLITICS. She picked the wrong calling.

Lastly, guys, understand that women feel emotions 20x more than you do. A pinch is a nuclear bomb, arguing against them is declaring world war etc.

sardinemanR • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 08:43 PM

I agree in part and then disagree in part.

Yes the victims get together and want to cause damage. But that's not "feelings" that is cold hard manipulation and strategy.

Women are also not adults. They are children. They do not develop past a 14 year old's maturity or intellect. That is the major problem with Western society now, they are elevated beyond their capabilities and are given powers that children really shouldn't have, because children are not objective and can't use power correctly, they abuse it.

And lastly, I don't think women feel emotions at all. I think they fake emotions and try to use them to get their way. I've seen plenty of women, starting as young as 14, cry and make scenes, and if nobody pays attention to them they just pick themselves up, brush themselves off, and wait for another opportunity.

Women are cold and callous. There is no compassion in them. They can also very easily move on no matter how many years they've been with a guy. They don't have any loyalty (see Briffault's Law). Men fall in love easily and long term, we need TRP to set us straight. Women don't have these issues, they bounce around from man to man looking for whatever is best for them.

Don't think of women as emotional creatures. Think of them as actresses, or even psychopaths, because that is what they are. No woman has ever been blinded by her emotions, if men aren't around to take care of them women cut out the histrionics because they don't work on each other either.

ThrowyMcGruder • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 02:32 AM

I always liked Dylan Moran's view of women's feelings.

balalasaurus • 121 points • 16 July, 2015 04:45 AM

The plaintiff is a "Gender Justice Consultant". I swear you can't make this shit up.

NidStyles • 47 points • 16 July, 2015 06:28 AM

When they start creating their own official sounding titles, then you know that the retard runs deep in that

culture.

RemyPrice • 19 points • 16 July, 2015 03:42 PM

Oh fucking hell. That's enough for today.

nouveaugosse • 98 points • 16 July, 2015 02:23 AM*

This guy was even friendly with them before hand. He at one point offered to design a poster for one of their events. Feminists are ready to threaten your livelihood the second you don't toe their line, regardless of past interactions.

IllimitableMan • 59 points • 16 July, 2015 03:59 AM

Feminists are ready to threaten your livelihood the second you don't toe their line, regardless of past interactions.

Briffaults Law is real. Prime example of that right here.

[deleted] • 59 points • 16 July, 2015 02:16 AM

I'll never get out of the rage phase.

SuckOnMyBigRedPill23 points 16 July, 2015 05:22 AM **[recovered]**

You'll keep feeling whatever you surround yourself with.

If articles like this piss you off, do your best to stop reading them. Focus on the good aspects of women (fun, feminine, cute, dumb as bricks sometimes (in an adorable way), sexy, etc). Focus on the good aspects of life.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 09:32 PM

This was huge for me.

I was stuck in the anger phase and cost my self some dates with women I got along with really well because I spent so much time reading little more than TRP.

Go outside, the crazy shit we read here isn't as common as it seems, though it is terrible.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 03:28 PM

After a while you become desentizised. You realize intellectually that this is BS but it doesn't affect you emotionally anymore.

[deleted] • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 04:25 AM

You aren't desensitized enough then.

SaiHottari • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 08:08 AM

You have to be careful with desensitizing yourself. If you can't feel the heat then you risk being burned.

Benjruba • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 05:16 PM

I have never heard of this 'rage phase' before. But I can confirm I've been stuck in this for almost 8 months now, 2 months after I broke up with my ex.

Can anyone tell me where I can find some content on this issue alone? It's intriguing. Articles like this make me so fucking mad!

SuckOnMyBigRedPill1 points 16 July, 2015 10:52 PM [recovered]

Read what I wrote above. You will ALWAYS feel mad reading this stuff. So stop reading it.

As for some more practical steps, are you over your ex?

GayLubeOil • 52 points • 16 July, 2015 05:02 AM

Frivolous lawsuits are damaging to judicial legitimacy. Without the rule of law men devolve into the state of nature which is puts women at very serious risk.

NidStyles • 22 points • 16 July, 2015 06:32 AM

They brought it upon themselves.

[deleted] • 13 points • 16 July, 2015 10:54 AM

Honestly I would argue that our civilization *is* a state of nature.

[deleted] • -5 points • 16 July, 2015 03:26 PM

So you're going to change that after you get your law school diploma?

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 12:26 AM

What's the fucking relevance relevance?

collidoscope • 24 points • 16 July, 2015 02:27 AM

I would disagree with the charges, but after reading the entire article still I don't know what he's being charged with.

tl;dr: Take Your Daddy Issues to Court Day becomes a national holiday in Canada.

fake7272 • 10 points • 16 July, 2015 02:53 AM

in canada it is harassment if the person feels like their life or well being is threatened.

the girl says that over time, she became more fearful of his as the debate went on, leading to him "harassing" her despite her inability to ignore/block communication.

GrandmasterHurricane • 11 points • 16 July, 2015 04:43 AM

*If they feel like they might feel fear in the future.

She says she MIGHT feel fear in the future.

[deleted] • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 01:56 PM

what the fuck is wrong with you canada? did you get snow in your vajayjay?

[deleted] • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 01:32 PM

despite her inability to ignore/block communication.

That's the kicker for me.

As the defending attorney, I would have asked her/them what reasonable measures they took to quell the harassment. Did you ask him to stop, stating that you felt harassed? Did you attempt to block his means of communicating to you?

Oh? You did neither? And you instead had a group meeting on how best to shame and "punish" my

client, which seems to have culminated in a frivolous lawsuit, would you not agree?

But I'm not a lawyer. I'd probably end up looking like Leo Decaprio in Catch Me if You Can when he plays at being a lawyer.

[deleted] • 115 points • 16 July, 2015 01:59 AM

And that's another reason why any sane human should hate feminism.

Dreamless_41 points 16 July, 2015 03:06 AM* **[recovered]**

No, not hate. Hate is for too reactionary and filled with ulterior motive. Men should be aware of modern feminism and the role it plays in shaping society's norms, but only insofar as to bend the rules of the game to his favor. If you think you're going to "win" this game through hate, you're sorely mistaken.

Go ahead and be mad at feminism, be resentful of it, whatever the case is. We've all been there shortly after getting unplugged. But to let it become a drain on your fight to the top, your journey to being the best version of yourself is an exercise in futility.

Process it, then let it go. Be better despite it.

Born_of_a_broken_man • 18 points • 16 July, 2015 06:40 AM

Appreciate your perspective. Don't think I could disagree more though.

We should hate this nonsense with the burning rage of a thousand Gengis Khan's, it's destructive to the collective male. Be selfish if you want that's your prerogative. But collectively... men should hate the fuck out of this shit and not let it step another foot in our homes.

LeeHePro92 points 16 July, 2015 03:32 AM **[recovered]**

Look, I'm self-serving too, the world could burn after I die for all I care.

If everyone followed that advice, however, we would all be slaves.

Who cares about a man put in jail for thoughtcrime? Just ignore it, pretend to be a good citizen and go on with your life.

Who cares about this? Who cares about that? Understand the rules and play the game to win!

Repeat this process until you can't even say what you want in private.

Someone has to step up sooner or later and say "Enough".

Dreamless_0 points 16 July, 2015 03:37 AM **[recovered]**

Friend, I'm not arguing that. I may not agree with any one person's reason for being angry at feminism or staying in the anger phase, but I'll fight for their right to take that stand. My point is it's all about picking your battles. Sooner or later, you HAVE to weigh the pros and cons of what you're getting yourself into and weigh the worth of the fight against your worth of self. It's only up to you to decide which one means more to you in the short- and long-term.

