

Innocent men now can be ordered to inform police of sex they have 24 hours before it happens or face 5 years in jail (UK)

January 24, 2016 | 1022 upvotes | by [CHAD_J_THUNDERCOCK](#)

tl;dr: Since March 2015 in the UK police have had the ability to prevent innocent men from having sex without finding out information (address, date of birth) about the woman and sending it to the police 24 hours in advance. One man was accused of rape and found innocent, but police have ordered him to inform them of sex he has 24 hours before he has it. If he does not manage this he will receive 5 years in prison.

<http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-york-north-yorkshire-35385227>

A man cleared of raping a woman has been ordered to give police 24 hours' notice before he has sex. The man, in his 40s, who cannot be named for legal reasons, was acquitted in 2015 at a retrial after claiming the alleged victim had consented.

An interim sexual risk order, initially imposed in December, has been extended for four months by magistrates in York.

It requires the man disclose any planned sexual activity to the police or face up to five years in prison. The order - which was drawn up by magistrates in Northallerton, North Yorkshire, and extended in York - reads: **"You must disclose the details of any female including her name, address and date of birth."**

This limits his ability to have sex without giving some form of commitment to a woman and finding out more about her. It will be especially difficult for him to find out things like her address and date of birth. The man is 40 so how many women will openly talk about their exact age?

Obviously any one night stands or flings are out of the question. And hopefully any girlfriend he has does not wake him up to a surprise sunday blowjob.

"You must do this at least 24 hours prior to any sexual activity taking place."

It also contains restrictions on his use of the internet and mobile phone devices and requires him to inform officers of any change of address.

We don't know what exactly this entails but it might be to do with watching porn?

A further court hearing in May will decide whether the interim order should be made into a full order, which has a **minimum duration** of two years and **can last indefinitely**.

Its legal to create a lifelong sentence limiting your sexual freedom, even if you have committed no crimes.

The female instinct to force men into commitment before having sex is slowly being written into law, and this is a major first step. You will need a bit of commitment before many women 30+ are going to tell you their date of birth

Sexual risk orders were introduced in England and Wales in March last year and **can be applied to any individual who the police believe poses a risk of sexual harm**, even if they have never been convicted of a crime.

But at the same time we are told all men pose a risk a risk of sexual harm, and all men need to receive

educational courses about rape culture. No politician is going to side with chauvanists.

First night lays from tinder/clubs/bars can be made punishable by 5 years in jail - all a spiteful ex girlfriend has to do is accuse you of drunk/rough sex to the police without evidence and get you an 'interim sexual risk order'...

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 173 points • 24 January, 2016 04:57 PM

Is this not blatant gender discrimination?

MattyAnon • 123 points • 24 January, 2016 05:43 PM

As opposed to all the other laws ?

spacecowboyreturns • 47 points • 24 January, 2016 06:35 PM*

deleted

daten-shi • 13 points • 24 January, 2016 10:34 PM

I hope that's /s and not serious.

spacecowboyreturns • 9 points • 24 January, 2016 11:51 PM*

deleted

through_a_ways • 20 points • 25 January, 2016 12:17 AM

it worked for minorities

There's a reason blackpass doesn't exist, while pussypass does.

Minority "privilege" does not exist (Asians). URM privilege is limited to getting affirmative action for filling quotas.

Unwarranted sympathy for women has existed for over 200,000 years. Unwarranted sympathy for blacks and Hispanics has existed for a few decades.

twatbutter • 10 points • 25 January, 2016 12:58 AM

This comment is on point with regards to Asians. If anything, Asians have it harder when it comes to matriculating into schools in various fields.

Blacks/Hispanics, however, do see a lot of unwarranted sympathy these days, both economically and socially.

I'd argue that the pussy pass was minimized in RP societies of the past simply because women were relegated to household duties and were punished for being unruly

spacecowboyreturns • -2 points • 25 January, 2016 03:34 AM*

deleted

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 12:30 PM

the logic and facts that women have it better than men in every conceivable statistic? shut your mouth idiot.

bluedrygrass • -2 points • 25 January, 2016 11:42 AM

There's a reason blackpass doesn't exist,

That's kind of questionable. For example, it's easier to enter a college if you're black than if you're white or asian.

Similarly, if a black drug dealer gets killed trying to resist his latest arrest, it's national revolt day, while when a white boy or mexican one gets shot for lesser reasons, nobody gives a flying fuck and the news won't go past regional medias.

RojóEscarlata • 14 points • 24 January, 2016 09:07 PM

This is outright fucking tyranny.

franksymptoms • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 10:51 AM

It is-- or was-- the difference between being a citizen or a subject.

foldpak111 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 07:23 AM

We're disposable. Best way to win is to not play. MGTOW gives you all the power in the world. I got all this money saved up, man... Wouldn't have it or the freedom if I fucked around with women.

[deleted] • 344 points • 24 January, 2016 03:56 PM*

This shit is getting way out of hand. Men are creatures of endurance who've withstood hunting in the winter before technology, fought through wars, and spent years at sea without seeing their fellow citizens. For thousands of years, this was an asset to growing our species but it's all going to shit under feminism. The endurance that used to go towards production is now being applied towards seeing how much self-flagellation men can put up with, how much guilt, how much humiliation, and how much unhappiness.

I like to think of TRP as a reapplication of that enduring nature towards something better. We can endure struggle in the gym and in conflict. Whichever flagellated cuck has to compete just cannot operate under the same stress and fire that we can. He doesn't even know to try. The world is an objectively shitty place for men, but at least I'm safe.

[deleted] 24 January, 2016 05:34 PM

[permanently deleted]

mugatucrazypills • 50 points • 24 January, 2016 07:25 PM

UK has gone to shit. They had a slight stay of execution under the Iron Lady, now they're all going to get raped to death by migrants.

Hope that island sinks. Then the gulf stream switches off and they freeze like Jack in Tit-anic while those slag cunts are treading water.

It was the torch of western civilization for a while, and now the light has been snuffed out. There's 100 cameras on every corner looking up your ass, the people aren't even allowed to read their own history for 100 years and they can lock up anyone who thinks or speaks the wrong way in the tower.

Leviticus59 • 16 points • 25 January, 2016 12:18 AM

Yep. They are, along with the continent, being colonized, and the UK people will subsequently be bred right out of existence.

I'm just certain the migrants will fully comply with the new law, though. That thing about them shitting in swimming pools was just a mistake.

balancespec2 • 8 points • 25 January, 2016 05:59 AM [recovered]

What do you mean not allowed to read their history?

mugatucrazypills • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:24 PM

if the queen farts they call it national security and seal it away for 100 years, their official secret acts', they can lock you away under pretext so thin it would make the CIA waterboarders, Cheney and patriot act enforcers blush.

UK takes the lead in most oppressive and invasive technologies, never know when the IRA might strike or some blokes might use their penises to patriarchy somebody.

lordmaximus92 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:45 PM

As opposed to the completely free and liberal (NSA infected) US? You are kidding yourself.

Also , welcoming political migrants is the quintessential essence of freedom, providing a safe haven for those under threat.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 12:07 PM

Lol wtf? Raped to death by migrants?

Ur just chatting shit, shut up

DJvendetta-5 points 25 January, 2016 12:58 AM [recovered]

Holy fucking shit, your views are a bit extreme.

RP-on-AF1 • 12 points • 25 January, 2016 02:38 AM

Kids these days. You can't even fantasize about the wholesale destruction of a nation and their land without somebody getting offended.

venicerocco • -1 points • 25 January, 2016 08:05 AM

Haha. I get it. It's a parody account of a complete moron. Good job.

polyethene23 points 24 January, 2016 06:35 PM* [recovered]

Supplements are bullshit but actually steroids are practically decriminalised for personal use in the UK (Class C), and the NHS give out free needles and syringes. So let's not get carried away here. Sure the laws are retarded in some places but that just keeps betas where they should be.

nuesuh • 8 points • 24 January, 2016 11:13 PM

Supplements are bullshit? How so? I'm pretty sure that I've had benefits from my hydroxocobalamin injections.

Supplements have their time and place imo.

foldpak111 • 5 points • 25 January, 2016 07:30 AM

Fish oil, vit d, and zinc supplements aren't bullshit either.

polyethene1 points 24 January, 2016 11:26 PM* [recovered]

Well he was talking about banned supplements and I've been tracking legislation here in the UK and completely agree with the decisions on banned products so far. DMAA for example is simply

unsafe to be sold OTC especially when kids buy that stuff.

More to the point though the UK isn't a bad place to live. Neither is America. These anger phase red pillers need to stop sensationalising all the time. The fucked up laws only affect the lives of beta males with low SMV.

akjoltoy • 8 points • 25 January, 2016 02:52 AM

Nah. I think getting pissed at this stuff and pushing back is probably a good idea.

Your attitude would have it get worse and only cry when it's far too late.

Mgtowredpillonroids • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 08:06 PM

Afaik SARMs are legal as well.

nzgs • 0 points • 25 January, 2016 04:58 PM

The NHS do not give out free needles and syringes. The NHS take a vast amount of money from people by force, waste most of it, and spend a little on needles and syringes which are mostly given to drug addicts not steroid users.

Part of the reason the UK is such a shithole is because so many people here are brainwashed into thinking that public services are "free". And then they wonder why we have no disposable incomes, why manufacturing is gone and why there are no jobs. The state is one big financial black hole that sucks money from everyone - individuals and businesses - and spits out little token services in return.

No thanks, I'd rather all drugs were legal and we had a competitive market for needle exchanges.

The-Amazing-Potato • 13 points • 24 January, 2016 08:51 PM

No it isn't. It is liberal on some issues but it's also very conservative on others. The porn thing was brought in under the conservatives (right wing party) so nothing to do with lefty liberals there. dont know anything about supplements so I won't comment. As for self defense you can use reasonable force. So if someone breaks into your home and you twat them in the face with a bat no problem! however if you chase them down and beat them half to death then yes your gonna get shit for it. It's just like any other country some good stuff some bad.

vicious_armbar • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 02:31 PM

As for self defense you can use reasonable force. So if someone breaks into your home and you twat them in the face with a bat no problem! however if you chase them down and beat them half to death then yes your gonna get shit for it.

The problem comes when you step outside your house. If you carry anything that could be considered an: "*offensive weapon*" from a baton to a knife you can be arrested and charged. Lets not even start to get into Britain's firearms laws. Basically any type of firearm is illegal, and even beat cops can't possess them. The thing is firearms are an equalizer. They allow weaker law abiding citizens to protect themselves from ruthless thugs. Thugs who have no problem preying on the weak regardless if they have access to guns or not.

nzgs • 0 points • 25 January, 2016 05:02 PM

Tories are not right wing. All of our parties (except maybe UKIP) are statist social-democrat soft-left parties. We have no anti-tax parties or movements, even UKIP have softened their anti-tax stance. We have no parties that accept that free markets are superior to state services, even UKIP abandoned

that platform and now support the NHS. None of our parties would scrap the marxist propagandising BBC. Under the Tories immigration has risen to its highest levels in history. Our "conservative" leader believes there are "too many white faces" in the UK.

It's the same story across Europe - politics is entirely controlled by a cartel of leftist parties who merely take turns to remove freedoms and expand the state each time they are in power.

[deleted] • 10 points • 24 January, 2016 06:11 PM

No supplements as in like protein powder and stuff? Wtf

lugubrius • 57 points • 24 January, 2016 06:25 PM **[recovered]**

Anything psychoactive is going to be banned this april i think. Shit like modafinil and ashwagandha or any other legal nootropic is no longer allowed.

To give you a idea of how stupid the law is, if they didn't specifically exclude stuff like caffeine you would be arrested for trying to buy it.

