

Massive censorship on reddit of discussion relating to migrant gang rapes with clear implications for red pill.

January 12, 2016 | 759 upvotes | by [Keepsalowprofile](#)

As red pillers we are under constant attack for our views by SJW's. I think everyone needs to realise how serious this is! 29 out of 30 posts on some threads are censored and the mods are actively manipulating the discussion.

I can't link to it because Reddit bots automatically censor it.

So try this out:

Go to world news and click on the migrant rape thread and type " un " in front of reddit in the url

This shows the comments that were censored - everything highlighted has been deleted by the moderators

Maybe 29 out of every 30 posts are censored. Reasonable thought out well written posts that have nothing wrong with them except that they are at odds from the moderators political leanings.

Go to TwoXchromosomes and you will see similar censorship on discussion there - in fact they have even locked the post!

I hope red pill mods don't censor this as being off topic or otherwise. It is a demonstration of the war we are in with feminists and leftists.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

redpillschool[M] [score hidden] 12 January, 2016 06:07 PM* stickied comment

Go ahead and post the unreddit link and I'll approve it.

Edit: Hijacking top comment:

https://unreddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/3zxxhi/reports_of_sexual_assaults_on_women_across/

Moneyley • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 06:19 PM

I wonder if anybody else has tried. I posted it just now and it was removed.

redpillschool • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 06:48 PM

Automod lacks regex look-arounds, which means our level of control over what it removes is really quite limited. We wanted to remove all inter-reddit links, but unfortunately with the toolset, we can't even whitelist our own sub, let alone domains that are similar to reddit.com (unreddit)

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 07:45 PM

What kind of regex is it? If it's something you have the power to edit, I could try to draft up one that blocks only Reddit and allows posts from this sub. I haven't messed with it too much over in my sub, but I really ought to.

redpillschool • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 07:52 PM

Automoderator uses RE2 regex engine which does not support lookarounds. Source

That means you can't have a rule that says:

Remove link where text = reddit.com/ where not followed by r/theredpill

Removal rules supersede approval rules, so we can't simply pre-approve the redpill posts and then scan for deletable phrases.

Further, we cannot preapprove posts that include reddit.com AND the redpill because we won't know if both apply to the same link.

You need regex lookarounds, and they're simply not supported.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 11:44 PM

Wow, that's really stupid. I'm surprised that they're not. Also TIL that's what those are called. I've used a few for work, and guess I've taken them for granted.

AlphaJesus • 8 points • 12 January, 2016 06:18 PM

I just want it to be known that you're the hero Gotham deserves. A dark knight, a watchful protector, a silent guardian. And to everyone who has ever contributed to rp I fucking salute you. Red or dead fellas!

B_uckets • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 07:17 PM

Might wanna mention the Undelete subreddit too. Automatically tracks deleted topics from the top 100 of All.

Moneyley • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:16 PM

https://unreddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/3zxxhi/reports_of_sexual_assaults_on_women_across/

putin_vor • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:38 PM

Here:

https://unreddit.com/r/worldnews/comments/3zxxhi/reports_of_sexual_assaults_on_women_across/

(takes a while to load)

That's 5327 comments deleted in just one post. Fucking insane.

[deleted] • 403 points • 12 January, 2016 09:01 AM

I was banned from / r / e u r o p e for writing something critical of the immigration policy. It was quickly the top comment with at nearly 200 and it was gilded. In a message from the moderators it was said that the reason is that I had written "hate speech" about "white genocide."

The astonishing thing about it is that I write in an extremely moderate tone. Even here on TRP I tend to be pretty moderate and over there I clean it up tremendously. There was nothing hateful in what I said, at any point. The mere act of criticizing political correctness was sufficient for it to be deemed hate speech.

If anyone is interested, I've pasted below the comment which got me banned from / r / e u r o p e :

What is happening in Germany, in my opinion, is a manifestation of a larger culture shift in the West which has been occurring gradually over years. I think we are in a crux of seeing whether this culture shift will continue in the same direction, or not.

When I was younger I identified as left-leaning, politically, so it annoys me when people use the term "leftist" as an insult. But in this case I think it is somewhat relevant. Leftism, identity politics, political correctness, social justice, and the idea that designated "victim" status means that some people are just more "equal" than others. (for full clarification I don't think of myself as 'right' or 'left', i think the political spectrum is kind of artificial). This same thing is happening in other parts of the Western world but it is being expressed in various ways. I'm not a conservative, or a reactionary, or a racist, or anti-immigration, or Islamophobic, or any slur that is used by the left to shame and silence dissenting voices. I consider myself a reasonable person who goes by the facts, and I've studied political issues like this nearly every day of my adult life. And I remember that in EVERY single thread about the immigration crisis in Europe, there were people who, confronted with the idea that Europeans might become a minority in their own country, said "What's wrong with that? Cultures change." Another type of person suggested that Europeans deserve this, because of political events of centuries past. Mind you I'm not saying everyone believes this - but a critical mass of people DID believe this that it says something about where the median of our culture is currently sitting.

I think there's something fundamentally wrong when a people see nothing worth protecting in their own culture. That so many Europeans said "Yes it's okay if we are the minority and Arabs/Africans are the majority of Europe because we will adapt to their culture." For me this reveals that something is out of balance.

This feeling that Germans have I think is a result of the fact that this "leftism," and I really hate using the word but I think you will understand what I mean, has reached a critical mass of popularity that now it's taken the reins in government. And we are starting to see what it means. Especially Germans.

And especially Swedes. And I found there something kind of poetic, or ironic, or some such word, about the fact that right after I discovered that Norway is holding "please don't rape us" classes and Sweden is admitting known ISIS agents and giving them free apartments and preferential job placement, the next day I read how every teenager in Sweden will be given a book about the importance of feminism.

I'm not against feminism. But as the OP of this post explains, we are so feminist until Muslims hurt women and then we forget all about or feminism. I know that this is an unpopular opinion but I think very often that our left-leaning "isms" are just insincere ideological hobbies. I saw more outrage from feminists about men sitting comfortably on busses than Muslim girls in Europe being murdered by their own families, or otherwise deprive them of our human rights. But a leftist can't criticize Muslims - they're on the new leftist "victim" ladder maybe even higher than women.

With such obscene hypocrisy becoming the norm, what exactly is our priority here? We misremember history in a way to remember Western as bad and Non-western as good because this aligns with the new politically accepted version of reality. We can't talk about the millions of Europeans who were enslaved by Muslim countries. We can't talk about the role that the Ottoman Turks, after centuries of domination, played in influencing the politics of the Middle Eastern world. We can't talk about the number of times that it says in the Koran that murder gets you into heaven. We have to say that all religions are the same, their behavior is the same, and Christians care about suicide bombings just as much as Muslims - even though any person with eyes can see that they don't. We can only remember what we did wrong - they are beyond reproach. I'm not suggesting that imperialism didn't occur - but I am stating, loud and clear, that I feel uncomfortable mentioning these facts because I know I will be met with hostility for knowing them. I'll be insulted, probably called a racist, and maybe called a nazi, for knowing truths.

When a certain culture is hostile to facts, what does that say about it ?

I have seen a lot of threads where the morally righteous pro-immigration leftists will just call any person stupid or ignorant or racist who even questions the wisdom of open borders. I cannot believe my eyes that I see this kind of thing is even real. But this is a new normal. "Progressive" is no longer what it used to mean, and "progressives" no longer use facts or believe in human equality or equal treatment under the law.

Imagine that - we're at a point where believing people ought to be treated equally under the law is a controversial belief. This isn't what "liberal" used to mean.

We went from the culture of "I may not agree with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it," to the culture of "if someone from the officially designated PC special groups threatens to murder you for exercising your basic human right to free expression, then "free speech has consequences."

Socially speaking (not economically) I think our pendulum is swinging so far to the left that absurd elements of imbalance are becoming more and more visible.

I hope that these events will cause a culture shift not towards conservatism, but towards reason. That we can make decisions not based on ideology, but based on what is best for our societies. I saw a lot of Europeans during this crisis who genuinely seemed not to believe that what was best for their society was all that important, as long as they stuck to their ideology.

That is troubling. Progressive, egalitarian, wealthy societies are a historical rarity and we have no reason to assume their institutions are invincible. Why is it racist to say that there are circumstances conducive to the health of such societies, and circumstances which erode might erode the institutions that make those societies such desirable places to live?

I understand that this is a divisive issue and unfortunately / r / e u r o p e has fallen into that sad habit of downvoting dissenting opinions. I'm not against anyone. I'm just trying to keep an open mind and observing what I see as best I can. I invite other people to share their perspective.

I have only respect for the German people (since this thread was about Germany) and while I am just another anonymous observer, I hope to see them finding a new equilibrium, which is both humanitarian but takes the well-being and beliefs of the German people into account when formulating their policy. Oh, and happy new years :)

sweetleef • 84 points • 12 January, 2016 12:38 PM

I was also banned from r / europe, for criticising their censorship of the Cologne refugee mega-rape story. If you're pushing an agenda that doesn't fit with reality, at some point you'll have to ban discussion of reality and punish those who point out the inconsistencies. This has been the pattern of every religion and political movement, and the religion of PC is no different.

B_uckets • 43 points • 12 January, 2016 03:24 PM*

Sorry to hijack your comment, but I think people here will want to know about this:

Subscribe to the subreddit called Undelete if you want to keep tabs on the censorship. Deleted posts from the top 100 (of All) are automatically listed there, and there's a decent amount of discussion too. It needs more active users upvoting actual censorship though.

There's also a bot that attempts to retrieve removal reasons (flair) and mod explanations so it's easier to distinguish legit removals from censorship.

If you really want to see how deep the rabbit hole goes, subscribe to **Longtail** as well. That sub shows anything deleted from the top 1,000 of All. Far more difficult to sift through because of the sheer quantity, and no one seems to be doing it right now. Probably a gold mine of censorship if you have the patience to dig through it though.

I believe even mentioning the Undelete subreddit is enough to get you banned from most default subs (or filtered by AutoMod), so don't bother trying to tell people about it outside of subs like this.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 04:39 PM

[permanently deleted]

B_uckets • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 04:45 PM

Possibly Unreddit? You'll have to Google that -- I think automod will filter my post if I type out the full address or explanation here.

Not sure how well it works though, only heard about it within the past couple days.

AcrossHallowedGround • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 05:23 PM*

I tried the un thing OP said, I just got a 404.

EDIT: You have to go into the comments and then do it.

trplurker220 points 12 January, 2016 09:26 AM* [recovered]

And you just described why Trump is so popular in the USA.

He is saying shit that many want to say but can't out of fear of that same social attacks you describe.

Just_in78 • 46 points • 12 January, 2016 05:28 PM

Exactly. It almost feels like Trump is grinding the pendulum slowly to a halt, and might just reverse the swing. It is a legitimate fear, in both America and outside, that harsh consequences can result from defying and fighting back against these sorts of movements. Trying to have a meaningful debate just ends in buzz words and hurt feepees.

Just look at that Canadian who's threatened with jail just for disagreeing with a feminist, or any of the many people that lose their jobs because people dox them and their employers are flooded with bs. Is Trump a perfect candidate? Of course not, be he also has the balls to say what society can't, and we definitely don't need 4 more years of shillary or Bernie encouraging and egging on this shit show either. I don't necessarily hate Bernie, but the fact that he let a bunch of BLM tards take the podium from him discourages me.

gekkozorz • 32 points • 12 January, 2016 06:15 PM

I don't necessarily hate Bernie, but the fact that he let a bunch of BLM tards take the podium from him discourages me.

Yeah, he looked like a fucking cuck up there. Head down and eyes averted as these shrieking cunts take the mic and yell about nothing. There are a lot of things you can say about The Donald, but you know he wouldn't have taken that invasion lying down.

Thengine • 23 points • 12 January, 2016 07:58 PM

He did the right thing. It was a no win situation, but he took the high road.

I wouldn't put that on my top 50 list of reasons to choose a candidate. Kinda sad that someone would weight it so heavily in their decision making process.

waynebradysworld • 12 points • 12 January, 2016 09:24 PM*

It sounds like you understand conservative talking points, but not the inner workings of what it takes to be a respected, successful conservative man.

The way people react to situations reveals alot about their personality. Sanders lost me at that moment the same way Rubio lost me when I found out he was in cahoots with Mark Zuckerberg. Some doodles can't be undone.

Thengine • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 09:38 PM

It sounds like you understand conservative talking points, but not the inner workings of what it takes to be a **respected, successful conservative man**.

Not sure what you mean here. So I am guessing not. But more to the point, what the hell are you talking about? Sanders isn't a conservative.

The way people react to situations reveals alot about their personality. Both cucks

That's quite the stretch there. I'm not sure how that reaction makes them cucks. Still doesn't rank in my top 50 criteria for a president. Going to go back to what I just said:

Kinda sad that someone would weight it so heavily in their decision making process.

waynebradysworld • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 09:47 PM

Not sure what you mean here. So I am guessing not. But more to the point, what the hell are you talking about? Sanders isn't a conservative.

Exactly! He's soft as fuck, a career politician who has done nothing his entire life besides spend the tax money of other people. TRP lifestyle is conservative and traditional in many senses; Bernie embodies the blue pill.

That's quite the stretch there. I'm not sure how that reaction makes them cucks. Still doesn't rank in my top 50 criteria for a president. Going to go back to what I just said:

Picture your microphone as an LTR. you've spent 60+ years building this LTR. You are showing off to an entire ENTIRE stadium of people how u get down. Then Chaddettqua Thunderpuss rolls through, snatches up your bitch, in front of thousands of people. What do you do? Hang your head in shame, do nothing, and leave the stage. That doesn't sound cucklike to you?

Kinda sad that someone would weight it so heavily in their decision making process.

Kinda sad you don't know a cuck when you see it.

Karmastocracy3 points 12 January, 2016 10:30 PM* **[recovered]**

Nah, this is when theory clashes with reality.

When Bernie stood off to the side to let them have their moment it proved how weak their argument was, gave him the power to accurately criticize their movement, dissuaded the event from happening again in the future, and took away the significant ammunition it would have given his opponents.

It was a calculated and savvy political move and that's how a mature alpha should handle an issue in public.

waynebradysworld • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 10:41 PM*

This IS when theory clashes with reality.

In reality he got punked, looked weak, let down his supporters, did nothing to end the BLM movement, and gave away his power.

In theory he looked like the bigger man, and didn't somehow get booted off of his own stage

Your hamster is spinning, friend. Control it.

Just out of curiosity... How many times (if any) did you vote for Obama? Are you one of those people who got "tricked" the first time around?

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 09:21 AM

It proved how fucking stupid BLM and it's supporters are but you can bet Bernies a supporter of it.

firstpitchthrow • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 05:54 AM

I don't think he did. They took the podium and spouted non-sense that makes anything Trump could possibly say look sane by comparison. The biggest nut-cases I've ever seen are the people who said what those protesters said. Read or watch what they said that day, if Trump is crazy, that stuff is way beyond.

Trump rule #1: never apologize. Apologies look weak and apologies cede negotiating leverage to your opponent. Looking weak looks un-presidential, and as a general rule, people will always favor strong and wrong over weak and right. Right or wrong doesn't matter, the

perception of strength is important.

Sdom1 • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 04:01 PM

He did the right thing. It was a no win situation, but he took the high road.

How was allowing people to hijack a private event "taking the high road?"

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 09:16 AM

But Trump would have Stumped them, Bernie just took the cucking

Imightbeflirting • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 04:45 AM

That said, he did cancel his speech in disgust and walked off. Sort of a "fuck it," moment. Not the most "red pill" thing, but it's not like he integrated them into his platform or whatever or just let it go on.

plenkton • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 09:19 PM

While the event may have occurred organically, an opposing leader could have spurred them to do so.

APookIsAPook • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 10:24 PM

Trump has a different audience. If Bernie did what Trump does it would have turned out even worse. Bernie was fucked either way in that scenario, at least he avoided "Privileged old white politician silences black activists" headlines.

Tipsy_Gnostalgic • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 09:17 PM

I don't necessarily hate Bernie, but the fact that he let a bunch of BLM tards take the podium from him discourages me.

Not only that, but as MisterMetokur (youtube) said, he is a political piñata. Promise the masses you will give them free stuff and hope they will vote for you in exchange.

Just_in78 • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 09:49 PM

Well with enough restructuring you can make a lot of money pop up out-of nowhere.

In America, we spend so much on meds and college because there is little regulation and enough of a free market to allow the prices to get that high (hence those cases that make the news of some CEO raising the price of a drug by 5000% for no reason other than money), and tuition prices going up to build that new luxury hot tub/pool for the dorms.

The argument against socializing the programs are that, being financially motivated, more people strive harder to make breakthroughs in technology, quality, etc. This is seen with a lot of the best universities and colleges in the world being in America (they're financially motivated to better themselves in various ways) and lots of new medical advancements (such as drugs and procedures) being headed in America. Socialized programs that tax the people are cheaper, but they lessens/remove the financial motivation to improve said program.

Back on topic, overpromising is an easy way to garner support, and he can just blame Congress/Senate if he can't get the people what they want.

realityinhd • 53 points • 12 January, 2016 05:17 PM

Exactly. Most people I know that will vote for trump, aren't doing it because they are a bigoted bible thumping hill billy. They are actually all very intelligent. They don't even agree with many of his policies (which many people realize he will not enact but hes just riling up the bigots to vote for him). They are voting for him because he's the closest thing to real in the elections. He tells it like it is, which is a breathe of fresh air in the PC society that has all of a sudden taken over.

wile_E_coyote_genius • 21 points • 13 January, 2016 12:50 AM

I'll get downvoted here, but that's the reason people like Bernie Sanders as well. I'd argue that this is the first time, in a long time, that the U.S. Has a (slim) chance of two candidates running for president who actually speak their minds - a dangerous thing at the best of times.

realityinhd • 6 points • 13 January, 2016 03:19 PM

Bernie Sanders and his ideals is literally the feminist movements metaphorical equivalent in the economics world.

However I did want to add that o do agree with the notion that bernie sanders is a pretty honest stand up guy. I very strongly disagree with most of his policies, but still respect him.

[deleted] • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 09:27 AM

Bernie is cut from the same cloth as these people. He supports the stat quo of anti-white marxism being the religion of our social elite.

Dr_HoaxArthurWilmoth • 4 points • 13 January, 2016 06:03 AM

Take that word "bigot" out of your vocabulary, it is a tool used by SJW's to shame opposition into silence.

Along with "problematic" and "racist".