You can stay mad at feminism all you want, but in doing so, you leave yourself prone to reacting out of anger instead of a higher wisdom, a more informed position. One of these positions is righteous, the other is not.

[deleted] • 9 points • 16 July, 2015 12:21 PM

Anger and higher wisdom are anything but mutually exclusive. The feminist PC bitch boys and their goddesses just want you to think that so you'll refuse to be angry with them.

LeeHePro14 points 16 July, 2015 03:44 AM [recovered]

Hate's not anger. You could hate a song and reinforce your hatred every time you hear it, but you don't think about it during the day.

Dreamless_-7 points 16 July, 2015 03:46 AM [recovered]

hate's not anger

To-may-to, to-mah-to. If I'm not thinking about a song during the day, I am indifferent to it. I am not angry towards it. Anger leads to hate.

RedPill_Rorschach • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:49 AM

"Door leads to ship, ship leads to home, and home leads to jerking off! And jerking off leads to the Dark Side!"

Sorry, I had to.

XD

NidStyles • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 06:25 AM

Hatred is from disgust. Anger is from love. They are not related in the least.

mryddlin • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 10:35 AM

hate and anger are very much related.

Love/Hate dichotomy is an oversimplification.

mryddlin • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 10:36 AM

I get you here btw

You are not saying ignore them, he is saying DO NOT LET THEM GET YOUR GOAT!

i.e. don't lose frame when interacting with SJW, it's even more important not to.

Cyralea • 10 points • 16 July, 2015 01:10 PM

Process it, then let it go. Be better despite it.

Sorry, but that's terrible advice. Toronto is increasingly becoming a hellhole for anyone who dares to have a Y chromosome. Putting it on the backburner of your brain is simply dangerous even at the individual level.

Actively refuse to deal with these femcunts. Any self-identifying feminist is a ticking time bomb.

[deleted] • 9 points • 16 July, 2015 12:20 PM

I don't really understand why anger is said to only be temporarily useful. Maybe it's true for some but for many it's a lifelong motivator and never falls obsolete. For others it's just a natural emotion and repressing it is harmful. Sometimes it becomes useless but I think that's less common than red's often say it is.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 03:12 PM

Anger is useful.

Rage is not.

vengefully_yours • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 04:16 PM

Rage is useful otherwise we wouldn't have it. However it must only be used when necessary, required, or is justified. Jumping straight to rage every time you get annoyed is not using it the way we developed it. Rage kills the beast that has fangs and claws, because reasoning with a carnivorous predator or another man intent on killing you isn't going to be effective.

[deleted] • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 04:41 PM

Rage is useful otherwise we wouldn't have it

Not necessarily. Rage may have been useful in the past, and be maladaptive now.

However it must only be used when necessary, required, or is justified.

The very concept of rage precludes the ability to make this judgement.

vengefully_yours • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 04:46 PM

Never had to use it, have you? You might be safe in your little world, but the rest of us might not be. Maladaptive to you, your current situation, but not in many situations in my past.

Are you the type who runs from danger, or the type who leans in or runs toward it to destroy it quicker? I've known both in my time, never heard the latter claim rage isn't useful.

TekkomanKingz • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 05:29 PM

The purpose of rage is to avenge fallen comrades. It is typically highest when a close friend dies due to predator attack.

vengefully_yours • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 05:36 PM

Also self preservation. Mine comes more from that than anything else.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 08:56 PM

but not in many situations in my past.

Details lacking, I notice. I'm almost positive that outside of war or a prison riot, there's a better path than succumbing to mindless rage.

Are you the type who runs from danger, or the type who leans in or runs toward it to destroy it quicker? I've known both in my time, never heard the latter claim rage isn't useful.

I never find myself in dangerous situations, because I'm not an idiot. The only reason you think it's a virtue is because you've embraced society's view that you are disposable. Why do you want to destroy danger when you can avoid it? LOL.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 02:02 PM

If it's intent on killing me, I'd rather kill it and eliminate the threat. I'd prefer not to die, I have shit to do. You have never found yourself in a situation because you haven't moved out of the bubble wrap. I never had the bubble wrap, and this is pointless because you're the type who runs away, never stands his ground.

Mugging you would be easy.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 06:45 PM

Mugging you would be easy.

Real tough guy, aren't you? LOL

Implying I give a shit about whatever negligible crap he would steal off of me. That's part of "not being an idiot", realizing the true worth of things. My life is not worth any amount of money, and there's always a bigger bad-ass/more psychopathic person/quicker draw than you out there, and they also possibly have friends off to the side in case you think you're a tough guy. They don't want to get hurt any more than you do, and unless you are a cop, they have way more experience than you in real-world violence.

You know what my bubble wrap is? Abundance mentality applied to resources.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 04:25 PM

Of course it is, if handled by someone who's not an idiot.

[deleted] • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 03:19 PM

Agreed.

If you respond with rage and hate, you are playing right into their narrative, and losing your frame and control, and accepting theirs.

You don't hit children, you don't argue with idiots, and you don't get into emotional arguments with women.

plenkton • -2 points • 16 July, 2015 06:50 AM

You should not hate the movement, as its intentions are the same as every man and woman's: wealth and power.

What is wrong and worth hating is democratic rule, as it limits freedoms and steals from others. Democratic rule favors those who produce the least, while stealing from those who produce the most.

Don't hate the player, hate the game.

nzgs • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 07:52 AM

Agreed the problem is with democracy and government itself. I don't really understand how some men can claim to be "red pill" while supporting statism.

plenkton • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 08:05 AM

I believe the reason men support statism while claiming to be TRP is because they do not understand the effect of government in the sexual or monetary economies.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 07:07 AM

Nah ill stick to the other guy advice hatin will not solve anything its time to work on things and by that start by myself. In fact i will learn the feminism game and will crush them. I stand by my name for a reason im always the top ranker while playing, at my work, but not at the gym or when theres a debate ao i will on these until i become at the top!

[deleted] • -16 points • 16 July, 2015 09:20 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 10 points • 16 July, 2015 09:44 AM

We understand it just fine here. This is what it's bringing us.

[deleted] • -11 points • 16 July, 2015 10:08 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 13 points • 16 July, 2015 10:59 AM

You must be lost. This is the forum where we recognize actions, not dictionary definitions or words. The feminism we see is ruining free speech and open markets under the guise of "equality" (which is a definition with constantly shifting goalposts).

[deleted] • -5 points • 16 July, 2015 12:53 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 01:31 PM

So you are willingly deluding yourself to be against something that does not actually represent the actual definition.

Definitions mean nothing to me. Less than nothing. Show me actions.

[deleted] • -6 points • 16 July, 2015 01:54 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 02:29 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 03:08 PM

[removed]

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 06:14 PM

What does that have to do with definitions? At all? Way to move the goalposts and change the subject. Stay on point. Argue the issue at hand.

hebola4lyfe • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 10:26 AM

Feminism at its core is about equality across both genders

equality does not exist in nature and biology .

You dont try to fight nature . You can't mold nature through this social construct "equality" .

The more humanity tried to implement this marxism ideology the sooner society will go back to its tradition gender roles. Women are not equal to men in any way. They never were and never will be .

mryddlin • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 10:38 AM

you need to read up on the origins of feminism.

This isn't crazy for that ideology, it's PAR FOR THE COURSE!!

It encourages this behaviour all over, go take a women's studies course and you'll see how bad it is.

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 10:40 AM

[removed]

mryddlin • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 11:30 AM

Calm down man, you need to look at the ideology objectively and deal with the negatives with in it.