[deleted] • 31 points • 24 January, 2016 06:28 PM

Holy shit. That is an ass backwards country.

Mr_Donnerhuhn • 35 points • 24 January, 2016 07:06 PM

The left won, they used emotions & fought dirty. They won.

[deleted] • 46 points • 24 January, 2016 07:39 PM

There is unrest in the forest
There is trouble with the trees
for the maples want more sunlight
and the oaks ignore their pleas
the trouble with the maples
and they're quite convinced they're right
they say the oaks are just too lofty
and they grab up all the light
but they oaks can't help their feelings
if they like the way they're made
and they wonder why the maples
can't be happy in their shade
there is trouble in the forest
and the creatures all have fled
as the maples scream oppression!
and the oaks just shake their heads
so the maples formed a union
and demanded equal rights
the oaks are just too greedy
we will make them give us light!

now there's no more oak oppression
for they passed a noble law
and the trees are all kept equal
by hatchet, axe, and saw

Rush - The Trees

[deleted] • 12 points • 24 January, 2016 08:09 PM

Well fuck, I had no clue how meaningful that song was.

howyoudo • 7 points • 24 January, 2016 09:35 PM*

Is it wrong I pictured that animated with a massive oak standing over a tiny maple screaming at the big oak?

If you read that in this current context it's very apropos.

Wonder if the women screaming oppression realize that we all hold the same fate. If they can't bear the thought of being a supplement, just like the hundreds of generations before them have, then we *all* will not like the outcome.

Essentially we all fulfill our roles, or there's no longer any roles to be had.

Now I'm picturing a remora deciding that he'd rather be the shark swimming instead of a small guy stuck to the side of a beast. A shark can't ride on a remora obviously. Even if it tried it would just kill it, or end up eating it by accident....Now the shark doesn't get cleaned and could possibly die as a result....both will cease to exist.

Edit. Yup sounds like another good dynamic of that which we currently face. Oh nature....you're a trip!

The relationship between a remora and its host is most often taken to be one of commensalism, specifically phoresy. Though it was originally thought that the host to which it attaches for transport gains nothing from the relationship, research[5] indicates that hosts also benefit, given that remoras feed on parasites (such as copepods) and clean sloughing epidermal tissue as well as ingesting scraps of food, feces, and small nekton and zooplankton. ***The remora benefits by using the host as transport and protection, and also feeds on materials dropped by the host.***

[deleted] • 10 points • 25 January, 2016 12:27 AM

Hey, this turned out a little long and isn't really related to the original post. I just wanted to respond to your observation that: "Essentially we all fulfill our roles, or there's no longer any roles to be had.", and got carried away. Let me know what you think.

The division of labour that existed in the past is no longer as advantageous as it once was. Old roles no longer make economic sense. Advances in medical technology and automation have made it possible for cultures (by cultures I mean the category including countries / nations / states / races / religions) to be successful with lower fertility rates. This means that children are not as valued for

their labour (present and future) as they once were. In the farming economy one or two generations past, children were valued for farm work. As adults, they might be needed for factory work. They were expected to support their parents in old age. Now fewer pregnancies are needed to generate the same number of children. It is illegal to use them as a source of labour. Automation and outsourcing have eliminated much of the need for factory workers, and dividends from stock market investments can provide support in old age. Where once thousands of infantrymen would die taking a beach, now much fewer can do the same with the help of sophisticated robotic weaponry. The result is that the expected value of a pregnancy to the culture has decreased significantly. The expected payoff to parents of having children is now negative. It's more economical to import people from developing countries than to raise and educate them in the rich western world.

The dramatic decrease in the value of children from agrarian to industrial and post-industrial cultures diminished the value of women and mothers, forcing women to take on new roles and compete with men in traditionally male occupations. Essentially, gender roles that were advantageous to all for generations became primarily advantageous to men with the industrial revolution, and have become even more advantageous to men since then. Essential goods-producing industries like oil, agriculture, mining, and manufacturing are dominated by men. Men are the vast majority of engineers and non-biologist scientists. The pay-gap between the average man and average woman shows that the average male worker is more valuable than the average female worker. It's PC to say that these differences are the result of culture and socialization, but to anyone on TRP they're obviously the result of physiological differences between men and women. Men's physical strength gives them an advantage in the trades, and differences in cognition between men (search "testosterone cognition" on Google for papers) and women give men an advantage in engineering. I believe feminism is a response to the growing gender inequality and competitive gender roles created by industrialization.

Where women could once best contribute to the material success of the culture by having children, they now primarily do so by working. Without the ability to work, 21st century women (unlike their grandmothers) would be almost completely useless. Unfortunately for female workers, they're not as valuable on average as male workers. If we imagine (don't laugh) that women want to be equal to men in social standing and respectability, then they have to find either some other means of contributing to the culture's prosperity besides labour (such an alternate means doesn't exist, as far as I can tell) to make up for their handicapped productivity, or they need to handicap men through the creation and perpetuation of sexist stereotypes, drive them out of universities, and skew the legal system against them. It seems to me that this some of what feminists have achieved in the last generation or so.

tl;dr: old (co-operative) roles don't make sense any more because technology. Feminism is a response to new (competitive) roles. The only way for women (on average) to compete with men (on average) is to handicap them, which is what feminism has managed to do.

howyoudo • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 04:13 AM*

Damn that was actually pretty fucking good. Didn't think it was too long either, as you're trying to squeeze a lot of thoughts into a post. I kinda rambled myself.

I too kind of hold the same thoughts. I agree that the fact birth mortality rate severally decreased back in the 60s I believe, was an early precursor of whats to come. I do know that throughout history, up until modern times, it was usually looked at as a curse. Often times it killed the mother, or both the child and mother would die in labor.

I also carry the same thoughts about how people having a shit ton of kids nowadays is retarded. I have a friend that has 8 kids. He doesn't like when I bring up that back then, it was cool cause they got to help on the farm or work in general. Need a worker have, have a kid. The fact 5 are with his wife, and don't get me wrong he's a great dad, but having 2 prior and 1 with a fucking one-night stand was dumb as shit.

Never really thought about putting the bigger picture into play and how child labor is banned now and the outsourcing and automation jobs affecting the other side. Some really good thoughts here for sure.

I do still think it's natural to want to procreate. That's just nature in general to want to spread your seed. Not to levels we have in the past, or to the lowest levels like the Chinese did. They do still hold that power over us, so they provide value from that alone. We also hold power, by being the natural powerful to balance the dynamic.

I like that you pose that in order to provide "more value" in our eyes is by knocking us down a few pegs. As we all know though that's pointless and we know it doesn't matter, but that's the conundrum since we both think differently which helps explain why they're better in fields separate from us. We congratulate and they take it wrong and think we mean harm and disrespect, or we were mean so he raped me.

Some go as far as actually making the false allegations no man will come back from. With the outcome now being you have to register 24 hours prior to any sexual encounter is nuts. After you text your plate, tell them tomorrow instead at 1700, and then immediately text the police the same fuck plans Oo. Next they'll want AV in the room to make sure its on the up and up. Could you imagine a modern Salem Witch Trial.

I honestly have no problem working with, or for a woman. I don't mind that they want to be treated equally either. But, big but, if you require that roles reverse, or that we're equal, then don't expect to get away with all the shit that you think you can....there has to be balance and repercussions.

Women needing to make us seem like less of a man, first, does make complete sense. If they want to turn it into a full out war, or competition, again we know who will win. Kudos!

Paid_Internet_Troll • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 04:40 AM

Where women could once best contribute to the material success of the

culture by having children, they now primarily do so by working. Without the ability to work, 21st century women (unlike their grandmothers) would be almost completely useless. Unfortunately for female workers, they're not as valuable on average as male workers. If we imagine (don't laugh) that women want to be equal to men in social standing and respectability, then they have to find either some other means of contributing to the culture's prosperity besides labour (such an alternate means doesn't exist, as far as I can tell) to make up for their handicapped productivity, or they need to handicap men through the creation and perpetuation of sexist stereotypes,

Damn dude. That was on-point.

mugatucrazypills • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 07:27 PM

they sent their most broken down shitheads to canada to do this over here.

[deleted] • 29 points • 24 January, 2016 07:38 PM

I would respond by sending them a letter with my intent to have sex every single day. 365 letters per year.

If the sex doesn't happen, hey that's not illegal is it?

"Officer, it's my *intent* to go out and score... Yes, every day"

workdavework • -1 points • 24 January, 2016 08:18 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

billcosbyeatsbabies • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 10:03 PM

are you mentally handicapped? canada is a british colony, we are essentially a piece of the monarchy

vicious_armbar • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 02:33 PM

The right is in power there right now. They're not much better. They outlawed porn and did a bunch of other stupid anti-male shit from what I remember.

-Tom • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 12:48 AM

Most of these bullshit policies are being pushed through by the right, not the left...

tallwheel • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 01:35 AM

If that's the case (and I believe it since in the U.S. it is primarily the left legalizing marijuana), then the above replier made one hell of a shitty post. "The left won" in response to shit policies championed by the right...

FridayNightBowling • -2 points • 24 January, 2016 11:12 PM

Implying the right doesn't use emotions and fear tactics to fuck people. Or did you forget America 2001 to 2008.

NLCM • -2 points • 25 January, 2016 11:38 AM **[recovered]**

I love how reddit kiddies are so pro Obama and his racist , divisive ways completely go right over their heads, evident by your negative points.

Reddit user-base is such a joke

FridayNightBowling • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:07 PM

Also implying Obama isn't the biggest shill since Reagan. You're not a genius buddy. I just don't pretend the left is some vile poison and that the right isn't like many of the people in this sub. Life is nuanced and what's up with all you right wing people having a thorn up your ass about Obama. These leaders all suck. I would calm down before you have a bunch of assumptions about people. Cheers.

NLCM1 points 25 January, 2016 06:24 PM [recovered]

What's up with people having a thorn up their ass about Obama? If I have to explain this to you, then you're already a lost cause.

Toastlove • 0 points • 25 January, 2016 01:49 PM

Are you just making this shit up to fit in? The left has lost the last two elections and is currently in meltdown.

Mr_Donnerhuhn • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:12 PM

I'm talking about policy here, the tangibles and deliverables are overwhelming left in nature.

Toastlove • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:27 PM

Cuts to public services, benefits, privatization and government snooping are left wing?

lugubrius-7 points 24 January, 2016 07:15 PM [recovered]

Problem is the people who decide these laws and get them passed are 50 year old men who don't understand jack shit about the shit they're banning.

vandaalen • 21 points • 24 January, 2016 07:28 PM

LOL. Do you really believe this to be true?

Do you really think that just anything on those levels does happen by accident or by ignorance? There is always a plan and there is always an agenda. The question is just whose it is.

The finest trick of the devil is to persuade you that he does not exist. - Charles Baudelaire

nuesuh • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 11:20 PM

True. Follow the votes, follow the money.

those "50 year old men who don't understand jack shit" are in their current position due to competence. Even people that appear incompetent aren't. They just don't give a shit about the issues the general public cares about, unless it's going to make them more money or get them reelected.

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 January, 2016 09:36 PM

Did you really think we want those laws observed?" said Dr. Ferris. "We want them to be broken. You'd better get it straight that it's not a bunch of boy scouts you're up against... We're after power and we mean it... There's no way to rule innocent men. The only power any government has is the power to crack down on criminals. Well, when there aren't enough criminals one makes them. One declares so many things to be a crime that it becomes impossible for men to live without breaking laws. Who wants a nation of law-abiding citizens? What's there in that for anyone? But just pass the kind of laws that can neither be observed nor enforced or objectively interpreted – and you create a nation of law-breakers – and then you cash in on guilt. Now that's the system, Mr. Reardon, that's the game, and once you understand it, you'll be much easier to deal with. Ayn Rand, Atlas Shrugged

Kyuzo_ • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 12:43 AM

The more I read on all the socjus bullshit going on, the more I think it reads like something out of Atlas Shrugged, well quoted here.

billcosbyeatsbabies • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 10:04 PM

well, coming up with that explanation took absolutely zero brainpower didn't it?
politicians are pawns, it's all very carefully rigged.