LuckyLuke23 • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 05:31 AM

this is why the fact i think trump will WIN or get close to winning.

why? the fucks he gives are -100000000000000

it's not even 0 anymore. the kid is running from PRESIDENT of the usa and he doesn't have ANY FILTERS. you think someone on his team would tell him to stfu about the Mexicans and stop bashing women because he could loose there vote.

nope, he is doing him to the core. thats why he will win

skulk2fade • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 10:49 PM

The problem is, I am from Australia, all leaders seem to be spineless these days, this is why we need someone like Trump. I mean he is no Winston Churchill, but he would be better than Hillary Clinton if a mass war was to break out.

NULLTROOPER • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 05:06 AM

What mass war? we live in the most peaceful era of human existence. We need a strong leader yes, but we need someone who is looking forward not backwards. Trump is also actually insane he actually says racist things and most of his comments are outright lies. He is a terrible candidate fueled by a hateful conservative portion of the populace that doesn't have a clear grasp on reality.

Nofap192192 • 33 points • 12 January, 2016 12:45 PM

You think this is all a coincidence? NSA surveillance was a conspiracy theory until it got proven. I think we just got proof for mass coordinated western media propaganda. Not sure why they want the immigration thing so bad though, guess we'll find out soon enough.

Fred_Flintstone • 18 points • 12 January, 2016 05:45 PM

To understand why mass immigration is being pushed at this scale and over this time period you must look at a 50-100 year scale of large institutions and ideologies.

This guy founded the Paneuropean union which became the European Union:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Nikolaus_von_Coudenhove-Kalergi

His book talks about engineering a new race of people who were half eurasian and half african. An international race of ... people would be the ruling class, instead of the preexisting anglosaxons and germanics. He was a jewish supremacist. When Hitler was talking about fighting 'international jews' he was talking about people like this. History has largely written over and forgotten this. Victors write history. For example allies genocided more people (mostly Stalin) than the germans yet we see ourselves as the goodies.

Two quotes from his Nikolaus von Coudenhove Kalergi's book:

The man of the future will be of mixed race. Today's races and classes will gradually disappear owing to the vanishing of space, time, and prejudice. The Eurasian-Negroid race of the future, similar in its appearance to the Ancient Egyptians, will replace the diversity of peoples with a diversity of individuals. ”

Instead of destroying European Jewry, Europe, against its own will, refined and educated this people into a future leader-nation through this artificial selection process. No wonder that this people, that escaped Ghetto-Prison, developed into a spiritual nobility of Europe. Therefore a gracious Providence provided Europe with a new race of nobility by the Grace of Spirit. This happened at the moment when Europe's feudal aristocracy became dilapidated, and thanks to Jewish emancipation.

The paneuropean union essentially morphed into the EU. These are still the beliefs of the EU.

Current day examples:

“We still nurse a sense of our homogeneity and difference from others, and that’s precisely what the European Union, in my view, should be doing its best to undermine.” - Peter Sutherland, EU Commissioner and head of the World Trade Organization.

The goal is to meet the challenge of racial interbreeding...”. “Not to intermarry racially is bad for the survival of the country.” - Nicholas Sarkozy, ex-President of France.

“Germany is to be contained from outside and heterogenized from the inside by influx, ‘diluted’ so to speak.” - Joschka Fischer, ex Foreign Minister and Vice Chancellor of Germany.

Ultimately the aim is to racemix anglosaxons, gemanics, slavs etc. out of existence, it has been the aim for 80 years or so now. Recently people started talking a lot more about it though.

DarkCrime • 6 points • 13 January, 2016 04:24 AM

Diversity for thee but not for me.

In Israel:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=irhw6bj5pa0>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8iUhAxvTapA>

<http://www.jpost.com/National-News/Eritrean-migrants-resettled-from-Israel-to-Sweden-337414>

In Europe:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5jl-OJJVAEg>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QuYKtwnzG7M>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=riQh4Qpvxm4>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=x5Ntc42QpjQ>

<http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/sep/21/rabbis-david-cameron-refugees-kindertransport>

In the USA.

<http://i.imgur.com/TBnkkOE.png>

<http://pbs.twimg.com/media/CAEoCCNU8AAWvuH.jpg>

<http://i.imgur.com/AZU3bfe.png>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q90kmUbEv7c>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1ACt3_yq0bU

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 08:34 PM

[permanently deleted]

putinbusch • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 10:40 AM

Whats your opinion 90 medaphonil

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 12:15 AM

"Eurasion_Negroid" would be the best Reddit username of all time

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 06:08 PM

And why the fuck is the purpose of that? Decimate the blond population?

letsdocrack • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 06:38 PM

Long term? To bring about an end to prejudice.

If everyone is a Eurasian-Negroid, then there aren't Europeans against Muslims, White Americans against Africans, Chinese against S.E. Asians, if we are all an intermingled race then we might stop trying to kill each other. Or at least, that's the theory.

skoobled • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 09:20 PM

The naivety is thinking we humans won't just find other lines to draw between ourselves. Fundamental proto-tribalism probably runs even deeper than social groupings of any kind. Better to accept that the only thing that could ever "cure" this is hundreds and hundreds of thousands of years of evolution

KillYourselfLiving6 points 12 January, 2016 09:37 PM* [recovered]

This has to be one of the most blue-eyes comments I have read. Do you honestly believe that if you mix through every single race on this planet, that you will end racism and people will stop trying to kill each other?

People are always going to form groups and discriminate against others. On a long enough time scale you might be able to properly mix everyone, but we are talking about hundreds of years. As long as that doesn't happen, people will still discriminate against other shades of black/brown/white/etc.

If not racism because of the skin color, it will be eye-size, religion, height, weight, cock size, etc. Trust me, mankind will always find a way to distinguish between people.

letsdocrack • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 11:12 PM

No, I don't. Those aren't my views, I was explaining what the presumed purpose was behind the theory, I don't agree with it at all.

[deleted] • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 09:31 AM

A low IQ race of people are easier to control. European nations have been the most subverted but also fought back the hardest

southernmost • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 09:29 PM

I think they drastically misunderstand human nature if they think we won't find things to hate even if a genetically homogeneous world population were achieved.

Dr_HoaxArthurWilmoth • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 06:07 AM

Not to end prejudice, but to destroy a homogenous population by diluting and destroying their identity of race/religion and nation.

The end goal is an easily controlled population. Cattle. Goyim.

Firespit • 1 point • 15 January, 2016 07:28 PM

That can't be the real reason, since the elite is using conflict as one of their primary tools to rule. It is much more advantageous to segregate and stir up conflicts all over the world. That way people are much more concerned with fighting each other than to look to where the real enemy is.

letsdocrack • 1 point • 15 January, 2016 08:37 PM

Drive down the price of labor.

Azzmo • 5 points • 13 January, 2016 01:03 AM

Not sure why they want the immigration thing so bad

In a cohesive and strong society the people have high expectations. They want resources for the masses. Opportunity for the masses. Education, Health Care, Environmental Protection, Regulations, Opportunity.

How do you remove this expectation from the populace?

You find a way to fracture them and make them afraid. That's what's going on now. A generation of propaganda has created enough political capital that the craziest fucking thing you'd ever have imagined is actually happening:

People are allowing their government and oligarchs to **invite** detrimental foreigners into their own nation and *protect them after they commit crimes once there*. This will change the cultural expectations from

expectation of opportunity and wealth and health to an expectation of a modicum of security. Fear in their own nations. Unbelievable.

Kathulos • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 03:59 PM

I remember reading an article somewhere about an 'army' of Russian bloggers. The article stated that they were paid to write blogs that subtly expressed a pro Putin opinion. If conversations by dissidents were discovered on message boards they would be overwhelmed with paid shills shouting them down.

ISreali has their internet defense force. I just wonder how much of the american 'defense force against illegitimate opinions' is useful idiots and if we are financing some think tank of bloggers via our taxes whose job it is to influence public opinion.

Although they probably get all the useful idiots they need from American universities. Similar to the 'unpaid' groups of feminists editing Wikipedia.

lala_xyyz • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:55 AM

When Russians do it it's called "troll factories" in the MSM. When the West does it it's called Human Science Operations Cell and it's not widely reported.

Kathulos • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 10:15 PM

Interesting article. Thanks for the link

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 January, 2016 09:43 PM

The interesting thing about this, is that they are using people. Yes, they are pushing false narrative and distracting people, derailing conversation and arguments, but you can spot them from a mile away. They never make good arguments. If you understand rhetoric you see what they are saying is all hot air. The possibility also exists that we, ironically, are changing the views of the shills by their being exposed to our conversation.

bluedrygrass • 8 points • 12 January, 2016 01:21 PM

Not sure why they want the immigration thing so bad though,

It isn't a mistery at all nowadays. Head over to darkenlightment for a quick start, but there are dozens of blogs discussing the politics behind.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 03:57 PM

I've heard them referenced on TRP many times. I visited it more than once and at no point found anything worth sticking around for, and I walked in willing to consider what they had to say.

Fred_Flintstone • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 05:21 PM

Fair enough.

Here are a couple useful summaries for anyone interested:

<http://hestiasociety.org/bestofnrx.html>

<http://www.socialmatter.net/2016/01/01/a-huge-success-reviewing-social-matter-in-2015/>

<http://www.humanbiologicaldiversity.com/>

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 03:22 PM

That sub is such an edge fest. Can't fucking stand it.

[deleted] • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 12:58 PM

No, I don't think it's a coincidence. But the dominant theory about who would organize such a thing is that it's "the jews" and I never found this argument very compelling.

redestofthereds • 5 points • 13 January, 2016 03:53 AM*

I never found this argument very compelling.

Well shit look at Hollywood. Even though they're only two percent of the population here in the states, they are over-represented in a bunch of movies and shows.

You don't think feminism was started by some Jew. Or how about liberalism?

They are the ones who are pushing the idea that all people are equal. Maybe you believe that and that's okay. I sure as hell would want that to be true.

But men and women being equal to each other? Come on, as an enlightened TRP man you know that is utter bullshit.

Keep going down the rabbit hole. I did. I don't even look at Game of Thrones the same way anymore. There's way too much of subversion going on in that show for me to ignore.

But alas, one idea that they pushed benefited me as my parents were born in Mexico. If it wasn't for multiculturalism, I probably wouldn't be here.

Danimal876 • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 04:35 PM

The main Jewish organizations have pushed for open borders for quite some time. Individual Jews can often be against it, but the leadership has always been uncomfortable with homogeneous European societies, as they've historically been considered and consider themselves the outsiders in Europe.

Dr_HoaxArthurWilmoth • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 06:11 AM

Replace Jews with "Globalists".

Is it too hard to believe that a small group of elitists believe they know what is best for the general population and to ensure that the wealth stays in their families coffers forever?

The Rothschilds have been kingmakers and breakers for generations. Look at the Bush family as well.

They are not all Jews, but such a large percentage of the globalists are part of the tribe that it would be ignorant to discount that fact.

Nofap192192 • -1 points • 12 January, 2016 01:00 PM

Nah probably not Jews, but who knows

Mr_Donnerhuhn • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 04:18 PM

marxism, which heavily draws on the jewish influence of it's founders.

Momo_dollar • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 04:28 PM*

Well many western nations want Apple and Google to open up backdoor entry so they can read peoples encrypted messages etc. What better way to get it then to let 100000s of immigrants in from the ME and

then say "opppps 10% of them are communicating with IS via whatsapp etc so we need this bill to pass"
Truth be told all the males who came don't give two shits about their country, their religion , or their people. The ones that do won't leave they choose their side based on who they think the bad guy is and who is the group that best fits their ideology best, is doing the most to fight the 'bad guy' and they stay and fight.

SlowWing • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 04:30 PM

why they want the immigration thing so bad

lower salaries innit. Wage down pressure.

Steel-Mech • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 05:11 PM

Climbing a few rungs further down the rabbit hole, there Hungary's government has accused billionaire globalist George Soros of funding and fueling the migrant crisis. To what ends we may never know, but he hasn't denied the accusations. If any further proof was needed that some people do indeed *want* the Islamification of Europe George Soros is your person of interest. Source: via Breitbart news

Keepsalowprofile[S] • 48 points • 12 January, 2016 09:13 AM

Great comment, long but we'll worth the effort to read.

[deleted] • 32 points • 12 January, 2016 09:14 AM

Thank you. Imagine what it says that I was banned for such an opinion.

Madison • 31 points • 12 January, 2016 02:08 PM

I was banned for posting this in a thread about the women getting assaulted in cologne;

'I wonder how many of these women were blindly waving welcome signs a few months ago?'

So honestly it does not take a lot to get banned. Lefties are just scared because public opinion is rapidly swinging to the right in Europe.

reigorius • 17 points • 12 January, 2016 02:38 PM

Honestly I'm not surprised you got banned. You indirectly implied women asked for it. Now, whether that's true or not, this is canon fodder for the trigger happy SJW mods.

Mold your statement in their lingo and point of view to leave an impact. Hinting that feminism is a wrong turn we took, giving of a smell of sweeping generalisation of minorities, rejecting the embrace of human fucking kindness, yadda yadda, is directly translated to misogyny, racism and egotistical self-centeredness. Hence a ban.

You have to be a sublime writer to instill a nagging doubt in their minds without them realising. Usually our well intended efforts are too direct, too blunt, too easy to spot.

Steel-Mech • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 05:06 PM

It's harder on reddit, but if you're confronting one of these people in person the best way to beat them is to use circular logic to cause them to argue against their own points. Trick them into lambasting their own ideas and the cognitive dissonance will crush them.

newgrounds • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:45 PM

Yet the hamster still runs.

Adeus_Ayrton • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 08:05 PM

Do you think that you were banned because you were on some sort of 'list' ? The one in which I happened to find my user name in, some months prior ?

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 02:30 AM

i don't think I was on a list. I think it drew very effective, concentrated attention in a way critical of the philosophy of the mods. It wasn't my extremism - it was that people agreed with me.

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 09:51 AM

It says sanity remains in this world yet.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 03:13 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool • 10 points • 12 January, 2016 06:16 PM

Surprising or not, TRP was one of the few subs that did not censor the subject.

I get that we have a reputation for removing a lot of stuff, but our metric is Quality vs Shitposting. Of course we wouldn't censor this subject.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 07:07 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool • 10 points • 12 January, 2016 07:13 PM

It was like through a paradoxical chain of events, TRP with that thread turned into a carrier of real Women Rights standard and kicked the feminists right in their fat asses.

I've said it before, but I think TRP are the only ones that treat women like equals.

itgscv1 • 6 points • 13 January, 2016 12:28 AM

There have been studies that showed that when men treat women exactly equal to other men, people think the men are being sexist. When the men treated women preferentially, the same people thought that it was equality.

I think this is a huge reason why people look at TRP and write us off as misogynistic shitlords.

dr_warlock • 4 points • 13 January, 2016 03:37 AM

Women are wonderful and whiteknighting + women's in-group bias is a biological religion. It transcends age and race.

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 03:47 PM

I was over there for a while, it felt too cozy with neonazism for me to want to stick around very long. and all they did was call people "cucks" in every thread. Yawn.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 04:40 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 02:45 AM

The word "yawn" does not imply offense. It implies boredom. I go where the discussion is interesting. "look at this stupid cuck faggot" is not interesting.

[deleted] • 20 points • 12 January, 2016 11:30 AM

Such a shame when productive comments like this are shut down. Everyone loses when rational discourse is silenced.

iliketreeslikereally • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 08:05 PM

Damn, I remember your comment! It was the most moderate, well-thought comment in the entire thread! You got banned for THAT?

I am starting to dislike this world.

[deleted] • 4 points • 13 January, 2016 02:29 AM

I am starting to dislike this world.

You may want to narrow your criteria slightly :)

oakbasedpaint23 points 12 January, 2016 10:54 AM **[recovered]**

Good comment. I'll only say that this is what the "right/conservative" voters have been dealing with for decades. Egalitarianism hasn't existed in progressive politics for a long time; things like affirmative action, divorce rape, etc are long standing leftist traditions. It isn't that this is a recent culture shift, it's simply that, I believe, the left has become emboldened in the pursuit of their ideology, on one hand, while reality is careering toward their illogical beliefs on the other.

In other words, as Ayn Rand put it: "We can ignore reality, but we cannot ignore the consequences of ignoring reality."

My point being, welcome to the side of reason friend. We've been fighting this battle with these psychopaths for decades.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 11:44 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 05:51 PM

GOP Conservatism \neq the Right. Their policies follow in the shadow of the left, never really offering an alternative. Democrat and Republican are pretty much the same.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:40 AM

Democrat and Republican are pretty much the same.

I don't feel too good about either of them.

Drmadanthonywayne • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 10:29 PM

@Down_with_Whoever You are painting conservatives with a broad brush and demonstrating a lack of understanding of the underlying issues.

Religious conservatives oppose sex education as they believe it encourages promiscuity. You can certainly argue the point, but I wouldn't describe such an opinion as evil.

They oppose abortion because they consider it to be murder. I think most people would oppose at will abortion @ nine months, and most would probably support abortion shortly after conception. Again, you can argue over where to draw the line, but I wouldn't consider drawing the line too early to fit the definition of evil.

Regarding social programs, the idea that social programs may actually do more harm than good should not be foreign to someone on this subreddit. In fact, it has a direct bearing on the red pill in that the state is encouraging hypergamy by protecting women from the consequences of promiscuity via social programs. Women are free to fuck whoever they want, then we'll tax the betas to pay for their bastard children.

Regarding healthcare/slavery, the point he was trying to make was that when you claim that someone has a right to a service, you are saying they have a right to force someone else to provide that service. There can be no natural right to something that must be provided by someone else.

[deleted] • 0 points • 13 January, 2016 02:20 AM

You are painting conservatives with a broad brush

Yes. Because I'm not going to sit here and write a book analyzing American politics. I gave an example of why Republicans are very unappealing to me because of endorsing harmful policies. I understand WHY they endorse them, but that doesn't make them right about it. Being against sex education is one of those policies that, when looked at objectively, has no valid justification and is 100% bad in its outcome, and that this fact does not dissuade them is indicative of why they are so unappealing to me.

Drmadanthywayne • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 04:39 AM*

Most Republicans, whatever their view on the merits of sex education, would rather that such issues be left to the states or localities to decide. The constitution, after all, has little to say on the subject.

Thus, whether you agree with the most extreme members of the religious right or not on the issue of sex education is largely irrelevant when voting for a federal office. Voting for your local school board is, of course, another matter entirely.

The point I'm trying to make is that the danger to our nation comes not so much from religious nut jobs wanting to teach abstinence instead of sex Ed, but rather from religious nut jobs who want to kill us. Worse yet are the left wing idiots who refuse to recognize the threat and seek to cover up any evidence of rape, murder, etc committed by migrants because it doesn't fit their anti-white male narrative.

The greatest threat to the continued survival of Western Civilization comes not from the right, but from the left.