The ideology you just referred to is called Humanism, feminism does not and has never supported equality. It is a gender specific ideology that pushes for increased legal powers for their gender.

This entire case is an example of how far it has gotten out of control and how out of touch people like yourself are with the inner circles of the ideology.

Moderates do not run the show, they are not motivated enough because they believe like you do. You are all actually Humanist if you believe in equality for people in general.

It also acknowledges that there are biological differences between the sexes and works towards that. Humanism has been sucking support away from feminism for a while now, I'd recommend you check it out.

for the record, feminist *hate* Humanism because it actually is inclusive towards men and their roles in society.

<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Humanism>

[deleted] • 72 points • 16 July, 2015 01:29 AM

El Chapo should deal with these 2 cunts.

[deleted] • 31 points • 16 July, 2015 02:29 AM

I'm really hoping that feminism becomes rampant and guys just start assassinating politicians.

R_E_D_1 • 65 points • 16 July, 2015 02:36 AM

Won't happen. The more popular modern feminism becomes the more likely men will withdraw from society. And in 50 years when men finally invent the believable sex robot women will wonder where all the men went and why.

LetsGoAllTheWhey • 28 points • 16 July, 2015 03:46 AM

50 years? It better not take that long.

iiMSouperman • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 11:13 AM

I'll be 76 by then, I'll have a few nuts left to bust I hope.

ferengiprophet73 points 16 July, 2015 02:46 AM **[recovered]**

Women are too solipsistic to ever acknowledge that they are at fault for anything. Honor, justice, and

responsibility are ideals that only men subscribe to.

bsutansalt • 8 points • 16 July, 2015 10:57 AM

I've always said it's honor, loyalty, and integrity that are masculine traits, drilled into is from early childhood. Women/girls just don't have the same expectations placed on them like that.

bicepsblastingstud • 11 points • 16 July, 2015 02:27 PM

I like Jack Donovan's concept of "tactical virtues" -- strength, courage, mastery, honor.

Cyralea • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 01:12 PM

I think it goes back even deeper. Men evolved honor/loyalty instincts to better construe a functional hierarchical system within the tribe. Loyalty to one's in-group vs. the out-group they'd be warring with would be a trait that would have been selected for, given the survival benefits.

Women never needed such traits. If anything, the opposite was true, given how often they'd become war brides.

cariboo_j • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 07:13 PM

Men had to be loyal and willing to put the group interests over their own for hunting and war parties.

Foraging and popping out babies required no such trait.

dr_warlock • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 10:59 PM

Women are expected to do whatever benefits them the most; optimize the female imperative. People do not uphold them to moral standard because honor, loyalty, and integrity hinders this goal.

LionLaw • 15 points • 16 July, 2015 06:03 AM

Those are indeed the tenets of a true man

R_E_D_1 • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 06:52 PM

Maybe I'm just being ignorantly hopeful. But when women are struggling to find ANY men worth committing to I'd like to think their ability to reason might kick in and they'll reform for a shot at true love.

OR they'll just buy robot men to cheat on, shit on and humiliate in public before they junk it for another updated model. LOL

jermanoid • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 03:06 PM

Please, someone post this to those two twitter twats. Lol

MattyAnon • 37 points • 16 July, 2015 05:17 AM

in 50 years when men finally invent the believable sex robot women will wonder where all the men went

But first they will shame men for using them and then try to make them illegal (either "breaking down the fabric of society" or "think of the children!").

At no point will they try to compete with dumb sex bots, even though they could - easily.

Case in point: porn. Women are failing to compete with *pictures of themselves*. That's right - when women feel threatened by porn, they are threatened by their own image. Why? Because porn does not passively-aggressively say no, and that is the basis of female power.

R_E_D_1 • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 06:28 PM

Women already try to shame us for porn. They REALLY try to shame us for Real Doll type shit too. They will try to shame you for getting muscles. They'll try to shame you for sleeping with lots of women. They will always shame us for trying to take our sexuality into our own hands. That's just what they do.

But when women are going out and all they can find are taco parties they'll start changing their behavior. It'll be hilarious to see, too.

ether_reddit • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:22 PM

Case in point: porn. Women are failing to compete with pictures of themselves. That's right - when women feel threatened by porn, they are threatened by their own image. Why? Because porn does not passively-aggressively say no, and that is the basis of female power.

No, usually it's that porn contains women (and men!) that embody an unrealistically achievable perfection of body. Even the most attractive person gets saggy bits by the time they're 40, and can't look as good as anyone in porn.

Dumb and shallow people try to chase that dream by pursuing surgical alteration, and feel threatened that they can't achieve perfection.

MattyAnon • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 11:00 PM

These people need to watch more *actual* porn rather than how they imagine it.

TehRedBirdCall • 13 points • 16 July, 2015 05:41 AM

50 years? well we are almost there.

<http://gizmodo.com/finally-a-vr-enabled-twerking-robot-butt-that-you-can-1716792260>

we just need the rest of it.

GrandmasterHurricane • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 04:23 AM

50 years? Ask and you shall receive.

<http://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2015/04/sexbots-realdoll-sex-toys>

CK_America • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 03:55 AM

Hahahahaha I foresaw the same thing, currently getting into robotics. :)

R_E_D_1 • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 06:54 PM

Gonna be a massive money field in the next 20 years. Robots will be awesome not just for sex, but for working jobs we won't, working places we can't and fighting wars we shouldn't. Massive growth field. Just go chill on the AI development, will ya'?

CK_America • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 10:02 PM

But robot consciousness is so fascinating! What if we're wrong and it's super baller having

hyper intelligent robots. We would be rollin like it's Star Trek in no time.

R_E_D_1 • 2 points • 17 July, 2015 09:33 PM

Yeah, I'm gonna go with fuck that. Self-realization is, literally, the end of the world. Not a gamble I'm cool with. But not like I can stop you nuts from doin' it lol

IronMeltsinmyHands • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 07:01 AM

I'm actually Hammurabi's Law is added to the law. It won't be. But it would certainly level the playing field.

Fagbasher01 • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 02:18 AM

Feminism already has won. it is part of the mainstream ideology in the west and spreading.

Squeezymypenis • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 05:47 AM

It doesn't affect his profits so not really a point. Though if you are interested, the cartels and anonymous had a showoff once. It ended without any casualties but still interesting.

surfjihad • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 07:02 AM

Trans North American Justice

[deleted] • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 03:10 PM

Cartels are top red pill men. Tho violent.

But they take shit from no one.

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:24 PM

Men are violent, humans are violent, probably the most violent species ever evolved, our destruction knows no bounds and we thrill at the thought of it.

It's fight or flight, men tend to stand and fight, women run for cover or just stop where they are and freeze. The cartels don't know flight, they have nobody to run to because their shit was stolen. They must deal with it themselves, and in an outlaw environment strength and resolve are everything. Be stronger and do not hold back with the retribution. You're alpha or you're dead. It's that simple.

[deleted] • 20 points • 16 July, 2015 09:01 AM

The graphic artist and father of four lost his job shortly after his arrest

I feel that the employer is a coward. Especially since the artist was fired because of an arrest, not a conviction.

EvrythingISayIsRight • 2 points • 17 July, 2015 07:43 PM

was fired because of an arrest, not a conviction

Sadly this kind of shit happens all the time. If you're arrested for anything, whether you did it or not, you are likely to get fired anyway.

RedPillarOfSalt • 19 points • 16 July, 2015 06:59 AM

New developments in this story. I love it.

<http://www.canada.com/twist+Twitter+harassment+case/9643198/story.html>

<http://www.canada.com/twist+Twitter+harassment+case/9643198/story.html>

Link is down. What was there?