MoneyStatusLooks2 points 24 January, 2016 10:48 PM **[recovered]**

I stocked up on Phenibut, bought 300 grams this month. Prob gonna do the same with Ashwangdha.

Modafinil was already controlled though right?

IllimitableMan • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 01:58 PM

I wouldn't worry, just buy it online, UK customs lets it all through - it'll just be very hard to get it from within the country. Shit's cheaper from abroad anyway, even with shipping.

akjoltoy • 5 points • 25 January, 2016 02:50 AM

The government also doles out worse sentences for software pirates than rapists and murderers. There are a few cases of that happening in the states but it's the norm there.

Fuck that shitty country.

Toastlove • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 01:51 PM

Remember the raids on Kim Dotcom where the US co-opted the New Zealand government, destroyed his entire business and and still trying to extradite him years later despite being told what they are doing is illegal and has no case?

Fuck that shitty country.

bur_ner_ • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 09:23 PM

What do you mean by no porn? Did they block the porn sites there?

rp_valiant • 0 points • 24 January, 2016 09:36 PM

for many ISPs you have to contact them and give them credit cards details as verification that you're an adult. They block everything and selectively allow it based on proof of adulthood. Which is retarded because what kid doesn't live under an adult's roof?

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 10:05 PM

This is incorrect. Your ISP already have your details - such as bank or credit card details so they don't need to ask for those.

When you sign up to new internet package you are asked if you want your filter enabled or disabled. If you don't answer - after a while it will be enabled for you by default. Internet account owner (the one who pays the bill) can easily turn on or off the filter online, without having to talk to anyone.

Porn filter is retarded and can be easily bypassed with free proxies, vpn's and smart DNS servers but please don't spread bullshit.

rp_valiant • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 10:48 PM

well, that's how it works with my ISP - I'm speaking from experience. If I access porn, I get an alert from O2 saying something like "this site is blocked, to unblock it please enter credit card details to prove your age. It will not be billed".

YMMV, clearly.

And to clarify, I am a home owner.

Kyuzo_ • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 12:45 AM

Not always true, the comment you're replying to is right. I picked up a prepaid Sim when I was in the uk on business, quickly discovered Internet filter that they wanted a cc to get rid of.

Toastlove • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 01:45 PM*

The labour and liberal parties were wiped out at the last election. We are on our second 4 year conservative government which has stripped back state benefits massively. The left have kicked up a fuss then gone into meltdown and appointed a man so out of touch even his own party are starting to split over him.

The hyper liberal feminists you talk off are excluded to university campuses and the odd segment on a tv show. They have no power and 99% don't give a shit about them.

5t3fan0 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 02:20 PM

what would happen if, say ur living in uk, someone break into your house at night and you snapped his neck/put on wheelchair? would there be a "excessive defense" or similar shit? would be different if you proved the snapping was "accidental"?

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 07:16 PM

while simultaneously being invaded by 3rd world savages who act in the complete OPPOSITE of the liberal feminist shit hole. Yet, for some reason, they are ENCOURAGED to act out their barbaric culture by these same blue-haired fat asses.

If the left doesn't collapse under it's own weight of bullshit, then we are in some serious trouble.

Hamster_S_Thompson • 12 points • 24 January, 2016 08:20 PM

Shit like this is what's driving reasonable people into the arms of demagogues like Donald trump

vicious_armbar • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 02:42 PM

The thing is maybe the system needs a reset. Elect one Donald Trump and from then on establishment politicians will start listening to the masses. They cater to special interest groups now because they know that getting special interest money and winning their party's nomination is 90% of the path to victory. When that game plan stops working because voters stop electing people beholden to special interests, then the behavior of politicians will change.

Backfist • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 10:32 PM

Once Immigration is fixed people will start acting reasonable again.

herculesisagreatguy • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 12:53 AM

I agree, but Trump is anti-abortion rights. How exactly would that fit with TRP worldview, I wonder?

Hamster_S_Thompson • 0 points • 25 January, 2016 03:03 AM

It doesn't. What I'm saying is that all that PC SJW extremism causes a knee jerk reaction into another extreme, of bigotry and conservative shitheadery.

tb87670 • 5 points • 25 January, 2016 05:22 AM

Conservative 'shitheadery' is not even 1/100th as bad as liberals wanting to self-destruct all progress out of self-guilt for their ancestors being successful. Not to mention leftists/liberals are the public figureheads for feminism, which we all know what that is doing to the world right now. How is feminism not bigotry? It is, and it's worse than anything conservatives could ever do.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 07:36 PM

It will keep getting worse until men start saying, stop, enough is enough.

foldpak111 • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 07:28 AM

I honestly think that it's going to get so bad that men will fight back and start a very violent revolution because as you said, this shit is getting way out of hand. The war will reset society and things will be alright again.

We may never see this day so the ultimate goal for men in this age is to save up enough money to buy some land and leave society behind.

Redasshole • -4 points • 24 January, 2016 05:52 PM

All this only apply to beta.

Solution : be attractive, high SMV. Boom, no problem anymore.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 January, 2016 05:57 PM

I like to think of TRP as a reapplication of that enduring nature towards something better. We can endure struggle in the gym and in conflict. Whichever flagellated cuck has to compete just cannot operate under the same stress and fire that we can. He doesn't even know to try. The world is an objectively shitty place for men, but at least I'm safe.

That's pretty alpha if you ask me.

But yeah, agreed.

MRM tells you the problem. TRP tells you the solution. We could be a social movement if we wanted to be. We could be the best social movement in the history of the world. We'd be good looking, slut nailing, shit lord, fuck heads who save the world. We're not though because we don't need to be. We're better than that. Men aren't oppressed in the west, just a little disadvantaged and not NEARLY disadvantaged enough to bridge the competency gap of a motivated man and a woman. All we need is tight game and a killer work ethic.

NightwingTRP • 135 points • 24 January, 2016 04:19 PM

I saw this nonsense. Who the fuck passes such a brainless law? Who the hell uses this?

It's impractical for the innocent. (A woman isn't going to wait 24hrs after being seduced for a fucking. She operates on her fee fees in the moment.) It's unenforceable for the guilty. (They can't publicise his name, so there's no way for women to know this man has this order against him. The police don't know where he is. Why would the woman report him if it was not rape?)

This is the definition of a worthless order/law.

[deleted] • 184 points • 24 January, 2016 04:50 PM

I'd call the police every day and say that I expect to get laid the next day. Abundance Mentality!

NightwingTRP • 105 points • 24 January, 2016 04:52 PM

I'd do it just to waste their time and resources.

[deleted] • 85 points • 24 January, 2016 05:10 PM

Give his address and his wife's number one day.

NightwingTRP • 47 points • 24 January, 2016 05:15 PM

His address, wife's number and the number of another woman (who'll be at the same address naturally.)

[deleted] • 39 points • 24 January, 2016 05:20 PM

His daughter.

twatbutter • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 01:01 AM

Blue pill or not, it's a bad idea to provoke someone with abusable power. They'll find some half-assed excuse to throw you in jail, or worse yet, potentially frame you for something. Better to fly under the radar entirely if you can.

Fulp_Piction • 6 points • 25 January, 2016 01:36 AM

Do you think that those guys are being serious?

Moneyley • 23 points • 24 January, 2016 07:35 PM

This shit right here! Agree with the law and amplify

OurSociety • 15 points • 24 January, 2016 10:55 PM

From their website:

"Send enquiries to general.enquiries@northyorkshire.pnn.police.uk - please include as much detail as

possible in your message,"

Dear North Yorkshire Police,

I never thought it would happen to me, but ... [*extremely long story involving Estonian gymnast twins wearing Clair de Lune and Louboutins, extremely expensive olive oil, a slip & slide, four strategically placed hammocks, and lots of smooth jazz, followed by an hour-long Shepard tone, enhanced by cognac and prescription painkillers.*]

Look forward to telling you more, much more very soon. Kisses!

[deleted] • 9 points • 24 January, 2016 07:53 PM

That's what they want. They'd just use the extra "work" to justify an even higher budget. Invent busywork -> convince people it's useful and necessary -> leech tax money to pay for it -> profit.

mahlzeit • 51 points • 24 January, 2016 05:56 PM

"Hello Officer, I'm just calling to inform you that I'm thinking of having a bit of a wank tomorrow, after tea. Good day, sir!"

[deleted] • 15 points • 24 January, 2016 05:58 PM

Be sure to leave a message when you start, just to let him know you're honest.

nyrp • 23 points • 24 January, 2016 07:14 PM

That might be a good way to get them to drop the program, Agree and Amplify. Record your masturbation and sex and insist the officers watch it to be sure that you're all good on that particular activity. Ask them to watch it twice and take notes so you can be absolutely sure you didn't break the slightest limit. Jerk off directly into the camera lens for some strong pov. Have your friend film you from behind with your asscheeks spread wide so your probation officer can see you didn't wipe properly the last time you defecated. Call out his mother's name when you come.

billcosbyeatsbabies • 5 points • 24 January, 2016 10:08 PM

act completely oblivious to the fact that he's overdoing it, continue amplifying until they ask a judge to remove the court order on his name

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 January, 2016 07:16 PM

I wonder what'd happen if he actually did that. It'd be a really nice protest and I bet her could actually get a good amount of support going raw shit lord for a good cause. Yes he was accused of rape and that would work against him, but he'd have such a strong case and I bet that at least men would believe him. I'd do it if I were his position. No clue if it'd be objectively good, but I like a good fight.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 02:12 PM

Of he sent the cops a wank video, they're arrest him for public indecency or something to that effect.

mahlzeit • 13 points • 24 January, 2016 06:05 PM

And of course bring in the evidence tissues to the police station. "I'm sorry officer, I didn't call in for that one, but I didn't know they had scheduled Basic Instinct after the game ... I hope that's not

going to be a problem, sir."

BradPill • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 06:48 PM

Just claim to be porn-addicted - that makes you a 'victim' and lots of (state) support will be offered for free.

GrandmasterHurricane • 8 points • 24 January, 2016 04:54 PM

But you must provide the name and address and phone number of the girl.

Sementeries • 45 points • 24 January, 2016 05:23 PM

I'd claim to bisexual and tell all my gay male friends to call in at all hours of the day.

I don't live in the UK, but if they wanna waste your time with this shit then I say game on, they wanted this.

The_Red_Paw • 17 points • 24 January, 2016 07:46 PM

Just give a fake name and address, then if they call you out say

"Sorry, bro, that's what she told me when we planned to hook up. Looks like I got the bait and switch. By the way, tomorrow I'm planning to bang this girl I just met. Says her name is Susie Q Person, 1600 Pennsylvania Ave, Washington DC. Age 18 and a day."

The_Red_Paw • 5 points • 24 January, 2016 07:41 PM

Not only that, but he is required to report what his sexual plans are, so I'd make sure to have a pile of barely legal litporn that I'd read to them ad nauseum until they got a court order telling me to stop.

max_peenor • 45 points • 24 January, 2016 05:47 PM

Who the hell uses this?