ArchAngelN09 • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 12:10 PM

at this point, it seems both parties have incredible faults. Liberals seem to do nothing but lie and slander others for personal gain and conservatives are simple idiots as you said. It's a pretty fucked up situation, this election will decide the trend for the next 20 years in the US

rootofunity-6 points 12 January, 2016 02:11 PM **[recovered]**

Please use refine your definition of the usage of the term liberal. It's wildly misused.

Liberal:

1. Open to new behavior or opinions and willing to discard traditional values
2. Favorable to or respectful of individual rights and freedoms
3. (In a political context) favoring maximum individual liberty in political and social reform

I mean no attack or anything of the sort and I'm not attempting any sort of debate or argument. Really, I am trying to help because the instant I hear anyone use the term liberal they instantly appear less intelligent.

Lastly, I agree it's a fucked up situation. Republican, Democrat all of the viable candidates are terrible. While there are the Republican & Democratic parties none of this will change but that's an entirely different discussion.

[deleted] • 12 points • 12 January, 2016 02:47 PM

Stop language policing other people. Every word in language has its own definition to different people, dictionaries are guidelines and not laws. A word like Liberal that has so much controversy and a "loaded" feeling to it, will have the loosest of guidelines.

There are hundreds of examples of this. You don't get to claim what liberal means to the person that used it.

If we were all using the text book or original definition as the word then Liberal is actually closer to the modern Libertarian or "Classic Liberal", there is a reason those two groups aren't called Liberals anymore.

When he said Liberal, you knew what he meant. We all did. Stop playing into identity politics or language policing, it's a feminine tactic.

rootofunity • -1 points • 12 January, 2016 03:14 PM **[recovered]**

What I claim is using it makes you appear unintelligent and shows a lacking of original thought. Lastly, thank you for policing my my comment.

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 03:25 PM*

Oh fuck off! It doesn't make someone less intelligent because *you* don't know what he meant by "liberal". It makes *you* less intelligent because you lack the ability to critically think for yourself or understand what the **intent** of what he is trying to communicate. Getting hung up on the language he uses is **their** tactic, understanding what the person's intent is is **our** tactic. Simply using a word in any context does not show the intelligence of anyone.

Oh and the "thank you for policing my comment". Fuck off. Dude honestly fuck off, that is ridiculously hypocritical. The same thing when people call others hypocrites for calling out SJWs on free speech. Just. No. Calling you out for policing is *not* the same thing. Not even close.

The use of a word does not dictate someone's intelligence. The belief that the use of a word dictates someone's intelligence, dictates one's intelligence negatively.

Edit: lol people telling me to "calm down" and "don't waste your time".... First off this is reddit, the entire point of the comments section is to talk, wasting time would be lurking. Second, I wrote that while taking a shit at work; the comment literally cost me a shit....

IMO free speech is vital and universal with one exception and that is being anti-free speech. Same concept here, applied to something admittedly stupid. People need to

chill the fuck out and let me call the stupid twit out without giving me some fatherly advice on life. I'm trying to make fun of idiots here while taking a shit.

[deleted] • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 03:53 PM

Never argue with idiots. They will drag you down to their level and beat you with experience.

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 03:59 PM

Yea just call them fuckwads and watch them squirm. Like what many people here are against can be summed up by this idiot's opening statement:

Please use refine your definition of the usage of the term liberal. It's wildly misused.

Switch "liberal" out with literally any "victim group" and you have what most of us hate. A feminine, "how does it make others *feel*" approach instead of deconstructing the point they were trying to make in the first place.

From now on I'll just be sure to only use the word "liberal" how **I** define it. Someone who uses an excess amount of lube relative to the amount needed when getting pounded in the ass. So when people use the word I can call them out for their misuse of the word, and anytime they want to use it I'll link some faggot getting pounded in the ass and say "see thats a *real* liberal!".

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 03:50 PM

using the dictionary definition of the word liberal really isn't appropriate in this context

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 05:31 PM

The reason they favor those policies is to create a large docile labor pool of people who will work for peanuts. In creating that labor pool, they maintain and grow their wealth and power.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:42 AM

The reason they favor those policies is to create a large docile labor pool of people who will work for peanuts

Why do you think this? The group in question has the highest rate of unemployment and crime, without much economic usefulness. I've never seen any data in my entire life that suggests that this was about creating more labor.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 06:01 AM

The problem with "wealth," is that wealthy people typically don't produce things. I mean, how many wealthy factory works, mechanics, barbers, crop-pickers, etc. do you know? Their work consists of growing their money by putting people to work. But the actual work? Well, forget about it. Now, suppose for instance, that everyone is a rich capitalist. Who is going to do the actual work? Robots? But who will build those robots? More robots? What if something goes wrong? In any case, we're not there yet. We still rely on people to do actual work to make civilization work.

Now, why do people even work anyway? Well, the first 18-22 years of their life, people are

more or less locked out of the labor force, or so it seems. They are actually creating jobs by being consumers of goods and services, and amassing debts they'll be expected to pay off for the rest of their lives. And then the first few jobs barely pay anything, hardly enough to live on. This forces them to continue working. But what if you just handed them a million dollars. What do rich kids typically do? Fuck around and spend their parents money until they're cut off or their parents go broke and then they have to work.

If you are a rich oligarch with intergenerational money, do you want hundreds of millions of educated, well-fed, somewhat wealthy people running around? Why, they might try to oust you from power! So much better to have hundreds of millions of people barely hanging on to what they have within a tight well-defined hierarchy. The only thing that keeps them in that hierarchy is that they need to survive, and that they hope to move up. If they get to the point where they're going to rebel, you can either pacify them with "reforms," which you then ratchet back at a later date, or provoke them into killing themselves with some sort of war.

I mean, haven't you ever wondered why the Republicans, the party of the rich are simultaneously pro-life and pro-war? It's because they make money off of both. The form assures a steady supply of new workers and consumers; the latter lets them monetize the disposal of people not fit to work or consume due to a surplus of aggression. And no sex education allowed; it might limit the supply of sheep to be sheared and slaughtered at a later date.

oakbasedpaint0 points 12 January, 2016 12:07 PM* **[recovered]**

Ah my mistake. Then you still have a lot to learn then I guess. The simple way you speak about these other opinions, without considering where they're coming from, shows that you are still acting within the scope of the leftist domain, aka: "feels before facts"

For instance, you say:

I saw a clip yesterday of Rand Paul saying, with no sense of shame at what an unconscionable pile of shit he is, that giving the poor access to healthcare is slavery. I am not an Obama supporter nor was I impressed by Obamacare, but only a truly filthy human being would call healthcare slavery. For me, that is what the Republican party in the US represents.

That's a lot of emotional drivel right there, and a general misrepresentation of what Rand Paul was saying and what he was saying this in response to. Let's not leave out the fact that Paul was responding to Bernie Sanders comment that "healthcare is a right".

Paul was simply responding to that statement by saying that if healthcare is a "right", then healthcare providers owe that healthcare to everyone, even if they can't afford it or don't want to provide it. That means, taking Bernie's statements to their logical conclusion, that it's a right, then healthcare providers should be coerced by any means necessary including violence, to ensure that right is maintained.

Say a doctor doesn't want to save the life of the man who raped his daughter. If the rapist has a "right" to healthcare, then that doctor should be forced to provide service to the rapist, by any means necessary, in order to preserve that right. This isn't far off from homosexuals having a "right" to having their wedding cake made by a Christian who feels gay marriage is wrong.

That you mindfully refuse to consider the logic of Paul's comment while hiding that refusal behind emotional and "moral" indignation show me you're still playing with the same deck as those psychopaths over in Europe, you're just unwilling/unable to use your entire hand like they are.

HalfPastTuna • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 03:33 PM

You are reducing reasonable points to absurdity. "All people should be entitled to healthcare" to "doctors will be forced to care for their daughters rapist"

ebonboneheart10 points 12 January, 2016 01:17 PM* **[recovered]**

This is poseur horse manure. Coming from a Canadian, I can tell you we're certainly greater patriots towards our countrymen than you are. Health care should be considered a right in any society as wealthy as yours. The original poster is correct -- US conservatism has become extremely authoritarian without regard to reason as well as highly corporatist -- turning a perverted version of Adam Smith's theory into a literal religion (the Market solves all).

You are literally the wealthiest nation on earth but yet have the most deplorable conditions for your underclass and working class, teeming jails with poor sentencing laws, and a literally insane belief that health care should also be based entirely on ability to pay. That's the definition of dystopia and you should be disgusted by it, not defending it. Real men lift up their countrymen and tear down their oppressors. This is just macho posturing to hamster away bootlicking.

Comparing the consequence of a client being denied a pastry to the consequence of a client being denied medical attention is so ridiculous it is barely worth mentioning.

Shake your head.

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 01:30 PM

Health care should be considered a right in any society as wealthy as yours

I agree with you entirely, but I did not emphasize that fact because that's not the point I was trying to make. I was trying to explain why I cannot call myself a Republican in the US because the poster to whom I was replying thought I was a conservative.

The irony is I said in the US, conservatives alienate moderates. His response was to this was to act like a total dick to me (read his comments farther down in the thread), a self-described moderate.

It's a pretty good example of what I'm talking about and why the conservatives in the US are so very very unappealing to moderates.

oakbasedpaint2 points 13 January, 2016 11:21 PM* **[recovered]**

because the poster to whom I was replying thought I was a conservative.

I didn't think you were a conservative, I thought you might have begun to enter the realm of thinking via reason. However, your reply was so entirely emotional, antagonistic, and so similarly worded to typical progressive talk that I was forced to withdraw my praise given in my original comment.

If you must know why I'm being so harsh toward you, I'll explain my reasoning as follows:

Thank you for the kind words but I should clarify that I am not a conservative and I'll tell you why.

I don't know where you're from, but in the US, conservatives frequently push for *really evil policies*.

Appeal to emotion fallacy, typical of progressives in pushing their ideologies.

To give one example - they are against sex education, which is known to reduce teen pregnancy and poverty.

This is debateable. As recently as 2006, the BMJ found that sex education had not affected teen pregnancy.

In their words 1:

*What this study adds

Enhanced sex education (SHARE) improved knowledge and reduced regret but did not reduce conceptions or terminations compared with conventional sex education

High quality sex education should be continued, but to reduce unwanted pregnancies complementary, longer term interventions that address socioeconomic inequalities and the influence of parents should be developed and rigorously evaluated*

Point is, this is debateable, so to imply that it is EVIL to not wish to have the state to educate your kids on sex, especially in an era of hypergamous women, is just simply wrong, and it is, again, not unlike the rhetoric typical progressives use when arguing their positions. (IE: "it's racist and evil to turn away the refugees")

They're also against abortion, knowing that the kids who get aborted are among the most statistically at-risk.

Again, this isn't EVIL, this is rooted in a moral opinion that life begins at conception. I don't agree with this personally, but I can respect their position enough to not see their motivations as EVIL.

And also against social programs.

This is ideologically rooted in the enlightenment era concept of individualism and that we own ourselves and that we are all responsible to only ourselves. If the state can take our money and give it to someone else, then we don't own ourselves in such a society. It's not unlike serfdom, where you might work the land, but you're then forced to pay a portion of the results of that labor to the nobility/king.

Societies, and individuals, can have a debate about these philosophical ideas/concepts, but not when someone outright dismisses these concepts as EVIL, in order to silence the other side's arguments; especially when the side attempting to claim the moral high ground refuses to justify their position, except through emotional blackmail.

So they want to knowingly create more impoverished people of the demographic most likely to commit crime, remove any social programs meant to deter them from crime, and then increase prison terms and build more prisons? What the fuck kind of insane dystopic way of thinking is that?

This is pure rhetoric and you are attributing a malicious intent upon an entire group of people without being willing to consider their reasoning or intent. Again, this is textbook progressive behavior man.

Also they are widely in favor of the kind of deregulation of the financial sector which creates more poverty and contributes to the worsening of financial crises.

You have to provide more evidence here than simply making grandiose statements here man. Are you an economist? How do you know they favor "the kind of" deregulation that creates more poverty and worsens financial crises? Their opinions on how to best handle markets and regulation are not coming from an EVIL ideology, but instead a different opinion on how to best create wealth and prosperity for a society.

They're also frequently against teaching science in school and whenever a politician starts talking about "family values" you can bet he's fucking a boy prostitute in an airport bathroom.

Wow dude, just fucking wow. So all people of religious opinion regarding how best to teach science in schools or family values, they're also a child fucker? Talk about jumping the fucking shark with your moral indignation.

All of my opinions are based upon the known data. I am the very definition of moderate. The right in the US has done precisely nothing to recruit moderate people and done everything to alienate them.

You're really not the definition of moderate, your rhetoric and emotional based logic conveys an opinion that is very much closed minded. Also, your opinions are not based on data, thats the definition of an opinion; and to claim that these topics, other than stuff like teen pregnancy and sex education, are based on "data" is a reach, because most of the stuff you're railing against is firmly within the realm of philosophy.

I saw a clip yesterday of Rand Paul saying, with no sense of shame at what an unconscionable pile of shit he is, that giving the poor access to healthcare is slavery. I am not an Obama supporter nor was I impressed by Obamacare, but only a truly filthy human being would call healthcare slavery. For me, that is what the Republican party in the US represents.

I've already responded to this part of your comment, as I felt it really sums up how far off the rails you are with regard to your emotionally charged and supposed moral superiority. Calling someone an unconscionable pile of shit and a filthy human being for simply challenging Sanders manipulation of the term "right" (because words have definitions, and by the definition of what a "right" is, Paul is correct) is exactly why I found your response so utterly devoid of logic and reason. You entirely fail to even consider these ideas, and are entirely unwilling to treat the opposite side of the aisle with even a minimum amount of respect, going so far as to call them outright EVIL.

Based on your comments, yours is the mind of an ideologue, and you share more in common with the tactics of those progressives in r europe working to silence information about the refugees than someone actually open to debate and discussion.

EDIT: Considering you included /u/sweetleef in this, I figured he might like to see my rebuttal.

sweetleef • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 08:52 AM

A common feature amongst most reddit comments, and the vast majority of women's communication in general, is the lack of distinction between an argument and the

personal opinion, emotion, and/or character of the speaker. The ability to understand that they can be completely independent seems to be a very rare quality.

Another is the almost universal tendency to leap to hyperbolic extremes - acknowledging that there is some doubt about A immediately leads to claims of fanatical support for B. Acknowledging that there is a rational basis for disapproving of elective abortion leads to hysterical, screeching accusations of "pedophile religious whacko!" or "hate the poor!"; recognizing that there's a rational argument against open-door asylum is met with "racist!" and "hate-mongering xenophobe!".

The concept that one can adhere to a position while acknowledging its limitations, or appreciate an argument without adopting it, is beyond these people's comprehension.

It's a shallow, child-like way of thinking and communicating, and /u/down_with_whomever is a perfect example, pontificating and wagging his/her finger about "nuances" and lofty ideals, while resorting to extremes, assuming the opinions of the speaker, conflating his/her emotions with argument, and screeching various emotionally-charged insults in response to positions on policy.

[deleted] • 9 points • 12 January, 2016 12:18 PM

The irony of your animosity towards me is that this thread is about censorship, and I commented that I was censored in another subreddit and called a nazi for having moderate (read: non-leftist) views. You are looking from the other direction and see me as a leftist for the inverse reason.

I understood exactly what he was saying. If it's generally a person's philosophical opinion that healthcare is not a right, then that's their point of view. But calling it slavery is where the shitty part comes in. In no stretch of the imagination can a person make this comparison honestly.

sweetleef • -3 points • 12 January, 2016 12:50 PM

no stretch of the imagination can a person make this comparison honestly.

If as you say you understood the context, then you see that the "slavery" is in reference to the providers. If the service of health care is a "right", then it cannot be denied, and consequently, those who provide it cannot refuse to provide it. Not being able to refuse a command to act is a form of "slavery", and that you disagree doesn't make it a "dishonest" comparison. His comment:

"If I'm a physician in your community and you say you have a right to health care, do you have a right to beat down my door with the police, escort me away and force me to take care of you? That's ultimately what the right to free health care would be. If you believe in a right to health care, you're believing in basically the use of force to conscript someone to do your bidding."

[deleted] • 9 points • 12 January, 2016 12:56 PM

Part of the dishonesty of that statement is in framing that the only way to ensure access to healthcare is by holding a gun to doctors' heads.

notevenatthestart • 14 points • 12 January, 2016 01:55 PM

Quite. The NHS in the UK doesn't go around dragging doctors away at gunpoint. They do something entirely different. Bear with me, because it's pretty radical; giving the

doctors money in exchange for their services. The doctors, like any other employees of any other company, can choose to leave their jobs if they want at any time.

[deleted] • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 02:21 PM

I don't know man I'm pretty sure you're wrong. You have a gun-to-the-head based system of paying operating your healthcare system. I just know it.

If there is any other way of getting something paid for than the gun-to-the-head system, no man has ever even conceived of it that I've ever heard of.

sweetleef • -7 points • 12 January, 2016 01:27 PM

If a doctor refuses to treat, but health care is a right which cannot be denied, how would you ensure the provision of health care without forcing the doctor?

[deleted] • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 01:38 PM

A doctor can't refuse to treat it's against the Hippocratic oath.

The issue is in how the system is structured and how medical treatment is paid for. There's a lot of ways it could be resolved and I'm not an expert at it. In the UK, all medical treatment is directly paid for by the government. Another potential option is to have subsidized health insurance for people too poor to have their own access (like food stamps, for medicine).

Referring to any such option as "gun to your head slavery" is just off the charts lunacy.

sweetleef • -1 points • 12 January, 2016 03:09 PM

Paul is making an abstract, high-level argument about deeming something a "right", and the legal and philosophical consequences that would have for those who would therefore be obligated by law to provide a service - and your reply is childish insults and tiddlywinks nonsense about single-payer systems.

Who pays or doesn't pay is irrelevant to the point of whether the government can compel involuntary service by creating a new "right", and the legal and societal ramifications of such creation.

The Hippocratic Oath does not force doctors to act against their will.

This sub is going to shit. Or maybe there are just a lot of snowflakes brigading today.

HalfPastTuna • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 03:36 PM

There is more then one doctor on the planet dude

notevenatthestart • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 03:04 PM

The same way you make sure that kids get an education without forcing people to teach or that roads get built without forcing people to build roads; you use incentives. In other words, you *pay* the doctors with *money*. The government can also subsidise training. I've heard that medical degrees in the USA can be quite expensive. In the UK, you can get the education for free and know there's a job at the end of it. That's proven to be quite a powerful way of ensuring a steady supply

of people.

Of course, those people can quit if they like, just as any other employee can do.

They can also set up a private practice if they want and treat people who want to pay money directly without having to go through the NHS.

Now, the argument that it's not the government's job to pay for healthcare? That people should get their own insurance? Fine. I disagree strongly with it, but I respect that as a position someone could take. The idea that the *only* way to ensure the provision of healthcare is forcing doctors to do stuff at gunpoint, however, is ludicrous.