FLFTW16 • 17 points • 16 July, 2015 10:24 AM

FULL TEXT

TORONTO — The so-called Twitter case — what appears to be the first time in Canada someone has been charged with criminal harassment based entirely on tweets — has taken an odd and unexpected turn.

Ontario Court Judge Brent Knazan came into court Thursday to announce he had received a letter from a stranger making the startling allegation the complaint he is hearing “is fraudulent, or worse.”

Greg Elliott of Toronto, 53, is charged with criminally harassing three women, though the Toronto Police officer in charge of the case, Det. Jeff Banglid, already has testified he found no overt threats or sexual overtures in Elliott’s tweets to any of the complainants.

The first one, 29-year-old Steph Guthrie, an articulate political activist, was on the witness stand when the trial first adjourned in January.

According to the letter, parts of which the judge read aloud in open court, the person claimed to be a former acquaintance of the three complainants and alleges they “conspired, in my presence, to fabricate a criminal harassment complaint” against Elliott.

The person also alleged the conspiracy extends “to the ministry of the attorney-general,” information relayed in the summer of 2012 by two of the complainants’ friends.

Judge Knazan said the letter, which he received Tuesday, was signed and provided contact information.

But he kept the writer’s name and gender out of the public domain, in case the person was well-intentioned or was unaware it’s inappropriate to write to judges.

Neither did the judge read aloud the names of the two complainants’ friends mentioned in the letter or its first paragraph, in which the writer explained the reason for writing.

Still, the judge said, the “allegations leave police and Crown counsel no option but to investigate,” and adjourned the case until its next scheduled date in May.

Interestingly, according to the Criminal Code of Canada, a criminal harassment charge appears to be rooted as much in the alleged victim’s perception of the offending conduct as in the alleged conduct itself.

(I also received a copy of the letter to the judge, sent by email last week, before the judge got his. I attempted to reach the writer via the contact information included, but neither phone number nor email worked.)

When the case previously adjourned two months ago, Guthrie was in mid-cross-examination by Chris Murphy, Elliott’s lawyer.

Murphy had questioned her at length about a meeting in the summer of 2012, when a group of people, including the other complainants and a couple of their friends, gathered to decide, as she put it once, “how as a community we could respond to predatory and harassing behaviour of men,” including allegedly Elliott, on Twitter.

One of the friends whom Guthrie identified as being at the meeting is one of the two named in the letter and alleged by the writer to be knowledgeable about the purported conspiracy.

When the meeting ended, Murphy alleged in January, the attendees “had a plan to deal with Mr. Elliott ... Each of them had a role.”

At one point, he told the judge, “It may be that at that meeting, a conspiracy to commit a criminal offence took place — to criminally harass Mr. Elliott, to commit mischief and interfere with his ability to enjoy Twitter.”

Given that all this happened well in advance of the letter being sent — the judge’s announcement and the letter appeared to take both Murphy and Crown attorney Marnie Goldenberg completely by surprise — it renders at least some of the writer’s allegations relevant and appears to lend them a little heft.

Were the people at the meeting — all the complainants attended, remember — just talking about what they could do to stem the oft-misogynistic ramblings on Twitter or did they hatch a plan to target Elliott, to make an example of him?

Certainly, the self-possessed Guthrie has admitted to “outing” others she deemed to be creeps.

She was questioned extensively about her decision to publicly shame a 25-year-old man from Sault Ste. Marie, Ont., who had invented a “beat up Anita Sarkeesian” video game, where users could punch an image of the feminist video blogger until the screen, and her face, turned red.

Guthrie had wondered aloud on the web if she should blow the whistle on the man, or, as she put it, “So I found the Twitter account of that f— listed as creator of the ‘punch a woman in the face’ game,” she tweeted. “Should I sic the Internet on him?”

When the answer was a resounding “Yes!,” she tweeted a link to the story about the game “to prospective Sault Ste. Marie employers” and the local newspaper.

As Murphy put it to her in January, “This was another case that rose to the level where you agreed with online vigilantism” and accused her of wanting to ruin the man’s life.

“I was simply making people aware,” Guthrie replied, but she acknowledged if others took action that ruined his life, “I would not feel sorry about that.”

ether_reddit • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 04:46 PM

This article is dated March 20 2014, so it's not "new". The ruling is still expected this October.

EvrythingISayIsRight • 2 points • 17 July, 2015 07:48 PM

Wow. This bitch belongs behind bars. She is a hypocrite and she is abusing the law to get vengeance on someone who she disagrees with politically. Shit like this makes a mockery of the legal system and she should be punished.

[deleted] • 17 points • 16 July, 2015 04:50 AM

Hey this might be a stupid idea, but do you think there will be a point where enough men against feminism will get together and riot?

through_a_ways • 2 points • 17 July, 2015 04:50 AM

Almost definitely not.

What you *may* start to see is acts of violence against people who pull stuff like this.

moneyandsexislife62 points 16 July, 2015 01:41 AM **[recovered]**

If I were Canadian, I'd join any male-centric rebellion.

They are completely out to get us, getting more extreme by the day, and effecting huge punishments.

Life is not worth living under those conditions. I'd be ready to die in a fight in a heartbeat.

MHOOD01 • 14 points • 16 July, 2015 03:14 AM

It seems the farther feminism gets, the more men are waking up.

Kashmon777 • 12 points • 16 July, 2015 10:28 AM

bull

more and more men, especially the younger generation love feminism...

YouGoJoe • 9 points • 16 July, 2015 06:06 PM

I'm 23 so I think I still qualify as 'younger generation' for most of us here. It's not as bad as that. For the most part I think more and more of us are putting on the feminist mask to stay out of trouble, but still dump the kool-aid in the house-plant instead of chugging it down.

Kashmon777 • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 08:20 AM

really? every discussion I have has at uni or school there are more female anti feminists than male anti feminists...

just saying

feminism was enabled by men made into law by men men love it...

YouGoJoe • 2 points • 17 July, 2015 02:14 PM

Unfortunately, University is a terrible place to be honest as a guy. On campus, women have way more freedom to express what they actually think.

Grab a couple beers with the boys, no chicks around, you'll be surprised.

Also, do you really expect the women to get the laws into place? They don't take action, that would open them up to failure.

lordrand11 • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:37 AM

And like any cause that's lasted far longer than it should have, it will eventually destroy itself. This has been the creed for any society that's been established, let these feminists do what they will, in the end they're only hurting their cause by doing so.

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:31 PM

I'd rather not be the victim of their bullshit anymore. False rape, false sexual harassment, divorce rape, jail time for shit I was accused of with zero evidence for and plenty against, just because I am a large, muscular, intimidating ex military man.

Fuck with me anymore and you're putting your life at the mercy of my mood. That's why no bitch will live with me, marry me, or even hear me say I love you. I live in the woods and avoid people, because one more false accusation or punishment for simply being male and I will do something worthy of punishment. I'd rather not, so I avoid situations where someone can affect me like that.

ferengiprophet • 21 points • 16 July, 2015 02:48 AM

Whenever you feel like this, take a break from TRP and the internet in general. The world is not as bad as some angry people on trp portray it to be.

LionLaw • 39 points • 16 July, 2015 06:05 AM

That man who lost his job for simply defending a kid on the internet could have been any one of us. Something needs to be done and fucking soon, and if we all took the same passive indifferent attitude then nothing will ever get done.

rpscrote • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 09:20 PM

Any country that has "free" speech laws like Canada's there are not free countries

thecompgame • -2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:04 AM

Couldn't agree with you more...sometimes you just have to "unplug". Pun intended. Good day.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 03:29 PM

I am canadian and I live in Toronto.