It exists so they can punish him for rape without holding another trial. Justice is just too inconvenient.

skoobled • 9 points • 24 January, 2016 04:26 PM

Unfortunately we've got to the stage where laws are passed based on unrealistic expectations of how sexual activity "should" take place. ie. I think that everyone here agrees that sex *should* take place only between consenting adults, and if it were possibly to draw up legally witnessed paperwork to verify that the activity took place 100% willingly and consensually, that would be a *good* thing... However That is NEVER realistic for how real human sexual activity *actually* takes place. Because that would mean acknowledging that humans are shaven apes at the heart of it, and that most often comes up only with sexuality.

Good luck finding many people in the mainstream who are happy to accept that and legislate around it

[deleted] 24 January, 2016 05:21 PM

[permanently deleted]

skoobled • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 08:02 PM

Don't get what you mean. My point was if it was in any way realistic to get a legally binding agreement for adhoc sex, then I'd hope everyone here would be for it since it would (in theory) make false rape accusations impossible... But doing so is entirely counter to how human sexual dynamics *actually* work. So the problem is legislation based on this ideal world vision on how things "should"

work

dr_warlock • 105 points • 24 January, 2016 04:30 PM*

The police state is coming as I feared. It's not about logic, it's about power. They're using societies inclination to irrationally favor women's safety to pass tyrannical laws under the guise of helping women. In addition, the government (includes department of education) and elite are manufacturing threats to justify the existence of the status quo. Men are the threat, they need to neutralize

Women, feminists, betas, and SJW's are just useful idiots. Eventually there will be a tipping point where the powers that be won't need to work with the sheep anymore. Everyone will realize that the government and elite never gave a shit about anybody, man or woman.

steelerfaninperu • 21 points • 24 January, 2016 06:45 PM

Absolutely. I think the whole PC movement is an extension of this. It distracts us from real issues. We're satisfied with calling a cop racist as an explanation for his behavior. We're content with giving women and minorities special privileges instead of asking why they're disadvantages (if they even are).

Obama, and soon Clinton, they're perfect. They're immune to scrutiny because nobody can call them out without being labeled racist/sexist. The media eats it up, and spits it out.

The US is doomed.

tallwheel • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 01:54 AM

So much this. No one bothers to really ponder the reasons, and are satisfied with the half-assed explanation that people are evil and hate people who are different for no good reason whatsoever.

steelerfaninperu • 4 points • 25 January, 2016 02:19 AM

PC is a giant pacifier for people. First it stirs people up, then it gives them a handy convenient answer. Then it bangs on the pot again and rattles the people. It's a feedback loop.

And all it does is keep our brains busy.

You have no idea how many times now I've been making a perfectly coherent rational argument on CMV or Politicaldiscussion and someone will tell me I'm trying to avoid hurting or hurting someone's feelings.

I never bring up anyone's feelings, I don't give a fuck about your feelings. But people are all wound up about feelings now. It's a pussified America. Instead of looking at behavior, we're looking at feelz. And it coincides perfectly with what women want, since they're the masters of feelz.

Mr_Donnerhuhn • 5 points • 24 January, 2016 07:59 PM*

yeah we're a few generations from either a genuinely free-society or a total hell-hole mix of caliphate and communism.

Neuroentropic_Force • 5 points • 24 January, 2016 04:54 PM

Ever heard of the Illuminati? I'm not joking, all redpillers should read the original text that reports on the goals of the Illuminati.

excerpt Proofs of a Conspiracy, by John Robison, [1798] (Keep in mind this is from over 200 years ago)

"There is no way of influencing men so powerfully as by means of the women. These should therefore be our

chief study; we should insinuate ourselves into their good opinion, give them hints of emancipation from the tyranny of public opinion, and of standing up for themselves; it will be an immense relief to their enslaved minds to be freed from any one bond of restraint, and it will fire them the more, and cause them to work for us with zeal, without knowing that they do so; for they will only be indulging their own desire of personal admiration."

There is a lot more. The full text can be found easily online.

Mildsoss • 3 points • 25 January, 2016 01:48 AM

Damn son that's got me intrigued.

Sementeries • 5 points • 24 January, 2016 05:18 PM

I don't know about all that, but it sounds a bit reasonable.

This just opens up a case for more "rape" cases. Anybody could claim you raped them and throw a piece of their clothing with their bodily fluids (underwear) in or around your house. It's like a shitty version of minority report except these fucktards are more likely to arrest you just based on a he said/she said scenario.

NaughtyFred • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 05:20 PM

I think "Behold a Pale Horse" is a more accurate representation of where things are going.

cariboo_j • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 06:28 AM

Illuminati? My money's on the new world order jewish reptilian bankers.

Everyone knows the puppet masters are jewish reptilian bankers. The illuminati is just a front organization.

What they *don't* know is that the reptilians are fighting a covert war with the **crab people**, who also want to enslave humanity for their own nefarious purposes.

Two enemies to be on the look out for: lizard people and crab people.

Illuminati is just the tip of the iceberg bro...

aguy01 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 01:44 PM

Look, another guy whose never done any research except read a few skeptic articles, but is nonetheless sure of himself.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 11:15 PM

Agreed 100%! More guys on TRP need to be aware what you're talking about /u/dr_warlock. For anyone who is interested: Roosh wrote a really good article about this a while ago ("We are Nothing More than Distracted Sheep in the Real Game of Power") and the manosphere blog Hawaiian Libertarian is a great introduction to these ideas.

[deleted] • 26 points • 24 January, 2016 05:11 PM

By doing this, women don't realize how much they are marginalizing actual rape. The real victims of rape are being trivialized with this bullshit just cause every girl wants to feel special and get attention

[deleted] • 33 points • 24 January, 2016 05:44 PM

Uh they dont' give a fuck dude. Lol they do not care about actual rape victims, like at all.

[deleted] • 4 points • 25 January, 2016 04:51 AM

People forget that things like slut shaming and bullying against women happen often because of other girls. They treat each other like shit due to nothing but jealousy/contempt, let alone men who are nothing but a utility.

cashmoney_x • 3 points • 25 January, 2016 02:15 PM

Most of them hate the others.

[deleted] • 49 points • 24 January, 2016 05:02 PM*

In his place, i would call every 2-3 hours explaining at length that, due to the court's order, he has to inform them of any sexual activity. Then add that he is jerking off to X-style porn. Do it again, and again, and again, in troll style. Then inform a local newspaper (so long as they keep his name under privacy). 1000 bucks the order will be revoked instantly - especially if he can add details on the poor women at the receiving end that are forced to receive all these details, and record them.

NotUpToAnythingGood • 25 points • 24 January, 2016 06:17 PM

Nah, they'd charge him with harassment.

We are 'supposed' to know our places after all... /s

tgeda • 62 points • 24 January, 2016 04:06 PM

Honestly, this is one of those things that has to get worse before it gets better. It must first get to the point where it hurts women (because men are too cautious to have sex, turn to porn, insist on having sex recorded etc) before the backlash comes.

Just chill boys, chill and weather the storm.

[deleted] • 69 points • 24 January, 2016 04:19 PM

Women figured out that men just want to fuck and will trade a lot to get it. Feminists abused that for a century. The problem though, with relying on men's horniness is that it'll only work so long as they can keep men thinking that feminism is the answer to their horniness. When shit like this shows up and men begin to think feminists aren't helping them, they'll rebel. Men have the capability of having a much harder frame than women. If men rebel, women lose.

systemshock86957 points 24 January, 2016 04:35 PM* **[recovered]**

I feel like dipshit pussy men are at the heart of the epidemic of shitty women. A woman can leave at any time because there's always some schmuck thirstier than you that can slide on in. Even the 'alphas' pumping and dumping them are technically rewarding their shitty behavior. Women won't get better until men get better.

[deleted] • 28 points • 24 January, 2016 07:47 PM

just men...

You think there's something inherently broken about those 80% of shit tier men? Wanna hear something scary? There isn't. Most guys are able to get to a quality man status, some just need more and better opportunities than others, or the direction to see the ones there now.

That's the scary part. It's not that the weak fall and the good rise, it's that we are all capable of being either, and rolling a few 1s is all it takes to go down the wrong path.

absent dad, shitty legislation, hedonist availability, just takes the right combination to hobble you up for the race.

Just be glad the manosphere exists, enough guys figured there had to be a better way, and put their collective heads together to swap notes

I_TRY_TO_BE_POSITIVE • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 10:24 PM

...man.

been trying to figure out how to put this for a while. Thanks.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 10:53 PM

Iron sharpens iron, it's TRP in a nutshell

Overkillengine • 8 points • 24 January, 2016 10:18 PM

Women won't get better until men get better.

To be specific, women won't get better until men stop rewarding them for being shitty. A man can be as good as he wants, but if he rewards a woman for being shit, she's going to keep doing it.

CalamariRP2 points 24 January, 2016 06:38 PM* **[recovered]**

I feel like dipshit pussy men are at the heart of the epidemic of shitty women.

Beta Bux

A woman can leave at any time because there's always some schmuck thirstier than you that can slide on in.

Due to beta bux, abundance is her default.

Even the 'alphas' pumping and dumping them are technically rewarding their shitty behavior.

You spread your genes, she gets no commitment. Win.

Women won't get better until men get better.

We're not a movement. We're the pump 'n dumpers. (yes, we do LTR's too, not the point)

EDIT: No longer confident in this assessment. Read /u/Questionablechoice comments below for a much better analysis.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:19 AM*

Beta Bux are not the tier of men making it shitty for other men.

The delta and gammas are the ones which are rewarding the real shit behavior.

The omega/alpha are merely the example which the feminist commonly holds up as an example of their charges.

The orbiters are not generally beta bux or beta fucks. They can get pussy they just pay for it in terms of sub optimal physical form, social status or via large resources. The beta bux is the hard working beaver, the alpha the strong wolf.

The delta and gamma however are the insects which are beneath most women and ultimately are the ones which lead women to hate without being alpha widows. The deltas and gamma which only get their shots on a domino stack of situations falling in line.

Beta Bux always get laid and always end up in a relationship. However they get there for their resources and get cheated on and often divorce raped. They get divorce raped because the delta, gammas and omega drink the socialist and feminist koolaid which leads to the law structure we have today. Believe if they advance the whims of women they will get upgraded to beta or alpha status and get laid.

Deltas get into relationship very seldom and end up being the little bitches which get walked all over and destroyed by the women they serve. They are the men in the shadows which only come into the light as the last option.

Alphas maybe the 20% which get the 80% but betas are the 20% which get the remaining 80%.

CalamariRP1 points 25 January, 2016 06:04 AM **[recovered]**

Interesting notes, thanks. What importance is it to further distinguish social hierarchy than just alpha and beta? Shouldn't those be sufficient for red pill context?

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 January, 2016 06:38 AM*

There are lots of RP reasons to understand the complete hierarchy.

Your Alphas (15 - 20%) are for most people in TRP the goal.

Your Betas (next 20 - 25%) are often your divorced raped, your cheated on, those separated from child, etc.

Your Deltas (next 30 - 35%) Your common RP subscriber (IMO) these men have never or perhaps once gotten laid. They are flooded into the asktrp sub. They are your high school students, your college freshmen you is XX age too late to date. These are the most common subset of TRP. If you don't believe it look at asktrp with a clear mind.

Gammas & omegas - While some of these are here they tend to be so extremely undesirable that improvement may not even be an option with you multiple years of work. TRP will often not be able to help these guys because they are so extremely disadvantaged they are broken.

The core reason why it is important to understand these groups is not only to understand what level of topic you need to start from but also how to apply your lessons effectively. It's also important to develop a clear understanding of how to classify others in the current market.

The hate on Betas specifically is a misguided and uninformed mindset. The beta male is a successful male although not as successful as an alpha. 40% of men (which successfully produce offspring) prior to the more recent evolutionary history were almost exclusively Alphas and Betas.

The Gammas & Omegas were unsuccessful or barely successful in passing on genes. Everyone here from the most horribly screw up shit storm of a background is the child of a successful string of alphas & betas with the possible rare Delta or Gamma thrown in the mix.