And, frankly, it's pretty insulting for a politician to try and sell that to you.

"Slavery", indeed. He must think the people listening to him are *really* stupid.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 03:54 PM

He must think the people listening to him are really stupid.

It seems that he was at least partly correct.

sweetleef • -1 points • 12 January, 2016 03:14 PM

Again, the comments in question don't relate to whether the government should fund it or not, or how best to pay for it, or how doctors earn money - the specific point here is the legal ramifications of deeming it to be a "right", and therefore incapable of being refused.

laiyaise • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:56 PM

I wouldn't mistake conservative values with the insane bible thumping neoconservatives who represent them. These are not conservatives. It kind of sounds like you're taking all the extreme elements of a fairly diverse group. Republicans can be anything from Christian fundamentalist, neoconservative, libertarian, etc.

Conservatives are not against social programs, they just want charity instead of forced wealth redistribution. They want this not because they "want" more people in poverty, that's just insane lefty speak to assume that. They believe that these welfare programs do more harm than good by creating incentive to be stuck in the cycle of poverty.

People pushing anything prison related are simply representing those corporate interests, not the interests of actual people.

Also they are widely in favor of the kind of deregulation of the financial sector which creates more poverty and contributes to the worsening of financial crises.

That just your opinion. For some, especially various forms of libertarian, our current economic situation is precisely a result of regulation. They believe regulation creates coercive monopolies by artificially hindering the markets forces of supply and demand. People who are for deregulation believe that it will create more competition, less monopolistic and predatory practices, cheaper prices and better quality goods or services. That doesn't sound so bad does it? They support economic freedom and market economies which have historically been the foundation of western economic superiority. In this regard their intention is that deregulation will help people get out of poverty, not put them into it.

They're also frequently against teaching science in school and whenever a politician starts talking about "family values" you can bet he's fucking a boy prostitute in an airport bathroom.

That's just the creationist retards.

I saw a clip yesterday of Rand Paul saying, with no sense of shame at what an unconscionable pile of shit he is, that giving the poor access to healthcare is slavery.

He is saying this from a philosophical sense. I understand the language he uses invokes emotion, which is probably his intent, however if you define what slavery is then examine his logic you can see how that label can be applied. In a way he is technically right.

I'm not saying conservatives are correct in their methods, I'm simply saying that if you think that people who hold conservative values legitimately want people to live in poverty and die then you're an idiot. They want the same thing as you, they just have a different way of getting there.

NULLTROOPER • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 05:13 AM

Except their way is entirely broken and economic models prove false all their "opinions". The vast majority of them are weak and manipulated by fear and hatred of other people. They are unwilling to readily accept new correct information when it conflicts with their ideology.

laiyaise • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 05:32 AM

Except their way is entirely broken and economic models prove false all their "opinions". The vast majority of them are weak and manipulated by fear and hatred of other people. They are unwilling to readily accept new correct information when it conflicts with their ideology.

This statement applies exactly the same to liberals.

[deleted] • 0 points • 13 January, 2016 02:36 AM

I wouldn't mistake conservative values with the insane bible thumping neoconservatives who represent them.

IT doesn't matter what moderate conservatives view their values to be if the Republican party has allowed its platform to be hijacked by the, to borrow your phrase, "creationist retards."

laiyaise • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 05:25 AM

One could say the same about the liberals being hijacked by the progressives and socialists.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 09:37 PM

True, the American right seems to cater only to religious tradcons.

We need a new secular right party.

Imightbeflirting • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:01 PM

Abortion, to them, is the height of evil. It is murder. Over a million "murders" per year trumps *any* other issue you can put before them. Frankly, I'm pro-choice, but if I saw it their way, I'd be pretty riled up about it, too.

Sdom1 • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 10:23 PM

I don't know where you're from, but in the US, conservatives frequently push for really evil policies. To give one example - they are against sex education, which is known to reduce teen pregnancy and poverty.

I'm not sure this is REALLY EVIL. Really evil is stuff like The Great Leap Forward, or Stalin starving the Ukraine, or his political purges, or Hitler's Final Solution. Or Pol Pot's killing fields, or North Korea's prison camps, where they feed live children to dogs and make the other prisoners watch. Fun fact, truly evil policies tend to be perpetrated by leftist communists and socialists - in other words, people on **your side** of the spectrum.

You can argue that abstinence education is harmful to society on the whole, and not an intelligent policy, and I would be in full agreement. It's important to note that not all conservatives hold these views, just a small but noisy part of the base.

I saw a clip yesterday of Rand Paul saying, with no sense of shame at what an unconscionable pile of shit he is, that giving the poor access to healthcare is slavery.

This is based on a libertarian belief, which is another small yet noisy component of our base. Also, while I don't fully agree with what he said, you're taking him somewhat out of context. He was saying that, when you believe you are entitled to a service that somebody else provides, that forcing them to provide that service to every and anybody is slavery. This is consistent with his beliefs as a libertarian, one of which is the non-aggression principle. He even mentions the implied threat of force in the full quote. He also says that he has always provided 100% access, because he chose to do so, both as a Christian and to uphold the Hippocratic Oath.

The issue he has is with being forced to do something by others (government) rather than choosing to do it. It doesn't make him a bad person.

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 04:00 AM

conservatives frequently push for really evil policies

No moralizing. You should know better.

Okrent1 points 12 January, 2016 02:37 PM [recovered]

It has been my experience that the problems in the republican party like sex education and abortion are solely because of religion. For example I had this Puerto rican/American Italian family as neighbors for many years that would always vote republican just because of the abortion issue. They were great people and I would call them pretty moderate politically but they were Catholic.

I consider myself conservative and I have no problem with early sex education or abortions in general. And I can't think of any conservative I know who is in their twenties who doesn't generally feel the same way. Even the ones who are christian.

I'm willing to bet the two party system isn't going to end in my lifetime. Eventually the younger conservatives and moderates are going to get tired of voting Libertarian, etc. and give it up and become republicans. Hopefully they then we might be able to have some effect on the party.

rather_be_redditing • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 04:33 PM

Sounds like you are looking for libertarianism, socially liberal, fiscally conservative. By socially liberal I don't mean SJWs who go after people for their posts and try to get people fired.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 02:47 PM

Religion is a big part of it but it's such a large part of what the Republican party's soul that I can't imagine this would change without a massive overhaul of what the parties stand for. Like what happened in the civil rights era (the republicans used to be the liberal party). And I don't expect this to happen.

borderline_sociopath • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 05:10 PM

You're reducing a diverse group of people into one definition: the socially and fiscally conservative republican who wants to control the markets and women's access to birth control.

The truth is that there is a true spectrum. The extremists get the most attention because they rail about flagpole issues like abortion, gay marriage, sex education, etc. At the other end is the purely fiscally conservative type (some because of ideology and others because of naked greed). The real money lies at the fiscal end of the spectrum and they are more than happy to let the social extremists do the flag waving and get out the vote.

If the Republicans ran purely on a platform of fiscal conservatism they could only get a small percentage of the vote. Add in a bunch of religious horseshit and scare tactics (big gubbmint is coming to take yer guns!!) and they can persuade a whole lot of people to vote explicitly against their own interests:

The people can always be brought to the bidding of the leaders. "That is easy. All you have to do is tell them they are being attacked and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same way in any country." -Hermann Göring

Small example: I actually know a single mom in her late 20's who spends her weekends holding anti-Obama posters off highway overpasses. She thinks he's the antichrist.

Government is the root of all evil. She works two jobs (one for the state!) and is on Medicaid and food stamps. It blows my mind. She's the definition of a liberal voter: single mom who can't make ends meet so she turns to the government for help. Yet she votes extremist GOP candidates because the president is a black muslim. Go figure.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 04:42 PM

You realize this censorship exists due to the plague known as Liberalism, don't you? Your post was censored by Liberals. They are actively covering up a mass rape of women yet "Republicans are evil" because a remark Rand Paul made and because Conservatives are supposedly against sex education?

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 09:10 PM

He was merely pointing out that the far right has problems as well.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 09:18 PM*

[permanently deleted]

libertypole • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 12:07 AM

i see your point because people are people regardless of their partisan politics but your example is strange.

try going in some liberal sub and shitposting a bunch of pro trump stuff. subs like that aren't really made for debate.

the problem people have is why are subs that don't claim to be political like news and europe being so heavily politicized?

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:44 AM

You realize this censorship exists due to the plague known as Liberalism, don't you?

Was there something I said which gave you the impression I am a liberal?

Stayinghereforreal • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 06:48 PM

In the US, conservatives frequently push for really evil policies. To give one example - they are against sex education, which is known to reduce teen pregnancy and poverty. They're also against abortion, knowing that the kids who get aborted are among the most statistically at-risk. And also against social programs.

Blacks do really evil things. To give one example, blacks commit crimes.

Wait, what? My overly-broad, unnuanced statement of way-too-broad fact comes across as bigoted nonsense? Yeah, exactly. Just like your characterization. Some blacks do evil things, including crimes. That is as far as you can go with that. And even saying that is not worthy saying, because duh.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:32 AM

Blacks do really evil things. To give one example, blacks commit crimes.

Right. But not at equal rates. Which blacks are MORE likely to commit crime? Well... the accidental children of teen mothers.

Republican policies produce more of this exact group, while complaining about that group the loudest. This is just an example of the type of reasons why I can never call myself a republican.

This is only nonsense to a very dense person.

And *nearly* every conservative who was offended by this comment addressed it by calling me stupid or bigoted or some such thing. Well done, really.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 01:37 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 01:41 PM

Eugh, how can you consciously allow that?

I don't know. I ask myself this all the time how the fuck so many people are either ignorant of, or indifferent to, what's happening.

The left calls for freedom and wants to bring in laws to enforce it.

I don't know that that's true for all of them. The whole SJW problem that TRP confronts is very much a problem of the left.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 02:37 PM

The left does not call for freedom, political correctness is not freedom it is slavery to the sensitive opinions of others

plenkton • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 09:26 PM*

but only a truly filthy human being would call healthcare slavery

A moral (by principle of self ownership) person would classify the mandatory taxation to support healthcare as the most evil.

TRP asserts rationality above emotion. When taxes are imposed to support healthcare of others, there is no rational basis. Only the emotional claim that "I *want* what others have."

Feels > Reals is how women/animals/low-intellect people operate. It's when a person makes their decisions based on principles (where one can be sure that they are not a hypocrite) that they act like rational beings.

stemgang • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 11:17 PM

You don't belong on Reddit. Seriously, this place is full of closed-minded hateful meme-jerkers. You are thoughtful and articulate, and don't fit in here at all anymore. Sorry.

[deleted] • 6 points • 13 January, 2016 02:15 AM

You are thoughtful and articulate

Thank you very much. But there is good discussion to be found on reddit. You just have to know where to find it.

A tremendous proportion of TRP itself is just bullshit noise written by idiots. But that doesn't mean TRP isn't valuable, or that there isn't pure gold to be found here.

Some of the guys here are absolutely brilliant and amazing writers. I personally recommend you read some of the posts by /u/illimitableman

nebojssha • 11 points • 12 January, 2016 11:27 AM

Well, West did fuck up main barrier against Muslim extremists, and those were Slavic countries that have at least 500 years of experience with fanatic Muslims. Albanian rich lobby combined with corrupted European politicians is a deadly combo for EU. And all those social politics really make nice cocktail of future fuck up on major scale.

ColdEiric • 10 points • 12 January, 2016 12:23 PM

And especially Swedes. And I found there something kind of poetic, or ironic, or some such word, about the fact that right after I discovered that Norway is holding "please don't rape us" classes and Sweden is admitting known ISIS agents and giving them free apartments and preferential job placement, the next day I read how every teenager in Sweden will be given a book about the importance of feminism.

Every betting site I checked last night predicts that the swedendemocrats will gain votes, and it's very likely that they are the majority in the next swedish election.

[deleted] • 16 points • 12 January, 2016 12:27 PM

I think Sweden has been a lost cause on this issue for a while.

It's much more important that German people figure out what's going on.

[deleted] • 10 points • 12 January, 2016 09:42 PM

As a German, most of my buddies are against our refugee policies. There's even this Russian dude who is ripped as fuck and approaching Nazi levels when it comes to politics. But the problem is, the

media is fully supporting Merkels policy. Critics are quickly shut down and labeled as Nazis and on top of that reports are biased as fuck. The events in Cologne were first ignored and then the media reluctantly reported them, saying some 80 women were harrassed by a group of a thousand "men". They left out the fact that they were refugees which is fucking ridiculous and insulting to all men.

And those harrassments aren't only happening in major cities. In my home town of about 150k people some parents are escorting their kids to school because they're scared something might happen. There was a recent event where like ten women were harrassed at a train station.

The amount of shit going on in this country is unconceivable. The media is basically no different from Nazi media, lying, downplaying and withholding facts and events. Just today on the frontpage there was a post about Swedish media first covering a story up until they were forced to come out with it at which point they blamed some politician or whatever. Our situation here in Germany does not seem much different from Swedens position. I honestly want to get the fuck out of this country. Just need a nice opportunity.

Regularguygamebrah • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 01:38 AM

Come to America bro. The mother fuckin land of opportunity. Ignore the naysayers. There's plenty here to go around. Th best part is these poor fucks are so ingrained into being machine parts, all you have to do is step outside of the machine and make a little money off it. Something for nothin. Murcia til I die. Or Puerto Rico cuz those women down there are unreal sexy.

[deleted] • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 02:27 AM

Why are Germans not more outraged about the fact that their leadership and media are handling it in this way?

bluedrygrass • 10 points • 12 January, 2016 01:21 PM

Of course. Look at France. Two major terrorist attacks in a short time, and what's the answer? "We need to go more left". At that point, what do you want to say? To hell with France, to hell with Sweden. Take your leftism and stroke with it.

skoobled • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 09:24 PM

Don't forget the botched train attack, botched attack from the Charlie Hebdo anniversary. Probably more

maybedick • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 03:31 PM

There is something needs to be said from the otherside of the camp. There is a socioeconomic drive that mobilizes east to west. When west came over to east, before imperialism, they came to us not only with their merchandise, but also with their god, faith, culture and the whole package. Then they brought their government.

History may not be repeated but you know how this goes. I believe the most important thing is to respect the fellow man. It may seem against the whole TRP philosophy but it is not. You respect other people and you respect yourself. Most people will fail to keep your respect and that's when TRP kicks in.

To conclude, I believe we get to be better humans over the time and this whole east meets west will be much more peaceful and in large, will lead to an amalgamation of culture, but only if Muslims drop some parts of their traditional faith. The ones that automatically weaponize against other faiths and culture.

In other words, you can't just migrate to a new country and ask them to be you..

[deleted] • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 02:52 AM

In other words, you can't just migrate to a new country and ask them to be you..

you'd think so but here we are

maybedick • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 07:12 PM

What the actual fuck? These guys are for real?

iagovar • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 03:29 PM

I'm more or less in your line. The problem is that expressing such opinion has it's consequences. As a sociologist, I suffered from that in the past.

Many people is unconsciously aware of this. They cannot explain it, but they understand what's happening, and that's the reason why so many europeans are shifting their vote to the right wing. The problem with right wing parties is that they just confront any immigration, but not using any rational arguments, or solutions, etc, and they also are willing to introduce harmful policies (long to explain), not only in this matter.

So social-democrats and center-leaning conservatives are probably going to kill themselves with this narrative and agenda, but there's no actual option in Europe.

In my country, Spain, the political arena is very tense, but immigration is not yet a huge topic. We have lots of experience with immigration, so people is more or less "trained" on what is acceptable and what is not. Even left-leaning parties have problems expressing openly about "open borders" etc. I'm not an expert on this topic, but I'd say that people internalized that immigration is different according to their culture of origin.

We had lots of immigrants from latin america during the housing bubble, and we managed it reasonably well. We had latin gangs coming here but the police dismantled almost all of them. I remember that it was a hot topic here, and we did not have this raping issue, or anything that was really a threat.

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 02:54 AM

As a sociologist you will understand that most peoples' thinking about social issues is very misinformed. I know this and it still astonishes me how much anger I can inspire with academically factual analysis.

iagovar • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 10:19 AM

Yep, but that's nothing new or unexpected. If you want people to believe somethibg you have to expose them to an storm of news, not to give them facts and analysis.

alphbux • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 01:01 AM

down_with_whomever

Do you think that having a TRP comment history also fueled this censorship? I really want to get involved with the current state of affairs on Reddit regarding Europe but I think I need to make a clean alternate account just for it. Any notion of TRP will allow these mods to think to themselves: "See, he is just a racist, sexist, bigot TRPer."

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:13 AM

Yes if you have this in your comment history you're more likely to be banned, no question. I was aware of this fact even as I was using the same account to post in both. I really shouldn't though, as the TRP mods always say. and they are right about this.

rather_be_redditing • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 04:29 PM

Are there any political subreddits that don't have irrational mods pushing agendas?

JDiculous • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 06:07 PM

Fuck r / europe, r / european doesn't seem to have the same censorship issues.

PS: Speaking of censorship, why do the mods here autoremove any comments linking to other subreddits?

[deleted] • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 02:38 AM

why do the mods here autoremove any comments linking to other subreddits?

so that nobody can accuse trp of brigading. our mods don't want to give anyone an excuse to fuck with us

RedSugarPill • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 08:05 PM

That question has already been answered in this thread.

IamGale • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 11:13 PM

Great essay, I can't believe you were banned... This is ridiculous

HAESisAMyth • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 11:54 AM

We can't talk about the number of times that it says in the Koran that murder gets you into heaven.

Source for these? I have a copy so Book and line numbers would suffice.

[deleted] • 39 points • 12 January, 2016 11:59 AM

Qur'an (4:74) - "Let those fight in the way of Allah who sell the life of this world for the other. Whoso fighteth in the way of Allah, be he slain or be he victorious, on him We shall bestow a vast reward."

Qur'an (9:111) - "Allah hath purchased of the believers their persons and their goods; for theirs (in return) is the garden (of Paradise): they fight in His cause, and slay and are slain: a promise binding on Him in truth, through the Law, the Gospel, and the Qur'an: and who is more faithful to his covenant than Allah? then rejoice in the bargain which ye have concluded: that is the achievement supreme."

Qur'an (2:207) - "And there is the type of man who gives his life to earn the pleasure of Allah..."

Qur'an (61:10-12) "O ye who believe! Shall I lead you to a bargain that will save you from a grievous Penalty? That ye believe in Allah and His Messenger, and that ye strive (your utmost) in the Cause of Allah, with your property and your persons: That will be best for you, if ye but knew! He will forgive you your sins, and admit you to Gardens beneath which Rivers flow, and to beautiful mansions in Gardens of Eternity: that is indeed the Supreme Achievement." This verse was given at the battle Uhud and uses the Arabic word, Jihad.