Men side with women.

You wouldn't believe some of the horror stories I could tell you.

Rooi_Aap • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 08:36 PM

If you have the time please type one up. I like getting my jimmies rustled from time to time.

[deleted] • -19 points • 16 July, 2015 03:25 AM

Oh yeah brother, wear a red banana and join the rebellion against the evil empire, and if they catch you you can pop a red cyanide pill into your mouth!

6030747 • 8 points • 16 July, 2015 07:32 AM

Its a bandanna not a banana retard.

[deleted] • 46 points • 16 July, 2015 03:30 AM

It blows my mind we're 120K strong and we do nothing. Where is the outrage? This should be the tipping point. This is dystopian. Any call to action gets immediately shot down with "We're not MRA's! Don't talk about the RedPill!" however I feel at some point somebody needs to draw a line in the dust and say enough

brannana • 12 points • 16 July, 2015 12:59 PM

This should be the tipping point.

No, a conviction should be the tipping point. People can bring lawsuits for just about any reason, if they have the time and money. The true litmus test is when those lawsuits bear fruit.

Now, I'm probably reading a lot into a few sentences near the end of the article, but it sounds as though the plaintiff's attorney isn't even very sure of the merits of the case, refusing to make a statement or release transcripts of her case. That's a far cry from "Oh, these poor women."

Now, if they actually find this guy guilty and sentence him? Yeah, then it's time to break out the pitchforks and torches.

vacationlife- • 8 points • 16 July, 2015 02:19 PM

No, a conviction should be the tipping point.

thats true, but it's pathetic that today a guy can lose his job for this shit. The guy in canada who said "fuck

her right in the pussy" on tv lost his job after e-feminists kept calling his place of work and complaining about him

those were canada, but even that one story about the guy taking a picture of a star wars poster and then got chased through the store by some crazy bitch who posted his pic online and said he's a pedophile i guess when the majority of western population is fully retarded, you get retarded results. no surprise when you think about it like that

RemyPrice • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 03:44 PM

it's pathetic that today a guy can lose his job for this shit.

I doubt he was doing very well in his job if they'll let him go over some bitchy phone calls.

If you're valuable to the company, your boss would tell them to fuck off.

[deleted] • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 04:35 PM*

Its a PR move. If they don't fire him, it is now the feminists against the company and they'll do the same shit online to this company. It doesn't have anything to do with his value or performance.

He didn't back down to their pressure and see what happened? The company is hoping to avoid the same issues.

Cyralea • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 01:15 PM

We are far too few in number, and ultimately not a unified coalition. We all have slightly differing goals.

I agree that there's a point where enough is enough, especially given that this is happening right in my backyard, but all we can do is act to our benefit on the personal level. Cut ties with anyone and anything remotely tied to feminism.

SuckOnMyBigRedPill22 points 16 July, 2015 05:25 AM **[recovered]**

Do something then.

A lot of us are just here to a) self-improve b) observe the world/culture so we can plan accordingly.

Not everyone is as angry as you (though I will admit stuff like this does blow my mind. Literal definition of insanity. 1984 stuff.)

[deleted] • 14 points • 16 July, 2015 06:21 AM

i'm here to do those things as well (obviously) but to sit back and allow our culture to become so diluted to the point where we fear to disagree? It seems cowardly to have such a large group of like-minded individuals stay silent hiding behind the notion that speaking out and activism is futile. I can't do much I'm just one man, but this still is a democracy and over 100k voices means something.

Wraithwain • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 11:59 AM

Ever read about the rat utopia experiment? There are other writeups, but here's one from ROK.

<http://www.returnofkings.com/36915/what-humans-can-learn-from-the-mice-utopia-experiment>

We may be over a hundred thousand, but how many of them are simply here as the "beautiful ones", as described in there? Solely focused on themselves. Sixty percent? Seventy? Eighty? Hard to tell.

And, while it may disappoint you that so many simply don't care, the few who do care can still make a difference.

Chin up, mate. I'm not even in the US, and I want to help.

SuckOnMyBigRedPill0 points 16 July, 2015 10:09 AM [recovered]

Making some big assumptions there, man.

stay silent hiding behind the notion that speaking out and activism is futile.

No, I don't say anything because I literally don't give a shit. It doesn't interest me. Ending feminism/fixing society is about as interesting to me as watching grass grow. I'd rather "enjoy the decline" and focus on things which do interest me/bring me happiness.

If you're passionate then fucking go for it man. I wish you luck. But don't assume everyone else is "cowardly"/scared/etc. Maybe it just doesn't interest us.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 12:07 PM*

You'll give a shit when something goes sour with a plate and she gets you locked up for "harassment" that she "perceived" and you lose your fucking job and face public scorn

CornyHoosier • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 05:31 PM

We're mostly Americans here and Canada doesn't have the same free speech laws as the United States. In Canada, groups like the KKK or Neo-Nazis, WBC, etc. don't exist.

But hey, if you want to organize a rally here in the U.S. I'll join ya.

vengefully_yours • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 04:39 PM

Choosing the right time is paramount, you do not begin an invasion of Russia in September, you do begin an invasion of Europe in June. The timing of action is nearly as important as the action itself.

If we were to do anything, we must wait until the bullshit is at the point where people can easily see through it, see the hypocrisy for themselves. If we move too early, our 100k will seem like a burp to the billions out there. There must be enough snow for the avalanche, otherwise it's just a pebble rolling down a hill.

sardinemanR • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 08:44 PM

120k against what, 310M others in the US? And how large is Canada's population?

Get a grip man. You will get destroyed trying to fight it, we're not MRAs, we know better.

TRP and MGTOW both arose because it was impossible to stem the tide of feminism. TRP teaches you best how to deal within it, MGTOW best teaches you how to avoid it (and is the safest possible path you can take). TRP is calculated risks that are designed to derive a benefit.

What benefit is fighting this for any of us? Especially those of us not even in Canada?

[deleted] • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 08:48 PM

whatever man. have an up vote and get the fuck out of my face

sardinemanR • -1 points • 16 July, 2015 09:01 PM

Why don't you man up a bit instead of being such a whiny cunt? BP much?

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 09:06 PM

damn bro calling me BP that's so alpha you must slam HB10's on the reg change your name to chad you're the fuckin man!

Sadpanda596 • 0 points • 17 July, 2015 04:51 PM

Seriously, I don't give two shits about other people screwing themselves over. If they're going to insist on screwing themselves, let them have at it. Paternalistically determining for someone else what is best for them is about as disrespectful as you can be in my book.

I deal with reality; fighting a losing battle out of principles is the domain of the emotionally stunted.

USmellFunny • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 05:59 PM

Starting from the premise that it's impossible to change one person's mindset to redpill if they're not looking to change it for themselves, how do you expect 120k to change the mindset of the world? Just keep this to yourself and use it to your advantage. The world is going to shit and there's nothing you can do about it except to vaccinate yourself against shit.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 06:38 PM

Time to stockpile some guns.

nzgs • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:38 PM

This is not an activist group.

donvalish0 points 16 July, 2015 07:45 AM **[recovered]**

This place is about accepting reality and making the most of that reality.

By trying to create this change that you want you are not accepting what life is and putting yourself in a weaker social position.

Life is not fair. Don't let yourself believe it should be

[deleted] • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 09:03 AM

Life ain't fair, but there has to be some sort of minimum acceptable moral standards that everyone should uphold. This is outrageous and should be challenged.

donvalish1 points 16 July, 2015 09:21 AM **[recovered]**

Challenge it then. Enter that cesspool of debating with feminists.

If you non emotionally reflect on what happened, you will see that the lesson from this story is not to argue with feminists in the current climate of society. That is also already common knowledge for most experienced members here.