This is why 80 - 85% of women are successful at passing on genes were even in modern society only 70 - 75% of males are. This jump for 40 to 70 is also only in a post medicine world. Up until the 1800's it was 50% or less even with marriage 1.0 and everything else in the advantage to the spreading of genes.

Blaming the Betas is blaming the 20% of the population which was successful but not as

successful as the alphas. If you think only 20% of the population has caused the current global situation your not looking at the issue with a clear mindset. If you think Betas are the thirstiest men out there your also pretty naive on the current issues. Betas get laid. Deltas, Gammas & Omegas are the thristy men which push the feminist agenda for them. Understand the difference is key in understanding the world around which is the cornerstone to TRP.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 07:44 PM

men want purpose. They like sex.

When you take away the former, what's left but hedonism for the latter?

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 06:05 PM

There's few things sadder than a man whose only objective in life is a pussy.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 06:32 PM

which is fine IMO, at first. Goals change as you get older. a 21 year old probably doesn't care about much else.

Once he gets a few under his belt, he'll realize it's not such a great goal after all, but it's one of those lessons a man needs to learn for himself, no one can tell him.

It does make me laugh though when I get called a faggot for suggesting it. reminds me of me at that age.

[deleted] • 19 points • 24 January, 2016 07:44 PM

the problem is the worse part.

I like Thomas Barnetts take on the Arab Spring, which seems apt here:

A man wants to go to school, get a good career, have sex, settle down and have a family. If you shut down opportunities for men to have this, they start to cause problems.

The whole arab spring started because a guy who believed in the dream of a smarter, richer worker having a good life was taken away, was willing to sit in quiet desperation with his fruit stand, and when someone fucked with his fruit stand, he lit himself on fire.

and that started the entire house of cards to fall. Wanna bet where a good portion of those disenfranchised adult men are working now for purpose?

Somewhere around Turkey I'd wager

boxing_eagle • 10 points • 25 January, 2016 03:23 AM

Do you people seriously believe that will happen in the West? I don't. It's mostly young men who lead an insurrection. Young men in the west are mostly neutered. The 'Bread & Circus' of the West is far more advanced than the 'Bread & Circus' of the Middle-East. I bet there would have been no Arab Spring if you gave everyone in those countries a World of Warcraft subscription and an iPhone. Heh.

That and you still need funding for your 'movement'. The Arab Spring was funded aplenty by foreign powers.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 10:16 AM

Check out japans "herbivore" men.

Yes the young in the west are neutered but theyre also getting smarter. Theyll learn their neutered selves cant win and will begin to opt out. Once enough opt out the betas wont be able to supplement the chads and the women will have to finally give something up

bluedrygrass • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 06:02 PM

Unfortunately, the japanese herbivores are the example of defeat, not of revolution. They're opting out the same way western nerds opt out in their parents basements.

If Japan had the immigrant influx of western countries, the native population would be wiped out in few generations.

People who opts out in western countries get simply kicked out of the game by some immigrant.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 06:20 PM

Resignation, yes. But realizing theyve been crippled and can never play the game as it was meant to be played (and therefore cannot win) and refusing to play is the best option they have. Being susceptible to an invasive population wont be their problem because its a threat to the women, not themselves. If they pursue other interests besides women they will be at an objective advantage over outsiders who women will quickly realize will not bend to their needs and feelings. If theyre not completely retarded theyll know what they need to do.

But thats an optimistic perspective of course

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 11:36 AM

It's a metaphor, I'm not talking about Canadians taking arms here.

Don't be obtuse

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:59 PM

Exactly, no revolution can possibly happen between western youngs.

Researches shows millennials are nowadays so dependant from internet and social medias, they start to have anxiety and panic attacks after few days without.

This is supposed to be the force that will fight against the tyranny and change the world? A whimpy nerd that spends half his time wanking in front of a screen? Or an hipstery one refreshing his status on facebook from the local starbuck, sipping on a frappuccino?

No, we are completely neutered and defused, regarding will power, motivations, reactivity. We're too dependant to our comforts, to our dopaminic drugs like porn, videogames, endless tv series and movies, to our relaxing fat joints, to our fresh beer on a sofa.

As long as we will have a basement with some fast food to feast on and some sugary drink, and a 24/7 internet connection, we won't move a finger, and even if we wanted, we're useless in combat or harsh situations.

On a sidenote, the arabic populations that revolted (and that wouldn't have done it without being started and pushed by people like Soros & friends) had literally nothing to lose, and their main objective has been to mass-move to western countries.

Where would western inhabitants emigrate, to Egypt, to Nigeria? Sure.

Quantum_Ibis • 15 points • 24 January, 2016 08:41 PM

So this is their reaction to allowing Pakistani Muslims to gang rape their girls for decades? Would they ever dare

apply this ridiculous standard to their Pakistani population?

What is wrong with these people?

aguy01 • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 01:52 PM

Seriously if they want to target 'potentially dangerous' people then all the Muslims should be on the list, but this only applies to white men.

CrimsonEllipse • 14 points • 25 January, 2016 02:00 AM

The real travesty is not the sentence he received, but the fact that he was found innocent after a retrial.

Think about that for a minute. That means they couldn't find a way to make this stick the first time around, so they just charged him again from a slightly different angle in order to make this guy's life unlivable.

Any country without protection from double jeopardy is an absolute shithole. The USA might have its problems, but at least I'll get to enjoy my constitutional rights for another 20 years before the liberals manage to completely dismantle them.

[deleted] • 7 points • 25 January, 2016 09:36 AM*

In the US they do this shit all the time.

Steve Avery was tried 7 fucking times for the same crime with 3 different tellings of how the murder was committed.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Steven_Avery

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Making_a_Murderer

They have so many laws that they just change the slightest detail and it's no longer double jeopardy.

Murder 1? Nope

How about murder 2? How about manslaughter? how about assault with a deadly weapon causing death?

How about Aggravated assault with a deadly weapon causing death?

etc etc etc.

BradPill • 34 points • 24 January, 2016 05:15 PM

Let me guess: this guy is white, right? This is what Hitler and Stalin dreamed of and what Orwell tried to convey. Total control, guilty up front and 'random 'justice'.

If he has a good lawyer, he sues those judges and the courts for Human Rights violations, up to the UN and The Hague. We should Crowdfund it. (which in itself is crazy, as this is state-terror - paid for with our taxes).

Also, what did they sentence the girl to? State subsidized, lifelong therapy, because of the trauma her false claim caused her?

[deleted] • 9 points • 24 January, 2016 07:49 PM

they said british man. If he wasn't white, he wouldn't be called one of the queens subjects.

BEHRPROOFcan • 7 points • 24 January, 2016 06:02 PM

She was deemed a hero for being so "brave" as she sold her lies to the world.

Mgtowredpillonroids • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 08:48 PM

I wonder how long it'll take till some affected guys go postal.

bittr_n_swt • 38 points • 24 January, 2016 04:04 PM

i'm from the UK and this has to be one of the most retarded thing i've heard

[deleted] • 11 points • 24 January, 2016 05:37 PM

Wow.....this one fucking shocked me.

This is perhaps the craziest thing I've ever seen. I wouldn't be at all surprised to see this as an onion article.

Holy fuck. Does the UK not have a supreme court? How in the fuck? I would not blame him at all for killing the judge. Bet then judges might not want to give out bullshit orders like this.

Insanity. Blackstone would kill you himself for this.

NolanHarlow • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:42 AM

I've thought the same thing before. It'd take some martyrs, but the attention on ridiculous rulings might shift focus to guys like this one if, on occasion, a victim of a ridiculous ruling transformed into Keyser Soze.

TheMGhandi • 12 points • 24 January, 2016 05:54 PM

This law got passed because too many daughters of politicians were deflowered.

Edit: and since rich men pay for escorts, this law doesn't effect them one bit.

[deleted] • 13 points • 24 January, 2016 07:57 PM

This is how all the shit is setup. The common man can't own a weapon and carry, but if you're rich you can pay for a body guard who does.

There are countless examples of shit like this.

TheMGhandi • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 09:06 PM

And when their fortunate sons fuck too many women and get in trouble, the law will get reversed.

This is all, one big fucking game bro. Maybe it got passed to screw over a rich man who's known to womanize? Chances are it was to test out how pathetic men are today. They're all laughing at how weak and passive we've become, and now they'll continue to emasculate us further until we are zombies.

[deleted] • 22 points • 24 January, 2016 05:18 PM*

As disturbing as this is, I would love it if he had the balls to sleep with all the women in the police force, or the policeman's wives/mothers.

"Sex Report:

Date: Your Birthday

Name: Mrs. Cop

Age: 40 years old

Address: Your House

Details: Anal and jizzed on her face"

DotishGuy • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 08:16 PM

Then the cop would pull some strings to get you in jail for rape :/

Archwinger • 10 points • 25 January, 2016 12:11 AM

Wait wait... For the crime of being found innocent, but still having been previously accused, a punishment has been imposed?

Statecensor • 9 points • 25 January, 2016 01:45 AM

The bigger question is how can you be found not guilty and still be required to abide by an order of the court after being acquitted?

cancer1798 • 7 points • 24 January, 2016 05:38 PM

Wow, they're just trying to oppress us. Really this is nothing more than a ploy to eliminate us alphas from society leaving betas and faggots behind. It's unbelievable that you can be sentenced like this. It's crazy that laws like this are allowed in the world of today. Controlling the natural instincts of men can lead to nothing but disaster.

RP15 • 3 points • 25 January, 2016 06:11 AM

Of course it is. The government/media elite has totally sold out to our enemies. We are being systematically targeted for destruction through prison and disrupting our procreative success.

Arm yourself. It can get a LOT worse than this.

MattyAnon • 6 points • 24 January, 2016 05:49 PM

My only hope for the UK is that European law will prevail and sort this out.

This is punishment without conviction, and if not checked will get worse.

Sexual risk orders start against those acquitted of rape... next is those charged with rape... next is those who look at women in a way they don't like...

Make no mistake, feminists will not stop with the supposed-guilty. The barrier to this sort of thing will get lower and lower. Feminists will shout about rape culture (neatly avoiding any basis in verifiable facts of course) and then demand that 15 year old boys are put on this list by default "just to be safe".

And these laws will never be repealed. They'll just be culturally accepted. To protect the wimminz.

steelerfaninperu • 10 points • 24 January, 2016 06:53 PM

On Rape Culture...

You know that women who go to university are actually *less* likely to be raped than other women? Even with all the bullshit cases these days, rape is still much lower for women in college than for women who don't go. (I believe the stat was from ages 16-24)

What's worse? Men are MORE likely to report rape/sexual assault in college than outside of it.

This is based off the actual number of cases, not a survey asking about their feels.

But of course feminism can't stop when they've got enough.

Archterus • 5 points • 24 January, 2016 10:09 PM

Interesting dystopic vision. All boys are automatically on a potential sex offender list from 12 to 18, graduation from that determined by a panel of womyn that is convened monthly. Restrictions apply, apps on electronic devices prohibiting porn, no hanging out with adult men outside the immediate household, no aggressiveness to females tolerated. If breached demerit points, get enough then onto a different list with greater restrictions on employment etc.

MattyAnon • 7 points • 24 January, 2016 11:29 PM

| graduation from that determined by a panel of womyn that is convened monthly.

Gradually graduation from the sex offender list would be extended and then withdrawn.. "for the safety of women and girls everywhere".

| no aggressiveness to females tolerated.

Worse than that... females believed when they say men are aggressive towards them. This results in men being less aggressive towards females. Then the bar lowers and lowers. We see that now with "microaggressions" - asking someone the wrong question is now a "microaggression".