Qur'an (17:33) "And do not kill the soul which Allah has forbidden, except by right" An important verse that is used by martyrdom bombers to not only justify their own deaths, but that of other bystanders who might be believers as well. The end justifies the means, with the goal being the defeat of the kafir and the establishment of Islamic rule.

Bukhari (52:54) - The words of Muhammad: "I would love to be martyred in Allah's Cause and then get resurrected and then get martyred, and then get resurrected again and then get martyred and then get resurrected again and then get martyred." This is why modern-day Jihadists often say that they love death.

Muslim (20:4678) - During the battle of Uhud, Muhammad was desperate to push men into battle. He promised paradise for those who would martyr themselves, prompting a young man who was eating dates to throw them away and rush to his death.

Muslim (20:4655) - A man asks Muhammad "which of men is the best?" Muhammad replies that it is the man who is always ready for battle and flies into it "seeking death at places where it can be expected." (Tellingly perhaps, the next most saintly man in Islam is the hermit who lives in isolation "sparing men from his mischief.")

Muslim (20:4681) - "Surely, the gates of Paradise are under the shadows of the swords." After hearing Muhammad say that martyrdom leads to paradise, a young man pulls his sword and breaks the sheath (indicating that he has no intention of returning) then flings himself into battle until he is killed.

Muslim (20:4635) - "Nobody who enters Paradise will (ever like to) return to this world even if he were offered everything on the surface of the earth (as an inducement) except the martyr who will desire to return to this world and be killed ten times for the sake of the great honor that has been bestowed upon him."

HAESisAMyth • 8 points • 12 January, 2016 12:04 PM

Thank you very much... Looks like you have this locked and loaded.

[deleted] • 15 points • 12 January, 2016 12:06 PM

I only form an opinion about something if I know some shit about it:)

I wish other people would do that too.

HAESisAMyth • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 12:10 PM

I tried reading it for knowledge's sake, but it's worse than the Bible by a longshot, and I'm no defender of the Bible.

[deleted] • 12 points • 12 January, 2016 12:12 PM

Of course it's worse. Context matters. Muhammed was a tribal nomadic warlord.

If Genghis Khan wrote a religion, what would you expect it to say?

Nofap192192 • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 12:48 PM

He would probably tell you to go read a book

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 02:59 AM

Exactly. If Genghis Khan is known for anything, it's his love of the magic of reading.

MaxManus • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 03:08 PM

Something along the lines of: I don't give a shit about what you believe as long as you know I am your ruler. My gods are bound to the country I came from and since I rule you all they are more powerfull than any you got. THE END

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:11 PM

knowledge? The Quran is insanity

HAESisAMyth • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 08:07 PM

Debatable, but if I could see into and understand their insanity perhaps I could see the motivation for their actions... In a perfect world I could construct a counter-argument that they would accept and destroy the religion.

anibustr • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 12:21 PM

Don't want to turn this into a religious debate, but cherry picking is never cool.

More

I agree with the rest of your post regarding West.

sweetleef • 21 points • 12 January, 2016 12:33 PM

The earlier comment asked for precise citations to murder. Posting such citations in response isn't cherry-picking.

anibustr • 10 points • 12 January, 2016 12:44 PM

Apparently I missed the context of his comment itself. Ironic.

[deleted] • 13 points • 12 January, 2016 12:25 PM*

The argument about cherry picking would be valid if not for the fact that these very phrases which people want us to disregard with things like that image you linked are very real for the Muslims who believe that Jihad is real and that killing and dying are a way to get into heaven.

They didn't pull these ideas from thin air. Many people really think this.

I also want to add I was responding to a comment asking for passages. You have a problem with the fact that I gave passages.

In other circumstances I might imagine that you have less of a problem with the nature of the evidence and more a problem with what the evidence shows.

Momo_dollar • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 10:24 PM*

Actually I would call it cherry picking when in full context the verses say "fight those that fight against you" "stop when they stop fighting you" etc and the jihadist mention that they are fighting / attacking us because of tangible things e.g AQ in the 90s said US bases, support for Israel, and US support for puppet corrupt regimes... After 2003 reasons were invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan... IS didn't start beheading westerners OR attacking westerners abroad until the US, France, and UK started bombing them in Iraq (later on Syria) and they actually said "we are doing A, B, C because you started bombing us in Iraq (later on Syria)".

On numerous occasions CIA and FBI agents have said its nothing to do with hating our way of life and our freedom, its about their perceived injustice and outrage at our foreign policy. I believe CIA and FBI agents more than any politician and my own research and reading concurs. Its about power, we want to keep controlling their lands and they want to resist it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 02:21 AM

perceived injustice and outrage at our foreign policy

Key word here is perceived. Hatred of US/Israel is a really convenient scapegoating tool for powerful Muslims across the world.

anibustr • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 12:29 PM

Of course, just for clarification.

[deleted] • 9 points • 12 January, 2016 12:30 PM

The argument you made is the exact same that I always hear from islamist apologists who want us to think that there is no relationship between religion and terrorism.

frys180 • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 03:39 PM

Don't want to turn this into a religious debate, but cherry picking is never cool.

More

I agree with the rest of your post regarding West

Ok. Fine. Let's say things were taken out of context. I'll give you that. However, *why* does a God with infinite power and wisdom allow for a reality to exist in which there is so much suffering and war? Why does a peace-loving God at *any* time say "Prepare steeds of war to strike terror!" Why not just intervene people's war efforts by creating an actively adapting force-field protecting villagers from harm? *OR* Why not just, I don't know, *eliminate the factors that are causing them to go at war in the first place!* Is it money? Resources? Land? Food? Water? Technology? A *real* peace-loving god would supplicate the needs of his creation without the "need" for bloodshed.

Fake ass peace. I could do a better job. If I were God, there'd be no wars, famine, racism, and everything would be self sufficient without the absolute need of human labor. I'd even let my creation invent their own things with the resources I've given them. As an added bonus, drugs like crack and meth would be non-habit forming and Redpill forums like this wouldn't be necessary because I wouldn't make each of the sexes have diametrically opposing goals.

You'd love me as a God. Way more than this Allah/Yahweh wannabe.

elrayem • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 06:04 PM

I would hate you as a god -- as you would have to enslave me to only do good. Else wise, of free will, I would spread pain and suffering to serve my own pleasures.

The old "if there's a god, why do bad things happen" line of attack, aka the logical problem of evil... or if God exists, why is their evil in the world... is an interesting one.

Google will be you guide (logical problem of evil), if you are truly motivated to pursue a philosophical answer, but ultimately is boils down philosophically to Free Will.

As Platinga concludes... Why, then, would a God give his creation free will? Because free will, though it makes evil possible, is also the only thing that makes possible any love or goodness or joy worth having. A world of automata—of creatures that worked like machines—would hardly be worth creating. The happiness which God designs for His higher creatures is the happiness of being freely, voluntarily united to Him and to each other.... And for that they must be free. Of course, God knew what would happen if they used their freedom the wrong way: apparently He thought it worth the risk.

BradWI • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 06:47 PM

Else wise, of free will, I would spread pain and suffering to serve my own pleasures.

Nice sociopathic thoughts you have there buddy. Please seek help before you harm others.

frys180 • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 09:39 PM

If I were God I wouldn't create the "energy of evil" in the first place. That'd by definition be a very evil thing to do. Especially if I could see the future of my creations. In other words, evil in regards to free will wouldn't be factor because it wouldn't exist. Who knows? Maybe there's things beyond our understanding that could've been but aren't by design.

Regardless, given the circumstances in which we exist, most likely quite godless, it makes sense for things to be the way they are. Almost as if they're on auto-pilot.

elrayem • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 07:27 PM

evil in regards to free will wouldn't be a factor because it wouldn't exist.

By definition the absence of evil is an absence of choice. It is yin without yang. If we can't, for example, steal from one another or even imagine theft...if we can't even covet what we don't have..imagine that for a second -- blissfully unaware as we play in shit that better options exist... that is a world of robotic automation, truly on autopilot.

I don't care if you believe in a God -- I'm simply explaining the presence of evil is not a defense of atheism -- it does not hold water logically. Your link about how God reveals himself if he exists is a much better argument.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 02:46 PM

I heard muhammad raped a 9 year old, is this true?

[deleted] • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 02:52 PM

Yes. Her name was Aisha. He married her when she was either 7 or 9 (I forget which) and this is not disputed historically. The only thing which is disputed was if she was 9 when he raped her or closer to 11.

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

HoScience • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 03:52 PM **[recovered]**

No, he married one. Unlike most people here refuse to accept it wasn't to 'rape' her, he didn't consume the marriage until she was fertile, but he married her that young because that's how politics worked at the time. If you marry into a rich family the whole family is suddenly connected to you.

Thorbinator • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 06:06 PM

<http://skepticsannotatedbible.com/quran/cruelty/long.html>

LuckyLuke23 • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 05:28 AM

FANTASTIC POST MAN!

though, I think in most country now (it's also happening in aus too) they are sick of all the Muslims (mostly them but others too) take over there country.

I posted on a thread in TIL the other day where it said the contry of brunei own a farm in Australia (my county) thats bigger than the whole country of brunei.

I got shitty say, how can they buy up Australia. everyone disagreed with me.

I'm not left or right, I'm more the Legal weed kind of voter. I say this not to give you a picture but rather to tell you i think the political parties have failed me.

"Yes it's okay if we are the minority and Arabs/Africans are the majority of Europe because we will adapt to their culture." For me this reveals that something is out of balance.

it's the same here man. Australia is just the dumping ground for the rest of the world I find. no one bothers us here, we have heat and everything seems to be ok. so people have been pouring in.

everyone just turns a blind eye to it and says it's " multiculturalism " and that the way we are built, but if you really look at things, it's not. some people integrate well i'm not saying that, all of them don't. but I have heard some horror stories. Most people come here and expect us just to be " there culture" 2.0.

my country was bombed to shit for x reason now you have to be my country. well thats what it feels like to me.

But a leftist can't criticize Muslims - they're on the new leftist "victim" ladder maybe even higher than women.

we have a political party over here called the greens. where number one policy is " let the refugees in" just give them a free pass and let them come here...

now, that would be ok.... IF THERE WASN'T 1 MILLION PLUS syrian refugees trying to get out. not to mention all the other countries.

no country can sustain a inflow of that many people. my question is. at what point is the "tipping point" most people don't want to be the " minority in there own country" but what happens when they do? and what if they ARE Muslim (i use Muslim as the EXTREME example because it would change society the most) do you now become a Muslim state? what about sharia law? is this now in effect to please the people? hey, they are the majority now and majority rules right?

people are scared of loosing what there country is what to outsiders coming in.

(NOTE: this is just a point of view of how i see things, don't take it personally and don't think i'm hating on either side, I'm not. i have met heaps of muslim people with diffrent degrees of being Muslim.)

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 12:21 AM

This was a great read. I saved it so I could refer to it later.

I read the Koran when I was in high school soon after 9/11. I thought it was important to do so. I would agree that there are a lot of loud people out there who just love causes and will tell you that a deeper look (socially, economically, or politically) is just racist.

PS - I would read your book if it came out.

CornyHoosier • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 04:17 PM

remember what we did wrong - they are beyond reproach. I'm not suggesting that imperialism didn't

As a fellow "leftist", I think that was a great write up.

It irks me when liberals and progressives are bashed here in TRP. This is a sub-reddit that really doesn't need to look through the political lens.

McLarenX • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 04:18 PM

That was an eloquent commentary with nothing remotely offensive. I'm not sure if anything else could have been said to appease them. The left is no longer hiding their agenda for mass censorship. Between them and cuckservatives, hope is dwindling for the European future.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:49 AM

cuckservatives

first time i've heard this one

[deleted] • 26 points • 12 January, 2016 02:44 PM

This kind of shit is really scary. Makes me wonder how many of the younger generation are completely comfortable with explicit censorship for any divergent opinion.

They're not thinking it through. They are laying the foundation for allowing those driving the bus to completely shut down the voice of opposition. The thing they don't realize it that they might someday migrate towards the voice of opposition as they age.

They're just not thinking it through. Fucking with freedom of speech is absolutely insane.

unsafeword19 points 12 January, 2016 03:59 PM **[recovered]**

Makes me wonder how many of the younger generation are completely comfortable with explicit censorship for any divergent opinion.

Wonder no longer. Google for the headline "40% of Millennials OK with limiting speech offensive to minorities"

Excerpt:

We asked whether people believe that citizens should be able to make public statements that are offensive to minority groups, or whether **the government should be able to prevent people from saying these things**. Four-in-ten Millennials say the government should be able to prevent people publicly making statements that are offensive to minority groups, while 58% said such speech is OK.

Even though a larger share of Millennials favor allowing offensive speech against minorities, the 40% who oppose it is striking given that only around a quarter of Gen Xers (27%) and Boomers (24%) and roughly one-in-ten Silents (12%) say the government should be able to prevent such speech.

The surveying was done by the Pew Research Center, which has a decent nonpartisan track record.

[deleted] • 9 points • 12 January, 2016 04:32 PM

Holy fuck, man. That is just sad. The future is going to be a scary place. American is filled to the brim with pussies it seems.

CosmonautDrifter • 4 points • 13 January, 2016 12:05 AM

New wave progressive dipshits unaware of reality.

ioncloud9 • 5 points • 13 January, 2016 04:27 AM

That's what happens when you coddle children and keep them safe from anything that might hurt their feelings. When they grow up they don't want to hear it either.

Polaris382 • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 09:22 PM

Indeed, it boggles my mind how they see nothing wrong with this type of shit.

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 04:48 PM

There was some kind of study that said 40% of millenials are ok w/ limits on speech

<http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2015/11/20/40-of-millennials-ok-with-limiting-speech-offensive-to-minorities/>

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 11:56 PM

holy shit.....we're fucked. humanity is fucked it really is

B_uckets • 21 points • 12 January, 2016 03:20 PM

Subscribe to the subreddit called Undelete if you want to keep tabs on the censorship. Deleted posts from the top 100 (of All) are automatically listed there, and there's a decent amount of discussion too.

If you really want to see how deep the rabbit hole goes, subscribe to Longtail as well. That sub shows anything deleted from the top 1000 of All. Far more difficult to sift through because of the sheer quantity, and no one seems to be doing it right now. Probably a gold mine of censorship if you have the patience to dig through it all.

forgotmythingmajig • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 04:33 AM

Sounds like a lot of work.

I'd rather just say to myself, 'reddit, because it has people, will have stupidity and corruption. at times it will be unfair, complete bullshit, illogical, etc.'

Tomorrow if everyone leaves reddit and goes to [websitex] it will be more of the same to a varying degree.

runnerrun2 • 52 points • 12 January, 2016 12:21 PM

In my home town a girl was attacked by immigrants and is in the hospital with permanent scars. It was all over facebook and now some local boxers have started a neighbourhood patrol for the night life. Politicians, media, the police, they have all failed horribly. This is the damage the leftwing Narrative causes! People have been forced to take right into their own hands to ensure their safety!

Archange_ • 13 points • 12 January, 2016 02:22 PM

In 2015 a synagogue in Paris was shot at three times with several months in-between. It happened at night and the security cameras picked only a few hoodlums. The police did not make any serious efforts to enquire and there were no media reports.

PS I am not Jewish. I just know people who leave nearby. Gunshots in the midst of the night are scary.

eccentricrealist • 10 points • 12 January, 2016 09:26 PM

You know it's getting bad when nobody helps the Jews

[deleted] • -1 points • 12 January, 2016 11:46 PM

Nobody ever helps the jews, they just cry when Israel defends itself.

BackOfTheOven • 7 points • 13 January, 2016 01:28 AM

fkn lol. Listen to any American politician talking about their "greatest ally". Always Israel.

account_rp • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 12:21 AM

How do young, dark-skinned men avoid getting the shit beat out of them when they're doing nothing wrong?

runnerrun2 • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 05:07 AM

These people only escort party goers home. Not assaulting anyone would prevent them from getting the shit beaten out of them.

account_rp • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 06:25 AM

That's better than what I was thinking of.

vandaalen • 77 points • 12 January, 2016 06:52 AM

To be fair, those threads are heavily brigaded. Doesn't change the fact that places like r.worldnews are censored and manipulated to fit the elite's narrative though.

As a German and citizen of Cologne, I've had a good chuckle over some US-residents perception of the whole issue, also here on TRP. Neither the islamisation of the occident nor the rise of the 4th Reich are happening nor is there anything close to civil war or even civil unrest in sight, although we Germans (the people, not scumbag politicians) take this matter very serious and this might serve as a wake-up call to many, who tried to turn a blind eye on the problems of uncontrolled immigration.

Archange_ • 11 points • 12 January, 2016 02:07 PM

Chancellor Merkel invited the masses of Syrian refugees to Germany and prodded Balkanic countries to let them pass. The decision left me dumbfounded as for the past 5 years a number of attacks against multikulti had taken place and they appeared to get traction amongst Germans. Part of the CDU was receptive and the chancellor seemed supportive. Hence I expected policies to assert German culture and mores over immigrant ones. Nothing of substance came. The current invasion has obliterated the combat against multikulti and ensnared the German people in a host of intractable integration problems. I believe it is orchestrated by the German and Western elite to crush the cultural resistance that was taking form.

[deleted] • 24 points • 12 January, 2016 08:51 AM*

although we Germans (the people, not scumbag politicians) take this matter very serious

With the caveat that I am not German and do not live in Germany, I do doubt this point at least based on my limited experience, for the reason that a huge proportion of the Germans I see discussing this maintain the very bleeding heart attitude of "oh those poor syrians, we can't possibly tell them no" and plug their fingers in their ears when confronted with the fact that the majority of these people aren't even actually refugees.

I've heard so many Germans argue that Europe is "far from full and can fit many more refugees."

To me that is not the kind of talk you hear from someone who takes the problem seriously.

vandaalen • 21 points • 12 January, 2016 11:26 AM

The average Joe does not think like that, but this doesn't fit in the media's narrative and people are also often afraid to speak out publicly, because of our country's history and the left's bite reflexes, branding everybody a nazi, who dare's to question whether things should be discussed more critically.

Archange_ • 24 points • 12 January, 2016 01:44 PM

In parallel the refugees from the civil war in Ukraine are completely absent from the media. Not a single news story about Ukraine mentions them. Yet there are half a million in Poland and 1+ million internally

displaced in Ukraine. However no leftist heart bleeds for them. Is it because the war was created by a leftist human rights intervention gone horribly wrong ?