Ketaminewarrior • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 01:09 PM

No, the lesson is to watch your back. He was totally open about his identity online. Thats a big mistake, even when you are in the right. Feminists don't fight fair - we know this.

The lesson is Don't get Doxxed, maybe even use a VPN. Imagine if some Feminist at reddit released all our IP/email addresses and then the unemployed army of fat SJW's set about systematically trying to fuck our lives....don't think it couldn't happen. We need to stand up to these cunts but we need to realise that we are vulnerable where they are not!

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 08:35 AM

"Look, I'm self-serving too, the world could burn after I die for all I care.

If everyone followed that advice, however, we would all be slaves.

Who cares about a man put in jail for thoughtcrime? Just ignore it, pretend to be a good citizen and go on

with your life.

Who cares about this? Who cares about that? Understand the rules and play the game to win!

Repeat this process until you can't even say what you want in private.

Someone has to step up sooner or later and say "Enough"." /u/LeeHePro

tallwheel • 15 points • 16 July, 2015 07:14 AM

I tried to warn people about this case over a year ago.

<https://archive.is/IYdbA>

cover20 • 27 points • 16 July, 2015 02:05 AM

OMG Canada's down the tubes. Compared to that, the USA is reasonable.

[deleted] • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 02:37 AM

honestly that's just a fallacy of the "big ol bad US of A". I don't mean to offend any Americans here and I assume as redpillers we're all past that stage where we moan and cry about us being offended over a piece of land but I feel it's just as bad in the states as it is here in Canada and if not it very well will be soon enough. Just my opinion though.

KungPaoEllenTheFist20 points 16 July, 2015 03:25 AM [recovered]

I don't mean to offend any Americans here

This right here is why it isn't a fallacy. Canadians will apologize before they even speak. Plenty of jokes have been made about it. You guys have internalized blue pill behavior to the point that it is what you are known for across the world.

SaiHottari • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 08:11 AM

I wish I was around back when we were known as "storm troopers", fuck this "apologetic Eskimo" BS.

Cyralea • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 01:19 PM

Completely disagree. Lifelong Canadian, visited over a dozen American cities. The climate is different. Only Portland and San Fran are similar. Other American cities are far more sane.

Canada is pretty deep into the feminist rabbit hole. We drank the kool-aid and then made an enema out of it.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 03:31 PM

Yeah.

Come here in Toronto and live there for 10 years.

Then come back telling us whether you were right or wrong.

NidStyles • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 06:30 AM

I can still tell a bitch to shut her cunt trap here in the USA, without fear of getting tried in court and losing my job.

A_Depressing_Cat12 points 16 July, 2015 03:08 AM [recovered]

Just wandering around reddit when I saw this. This part kind of pisses me off.

The criminal harassment charge is rooted in the alleged victim's perception of the offending conduct.

Have they essentially applied the same standards between the difference between sex and rape to online discussions?

EvrythingISayIsRight • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 07:51 PM

Apparently anything can be defined as harassment and the law has to take it seriously. If anyone downvotes me, or replies to this comment with anything I don't agree with, it is literally harassment and I will press charges!

B_Campbell • 9 points • 16 July, 2015 12:04 PM

Classic projection. When I clicked on the article I expected to see the guy had said some nasty things on Twitter but hadn't even done that. He did just the opposite and told them you shouldn't harass people online. The women are guilty of the very thing they're going after this guy for. It's very Orwellian.

generic_name5 points 16 July, 2015 05:06 PM [recovered]

When I clicked on the article I expected to see the guy had said some nasty things on Twitter

I thought the same. I clicked through thinking that surely this guy did *something* that he was actually arrested and went to court (and has been on bail, banned from using the internet for *2 years*). Nothing. I did a Google search and even looked at Jezebel. Not a thing. You would think if this guy was harassing people on twitter there would be screen caps of some of the things he said. You'd think Jezebel would put this guy on blast, showing off what a creep he is. But nope, nothing. Which only makes me believe he didn't actually say anything all that bad. It's sad really, that it's come down to this.

B_Campbell • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 10:55 PM

If you read the article the report makes the point that he never made a threatening or even sexist comment. He just disagreed with them and they were determined to make him pay.

generic_name • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 01:51 AM

Right, I assumed it was a biased article, which tends to be common. But nope.

thundercock2win • 11 points • 16 July, 2015 08:47 AM

Wow, this sounds insane.

Feelz before realz. Even in court!?

"When he asked her to point to one — just one — that had instilled fear in her, she snapped, **“That’s not how feelings work**, Mr. Murphy. They develop over time.” When the lawyer suggested she wasn’t fearful, that she’d made fun of Mr. Elliott and taunted him, she sighed theatrically and said, “There’s no perfect victim, Mr. Murphy, and no perfect way to respond to being stalked. Sometimes you have to fight back a little bit.... I’m sorry if I wasn’t a perfect victim.”

<http://news.nationalpost.com/full-comment/christie-blatchford-the-twitter-trial-of-gregory-elliott-is-becoming-much-like-twitter-itself-shrill-and-uber-sensitive>

CHAD_J_THUNDERCOCK • 10 points • 16 July, 2015 10:04 AM

Ahhh fucking hell. I'm not emotionally connected to the pill at all, I hit the acceptance stage 2 years ago. But

thats one thing that still gets the fist clenching; "Im sorry if I wasn't a perfect victim". That was what mattress girl used as a defence when the messages about her asking for sex and being flirty after she was allegedly raped were leaked to the press. Its a great reframe to be honest.

[deleted] • 8 points • 16 July, 2015 02:57 PM

"That's not how feelings work, Mr. Murphy. They develop over time."

Unfortunately, that *is* how the law works. You have to... you know... prove things.

"There's no perfect victim, Mr. Murphy, and no perfect way to respond to being stalked. Sometimes you have to fight back a little bit.... I'm sorry if I wasn't a perfect victim."

There are no perfect victims, but there are fake victims. Prove to me you aren't one.

EvrythingISayIsRight • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 07:55 PM

There's no perfect victim

I'm sorry if I wasn't a perfect victim.

God this victim perpetuation shit is infuriating. If you can make yourself look like a victim you can get someone punished for anything. Where the fuck is the personal responsibility? If she didn't want to see his comments then she can block him, simple as that.

digitalnomad5000 • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 05:26 AM

Notice she has Problem Glasses.

[deleted] • 8 points • 16 July, 2015 02:20 AM

It doesn't end there. Ever heard of "re-education" camps?

moneyandsexislife8 points 16 July, 2015 02:46 AM **[recovered]**

Schools, colleges, and jobs?

This post makes me want to double-check what preceded Congo.

Who's to say that the white knights and BPers don't get spontaneously, simultaneously pissed and turn on their masters?

Rimeheart • 9 points • 16 July, 2015 02:58 AM

Funny, I got into an argument, on the internet, and the person felt threatened, despite the fact I never once attacked her as a person. While she attacked me as a person. I think I learned my lesson here never argue on the internet, especially with women.

lindependentmale • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 05:25 AM

Arguing on the Internet is like running in the special Olympics. Even if you win, you're still retarded.

wont_tell_i_refuse • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 01:00 PM

To say nothing of arguing with women.

Ibex3D • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 05:03 PM

Or men who act like women. I once saw a video that was anti-war and shared it on facebook. It mentioned

that most soldiers aren't heroes, they are there for personal gain(education, a career, or just to kill some terrorists). My friend(and, at the time, soon to be roommate sadly) got all pissed and started attacking me personally and telling me how offensive it was. I was just like "dude, it's just an opinion. You can disagree." It got the point where I had to pretend to agree with him so he would stop harassing me and so we could live in peace the next semester. God I hated living with him. He's so emotional. It felt like being married to crazy woman. After a year I'm finally getting away and I don't intend to talk to him again. It's not just women. Dont argue on the internet. Dont share your opinion. People can't handle it when you disagree. Their minds are far too fragile.