Next on the "aggression" list is not taking positive action towards women. Eg not hiring women (an otherwise passive act) is now sexist and discriminatory and illegal. Positive action to protect women's interests is now the law. We're also seeing this in colleges - men taught and expected to protect women from sexual assault (which of course is defined in the widest possible way, to admit as many new worshipers... err sorry "victims" as possible).

Women ... as always... are under no obligations towards men, to protect men from false accusations, to be clear about their intentions, to be honest, etc. Women get a free pass on everything, as usual. Women Are Wonderful And Can Do No Wrong. And if they do do bad things (which most do), we just blame ~~society~~ men for their behaviour.

It's all deeply pathetic, and it will get worse before men wake up. And by then it will be too late. Women will not allow men the equivalent of feminism, freedom, lack of discrimination, etc.

mrust • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 07:55 AM

This was my thought as well. Undoubtedly violates either some right to association, or human rights clause. A good lawyer could also argue that it infringes on the privacy of his sexual partners. Since EU legislation has strong privacy protection, framing the issue in terms of how women are harmed would be most likely to succeed.

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 January, 2016 07:21 PM

This man needs go get a database of all addresses in the uk, a list of all names in the uk, a list of all dates since the 1920, loop through the arrays and print out the massive massive list and drop it off at the police station every day. That way he can have sex with anyone anywhere in the uk. It would takes while for it to run. If he decided to only have sex at his place he could shrink the list to only a couple trillion entries.

[deleted] • 7 points • 25 January, 2016 03:02 AM

This guy should just convert to Islam. Then, he'd be able to fuck any woman he wants, whenever he wants to - whether they want it or not - and all the liberals and SJWs would just excuse and/or ignore it.

Neuroentropic_Force • 12 points • 24 January, 2016 04:48 PM

As terrifying as this is, it's not enforceable. It's an unfunny joke symptomatic of how diseased the state of affairs is in the UK, the brits have no balls, at least they are trying to make it illegal too. This would not and never will fly in the U.S. no matter how hard the feminazis scream. I doubt it will fly for long in the UK either.

[deleted] • 12 points • 24 January, 2016 07:26 PM

I've seen a few stories out of Britain in the last few months that left me scratching my head.

Butter knives confiscated by police

Pepper spray is an illegal "firearm"

City officials whose only job is to tell smokers to threaten smokers with a fine if they don't dispose of their butts properly

Child prostitution rings tolerated by police because the pimps are immigrant

Uneducated people leading cushy middle-class lifestyles with welfare money

I'm sure that if I dug deeper, I would find more bizarre stories. To any Brits reading this: What's going on in your country? Has it always been like this, or is it getting worse?

vacuu • 3 points • 25 January, 2016 03:34 AM

I've been hearing outrageous stories coming out of that country for years.

RedMoonAscendant • 6 points • 24 January, 2016 07:51 PM

Yeah, that whole child prostitution thing is fucking amazing. How can any sane person not just vote out every single politician when they realize their government is explicitly allowing children to be raped?

Maybe the Catholic Church numbed us to it?

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:49 PM

Catholic church, Britain. Pick one. Or try not to look too stupid in doing all you can to throw mud to the Catholic church only because medias told you so. You should know better

RedMoonAscendant • 1 point • 26 January, 2016 05:20 AM

I see English is not your first language. Expressing thoughts in a foreign language is more difficult than understanding them written by a native speaker, so what you want to do is simplify your thoughts into extremely simple sentences. I'll give you an example in the following paragraph:

Catholic priests raped boys. It is proven. The church denied it. The denials were debunked. Many Catholics live in the UK. Many ignored the rapes. Now immigrants rape children. Many ignore this. Perhaps these are related.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 27 January, 2016 11:28 AM*

I'm no native speaker, but what you wanted to say was clear.

Some priests raped children, as there are always rotten apples everywhere. Some higher ranked priest tried to cover it up. Same principle. But the church, as a whole, fought it, and punished the responsible, and lead them to courts. It's not a church's principle to rape boys. Nor it is a common procedure. In fact, there are more rapists in your average government, only that those faces no consequences for their actions and usually go unnoticed.

Catholics are a minority in the UK, since, newsflash, protestantism is the "dominant" religion (it really isn't, Islam is, as well as in other countries, nobody really believe anymore).

Another news for you: no immigrant is Catholic, they're all Islamic or agnostic. The reason their rapes got covered up is because accuse them wouldn't have been politically correct. That's right, UK prefers little girls to be raped than to be accused of racism.

Yet, somehow, the Catholic church is responsible, because medias told you so. Ask yourself why masonic one-tought medias hate the Catholic church so much, while have nothing against refugees etc.

SpeakerCid • 25 points • 24 January, 2016 05:29 PM

Meanwhile, refugees are allowed to go around raping, beating and killing.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 January, 2016 07:54 PM

I find that to be the logical conclusion of consequence free politics for the past few decades.

Like a peacetime military, all of a sudden thrust into war. All of those politicking people who have DT'd their way to the top, now in the face of real danger are woefully unequipped to handle it.

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 January, 2016 07:18 PM

*rapefugees

[deleted] • 7 points • 24 January, 2016 09:51 PM

was acquitted in 2015 at a retrial after claiming the alleged victim had consented.

No, the retrial confirmed, or declared, or determined, that the alleged victim had consented. Using the word "claiming" implies that the court just had an opinion on the subject, no more or less valid than anyone else's.

spoona96 • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 05:05 PM

With all the shit stupid laws like this and other things not to do with sex just stupidity I feel like in the next 10 years or so there will be a major uprising in the west like enough is enough.

Rimeheart • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 05:45 PM

No way just submit every address in the entire country. Do this for every day of the week, for the whole year.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 06:00 PM

BBC.co News is real right?

Well guys in the UK, start running to the Airport towards another country...FAST.

When shit gets so worse, always know that you have the option of walking away.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 07:51 PM

And yet again my decision to abstain from women completely is reaffirmed.

deaduponaviral • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 09:06 PM

Why not just leave the shit hole that is the UK?

OfficialMotherfucker • 3 points • 25 January, 2016 12:58 AM

He should just start filming all of his dating and sex ordeals documentary / vlog style, and make them public with proper censoring. Yesterday you were accused of rape and today you use it to get instant celebrity status

[deleted] • 13 points • 24 January, 2016 04:53 PM*

People from the UK have been getting fucked over by their government for ages, this is just a single example.

A country where you are not allowed to defend ones self or ones family or property is a shit county. Criminals know a home invasion in the UK has a much higher success rate with little resistance from the home owners compared with America.

Imo this is just another symptom of a twisted society in need of a reset.

edit: If you are from the UK and advocate to have a gun free society, you're a hypocritical piece of shit. The Brits ruled the entire world through the barrel of a gun for decades, as they said the sun used to never set on the British empire. Now suddenly it's peace on earth, good will towards men, put down your guns and lets sing

cumbaja as we all hold hands together? Get fucking real. Understand your society subjugated countless others for decades; now suddenly Brits are advocating to throw your weapons down? Un-fucking-believable.

[deleted] • 8 points • 24 January, 2016 05:46 PM

Don't post lies and frame them as truth. The position of the Government and the Crown Prosecution Service here in the UK is simply that you cannot murder somebody because they have unlawfully entered your home. You can kill them in defence of your property and your belongings, presuming that your reaction is proportionate and justified. What this judgement prevents against isn't killing somebody within your home, but rather, administering capital punishment simply because you deem their invasion of your home to be unacceptable. Let me present two different scenarios. In scenario A, somebody has broken into my house at night. I keep a cricket bat under my bed, so I sneak to wherever the intruder is, and smash him over the head. I call the police, but the intruder dies before/after they arrive. After investigation, no charges are pressed against me because my response to the intruder was proportionate to my level of fear given the situation. In scenario B, the same occurs as before, except, after my first blow, the intruder is merely incapacitated. But that isn't good enough for me. So I strike him again and again until he dies. The police arrive, an investigation ensues, and I am charged with murder for repeatedly striking the intruder when he was already incapacitated. I am tried and found guilty.

So, while some of our laws are stupid, and some of our judges are useless, as in the case cited in this topic, it is a poor argument to seize upon one thing and extrapolate that to the point where it creates an (incorrect) argument to support your perception of our country. There was previously something of a grey area in the law, where Tony Martin shot a gypsy who was burgling his home. One of the critical issues with his case was that he used a weapon that he was not legally permitted to carry - his defence was that he claimed to have found it. His conviction for murder surrounded the interpretation of proportionate force. In this country, you can only bear arms under certain circumstances while possessing certain licenses. There are pros and cons to this, but the biggest perk is that our homicide rate is among the lowest in the developed world (in all of the world, for that matter). For all that you could say that a home invasion has more chance of success in the UK, I could say that school shootings have a much higher success rate with little resistance in the USA. Or that any type of pre-planned mass shooting has a much higher success rate with little resistance in the USA. But I think we could reasonably agree that we live in two societies that are twisted, broken, and on the verge of collapse. But they won't be reset, they'll be bandaged by the very people who should not be trusted to care for them. They'll be forged anew in the same image as before, and the white man will suffer.

NotUpToAnythingGood • 6 points • 24 January, 2016 06:16 PM

Bear in mind that nearly all mass shootings (and all school shootings) are in so-called "gun-free" zones. These are places where people are prohibited from carrying / possessing firearms. So the people in those places were sitting ducks (soft, easy targets).

Yet when rampage shooters run into armed resistance, they typically kill themselves in short order instead continuing on to kill others.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 07:53 PM

it's not that schools are gun free zones, it's where the disenfranchised spend most of their day.

Most shark attacks happen in the ocean, but it's not because the beach is a gun free zone.

selfsufficientnigga4 points 24 January, 2016 06:45 PM* **[recovered]**

Don't post lies and frame them as truth.

And here you are, arguing how UK legal system is actually decent, in a thread about how it went haywire.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 07:50 PM

the thing about common law isn't that it's not effective, it's really only as effective as the person arguing for his clients behalf

Thats why rich people get off. Bright lawyers able to use whater previous cases make their client look the best under the law

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 08:24 PM

I'm fairly certain I haven't argued that at any point. In my first post, I agreed that our (UK) society was broken. I've even described our government as Orwellian. To interpret my posts here as some kind of patriotic rambling is to misrepresent the fact that I was taking issue with a misleading post. I see so much pro-gun, American machismo on reddit, often extending to denigrating those countries that are anti-gun (and proud of it), that I sometimes have to take exception and point out that, actually, we're doing alright without guns.

[deleted] • 8 points • 24 January, 2016 06:14 PM

I'm amused how in both your little "scenarios" it's a one vs one battle. So when a group of men pull off a home invasion, you're going to defend yourself with a cricket bat? One versus two? How about one verses three, or four? Your entire premise exists on a fair fight which doesn't occur in the real world, that is the purpose of owning a firearm, is evening out unfair odds.

No matter how much you try to fool yourself (and by the looks of it you've done a fantastic job), you have less right to defend yourself versus a group of intruders than American's do.

I'd expect people who visit this sub would have at least a partial understanding of this as they grasp things the majority of men don't simply by being here and knowing these concepts. You understand that your government is trying to hold you down when it comes to sexuality, but somehow when it comes to personal rights, freedoms, and the right to defend yourself you suddenly go completely blind to your countries bullshit it shoves down your throat.

Absolutely America is twisted as well and also needs a reset, but at least the people here have a much better chance of defending themselves if this occurs. If and when the revolution comes to England, I really hope your cricket bat serves you well.