[deleted] • 38 points • 12 January, 2016 01:46 PM

It is because they are white. Their white privilege will take care of them they don't need our help.

iagovar • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 03:54 PM

That's hard to explain, when even right-wing media does not talk about it, as far as I know.

iagovar • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 03:52 PM

Because you are exposing yourself to a non-representative sample of the european population. This topic is creating a huge debate between most Europeans. It's not like there's the PC view of the media controlling the debate. Not this time.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:51 AM

Because you are exposing yourself to a non-representative sample of the european population.

This is true, but it implies that leftists are dominantly active amongst the media/internet sources for Europeans, and I am not sure that's the case.

iagovar • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 10:21 AM

Well, keep in mind that reddit is not that popular in Europe. I bet that most people who uses Internet dont know about it.

bluedrygrass • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 01:22 PM

Neither the islamisation of the occident nor the rise of the 4th Reich are happening

On one of those things you're right. But on the islamization of the occident, either you're totally or willfully ignorant.

"although we Germans (the people, not scumbag politicians) take this matter very serious "

No, you aren't. Unless with "very seriously" you mean that you are very seriously trying to get even more immigrants in.

bleed-red • -3 points • 12 January, 2016 07:03 AM

Examples of worldnews censorship?

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 07:28 AM*

In the beginning they deleted every article that had to do with rape issues over new years eve. It was addressed by a post on reddit out of the loop. There were some small brigades of new accounts, but I didn't see any in large numbers. Of course I many comments were deleted quickly, so my evidence is not great.

vandaalen • 27 points • 12 January, 2016 07:24 AM

Sorry if I gave the impression of being a guide dog.

Unfiltered_Soul • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 07:45 AM

There is nothing wrong with what you said. I think it is important for those that are reading about the

things that are happening in Germany to hear from someone who is from there and what are their thoughts. From someone who is not from Germany, you guys seemed screwed from what the news has been showing and people just recently moved in there.

sir_wankalot_here • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 09:47 AM

Read Chomsky manufacturing consent. Chomsky is a leftist but his views on this are still valid.

Keepsalowprofile[S] • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 10:40 AM

Did you not read the original post? Use U N R E D D I T and you can see for yourself

Seducibledotcom • -6 points • 12 January, 2016 12:21 PM

As a German yourself, do you now understand what Hitler was talking about in Mein Kampf or do most Germans still shrug it off as just a book written by a crazy guy? He pretty much predicted all this shit would happen in that book.

[deleted] • 10 points • 12 January, 2016 12:41 PM

I have read mein kampf and I am not entirely sure what you are referring to in your comment.

Seducibledotcom • -8 points • 12 January, 2016 02:09 PM

You read the book but you didn't understand that he wanted to protect Germany and that he was explaining why the Jews will corrupt and destroy Germany and it's great people? As they're doing now along with every other western country.

bicepsblastingstud • 14 points • 12 January, 2016 02:33 PM

>Thread about Islamic immigrants

>Still manages to blame "the Jews"

Seducibledotcom • 1 point • 16 January, 2016 03:04 AM

Failing to see the big picture, blasting your biceps, at least you're consistent.

rave_n • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 04:35 PM

You are full of sh*t. As a young, conservative german who is reasonably agitated about the latest events I tell you one thing: No matter what happens here, Hitler never wanted to protect Germany. He was the crazy product of a skewed vision and a sourrounding (post ww1-Germany) that unfortunately supported him. His "vision" brought pain and agony over the German people. Yes, I am worried, but supporting Hitlers views is about as wrong as it gets. He was NOT supporting Germany.

cdtCPTret • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 05:41 PM

No offense but a German-educated anyone would be the last person I would ask for about an objective perspective on Hitler. Same with an Israeli-educated anyone about the state of Israel. Your anti-hitler/pro-Israel education is downright indoctrination. History is subjective though.

[deleted] • 29 points • 12 January, 2016 07:31 AM*

What's really going to be interesting is how Sweden and the nordic countries will face potential immigrant organized crime groups like the US did/does. For over 150 years the USA had irish gangs, jewish mob, italian

mafia, and black gangs etc. The police and feds are used to dealing with the type of crime that migrants with no work bring. The nordic countries have not had this so in the short term they could potentially be fucked on the crime front. Which from the sound of it may be in its infant stage.

NightwingTRP • 39 points • 12 January, 2016 10:48 AM

It's worse than that mate. The UK already has problems trying to build cases against anyone who doesn't fit the narrative. See the Rotherham scandal. I also recall in a documentary that the police are not able to do their job due to PC laws. For example, an organised Romanian crime syndicate is operating in an area amongst some innocent Romanian immigrants. The police would like to target resources at that area to focus on the Romanian gang... but no. That's racial profiling, so you can't do it.

I wonder how long it will take for white women to realise that on the oppression scale they appear to rank less important than coloured people. Therefore they can be raped with impunity until this sort of thing changes. (As long as it's not by a white man obvs.)

The whole thing is horseshit and from what I've read about Sweden's police covering things up too... it looks like the Swede's police force have their hands tied too. Only going to get worse.

Thorbinator • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:17 PM

That's not hands tied. That's willful political policing.

[deleted] • 19 points • 12 January, 2016 08:55 AM

For over 150 years the USA had irish gangs, jewish mob, italian mafia, and black gangs etc

There is a key difference though. Black ghettos were something that was historically imposed upon them and the gangs were a reaction to circumstance. As were the others.

The Islamist criminals aren't reacting to harsh circumstances in Sweden. In fact I cannot imagine less harsh circumstances anywhere on earth. They have a very different underlying motivation.

[deleted] • 19 points • 12 January, 2016 01:13 PM

Since northern European nations are feminized they are regarded by Arab immigrants as uncivilized and uncultured. Barbarians allowed to be treated in any way they please. Just how some Europeans would treat Native Americans as their culture was completely different.

For an Afghanistan immigrant to listen to and adapt to what Scandinavians tell him would be like for you or me to listen to and obey a five year old girl, nonsense. Scandinavians are infantilized. There is a threshold in behavior and knowledge which deems a person to be considered adult, and most Scandinavians haven't breached that threshold. Even the old people are children.

SlowWing • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 10:52 AM

Japan's a bit like that too. A country of children.

MyDickFellOff • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 12:52 PM

It's their culture.

I studied abroad in Korea with a couple of Maroccoian people. They always used to tell me how in Marocco, people are more angry, more jealous and completely different in mentality to the Korean people. The Korean people seemed to them almost too trustworthy and they felt they were too kind.

I talked with them about this and they basically told me that Islamic culture makes you more of a man, but also more of a dick.

And I agree. Most Islamic men that I know are pretty alpha, but also pretty big dicks.

bluedrygrass • 20 points • 12 January, 2016 01:33 PM

Not alpha, just dickheads. The two things gets mistaken too often, but they generally are unrelated.

alphbux • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 01:13 AM

<https://rationalmale.files.wordpress.com/2011/10/venn-diagram.jpeg>

iagovar • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 04:02 PM

I don't think that's true. That's only an ad-hoc rationalization of it. My understanding of being a Man does not include framing your worldview towards irrational and dangerous beliefs.

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 12:55 PM

I haven't known a lot of Arabs personally so I can't share my experience but the guys I known who've had to work in the Gulf would entirely disagree about them being alpha.

Momo_dollar • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 10:30 PM

Rich gulfies vs North African no contest. Look up highest obesity rates in the world, Qatar, and some other Gulf countries come top. While most North Africans and other types of Arabs are pretty athletic

dr_warlock • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 02:49 PM

IIRC correctly gangs + drugs (weed) and prostitution were the reaction. Then when blacks started making big bucks off of these, a massive propoganda campaign (politicians & D.A.R.E) began to insist that blacks lure women in prostitution dens with weed and and become violent due to the high. It was racism at its finest. Black people aren't allowed to rise above their station.

Same thing happened to the chinese imigrants with heroine and farming (read: Chinese Exclusion Act). Chinese were great farmers in Cali because they've *only* been an agricultural nation for 10,000 years. They know a bit about it. Whites didn't like it nor the heroine money they were bringing in.

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 02:55 PM

Not only the massive propaganda campaign. The entire war on drugs was very racist from the start.

It is ironic that the SJW version of racism (i.e. racist=white) seems to distract people from the reality of *actual* racism, i.e. what you are talking about.

dr_warlock • 8 points • 12 January, 2016 03:22 PM*

this is why history is important and why it's being censored and re-written.

Not to mention the Roman Empire (italy ==> europe) was built on slavery of other europeans.

Not to mention Africans enslaved millions of whites during the Babary Wars. It was so bad, whites paid tributes to pirates to avoid capture.

edit: /u/down_with_whomever

Not to mention the Portuguese (Christopher Columbus and Hernan Cortez) committed arguably the greatest genocide to ever exist (native americans). Read: American Holocaust by David E. Stanner. You dont see them giving a shit about Native Americans.

edit 2: afticans kidnapped other africans to be sold into slavery in exchange for white man weapons.

But this doesn't support the narrative.

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 03:27 PM

What you're saying is extremely similar to the comment I wrote that got me banned from r Europe.

You know your history. I tip my fedora to you, m'redpiller.

Sdom1 • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 12:35 AM

Not to mention the Portuguese (Christopher Columbus and Hernan Cortez) committed arguably the greatest genocide to ever exist (native americans).

That was mostly smallpox and other European diseases. Nobody gave smallpox infected blankets to the Natives, either. Even if they knew enough of germ theory at the time (which they didn't), smallpox was so dangerous that nobody would have willingly handled the blankets to set the natives up.

In some places over 90% of the natives were wiped out very quickly - a true apocalypse. As happened with the classical world and the bubonic plague, having your population depleted by disease collapses your culture and makes you very vulnerable to invasion, whether by muslim barbarians or conquistadores.

To say that Columbus was responsible for that genocide is interesting, as he wasn't involved with the continent at all, just the Caribbean.

Now, what the whites DID do was to destroy a lot of native cultures by doing things like pulling down statues of their gods. But honestly, especially in central America, those religions were horrible and needed to go.

dr_warlock • 2 points • 14 January, 2016 01:43 AM

Read: American Holocaust by David E. Stanner

Free PDF: [Here](#)

The conquistadors and others took infants from mothers, then threw them to the dogs or used them for target practice, or slammed them against rocks. They fed others to the dogs as well. They raped women in front of their men. They raided villages. They tortured the people with fire and had slashing contests. They placed dead bodies in their drinking waters and gave them diseased blankets. They posed as freindlies in festivals only to slaughter them. The ones that weren't killed were exiled or made forced into gold mining slavery. I didnt even read more than half, gets too depressing. This is not including future exiles like the infamous Trail of Tears or Andrew Jackson.

"It was just disease" is the narrative, nowhere close to reality. Much of it was natural exposure to foreign disease no doubt, but the rest was intentional systematic mass murder and slavery.

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 02:52 PM

Sweden is also more or less building ghettos

Teatach9 points 12 January, 2016 11:43 AM **[recovered]**

If these gangs were around today, media would at least write about it!!

In prisons in the UK, inmates are forced to convert to Islam or pay "Jizya" which is a tax for non believers.

In Sweden it was just leaked that the police had kept their mouth shut about rape-gangs (guess origin) occurring at a festival 2 years in a row, because the police themselves didn't want to create ammo for the "right-wing" political groups. So even the police are not neutral, they are "PC".

I see your point made to the gangs, but I'd rather compare it to what happened a thousand years ago in Scandinavia when Christianity implemented "convert or die". The last Viking is long gone, and it could explain evolutionary why our Scandinavian balls are so small now.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 01:07 PM

Will the immigrant mafias be worse than the current Scandinavian government mafia who is treating their own nations like an occupying force would?

wile_E_coyote_genius • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 12:56 AM

It's my understanding that with the exception of Sweden, the Nordic countries aren't accepting a bunch of immigrants.

urpe • 8 points • 12 January, 2016 04:17 PM

it is a demonstration of the war we are in with feminists and leftists

No it isn't. It seems as though the mods and the media are choosing to protect the immigrants instead of the women.

Overkillengine • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 08:23 AM

No it isn't. It seems as though the mods and the media are choosing to protect the immigrants instead of the women.

The better to get the women to abdicate even more rights in the guise of gaining security.

nice_guy_bot_ • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 08:10 PM

It's hard not to get the feeling that these migrants are basically being used as bioweapons against Europe, as only a small part of a greater attack on the European people and indigenous cultures of Europe.

[deleted] • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 05:27 PM

I will say this, I find the situation where migrants are raping women abhorrent and it is something that must actually be addressed. Yet I also know that men in the west won't care as much since they have been demonized, slandered, and they have been falsely accused of rape. There is nothing wrong with calling out wrongdoing

where it stands.

However, there is also nothing wrong with criticizing these countries as well. Taking in all these extra people in a country where the culture is vastly different is just a volatile mix waiting to happen. Sweden felt they were too good that they had to help the immigrants by catering to them which as a result increased crime. Germany did the same thing and look we have a rape scandal they want to keep hush.

I'm sorry but what the fuck is wrong with society now? Are we that scared of being accused racist and sexist that it supersedes all the other things like rape and being a pedophile? Black Lives Matter protested on behalf of people who actually did crimes, Salon and other news websites have started saying pedophilia is okay, and now rape isn't okay unless you are Islamic. Society is headed towards its own demise and there are very few bastions left.

I guess the best we can hope for is to look out for number 1 and those close to us and hope that those close to us aren't a part of this political correctness hivemind.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 01:13 AM

and ive been told by women rape is worse than murder, i guess only when committed by white men though.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 01:24 AM

I was trying to be clever and find a clip in the onion movie where instead of solving a murder mystery, they were trying to figure out who raped this girl, but have this brave athlete overcomes rape he committed instead.

LasherDeviance • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 01:49 AM

Enjoy the decline. When it all falls, what will rise from its ashes will be stronger and with literacy at its highest plus the internet to hold a permanent record for all to see, those in power will hopefully learn not to make the same mistakes that led to the downfall in the first place.

[deleted] • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 01:52 AM

I actually love the ensuing chaos despite the frustration of the decline in human intelligence. After the dust is settled Darwinism will come into play and we will be the sole people who can fix this and hopefully all can be right with the world.

denart4 • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 03:56 PM

Visit / r / european and / r / subredditcancer

[deleted] • 5 points • 13 January, 2016 05:41 AM

I live in Germany and let me tell you this is NOT censored over here. Half the population is ready to overthrow our government I swear...

noobforlife • 2 points • 14 January, 2016 04:14 AM

Let's hope so for your own survival. They plan on bringing in 10 million more. I guess border security isn't a national concern, who would have thought I'd see the day where that could be the case.

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 January, 2016 07:04 AM

There has to be something else going on here. The elites must want to dilute the population with muslims, no logical person would think this is a good idea.

Americans create a civilization requiring drastic widespread social complexity and then they are shocked to discover that different groups typically end up occupying different niches: Jews and white women the soft sciences, Asians and white men the hard sciences, petty office labor for the bulk of whites, physical labor for Hispanics and poor (and dumb) whites, government jobs, prison and drug trade for African American men, chronic depression and self-abuse for native Americans.

Rich whites love the idea of social equality, because they can afford to be seen as white. Their social class means they're taught from day one how to avoid saying anything that might be interpreted as "offensive". They're gentle and dance around the issues.

At some level rich whites would love to be surrounded by minority groups allowed into their economic niche, because deep down they don't really believe that races are equal and feel less threatened by a black lawyer or engineer nobody will hire than they feel by a poor white or poor Asian one.

Even if you made a society where statistically speaking the Sioux are as likely to become lawyers as Jews, black women as likely to become engineers as Asian men, liberal Boston Brahmins as likely to become truck drivers as white trash (gasp!), you'd still have a society where people would rather marry the lawyer or the doctor than the truck driver. The lawyer would still have a stronger social network, more power to influence government, pass on success to his children, and so forth.

The only societies known to man that are relatively egalitarian are those where families are able to be largely self-reliant, like hunter-gatherers. That's why Jefferson praised the independent Yeoman as the backbone of the US. That's why Catholics responded to Communism by promoting Distributism. You will never have any sense of equality until you get rid of social complexity. The only solution to the privilege of doctors is to eliminate people's dependence on the medical cartel. The only solution to the privilege of college professor is to stop forcing people to get a college degree to get a decent job. The only solution to the plight of the toilet-cleaner is to force every office worker, every Boston Brahmin, every Jewish lawyer or economist, to spend their free time cleaning their own desks and toilets.

But nobody wants that. You don't want to sacrifice your triple-bypass surgery, you want some magical miracle to change society and make the doctor performing the surgery as well liked and respected as the guy cleaning his toilet.

You can't have your cake and eat it too.

frys180 • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 02:50 PM

The only solution to the plight of the toilet-cleaner is to force every office worker, every Boston Brahmin, every Jewish lawyer or economist, to spend their free time cleaning their own desks and toilets.

But nobody wants that. You don't want to sacrifice your triple-bypass surgery, you want some magical miracle to change society and make the doctor performing the surgery as well liked and respected as the guy cleaning his toilet.

You can't have your cake and eat it too.

Could you elaborate a little bit more on this? I see where you're getting at but I feel I'm missing something.

Thorbinator • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 06:25 PM

He's saying race and socioeconomic class are currently highly correlated for a variety of factors. If you eliminate the factors pushing races into certain economic classes, that won't eliminate the economic reality that a doctor is simply better than a janitor.

bowie747 • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 08:15 PM

I'll preface by saying I'm speaking strictly about social media here. It's really disappointing to see that 10 000 shares of a PC opinion can result in the creation of law. Politicians have to listen to these people because **they can all vote therefore their opinions are worth money**. Since when is the opinion of a 16yo Tumblr feminist equal to an established academic? $10\,000 \times 0 = 0$ IMO but that's not how this works. Unfortunately everybody is being assigned a value of 1 regardless of their intellect or knowledge on the subject. Since when is the political opinion of the head of a family worth the same as the infant with an iPad? It's a joke that law-makers have to listen attentively to the voice of Facebook and trashy forums.

DforDeadpool • 19 points • 12 January, 2016 10:27 AM*

Leftism and feminism want a *New World Order*, to say. Before laughing about it and making MLG Illuminati jokes, that's why they are all in for immigrancy and interracial breeding (it disturbs me because it's promoted so much by liberal media, makes me feel something is fishy). I'm not even white myself. I'm like a Caucasian-Mongoloid mix, even though the Mongoloid part was too back in the future and I appear white. I don't see myself as white but I don't buy into "white men are evil" shit. Because it's just feminist propaganda. Feminists want a world where there are no borders between countries (Hello daesh our friendly neighbour!), savage 3rd-worlders impenetrating all the women and high quality (but betafied and not attractive) men are all slaves now, where women and mentally ill hold all the power by laws, laying around and being a fat filthy animal is *encouraged* by the communist system, and etcetera.