[deleted] • 7 points • 16 July, 2015 05:03 AM

So... a political prisoner then? Don't sink that low, Canada.

swolebird • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 06:26 AM

Somebody should sic 4chan's Anon on them, so they understand what Internet harassment REALLY is.

EvrythingISayIsRight • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 07:56 PM

Just who is this 4chan anon? Is he some sort of system admin or computer hacker?

skoobled • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 08:05 AM

I can't understand why anyone Tweets. Seems a week doesn't go by without someone getting into hot water for choosing the wrong sequence of 140 characters

rukiab • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 10:11 AM

Yeah, I stay off Twitter unless I am going to a conference mostly. I don't know the character limit, the fact that it is tied to your identity, with far less privacy, means in my opinion you really shouldn't post personal information on there. Though as time moves on we are losing sort of this narrative that the internet is a place for aliases, a place for anonymous discussion, and honestly for the most part that is better in some instances. I feel like people often disassociate the real world and the internet world.

Though personally I don't know I couldn't find any actual information on this case that wasn't steeped in bias, but no one actually posted the actual tweets. So it is hard to formulate an opinion, I feel like if there are threats involve that is vastly different than disagreeing with someone.

bluedrygrass • 6 points • 16 July, 2015 08:57 AM

Yet somehow, according to some redpillers, "we shouldn't bother with politics, but live our life at the fullest and ignore them".

MentORPHEUS • 14 points • 16 July, 2015 01:39 AM

The ruling isn't until October 6. If he rules in favor of Mr. Elliot, then all of the handwringing is for naught. It doesn't look like a strong tangible case in favor of the women, and it might even leave open the possibility that he could sue them for actual damages.

mstersmith • 31 points • 16 July, 2015 02:28 AM

Man was drug into court over words on the internet! Ya it is still a problem even if it is ruled in his favor.

MentORPHEUS • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 02:58 PM

If the ruling goes against the women, it sets a legal precedent that will make attorneys unwilling to take

such cases to trial in the future. It also makes radfems look foolish in the court of world opinion.

systemshock869 • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 02:10 PM

I hope he doesn't hold back. Destroy those idiots.

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 02:33 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 09:16 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 02:28 PM

[removed]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 03:43 PM

[removed]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 04:01 PM

[removed]

redpillschool • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:26 PM

Please no doxxing requests.

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 07:52 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 09:22 AM

[removed]

ProudRedPill11 points 16 July, 2015 02:05 AM* **[recovered]**

This is seriously fucked up, absurd and a direct violation of Free Speech.

Red Pill enforces us to accept that the damage is already done and we need to accept it. But this? I can't even talk to a librarian without the thought that I could possibly harass them.

There will be a point where men won't take it anymore. I can already see it. People are starting to question it and even when I talk to people irl tell me they despise feminism.

tygertiger • 8 points • 16 July, 2015 03:09 AM

Free Speech doesn't exist in Canada like it does in the USA. There is no First Amendment in Canada. Free expression is enshrined in Canadian law, but it doesn't cover "hate crimes", "hate language" etc.

cucaculpa • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 05:34 PM

True, but you can certainly hack it.

Amicus curiae have absolute immunity from libel and defamation. This was true, BTW. She is to be pitied, not punished.

<http://news.nationalpost.com/full-comment/christie-blatchford-twitter-harassment-trial-halted-by-surprise>

-letter-alleging-fraudulent-conspiracy-against-accused

knuckelz • 5 points • 16 July, 2015 03:17 AM

To be fair, Canada doesn't have free speech. That's mostly unique to the US.

f3yleaf • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 04:58 PM

not quite, countries like Holland and Denmark are free speech absolutists, even more than USA.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 03:37 PM

free speech doesn't exist in Canada. It just doesn't. You could get arrested, laid off because you said something on the street, even if you were joking.

damanx • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 05:16 AM

Any transcripts of said tweets? I'm noticing a severe lack of evidence for this case.

DRMMR76 • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 07:55 AM

Do not try to see a feminists logic. That is impossible....only try to realize the truth.

They have no logic.

INV0K3R • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 01:12 PM

This is getting media attention due to the retardedness (read: Canada) of it.

He won't get jail time unless there is some "public concern" ie. he threatened them or something major. The prosecutor's attorney didn't even want to talk she knows how fucking dumb it is lol.

This wouldn't have even gotten this far in the American court.

Source: Lawyerfag friend.

[deleted] • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 01:21 PM

Canadian feminism is the worst in the world

cariboo_j • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 05:04 AM

The West is in the midst of it's own Cultural Revolution...

lucidsleeper • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 07:38 AM

Feminism and freedom of speech seems to be contradictory ideologies. It has become more apparent lately with feminists attacking various people on social media and threatening legal or political action simply because they don't agree with someone's opinion. Oh how petty people have become, and how ignorant they are for supporting such a cancerous inhumane ideal.

Riusakii • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 03:44 PM

Just another reason to stay off social media. Social media is for betas and women.

Cloudkidd • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 04:40 PM

This is absurd. Feminist are far more violent than the men they hate.

idonthaveacoolname13 • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 03:00 PM

We live in a world of princess faggots. This trend will only get worse.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 02:01 AM

Sounds like it's going by summary conviction, so it's *up to* 6 months in prison, or a \$5000.00 fine, or both.

Will probably just get a year's worth of probation (if convicted)

Still BS though

IronMeltsinmyHands • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 06:58 AM

if the guy killed himself it's his own fault for bringing it on? Victim blaming.

And what else, disagreeing with femcunts is harassment?

do we really need any more reasons to bite the redpill?

satanicpriest13 • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 02:00 PM

This is the reason I'm off social media. I have a knack of getting into arguments and calling people out. And no one can track down satanicpriest13 from reddit.

Dueperdue • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 04:43 PM

I saw someone mentioned Hammurabi's laws. I would take most of the sex-related stuff and put it into law IMMEDIATELY, while there is still something we can recover.

sardinemanR • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 08:35 PM

I guess Canada doesn't have free speech, but this is why people should maintain their privacy online. He used his real name and they knew who he was. If he had used a pseudonym, perhaps they'd still track him down but I bet it would have been harder and maybe they'd think it not worth the effort. Also they'd need to subpoena twitter and an ISP or two for the information, so it would take awhile.

Twitter in general is more for businesses to market themselves. It doesn't make much sense for regular individuals. I tried it out a bit and didn't see the point.

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 10:25 PM*

[deleted]

tygertiger • 1 point • 18 July, 2015 12:25 AM

Apparently she does have a boyfriend. I can imagine the pegging must be painful.

dark_prophet • 4 points • 16 July, 2015 09:03 AM

Is there the snapshot of these conversations anywhere? How can we see for ourselves what exactly happened there?

Canada doesn't have the free speech, so such ridiculous things happen.

I had been banned online for "trolling" few times on various boards for simply disagreeing with the predominant line of the conversation. Every time I carefully reviewed what I said, and stood by every word I said. People just can't tolerate opinions too different from theirs.

Ninebythreeinch • 2 points • 16 July, 2015 09:19 AM

Welcome to the female privileged society liberal, progressive feminists have fought so hard for. Removal of free speech would be a great victory for them as they can say whatever they want and claim harassment if someone

answers back.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 03:39 AM

A lot of times on TRP I see things posted about current events and can see both sides as having understandable positions. For instance the other day when the video tape of that QB jacking that girl in the face, I didn't see that as rampant anti-man media rabies.