[deleted] • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 07:52 PM

We could get into the triangle of intent, capability, and range, but you probably know that already.

you're taking OP's fairly good nuanced look at the current law, and you're putting your fingers in your ears, as if it doesn't exist, and you are the poor victim to the big bad crown.

like a woman.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 07:54 PM

Funny, when I mentioned what good a cricket bat would do in a revolution, I didn't get a response. To me that's as much as ignoring a point as any but you didn't seem to want leap to my defense for that point. Are you mad somebody bad mouthed the UK?

Why don't you go outside and play, the men are talking.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 07:57 PM

I can tell...

Not quite as adult like as your current submissions INDIA RAPE and GUNS GUNS GUNS in circlejerk, but cricket is a hard sport

A_Roasted_Peanut • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:34 PM

what good a cricket bat would do in a revolution

What good will a gun do if your own government turns on you? I'm sure your peashooters or even semi auto military rifles will do just fine against tanks, apache helicopters, cruise missiles, and military drones. For all your delusions of freedom fighting in the revolution, you'd be a stain on the floor as you get mowed down like stalks of wheat.

You guys justify the right to bear arms from an era when it was musket vs musket while the rest of us laugh. In comparison to the US military, with your right to bear arms you still have as much chance as some ISIS guy with an AK47.

Force multipliers have moved on in the past 250 years. Kind of ironic that citizens of a country with one of the most powerful militaries in the world haven't realised this.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:40 PM

Vietnam and Afghanistan did more than fairly well and they weren't as weaponized as the U.S. are.

Also the military would be against 300+ millions of people, the losses would be *huge* no matter what.

A_Roasted_Peanut • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:53 PM

Technology has moved on since Vietnam. Drone strikes allow effectively a near infinite kill-to-death ratio with almost no repercussions. Vietnam was a complete failure for many reasons.

If the US unleashed its full might on Afghanistan with no regard for innocent lives then it wouldn't have been a contest at all. Guerilla warfare against an entrenched enemy hiding among civilians is a completely different beast. If the US said "fuck it, we don't care about civilian casualties" the war would be over in weeks.

If the US government wanted to kill its own citizens, you won't stand a chance. You would be crushed like a bug, regardless of your fantasies. You're little more than a guy in a turban with his AK.

bluedrygrass • 2 points • 27 January, 2016 12:04 PM

Drone strikes allow effectively a near infinite kill-to-death ratio with almost no repercussions.

You don't know what you're talking about. A single drone missile costs as much as several hundreds of thousands dollars. Without counting fuel, manutention, etc.

Also ask on-ground troops how good they think of drone's efficiency.

And if the us were to unleash a full war on its own population, mediatically it would be suicide, the succeeding government would be a blown out tyranny

because nothing else would be accepted by civilians, and the us would be so devastated that China wouldn't even break a sweat in invading it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 January, 2016 03:50 PM

I always love the argument morons give that rifles are useless in an armed struggle.

Then they go on to say something something tanks, something something jets, something something drones. As if somehow this hypothetical government that is unleashing full out war on it's own citizens would work out without backlash.

As if somehow supply lines, support networks and infrastructure is all guarded all the time.

I bet most of these chumps have never read total resistance by h von dach.

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 January, 2016 06:26 PM

I'm not fooling myself at all, I'm saying that our laws are not based upon giving everybody the proportional right to kill one another by arming every citizen. The facts of these laws are laid bare by the low rate of homicide, by the low rate of violent crime. High-scale home invasions are a crime perpetrated by a very small minority of criminals against a very small minority of the population, hence, creating a whole law to justify defending against them is foolish. Whereas in the USA, the entire country seems to be pro-guns, and has to deal with the great amount of random and unexplainable death that that causes, this country is one that is proudly anti-guns, simply because our track record of violent crime throughout the last few decades justifies their absence from our culture.

To interpret this as an oversight of my government's power is to look at the argument from the wrong perspective - I am much more aware of the power of indiscriminate violence perpetrated by my neighbour, because that has a more immediate impact upon my existence. I can tell you for certain that my country is devolving into a police state. Our present Conservative government seems to be strongly Orwellian. And yet, the point of arming ourselves against them is null and void, because their weapons have moved beyond the times where arming the populace seemed like common sense.

Their weapons are obfuscation, surveillance, and propaganda. I cannot compete against these as a mere man. I cannot, as an RP man, change the course of my society to rein in the gains that feminism has made. Part of being an RP man is realising that you can only change yourself, and that you only exist within a microcosmic setting, wherein you do have some power, more than you would ever previously have believed, but you do not have the power to change the world, or the fate of your country.

Your example is one of taking a (perceived) wrong and extrapolating it to such extreme lengths that you believe the absurdity of what you have then extrapolated. I feel safe in my country because my neighbours may not possess guns. Nor may the police. I feel safe in my country because the prospects of my being the 0.00001% who suffers because of the law being an ass is far less of a chance than of the 0.1% who would suffer if the law was founded upon the sheer absurdity of extraordinary circumstance.

[deleted] • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 07:26 PM

You feel safe in the uk?

Not only is the violent crime rate (not homicide) much higher, the number of violent gun crimes actually went up for years following the gun ban and was only curbed when the police force was greatly swelled. You are much more likely to get robbed or knifed in the UK than here, and you are only less likely to die because of faster and more frequent police involvement.

UK police pull hundreds of illegal guns off the streets every week from the hands of criminals.

You should look up studies performed by Gary Kleck and commentary on the quality of those studies by Wolfgang, a pro-gun-control author.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 08:20 PM

That's simply not true, and is more a reflection of how different governments define violent crime than it is an actual comparable statistic. In the USA, violent crime includes murder, manslaughter, forcible rape, and aggravated assault. In the UK, violent crime is defined as all acts against the person, that includes all sexual offences, and all assaults. So, simply the act of possessing a knife or offensive weapon can be defined as violent crime in the context of our statistics.

Hence, statistics are utterly useless when compared.

Intersivity • 3 points • 24 January, 2016 10:20 PM

Hence, statistics are utterly useless when compared.

No, statistics that are compared poorly/sloppily are useless. Statistics that are compared well can be revelatory.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 11:11 PM

all acts against the person
possessing a knife

huh?

Aside from that, your point about the crime stats is overall true upon review. That is my bad.

whydoievenreply • 0 points • 24 January, 2016 10:32 PM

I lived in the UK and that's total bullshit. It is definitely more safe than the US.

[deleted] • -1 points • 24 January, 2016 07:52 PM

stay away from a soccer match, your survivability rises to almost 100%

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 11:12 PM

That's not a bad rule of thumb haha

vicious_armbar • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 02:56 PM

Relevant username: a_dainty_marionette

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:42 PM

I'm not fooling myself at all, I'm saying that our laws are not based upon giving everybody the proportional right to kill one another by arming every citizen.

No, you're trying to fool us. The government doesn't give the right to kill other people. Don't bullshit so much and call others liars.

You are the one lying.

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 January, 2016 07:46 PM

If my government will hand me an ar-15 to go to Iraq and shoot at muslims in the name of defending my own home country, I sure as fuck can own an ar-15 and keep it at my house to defend myself, my friends, family, and property.

I really don't give a shit about a bunch of blacks, mexicans, and other minorities shooting each other in the ghettos and driving up gun crime statistics.

White people in non economically fucked areas don't off each other in massive amounts, so therefore the idea that somehow I'd have to give my weapons because a bunch of idiots don't know how to behave themselves is laughable.

On another point, I'm amused at hypocrites like you. You UK bastard hypocrites ruled the world through the barrel of a gun for years. Suddenly now its, "everyone put your guns down! We're from the UK and we know better than you!".

Go fuck yourself buddy, take an introspective look at yourself and the reality you live in and realize you're a massive hypocrite.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 January, 2016 08:13 PM

I could hardly be described as a hypocrite for not taking into account events that were played out and concluded generations before I was born. It's your partisan views that have devolved into you getting emotional, into you telling me to 'go fuck yourself' over a simple disagreement regarding an issue that you initially proved yourself ignorant of. I don't understand what makes you think that you can cite one example of a culture you are not a part of, and then exaggerate it to the extent of writing off a whole country. I enjoy living here. I feel safe. I have visited other countries and liked them, too. They have flaws. My country definitely has flaws. I never once disputed that. Yet you have taken it to a UK vs USA mud-slinging match, and I'm not going to get into calling you names over it, simply because I think that you are wrong.

Intersivity • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 10:23 PM

On another point, I'm amused at hypocrites like you. You UK bastard hypocrites ruled the world through the barrel of a gun for years. Suddenly now its, "everyone put your guns down! We're from the UK and we know better than you!".

As if he had anything at all to do with UK colonialism. Similar argument is made by feminists - 'white men are oppressors even though young men today have no experience oppressing anyone!'

Go fuck yourself buddy, take an introspective look at yourself and the reality you live in and realize you're a massive hypocrite.

Ad hominem is not a debate tactic, it is a shaming tactic. There is no place for that shit here.

verify_account • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 03:18 PM

Is everyone in the UK this delusional? Your laws on self defense are shit. You should do something to change that. You do not live in safer better place and you if you can't proper defend your family.

There's one in every thread folks. But I luv me queen's cunt m8!

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 04:58 PM

Yes, yes, blah blah. Thank you. I've illustrated my point sufficiently that I shan't elaborate further. I've explored the pros and cons of the laws of the UK enough that I shan't explore them further. I don't know why everybody brings the Queen into discussions on the UK as if she is a powerful figurehead - she's just a cultural throwback, maintained for the sake of the rest of the world, more than because she has any actual say in affairs. Her entire position is ceremonial.

bluedrygrass • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:36 PM

But we all know how the law will be twisted against the citizen, such as if you'll shoot someone invading your home to rob you, you'll end in jail for murder.

This is already happening in other countries, for example Italy, another country with extremely restrictive weapons laws.

The home security is almost inexistent there, it continuously happens that self-defending citizens get processed for intentional murder by lefty leaning magisters and judges (they're called Red Robes there)

Hephaestus1968 • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 05:52 PM

I think it's part of 'the establishments' master plan - the whole feminazi, PC new speak etc. They want to tie us up in knots - whilst incidentally carrying on like the super sick fks they are. Stop any normal human interactions whilst allowing their bizarre activities and pedophilia.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 07:17 PM

And import tens of thousands of Muslim men in the meanwhile

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 05:58 PM

I would get the fuck out of the U.K. ASAP.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 07:16 PM

Britcuckistan has to be the most fucked up place in the west.

RPRedhead • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 07:18 PM

What. The. Actual. Fuck.

Enforcable or not, this is fucking INSANE. If this were the US, wouldn't this be unconstitutional? Limiting freedom, right? Pursuit of happiness?

This sounds like Minority Report with a deviant sexual twist. Thoughtcrime.

Sepean • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 08:06 PM

Democracy is not oppressive, right? Right?

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 11:16 PM

Now more than ever, God bless the USA. Fucking marxist-Orweillian nightmare across the pond.

Psynaut • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 11:27 PM

The British legislative system makes the US one seem downright sane and in favor of protecting citizens rights - and knowing how untrue that is, it really says a lot about the insanity of the laws being passed in the UK

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 12:13 AM

The best form of protest in this case is to comply to absurdity - every 24 hours, give notice of possible sexual intercourse. After a couple months, I'm fairly certain they'll just be like "okay, we get it, you're always planning on getting some. We'll just make sure to pencil you in daily. Just please stop and leave us alone".

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 01:56 AM

Does he actually have to follow through with this or is it just his "intent" to have sex with them?

In that case, Officer, I intend to have sex with this entire Women's Lacrosse team, Jennifer Lawrence and Scarlett Johansen at the same time, as well as that Woman I walked past in the street wearing leggings and walking a cute dog.

marinewannabee97 • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 02:03 AM

Right. I'm no legal expert. But this has got to be a human rights violation right?

furmensakume • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 04:05 AM

This makes me wish that the woman that got him initially charged gets punched in the throat.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 08:40 AM

Orwell's dystopian future resembles Britain todayn

pby1000 • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 10:01 AM

I would inform them everyday, and give them names corresponding to the wives/girlfriends of police, politicians and judges.