To me, racial breeding is promoted because if everyone looks the same, it's easy to go all commie! If there are no different cultures, no different opinions, no need for separate countries. No need for borders. Everyone would look exactly same everywhere. So nobody would get advantages. Pain of war and destruction, and loss aside, and I exclude good people, but I fucking hate immigrants. I was travelling with a girlfriend and they were staring at her all the time, hungrily, didn't matter how strong I seemed, because they carry knives and they'd outnumber me. They fuck up the Europe now. And if I weren't living in a tough country, they'd gangrape and kill our women too. My country accepts too many refugees. But our people being crazy, they know if they were to rape our women, people would chop their heads off, kill them, rape them back and even would burn refugee camps. If refugees were to rape someone I love I can almost certainly get away with killing them. Thank God I don't live in a cuckland.

Edit: Grammar.

[deleted] • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 01:26 PM

It makes sense if you think about it in the large scale. In the industrial age the most powerful nations will be those with the most betafied male population and the most ruthless psychopath rulers. They will obey and they will produce. Women will not try to fool Arabs into respecting and obeying them, because they know it's a useless endeavor, therefore they concentrate their forces on Western men, who have an integrated concept of mercy and peace. This is what Jesus meant when he said the meek would inherit the earth. The strong are too busy fighting each other. You need millions of betafied men to create the infrastructure needed for modern advanced weapons.

Middle Eastern culture is a culture of conflict, you will never build up a functioning independent industry there, you will never have any cooperation except when going to war. They couldn't do anything without weapons from the industrialized world and they cannot form alliances with other cultures as they are too supremacists.

The world will come together as one and all cultures have to bend a little or vanish in this millennial process. One strong and fruitful culture today is Southern American culture. It is welcoming to all people and has the good properties of Western culture minus all the bad. I see Western and Latino culture blending more in the

future.

DforDeadpool • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 02:50 PM

I still believe that Western "meek" men can rise again and reclaim their masculinity. Feminism is a good chance for men to see women's bullshit. Also, as you've stated, a country needs 3 things to be successful;

Betafied men

Strong, healthy men to inseminate women (Arabs in this case), to produce "quality betas" and rulers

Ruthless, psychopathic rulers

Given, if a country has ruthless and psychopathic men in their government ranks, I can assure you they will do their best to betaify men. Because they wouldn't want competition. *Just be nice, do your job, never have ambitions and we wouldn't kill you and your family.* Media, feminism, drugs, junk food, pornography, alcohol, women.. There are many things to pussify men.

The world will have it's one culture in the future maybe. If people don't cling to their culture, their culture and identity will be extinct. About Southern American culture, I hope so. All other cultures can have the good parts of them. Especially being sexually open, knowing how to have fun, difference between men and women, positive outlook on life and etcetera. What I fear is, whole world being Swedefied. *Come, we have feminism and we accept all the immigrants, come take our jobs, chop our heads with a meat cleaver and fuck our women!*

CaptainGloom • -6 points • 12 January, 2016 10:56 AM

Your logic falls apart when one remembers that A: most of the minority women hate it when their men go interracial, and thus the feminists support THEIR motives, thus are not pro-mixing. Also, what with 'cultural appropriation' bullshit it's clear that the feminists want nothing short of people being stuck in their own countries. You don't even know your enemy, you idiot.

bluedrygrass • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 01:44 PM

What? The feminists and leftists are all for miscegenation.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 04:36 PM

[permanently deleted]

johnmal85 • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 02:04 AM

The first part of that seems a major stretch. No comment on the second part.

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 04:45 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 01:28 AM

women should not be allowed to make any big decisions regarding the country

Adeus_Ayrton • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 08:07 PM*

I come from a Muslim country, and can wholeheartedly and confidently say this about mass migration:

The Europeans are making a *big* mistake.

thetotalpackage7 • 8 points • 12 January, 2016 03:12 PM

It comes down to one simple fact, which jives with everything that leftist loons do...they absolutely despise straight, white, male, christians. They view them as oppressors and the root of all their problems both present day and historically. They'll bit off their own hands in spite of themselves to dilute the perceived patriarchal tyranny. How delusional and fucked up do you have to be to be inviting radical, intolerant third worlders into your country because you hate white people so much? It's all part of the Frankfurt School plan. Political correctness derives from the school as well. Look it up for yourselves. You'll then see who the real puppet masters are who are indoctrinating the West with these self-destructing ideas.

noobforlife • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 03:16 PM*

I recently wrote a post called Sexual Terrorists detailing the motivation of the left (especially women) for wanting to let the invaders in. I also talked about the rape and pillaging of the dying European empires that we are seeing now.

Even though some of my post was political in nature it discussed sexual strategy and the changing sexual marketplace. I was glad to see the lively discussion and that it was not censored.

I have been looking around the other more mainstream subs and it is clear that reddit has been infiltrated by the regressive left. Another example, the second largest stake holder in twitter is a Saudi billionaire. They are pushing discussion into these internet ghettos (fb, twitter, reddit, youtube) and centralizing the control over these channels. That way it is easier to silence dissent and make other people feel isolated and that no one else shares their views.

Edit: Another thing, we gave Chateau shit for going all political but he has been surprisingly prescient on a lot of the things currently happening. I find myself more and more interested in the social and cultural shifts going on compared to just the same old field reports and theories on women. The concept of "redpilling" encompasses more than just sexual strategy and is an analogy about seeing the curtain pulled back before your eyes.

ANakedBear • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 05:52 PM

regressive left

This is my term of the day. It seems to fit well in broadly describing what is happening.

redpillschool • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 07:33 PM

I was glad to see the lively discussion and that it was not censored.

I rather enjoyed the discussion.

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 January, 2016 03:17 PM

Was banned from worldnews for a heavily upvoted comment comparing our treatment of Muslims today to the appeasement of Nazis during World War II.

AircraftWelder • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 03:22 AM

Well, "Those who ignore history are condemned to repeat it". Hello, Europe.

benczi • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 10:56 AM

I don't know, the top post, stickied post is about the nye sexual assaults with almost 15k comments. And reading the comments, they are pretty one sided and against the migrants.

BellSar • 12 points • 12 January, 2016 12:44 PM

They tried their best early on to cover it up, just like the mainstream German media.

Nofap192192 • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 12:50 PM

All posts were deleted until Jan 5th when it was printed in NYT and couldn't be censored anymore. But ya I'm sure you're real smart

Raigek • -2 points • 12 January, 2016 12:05 PM

but da leftist feminists!!!!

The irony on both sides is extremely strong.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 01:27 AM

What irony? The mainstream media refused to report on a story because it hurt their cause, don't see any going the other way bud.

enjoys_fisting • 23 points • 12 January, 2016 09:01 AM

I'm just happy all these clowns are waking up.

Muslims/Immigrants/Blacks are all a massive problem.

Before the downvotes, mind explaining why blacks commit over 50% of all murders and robberies and over 30% of all rapes and burglaries? Source:

<https://www.fbi.gov/about-us/cjis/ucr/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/tables/table-43>

trplurker • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 09:29 AM [recovered]

It's not about race but about economics. Poor people commit crimes at a pretty obscene rate compared to wealthy people. In the USA most poor people are Black or Hispanic.

A wealthy black man is no more likely to commit a crime then a wealthy white man, and a poor white man is no less likely to commit a crime then a poor black man. Of course the population distribute is such that the poor black man will come into contact with police more often then the poor white man, but that's down to living in cities vs living in rural country area.

dr_warlock • 11 points • 12 January, 2016 03:07 PM*

You and /u/enjoys_fisting

The original blacks that were *brought* to America (slaves) were chosen based on size, strength, and resistance to diseases (previous Native American slaves had weak immune systems due to isolation). From there after, they were bred to be brutish and low IQ to be good manual laborers and prevent learning such as reading and thus a revolt. Add to the fact that whites impoverished and discriminated against them every chance they had after the Emancipation, and you get generational poverty, violence, and single motherhood (one positive feedback loop clusterfuck).

Sidenote: there was an article in the Dark Enlightenment sub that discussed a man that lived with Africans for awhile. He noticed that their languages lacked abstract concepts including future tense thus long term thinking. He beleieved contributed to their lack of success. Can't find it though.

[deleted] • 3 points • 12 January, 2016 05:05 PM

Well regarding IQ, African-Americans also have more European DNA in them than Africans, so maybe it balances out. But everywhere they go, they commit more crime, etc. And of course, you can

say it's due to racism, which can't be controlled for. So have fun arguing with unfalsifiable opinions.

dr_warlock • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 10:00 PM

Well regarding IQ, African-Americans also have more European DNA in them than Africans, so maybe it balances out

That would be due to slave rape (new 'free' generation of slaves and wanted dat phat ass).

You, /u/robonubbins, /u/kevlarut, /u/Purecorrupt, /u/enjoys_fisting, and /u/trplurker

Found the article:

<https://whitelocust.wordpress.com/morality-and-abstract-thinking-how-africans-may-differ-from-westerners/>

TLdR: africans evolved with language that lacked specificity, and lacked concepts of morality (ie rape) and other abstract concepts involving time. Thus probable link to current black situations.

This is not proof of my claims, this is just suggesting a new way of thinking. A very interesting one at that. Very un-PC.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 10:56 PM

Yea I've read that article too. I'd love to see some evidence to back that up from linguistic journals. Unfortunately, linguistics is a very leftist-dominated area of academia so I couldn't find anything to back that up. Sadly, the article makes sense if you connect it with the everyday actions of blacks in America (for example, if black people are so poor, why are 80% of black women overweight/obese?)

SlowWing • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 11:55 AM

TLdR: africans evolved with language that lacked specificity, and lacked concepts of morality (ie rape) and other abstract concepts involving time.

Japanese has no concept of morality either, no future tense, is a vague language (no plural or gender marks, no declensions, no conjugation, no pronouns) and yet Japan doesn't look like Africa. Languages don't account for child soldiers of FGM. There's something else.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 05:18 PM

Even if hard evidence isn't available, there can be a discussion.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 05:46 PM

Lefties will just put there fingers over their ears, stomp their feet and say, "Na, na, na I can't hear you. Facts are racist. Na, na, na."

kevlarut • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 06:13 PM

Intelligent, hardworking, and obedient servants are more valuable than stupid, lazy, and violent servants. That's why Europeans evolved so favorably under Feudalism. The violent, stupid, pagan barbarians were bred into civilized, docile, cooperative Christians.

If anything, selective breeding in America would have led to a more docile and civilized breed compared with the founding population.

Suggesting that American slaves were bred to be more savage is absurd. Just compare African Americans to African Africans for the proof.

Purecorrupt • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 04:54 PM

Were they really chosen in that way. I suspect that they just went with volume... I imagine the weaker ones died or committed suicide before reaching their destination to be "sold". I remember seeing some visuals on how packed those slave ships were. Why would they discriminate? Unless there weren't enough buyers I just imagine a 100% sale rate.

dr_warlock • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 09:45 PM

Yeah, they're brought in volume, then at auction time, the buyers choose the strongest ones. Then only the strongest survive (natural selection).

[deleted] • 18 points • 12 January, 2016 10:35 AM

You are actually somewhat mistaken about that. There are behavioral differences between groups in society which cannot be explained by economics.

That doesn't mean "black people are bad." But it DOES mean that it cannot all be explained by wealth, as you suggest.

Archange_ • 9 points • 12 January, 2016 02:36 PM

A factor that is often overlooked for the difference in delinquent or criminal behaviour is the city-countryside duality. For instance Los Angeles is plagued by Hispanic violence but not inner California where countless poor Hispanics toil in the fields for a pittance. However I do not know what elements cause the difference.

Another factor is legacy. Like most human organisations, organised violence perpetuates itself beyond the disappearance of the conditions that generated it.

[deleted] • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 02:40 PM

It's really refreshing to see someone that is able to take a factual look at this.

You are right about that disparity. I don't know either. Rural poverty is generally worse than urban but without many of the accompanying social problems.

You're right about legacy. The existence of black ghettos in a great many American cities can be traced all the way back to the great migration over a century ago.

But unfortunately analyzing these things are beyond the heads of most people who seem to take an interest in race. Look at some of the shit other people have said to me lower in this thread for trying to suggest that society is more complicated than just saying non-whites are bad.

Archange_ • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 02:50 PM

I have read the other posts. In a tepid defence of their position, legacy includes cultural problems. The black subculture keeps alive practices that are detrimental to their material and spiritual progress. In order for the blacks to move forward, they must jettison most of their subculture and embrace the mainstream white culture. Id est they ought to become black on the outside white on the inside. But this is taboo for SJW and beyond.

Goodwill in the family and schools can easily accomplish the conversion. Hundreds of thousands of French blacks from the Antilles or New Caledonia, nearly a million arabs arrived

in France before 1990 have already accomplished the journey. However the current climate has stopped the process.

enjoys_fisting • 28 points • 12 January, 2016 09:38 AM

wealthy black man is no more likely to commit a crime then a wealthy white man

[Citation Needed]

poor black man will come into contact with police more often then the poor white man

[Citation Needed]

Please provide sources for your claims, thank you!

[deleted] • 32 points • 12 January, 2016 10:29 AM*

This guy shouldn't be downvoted for asking for a source on this because behavior is actually connected to race in some instances. I have studied this issue quite a bit and it's not accurate to ascribe all groups' behavior to economics.

For example: in the US, blacks do worse in school regardless of their income level. Wealthy blacks still do worse academically than poorer people of other races. The real question to ask is why - and that's a really hard question to answer even for professional social scientists.

Now I am not suggesting the reason for this is that blacks are genetically stupider or worse somehow, this is not my point of view because (to my knowledge) our current understanding of genetics suggests that it is not so. In my opinion it is more related to cultural circumstance because this is the most likely explanation, given all of the data I've read on this topic. But I digress.

The point is that it's not entirely incorrect to say that race is not relevant because statistically, it sometimes is.

oakbasedpaint • 18 points • 12 January, 2016 11:22 AM **[recovered]**

A little surprising to see people in TRP downvoting people asking for sources. I suppose the leftist culture of Reddit was bound to leak it's way in here eventually.

Today, it is limited to downvoting comments about race, next they'll be downvoting comments about gender. This is how leftists gain a foothold. Either TRP is about TRUTH, no matter the consequences, or it is weak to subversion. There can be no compromises when it comes to the truth.

[deleted] • -6 points • 12 January, 2016 11:36 AM

I think you misunderstand the nature of people downvoting him. I think they downvoted his asking for citations because the parent comment was racist. But I didn't downvote him, I just tried to redirect him towards the known facts.

oakbasedpaint17 points 12 January, 2016 11:50 AM **[recovered]**

racist

So you're part of the problem I was talking about then, eh? He makes a FACTUAL point about black crime, and you call that racist? I call bullshit.

Like I said, today it's downvoting "racist" posts, next, it's downvoting "sexist" posts.

Either, the truth is negotiable, or it isn't. You can't accept the facts that fit your personal

narrative and ignore the facts that don't.

[deleted] • -2 points • 12 January, 2016 11:53 AM

You've either not read my posts carefully or dramatically misunderstood them. Exactly everything I'm talking about is about looking at the facts.

He said that immigrants are a big problem. That is largely perceived by people to be racist. But my response, if you noticed, was that sometimes immigrants are very good for us, even if they are black/Muslim. I said this because it's statistically true.

In another comment, I defended him, explaining that race IS relevant to some statistics, like crime or education, in a way that can't be explained by economics. I said this also because it's statistically true.

Give the dialogue another read without assuming anything about my intentions and you might come out with a different reaction.

APookIsAPook • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 10:55 PM

I had the understanding that blacks in America tend to have a lower IQ than whites by around 10 points on average. That may be due to lack of education however, as that decreases IQ.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:17 AM

They do. Race and IQ do correspond. The trouble is explaining, in an objective and factual way, why.

sir_wankalot_here • -3 points • 12 January, 2016 09:49 AM

Assuming blacks are 10% of the population that means 90% of their victims should be white. It is far below this.

Blacks and Muslims are two different things.

enjoys_fisting • -1 points • 12 January, 2016 10:04 AM

Please post your verified facts, thank you! I'll be waiting :-)

oakbasedpaint • 11 points • 12 January, 2016 11:16 AM **[recovered]**

This is patently false. No matter how much you attempt to deny reality to fit your ideology, the facts are facts.

"NON-whites" commit something in the order of 80%-90% of all crimes, according to the FBI.

[deleted] • 7 points • 12 January, 2016 12:44 PM

"NON-whites" commit something in the order of 80%-90% of all crimes, according to the FBI.

This is true. Sweden might not publish the demographic data of their criminals, but we do. The crime (especially violent) rates vary tremendously by race independent of economic standing.

denart4 • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 03:51 PM

The wealth is not causing or preventing the crimes. Its IQ.

IQ predicts both of those.

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 10:58 PM

Have you ever heard of the Minnesota Transracial Adoption Study? There are plenty of other sources dispute your claim about economics but I doubt you'd actually go through them, so I won't waste my time.

bluedrygrass • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 01:40 PM

The explanation is simple evolution. White countries (and some Asians countries to a minor extent) selected the less aggressive, more respectful of the rules people for centuries.

If you were a thief or a murderer in any european country you had a good probability to end hanging from a pole on the side of the roads. Additionally, there was positive selection about skilled, crafty people, in the highly competitive urban societies of the past (today is nothing, in the past an artisan had to work 12 hours a day everyday just to have a slighty better life and barely survive).

Thus, in the long term selecting more for people with self controls and smart abilities.

ANakedBear • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 05:47 PM

today is nothing, in the past an artisan had to work 12 hours a day everyday just to have a slighty better life and barely survive

Just to clarify, before the industrial revolution, peasant life was much better then believed by the upper classes. It certainly was rough and rustic, but they had plenty of down time and holidays. The biggest down side seems to be the food and difficulty with good hygiene.

Great Video on it

You point on social structure influencing modern habits is probably right though. I believe I saw it discussed in another documentary but couldn't find it with a brief look so I am not sure of all the details.

Edit; extra letter

[deleted] • 6 points • 12 January, 2016 10:23 AM*

Muslims/Immigrants/Blacks are all a massive problem.

I hope you will realize that comments like yours de-legitimatz criticism of the very groups you're opposed to. I will explain why.

mind explaining why blacks commit over 50% of all murders and robberies and over 30% of all rapes and burglaries?

As a history teacher I could explain this to you. There are reasons for this. Doesn't justify the fact that it happens, and you're right, there should be a conversation about this shit. We shouldn't pretend it doesn't exist. But framing the argument to be about race alone is problematic.

I'll give you an example - you say immigrants are a massive problem. In the US, statistically, [legal] immigrants are way more successful and productive than the average native citizens. Did you know that? Even African immigrants to the US are more successful than native white citizens. Immigrants to the US have, statistically, contributed to our nation tremendously. This isn't my opinion, this is a verifiable statistic. Almost every Arab I went to school with became a doctor, and the only African I remember from my school has a PhD in chemical engineering.