This on the other hand is just foul. This is just bald faced naked villainy. I consider myself to be a fairly impartial judge on current events and this is just not OK.

brokenshell • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 04:34 AM

This will only be interesting when a judgment is reached, and only if it goes against the man, if then. As it stands now, it's just another frivolous criminal complaint, not uncommon in the most countries.

Granted, it's hilarious and sad because it's a batshit feminist making the claims, but still. Let me know if it goes down in the worst way.

throwawaymatthew • 3 points • 16 July, 2015 07:49 AM

the dude lost his job...over this shit, granted its just a job but at the end of the day he has had his name dragged through the mud.

Spaceduck4000 • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 06:06 AM

It would be interesting if someone built a small cage and locked these women up in it. Wouldn't be that different from what they are attempting to do , only difference is the state is not involved.

Trisha_Hill • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 08:47 AM

Steph Guthrie and Heather Reilly

Red_Suppository_Pill • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 12:59 PM

I don't believe that this story is real. I'm not being hyperbolic. I'll see you bandwagon-jumping fucks in a couple days when the facts come out.

RPthrowaway123 • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 07:55 PM

Holy shit. This is beyond insane. This guy lost his job and will have to spend time away from his children all because he told this entitled cunt off on twitter. How did it come to this?

Sdom1 • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 10:22 PM

Whenever people tell me that the US doesn't need its constitution, all I can do is laugh. When they point to Western European democracies (and the commonwealth) to show that you don't need a constitution to have civil rights, I laugh even harder.

Say whatever you want about us here in *les états unis*, but this shit would NEVER have happened here for the simple fact that we have robust Constitutional protections that forbid it. These idiots would never have found a lawyer stupid enough to take their case.

Nantafiria • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 10:57 AM

People point to western European democracies to argue against constitutions being necessary? I live in one such democracy, and we have a constitution just fine.

Sdom1 • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 04:56 PM

Specifically, a Bill of Rights. Sorry, I should have been more specific. A constitution is generally more of an organizing document, laying down the structure and boundaries of a government. I'm speaking more specifically of our bill of rights.

There are a lot of laws in Europe that could never be passed here, as they would trample our individual rights. In particular, a lot of European laws concerning public speech would be totally illegal here. Same goes for firearm ownership,

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 July, 2015 11:35 PM

The freakiest part is that everyone keeps pointing out he never made any sexual comments towards them. Does that even matter? Since when do you get six months in prison for a rude sexual remark? If he's going to be an asshole over twitter than well fuck him but six months in prison?!?! That's besides the fact that he didn't even do THAT.

ECoast_Man • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 04:11 AM

There's no way that the judge will rule in favour of the two piglets. Even with Canada's shitty 'freedom of expression', this would cross a line.

Also, the civil liberties interest groups would takeover funding to appeal this all the way to the SCC if they won. They're well funded and well represented.

I would seriously have to reconsider this country if this shit was actually ruled by a judge.

Candman91 • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 12:23 PM

Yet Guthrie and Reilly didn't behave as though they were remotely frightened or intimidated: They convened a meeting of friends to discuss how Elliott should be publicly shamed; they bombarded their followers with furious tweets and retweets about him (including a grotesque suggestion from someone pretending she was a 13-year-old that he was a pedophile); they could and did dish it out.

No threats or statements to fear for their safety, and they were already planning on destroying his reputation and character.

gclon2014 • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 12:51 PM

This is fucking sick and twisted.

wtfomg77 • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 01:46 PM*

One of my [former] SJW Facebook friends posted an everyday feminism article about 'thin privilege.' I wrote a very long, well thought-out, detailed argument against it, attempting to be as civil and open minded as possible. She was a friend of a friend, I've gone out to bars with her with our group of friends, so I didn't want to burn any bridges. I posted the comment, and skim it through for spelling/grammar errors. Not more than 30 seconds later, I reload the page, and saw she unfriended me; she definitely did not have enough time to read my comment all the way through. I had a feeling she would delete it (the articles she posts never get likes or comments, but all her selfies get dozens of likes). I message her saying how it was really immature to unfriend me because she disagrees with what I wrote, and that she could've replied to my argument. She replies with an emoticon and blocks me. She then proceeds to subtweet me, talking about how people are ignorant, calling me stupid, and saying how she can stand in an argument, but I was too stupid for it to be worth her time.

What did I learn from all this? Never engage these people. They have their agenda and have made up their mind

on their philosophy. They act like they're open minded but they're really some of the most closed minded, immature, and petulant people in our society. Acknowledging them only gives them undeserved credence. You could argue against SJW talking points to people who aren't necessarily SJW's but who may sympathize with some of their views. But never engage with SJW's directly. Not only is it unproductive because nothing will come of it, but by addressing them you are only giving their arguments more legitimacy. My hope is that if we ignore them enough they'll slowly go away. Directly engaging them will only want to make them scream louder.

I guess my only recourse is that she didn't attempt to 'ruin' my life and dox me

cucaculpa • 2 points • 17 July, 2015 05:09 PM

Guthrie unfriended me on Facebook when I called out her DISQUALIFY! ... on Twitter.

Make one bad move against the mother hen activist, and you're persona non Grata. GAE is a autistic who is neuro-atypical, and annoying, but he's harmless and certainly no criminal. Anyway, Guthrie was my red pill for leftists.

Former NDP worker

tygertiger • 1 point • 18 July, 2015 12:17 AM

If you have time to PM me, I'd be interested to hear your story.

Mephistopheles13 • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 02:28 PM

These cunts need to go to prison

sadleaf • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 05:02 PM

This shit is getting out of control. Same thing is happening in Brazil, the government even created a site where people can expose this kind of online harassment. It's called, 'humanizing the networks' and of course they only care about harassment made on feminists, blacks and LGBT. At least we have a few people fighting against this SJW shitters.

newmewuser4 • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 08:28 PM

Not too late to nuke Toronto.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 10:10 PM

There will come a day when feminists are no longer protected by political correctness, and will face the pent-up rage that they have tried so hard to silence.

tygertiger • 1 point • 18 July, 2015 12:14 AM

She refers to herself on Twitter as a "Turtle Island Settler". "Turtle Island" being the aboriginal name for North America adopted by the SJW brigade as a sort of white-guilt Mark of Cain to show how "inclusive" they are.

She is a lynchpin of the feminist Stasi in Toronto, which is itself the black, flaming bunghole of feminist ideology made manifest in the Western world. She and her sister haridans planned to take this fellow down, according to testimony.

When feminism finally faces the music -which it must - that battle will begin and end in Toronto.

NidStyles • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 06:23 AM

You know, if some of these dudes cracked and started shooting these women, I can't say I would be surprised.

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 04:37 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 05:44 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 05:46 AM

[removed]

[deleted] 16 July, 2015 06:56 AM

[deleted]

Gordatwork • 0 points • 16 July, 2015 03:32 PM

Where are you getting this information?

sophisting • 1 point • 17 July, 2015 04:58 AM

It was on Sept. 11 when Reilly began to be concerned for her safety, she testified. She and a group of friends met at a west-end bar and were tweeting about their evening, she testified. "A whole lot of ugly at the Cadillac Lounge tonight," @greg_a_elliott tweeted. The tweet made her fear that Elliott was at the same bar and search the room to make sure he was not, she said.

JohnPeel • -2 points • 16 July, 2015 11:58 PM

New account, first two posts here and only here.

Fuck off with your leftist entryism. It's patently obvious what you're trying to do.