Manducor2 points 25 January, 2016 02:40 PM **[recovered]**

Please email me the day TRP decides to buy a private island and establish a new country so I can buy my boarding pass on time

audscias • 1 point • 29 January, 2016 12:50 PM

Is this after or before we invade New Zeland?

Jessie_James • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 09:28 PM

Why anyone would (a) believe this story or (b) not understand the guy is probably a serious deviant or have some other serious mental health issues and (c) think this law is going mainstream

... is beyond me.

Seriously. Get a grip. This is clickbait at it's best. No names, no details, no sources, nothing. And you've all grabbed your pitchforks?

RedSugarPill • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 03:07 AM*

"In accordance to the principles of doublethink, it does not matter if the war is not real, or when it is, that victory is not possible. The war is not meant to be won. It is meant to be continuous." -Emmanuel Goldstein (alleged protagonist and enemy of the state in Orwell's "1984")

stawek • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 06:58 AM

It was in first page of BBC

johnchapel • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 10:29 PM

Came here to write this.

Get a grip.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 06:33 PM

What the actual fuck!

This basically says "dont have sex", "dont commit adultery"

Whats next. Stoning?

malariasucks • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 10:29 PM

this is literally one case of one man and they won't give details as to why they are doing it. He likely has HIV but they cannot tell the public that

katmf05 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 07:18 PM

They will just fake the HIV analysis, turning it positive, or worse, infect men just to have more power. You may believe you are smart, you are not.

NO_LAH_WHERE_GOT • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 08:34 AM

Shh, nobody wants your reasonable perspective.

Gawernator • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 04:30 AM

At least this wouldn't happen in the USA... (We can only hope...)

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 04:31 AM

All I can say is: What the fuck? I... I don't even know how to start with this one... he probably just should have stayed in jail at this point.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 04:43 AM

24 hours notice, that is going to cool the romance a little.

herewegoaga1n • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 06:34 AM

Please let them start doing this to crazy bitches...

dragonfangxl • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 10:00 AM

This is a brilliant move by the UK to establish a ho database. They are frustrated that tinder was made by a US company and now they are working on their own british model

DJGammaRabbit • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 12:25 PM

This is *so* useless. Nobody with a brain is going to do this.

Indigo_Monkey • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 12:51 PM

fuck-ing-hell....

I simply do not have any other words to describe my reaction to this.

5t3fan0 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 02:18 PM

so he got punished for being innocent... how is it even possible? a whole new level of crazy!

and i guess the woman who lied to the police (and wasted government money and time) just saw no consequences.

can a brit man falsely accuse a woman of rape? when truth is found, is he able to walk away the same way? just curious

Rasalom72 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 02:34 PM

And they wonder why men are withdrawing from society in droves?

0kool74 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 04:30 PM

The UK is beyond batshit crazy!

MentORPHEUS • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:49 PM

The story does not give enough information to form a strong opinion. Does this PARTICULAR man have a history of accusations and questionable behavior? I have a hard time believing that this order is *routinely* handed out to *all* men going before the court.

If it's another "On the sex offender list for life for peeing in the roadside bushes" type of practice, of course I'm against it.

OTOH if the guy appears to be part of one of these underage girl grooming gangs, what would you want then?

Scott_WWS • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 05:52 PM

The UK is out of their collective minds...

I just read another article wherein a Man was sentenced to 6 months for disagreeing with feminists on Twitter.

And now, the UN has proposed that criticism of feminism be defined as hate speech.

momomotorboat • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 08:48 PM

Mad world, I tell you. Mad.

For the first time in my life, I find myself saying "I can't..." I simply can't comprehend what the fuck is going on and how in the hell no one said "Hold on there, bud."

GayLubeOil • 1 point • 24 January, 2016 10:28 PM

He should just take his money and skills and live in another country.

FLFTW16 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 01:02 AM

All the Englishmen I was known and worked with say the same thing: **ENGLAND IS FINISHED!** There is a reason George Orwell, author of *1984*, was an Englishman. He saw where the world--and specifically where England--was heading.

tgeda • -1 points • 24 January, 2016 08:59 PM*

At a certain point I think men should be able to have the self respect to just leave women alone.

I can't muster sympathy for a guy who claims to have been falsely accused of rape yet is still interested in having sex with women. Why would a man willingly throw himself into such a powerless situation again especially

with the indignity of having to inform the police? This is the same way i feel about "yes means yes" laws in California. At a certain point men need to have the self respect to walk away. If you don't vote with you feet then things will never change.

Atleast women are smart enough to go lesbian after she gets fucked over raped/molested by enough males in her life. Men on the other hand just keep rolling the dice and expecting a different result.

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 January, 2016 06:00 PM

The police are now turning into the Social Services. What a joke.

drallcom30 points 24 January, 2016 07:00 PM* **[recovered]**

One man was accused of rape and found innocent, but police have ordered him to inform them of sex he has 24 hours before he has it. If he does not manage this he will receive 5 years in prison.

The police will only know in case of a rape and can only do something if there's proof. So you will go to prison anyway for the same reasons as before. Useless law (and using it for fun will likely get you into prison too).

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 January, 2016 07:15 PM

You didn't read the law, I guess.

The police will know if the girl wishes it, consent or not. All they need to prove is that sex occurred, which is usually not even contested in rape cases.

drallcom3 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 03:03 PM

The police first has to proof that sex happened. That's as difficult as proving rape (under sane laws).

And why would they even attempt it? The only time I could imagine is for when your under trial for rape the second time. Then they double fist you (rape + no notice). Afaik the UK already has a law where rape doesn't have to be proved. That combo is scary.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 07:00 PM

Well, in most rape cases the defendant does not contend that there was no sex, only that the sex was conservative sual. Proving sex happened is much easier than proving no consent.

For example, semen samples, pubic hairs of the woman or the man in the others' genital area, fingernail scrapings, circumstantial evidence like texts or witnesses describing foreplay, etc. Usually if sex occurred there will be reasonable physical evidence.

However, you are right in that it's unlikely this comes up without a rape accusation. My point is that any false allegation can effectively become an imprisonment for this type of scenario.

boxing_eagle • 0 points • 25 January, 2016 03:33 AM

But they can't publicize his name so how will the girl know that the man has this order against him?

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 January, 2016 06:13 AM

Well, the issue is not so much this one guy but rather the legal precedent it sets.

But again, this now means that in the case a girl regrets sex and calls it rape, all they need to show is that sex happened to land this guy in trouble.

national_sanskrit • 0 points • 25 January, 2016 05:03 AM

Wow, at this rate, someone who invents a religion that "prays away the straight" and turns men gay is going to get lot of followers. XD

jamesc1071 • -1 points • 24 January, 2016 06:51 PM

I think you will find that the man is HIV positive, of very low intelligence and had had unprotected sex with several women.

jm51 • -16 points • 24 January, 2016 05:23 PM

Believe or not, us Brits do have a strong sense of justice.

My take is that the guy is guilty as charged but managed to get acquitted. By law he walks but in the spirit of justice he doesn't get away with it.

There was a recent false rape accusation case here where the accused, the sort of guy that has a very sarcastic sense of humour, responded to the accusation by saying 'I tripped and accidentally penetrated her'. Case fell to bits, as it should have done and no such sanctions were placed on him.

Was another case a few years back where they set a precedent and allowed the jury to learn of a guys previous 7 or 8 rape trials. He had been found not guilty on all of them. That jury found him guilty.

MattyAnon • 6 points • 24 January, 2016 05:47 PM

My take is that the guy is guilty as charged but managed to get acquitted

Guilty by what definition? Why do you think he is guilty? What evidence is there? He was ACQUITTED. If that's not the definition of innocence, I don't know what is.

You are guilty of victim blaming. "The police did it, so there must be a REASON". This is siding with the strong against the weak, regardless of the truth.

allowed the jury to learn of a guys previous 7 or 8 rape trials.

So 8 accusations makes you guilty? This is a violation of basic human rights - the right to a fair trial.

No other crime operates like this. But if a WOMAN says you're guilty then you're guilty, and the judge will make it happen.

jm51 • -9 points • 24 January, 2016 06:05 PM

Guilty by what definition?

Those in the CPS tend to have a good idea of what happened in a he said she said situation. Note that this is the only guy subject to the 'notification before sex' sanctions. iow, next time he commits an 'unprovable rape', he gets 5 years without being found guilty of rape.

Much as TRP hates to admit it, some women are genuine when they say that they have been raped.

So 8 accusations makes you guilty?

If I were a juror and 8 women testified to being raped by the same guy, fuck yes I'd find him guilty of rape #9.

British justice isn't always accurate. Our police used to have the habit of fitting up known criminals to unsolved crimes. Bad guys get away with A) and go to gaol for B) which they didn't do.

if a WOMAN says you're guilty then you're guilty, and the judge will make it happen.

Did you read my post? I mentioned a recent UK case where the guy got acquitted of a false rape claim.

MattyAnon • 4 points • 24 January, 2016 07:43 PM

some women are genuine when they say that they have been raped.

Of course. Noone is saying otherwise. But there are a LOT of regret-rape cases levelled against men socially, by rumour, on the court of public opinion.

And "women are always honest about rape" makes rape-calling all the more believable.

a recent UK case where the guy got acquitted of a false rape claim.

And usually this is the case, except in the case of public opinion...

Gilkanese3 points 24 January, 2016 07:26 PM [recovered]

Those in the CPS tend have a good idea of what happened in a he said she said situation.

I'm glad I live in a country that convicts based on the concept of 'beyond a reasonable doubt'. Your life being decided based on someone "tending to have a good idea" doesn't sound great to me.

jm51 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 04:17 AM

It has its pros and cons. Many years ago, I was up in court charged with Actual Bodily Harm. I could have been charged with Grievous Bodily Harm as I gave the guy a real good kicking, (I was wearing steel toe capped boots at the time and he got lots of kicking)

Long story short, he was the neighbour of my ex and was terrorising her. Hammer breaking her windows at 3am, paint stripper poured on the washing and more. (Washing hung out to dry is a thing in England.)

What tipped me over the edge was my (at the time) 10yo daughter being unable to sleep because he had threatened to torch the house.

He was known to the police as all single mothers on the estate had had problems with him but there was never enough evidence to convict him of anything. My arresting officer admitted to me that he was a coward and a bully.

I pleaded guilty, why not I did it and for a crime that could have got me 6 months or more inside, I got fined £50.

I later learned that he gave no women any hassle after that. No regrets. :)

selfsufficientnigga4 points 24 January, 2016 06:42 PM* [recovered]

allowed the jury to learn of a guys previous 7 or 8 rape trials.

Where as opposed to that, it is not allowed to let jury know about the woman's previous false rape accusations, her previous sex history and so on.

My take is that the guy is guilty as charged but managed to get acquitted. By law he walks but in the spirit of justice he doesn't get away with it.

Sure, 'justice'. What will you do when the next step in 'justice' will be 'every trp member is guilty of rape, we just can't prove it'?

jm51 • 1 point • 25 January, 2016 04:27 AM

Hold your horses. This is a one off. If every guy acquitted of rape gets similar then sure, cry foul, you will have a point.

All I'm saying is, have a good think about WHY that specific guy got those sanctions and no other acquitted guy did. Just in case tptb got it right for once.

[deleted] • 5 points • 24 January, 2016 05:43 PM

Well if you're fucking innocent you can't be punished.

So much for your shithole cuck country's sense of justice.