Why is that?

The reason is because of WHICH Africans/Arabs/etc. we choose to admit or keep out. This is the issue. If we

admitted the smartest .001% of Africa and gave them green cards, would it benefit us? Tremendously. With that level of selectivity, immigration can benefit the host nation a great deal. This stuff isn't my opinion, I just happen to know the data on it. Everything I've written here is verifiably true. The question here (in immigration) is selectivity. Europe is actively and (dare I say) intentionally selecting for criminals by admitting those who violate their law and remaining strictly selective with legal immigrants. That's the stupidest fucking thing I've ever heard in my life, and that's what they're doing.

Same with the US and Mexico. Illegal immigration isn't problematic because they're Mexican - it's problematic because it's illegal and the selectivity rate drops to zero.

The only way that we can ever solve race/immigration issues is by attacking them as policy problems, and we are less likely to succeed in doing that if we solidify in everyone's mind that "criticism of PC protected groups = racism or nazism." It isn't.

We should not aid the leftists in convincing everyone that criticism of mass immigration and forced multiculturalism is racism. THEY are the real racists, and any kind of meaningful analysis of their views would reveal this.

edit: added some examples

throwawayyourliberty • 15 points • 12 January, 2016 12:07 PM

Perfection. You did it perfectly. You want to refute the thesis that Muslims/Immigrants/Blacks are all a massive problem but you could give ZERO valid arguments.

I hope you will realize that comments like yours de-legitimatize criticism of the very groups you're opposed to. I will explain why.

There are reasons for

As a history teacher I could explain this to you.....

Nothing. There are no reasons. There are no arguments.

Guess what you did. You circle-jerked around your great text of trash to say that:

framing the argument to be about race alone is problematic.

GREAT. You try to refute his argument based on statistics with morality. You then combine your morality with a cute mix of personal bias when you state

Almost every Arab I went to school with became a doctor

You got a sample size of what? 5? 10? OP got a valid stats of thousands. But hey fuck valid statistics.

You then find end your circle-jerking by stating that immigration can benefit the host nation a great deal due to "selection". Your argument is basically that problem ethnicities like Arabs or Muslims have no inherently cultural and biological issue, because you can select the best Arabs to come into your country. Consequently, you shift the responsibility from the ethnicites to the policy makers. WOW. GREAT. You are basically a SJW, who is trying to blame externalities and never your own flaws. The best joke is

Same with the US and Mexico. Illegal immigration isn't problematic because they're Mexican - it's problematic because it's illegal and the selectivity rate drops to zero.

You are basically acknowledging the fact, that if selectivity drops to zero, you have to deal with ALL people of the selected ethnicity. In other words, you get the whole rotten cake and not only a small one in decent condition.

Amazing, how you made an argument against yourself and your whole circle-jerking. And you do not

even get it.

[deleted] • 13 points • 12 January, 2016 01:17 PM*

You called me "friend" when you thought I was a conservative. Once I said that I was not, all the views we had in common became irrelevant to you and you began to view me as your enemy.

GREAT. You try to refute his argument based on statistics with morality.

Not based on morality. You've misunderstood. His exact words were that "immigrants... are a massive problem" in a context about race. I explained that sometimes immigrants can be beneficial, regardless of the overall statistics for each race.

here you can have some data comparing the level of education of African immigrants.

here you can read about the overall productivity of immigrants (not controlled for race) in the American economy. This is a direct contradiction to the statement that "immigrants are a big problem."

The fact that I included an anecdote about my friends from school doesn't nullify this data.

You are basically acknowledging the fact, that if selectivity drops to zero, you have to deal with ALL people of the selected ethnicity. In other words, you get the whole rotten cake and not only a small one in decent condition.

Yes. I am. I do not want all people of any ethnicity. I want us to be very selective about who we admit and only accept immigrants who will benefit the country, and not be so casual about illegal immigration as we are now. I don't want any rotten cakes I want the small part in a decent condition, to whom you refer, and that is why I am talking about selectivity. You seem to have gotten the idea that I'm a leftist because I have written that I'm not a conservative, but I am not and nothing I have said is even remotely so.

But here's the thing. Sometimes those "decent condition" ones might be black or Muslim. Not always, not even necessarily often, but sometimes. Thus going back to it being problematic making it an exclusively racial issue.

Since good argument is so valuable to you, you should make some of your own that don't involve whiny sarcasm and saying "circle jerk" over and over again.

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 01:50 PM

The nature of your very sudden change in temperament towards me reminds me a lot of the shop owner from the movie "falling down."

Walkebe • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 10:02 PM

Admitting the most talented Arabs, Africans, and immigrants from the third world robs those countries of the people that they need the most for their own development and only exacerbates the problem of economic migration. America has done well enough for itself even in times where immigration was heavily limited to those of the Caucasian race, and particularly of primarily Northern European genetic stock, as is evidenced by the development of Nuclear technology and the Apollo project. Let the third world retain its own doctors and scientists. This is more humane for people of all races and nations.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:21 AM

You're right. It's called brain drain. And it is a real problem for them.

Purecorrupt • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 04:50 PM

Less documentation of white crime, because white people are documenting it.

/s

G_G_Janitor • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 01:12 PM

Ffs I thought Reddit was the only safe one Twitter Facebook and YouTube shut down anything about rape jihad. Guess there's nothing to do now but wait for the real fucking racists

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 11:13 PM

You knew it was game on when they banned C00ntown, even after they said they wouldn't

prodigy2throw • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 05:27 PM

Feminism at work ladies and gents.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 05:29 PM

And then some mods try to portray themselves in a good light, as unpaid, busy volunteers fighting the good fight supposedly. Never mind the fact that they don't want critical issues discussed, banning even members of their own cause for voicing a little dissent. Sorry, but the mods don't have much credibility when they are silencing and nuking threads.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 01:47 AM

No they're petty, nerdy fucks who actively censor things they don't like.

zephyrprime • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 07:23 PM

Really amazing what type of comments were deleted. The vast majority were not voicing extreme opinions or racist views at all.

iam187 • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 09:51 PM

Guys what you wrote here about how to read censored posts may have changed my life forever. This MUST be spread!

ispeaknot • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 12:41 AM

pinkos can't allow facts to come into play. Once enough people understand the facts, the pinkos will be swinging from gallows

Revorob • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 03:33 AM

Holy Shit! I just read a small section of the comments on the German situation in unreddit. That is some serious censorship. The mad thing is that nearly all of the comments I read were fairly reasonable. Given this, is censorship really about eliminating hate-speech or more about not hurting some people's delicate feelz? I think we all know the answer to that one.

Seriously, the world needs to face up to the fact that although multiculturalism does not work in some cases, it doesn't in others. Fairly obviously, moving Muslims into predominantly Christian populations is a good example of this. I come from Australia and I have seen this first hand. We have Muslim Lebanese in Sydney who do nothing but sell drugs and terrorise white people. Tamworth has settlements of Muslims from Africa who will take to anyone they don't like with machetes. Personally, I don't give a fuck what these assholes do in their own countries but there needs to be a clear expectation of ALL people that when they come to western countries, they

abandon any beliefs, traditions or whatever that are going to be a problem for the locals. Any immigrants who don't like it need to stay at home.

I have never worked out why the powers that be see value in selling out to immigrants. In Australia, all levels of government (federal, state and local) all pander to Muslims at the expense of white Australians. For example, Muslims in Bendigo were allowed to build a Mosque despite the objections of most of the local residents. The same thing is in the wind at Albury where I come from. Why the fuck are politically correct idiots insist the majority must pander to minorities?

The situation in Cologne is just a single example of how fucked up the whole Muslim immigration thing is. Just imagine what it will be like in a few generations when all these ragheads breed and they eventually become the majority. At that time, being a white, Christian German would be really fucking unpleasant.

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 07:07 AM*

imagine what it will be like in a few generations when all these ragheads breed and they eventually become the majority.

if these fucking moron, self-destructive dumbass liberals think that the muslims are gonna be nicey-nice to the indigenous people when they are the majority, they are mentally fucking retarded. it's gonna be fuck you and big time payback as they see it

Revorob • 2 points • 17 January, 2016 06:50 AM

Damn Straight! And given the open-borders policy Germany have thanks to that dumb cunt Andrea Merkel, Germany is going to be the first country to be taken over by the muzzies. I dunno where the Krauts are gonna go when the muzzies kick them out.

One_friendship_plz • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 03:53 AM

Alright this makes me want to make a bot that notifies people that they were censored on Worldnews subreddit, PM's them to make them aware of what's going on.

ioncloud9 • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 04:18 AM

Ive been banned from r/worldnews for a while now. It was related to a comment I made about migrants 4 or 5 months ago.

[deleted] 13 January, 2016 03:28 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 4 points • 12 January, 2016 06:58 PM

our views

there are no "views".

There is only reality. TRP should be just about understanding reality, with women or in any situation.

The funny thing about reality is whether it's about relationships, economics, society, etc. you can only fight against it for so long before reality eventually rights all the wrongs people have deluded themselves with. And the longer and bigger the delusions are, the stronger the correction.

So about the migrant rapes, the longer they cover their eyes, the bigger and more severe the eventual correction will be. If it's addressed right away, it's not a big problem. If they wait and pretend, people will call for deporting all the "refugees". Wait longer, people will start killing them on their own. Wait even longer, and eventually

you'll get a genocidal leader with tons of support.

alphbux • 2 points • 13 January, 2016 12:55 AM

I just saw a story subbmited "Jews in Marseille urged not to wear skullcaps" to / r / e u r o p e and it was promptly removed due to "duplicate".

However searching that subreddit did not find duplicates.

It is batshit crazy when jews are now being persecuted and the left is covering it up.

vitringur • 3 points • 13 January, 2016 01:21 AM

war we are in with feminists and leftists

Chill out. If you are dragging politics into the red pill, you are doing it wrong.

Be careful of trying to blend all aspects of life into one ideology.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 04:02 PM

Depends on where you are. The US? Won't be a problem. The thing will be over by then. But the US needs to say it will take them so Europe will. Why? Because we need to drain ISIS of manpower and recruits. A lot of their army is folks going along to get along and they are running short of money.

Its the Machiavellian thing to do. Let Europe take them in. Helps the US. Few will get here. Nor are they more of a risk than the tourist visas we give out in the region. Its all a kabuki play. US military goals are taken care of.

As for Europe, they fought over the damn place and exploited it for cash. Now they have to pay for that.

[deleted] • 2 points • 12 January, 2016 06:01 PM

Or: European cultures were still somewhat monolithic and therefore more able to present a unified front against insane agendas. The United States is already multicultural and divided.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:53 PM

The US has always--always been multicultural. Ever since the first slave came over and the first Native Americans were here. Half the country was taken from Mexico, so the idea that we were not multicultural at some point is just laughable.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:06 PM

I'm sorry, but this has to be the most nonsensical narrative to come out of this.

Manpower and recruits aren't shit. Human lives aren't worth shit, they're actually a liability unless treated as a commodity. I don't see us putting the men in labour camps and selling the women as sex slaves, but you never know.

This isn't Machiavellian, there are lots of people in the world. Machiavellian is treating people as commodities.

Look at rural China; tens of millions of people but it's not worth shit. The developed cities are where the human capital is. Lots of countries have cheap labour; look at Qatar, they're not running out of slaves. Neither will Isis.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:51 PM

Someone hasn't been reading up on the problem.

ISIS doesn't want migrants leaving It is putting out videos saying that it is a violation of Islamic law to

leave the Islamic State

Why?

Predatory Islamic State Wrings Money From Those it Rules

They need the cash.

And they are running short of recruits

You can believe whatever you like, but it is ISIS that doesn't want us to bring in refugees. And the war will be over before any chance exists for any ISIS refugees from getting here. But Europe will be more willing to take them if we say we will.

Very simply, the EU is getting used. And properly so.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 07:17 PM

I never said Isis wants us bring in refugees. I said they have a massive supply and people are only valuable when treated as commodities, which Isis does. I simply don't think they'll it's a strategy in response, because it's not.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 10:11 PM

No, they don't have a massive supply. How many people do you think they have?

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 10:16 PM

Loyal? Or in the region that they can reach?

I think they have plenty of people around to herd like cattle and recruit. Your plan seems to imply we empty the country of everyone but Isis loyalists.

Just give it to them! It's a strategy!

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 01:41 PM

Its like East Germany. No state wants to have its population up and leave on them.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 03:11 PM

Pretty sure we were ecstatic to take them actually.

They hadn't been allowed to visit the other side of the wall that was put up under the authority of conquering states. It was a city divided in two. Why does everyone compare everything to the Berlin Wall?..

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 05:27 PM

The wall went up because thousands of people were fleeing to the West. As refugees. They had to stop it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 05:34 PM

Are they refugees or did they just want coca cola and freedom to travel?

kevlarut • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:27 PM

A strong United States is only possible with a strong Europe. The USA can't stand alone against the Asian powers; we need NATO.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 06:52 PM

WTF has NATO ever done? Second-rate forces. No depth, small, totally reliant on the US.

kevlarut • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 07:36 PM

NATO has broadened our nuclear deterrent.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 10:10 PM

We don't want more nukes and reneged on giving rhe UK the Bomb.

HoScience1 points 12 January, 2016 03:39 PM* **[recovered]**

Oh lord TRP is going politics again. One thing I despise most about this place is when a place of rednecks go into territory they haven't got a single fucking clue about. There is no unrest. There is no mass rapings going on here in europe. Not a single person I've heard is actually rioting about it.

Yes. People here have knowledge of women, and I come here to read about knowledge of women, but the amount of knowledge on politics on here is less than the avarage fox viewer.

Reddit is the place who is exaggerating the whole incident, not the fucking media. I seriously doubt the amount stated is anywhere close near the truth. I've read from a more credibly source the actual amount is 36 people, not a fucking thousand. I also strongly wonder how not a single mobile camera movie of this has yet popped up. These days pretty much every single man police shooting have a someone recording them, but **a thousand people** massively stealing, and raping people are a magical exception to this? Are people going to tell me that they removed the videos from the internet because the police didn't appreciate those, even though police shootings managed to stay on?

Reading politics on TRP is like a bunch of uninformed rednecks came together and blame literally everything wrong with the world on minorities. MUSLIMS THIS and MUSLIMS THAT. Yeah America didn't just bomb the shit out of the middle east. Without religion there would be no war they say for the thousanth time, yet both of the largest wars ever have been two atheist parties.

I know that this place is full of brainwashed (ex)soldiers, but if you could all do a little bit more than open the first blamepointing newspaper and say everything is the fault of other people without even realizing America CAUSED most of the problems, that would be great.

[deleted] • 4 points • 13 January, 2016 02:05 AM

I have seen a disturbing trend of people like you trying to derail the discussion here. You have have not made a single reasonable argument in your post and have instead resorted to shaming, distortion of fact, and trying to ensnare people here in irrational, emotive debate. What is the purpose of your sophistry if not to help us actually discuss these issues?

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 08:04 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 12 January, 2016 06:21 PM

WWi and WWII were atheist parties? Ok lol, if by that you mean communists in wwii

Shut up you uniformed faggot. I have no problem with Islam, shit I don't even think Islam is the issue, but you're just "mategauring" Syrian men, it's batshit.

bearmorgan • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 07:41 PM

You need to read more, kid

HoScience0 points • 12 January, 2016 08:21 PM [recovered]

I'm just saying the issue is blown way out of proportion. Also you might not have a problem with islam but apparently 90% of TRP suddenly does and as usual in TRP threads about different cultures a lot of lies and misinformation is being spread once again.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 09:06 PM

I mean your opinion of a truth is different than a white supremacists, in fairness.

Ever heard of you tuber "johntheother" ? (Not to associate him with the latter sentence!)

So far I think his videos on the subject are neutral and reasonable. He doesn't absolve potential guilt or blame Islam where lack of development is more to blame.

erbalot • 0 points • 13 January, 2016 12:25 AM

Thank you! The redneck influence on here, all frothily fear mongering and hyperventilating is whack.

noobforlife • 0 points • 14 January, 2016 04:12 AM

More concern trolling. If you don't like it downvote and move on. Better yet keep your concern to yourself.

LaV-Man • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 02:11 PM

Appears to have been delted.

LetsGoAllTheWhey • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 02:19 PM

This is a sample comment of what OP is talking about:

"Congrats Europe, you created an issue yourself that will haunt you for generations to come!!"

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 07:44 PM

this is the text book definition of the "regressive left".

randoor • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:07 AM

this blog <http://gatesofvienna.net/> has some real talk about islam and its potential threats. im just leaving this here as it is difficult to find information about this topic which go beyond the accepted narrative.

j0hnan0n • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 06:00 AM

29 out of 30 posts

As of the time I checked, it was more like 50 out of 50 posts. Thank you for bringing this to our awareness.

[deleted] 13 January, 2016 06:44 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 07:02 AM

I know it's awful but if these women vote liberal and support bringing refugees in, I can't really root for you. You're shooting yourself in the foot over and over and surprised when it falls off? Yeah I don't feel bad for you, sorry.

lfcsuarez • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 03:59 PM

because nowadays its intolerant to not tolerate intolerance. islam is not a race. its a stupid, racist, violent and sexist ideology, so i dont get why ppl always defend it

DoxasticPoo • 1 point • 14 January, 2016 05:53 PM

So much of what's being deleted is just basic discussion content... it's not even much of an "argument" sometimes... They're deleting stuff just because it mentions the situation, not just the "offensive" stuff.

TacoTacoTacoTacos • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 07:47 AM

They do this in their own countries as well:

En Español:

<http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20150719/54433998864/acoso-sexual-durante-fiesta-musulmana-a-pesar-de-promesas-de-policia-egipcia.html>

Translated to English:

https://translate.googleusercontent.com/translate_c?depth=1&hl=en&nv=1&rurl=translate.google.com&sl=auto&tl=en&u=http://www.lavanguardia.com/politica/20150719/54433998864/acoso-sexual-durante-fiesta-musulmana-a-pesar-de-promesas-de-policia-egipcia.html&usg=ALkJrhjMzIL8u8KmR593R7b-KL8_jplOUw

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 January, 2016 05:57 PM

Let the bodies hit the floor, let the bodies hit the floor

Gnometard • -2 points • 12 January, 2016 02:20 PM

We are not at war. Maybe you should head back on over to MRA or something?

[deleted] 12 January, 2016 11:46 PM*

[permanently deleted]

johnmal85 • 1 point • 13 January, 2016 02:38 AM

I'm not any pill, but I believe that they meant the PC leftists that put integration over nationalism... or something to that effect. I find that it isn't necessarily even a left or right leaning thing, just a compassion thing. Right now, some people are being too tolerant for the wrong reasons.