

Anti-Male Media Continues War on Men: Milo Yiannopoulos Suspended From Twitter

695 upvotes | 15 June, 2016 | by redpillschool

Edit: Ongoing Updates Can Found here: [#FreeMilo](#)

Once again, Social Media shows its hand in its agenda in its crusade for social justice (read: anti male). Just months after Twitter removed his [verification badge](#), Twitter finally just up and banned him.

For those who don't use Twitter, the verification badge exist literally to identify famous people and let users know it's really them rather than a parody account or imposter. That Twitter saw fit to remove the badge tells us exactly what Twitter's agenda is. Milo is a strong voice in favor of the conservative right, endorsing Trump while openly gay. This is a big blow to the SJW crowd, whose identities rely on Trump being evil to any minority including non-whites, non-straight (CIS), or non-men (all 7,000 genders they've made up).

Removing the badge doesn't mean that they suspected Milo's account was hijacked by some third party or hasn't been Milo all along. It means that they wanted to deligitimize him in any way they could, so they took away the badge for reasons unrelated to why the badge was there in the first place. They wanted him to look illegitimate.

As if Twitter, Facebook, and co announcing that they wanted to [stamp out hate speech](#) wasn't a loud enough warning bell, their actions today put nails in the coffin. Even if they eventually restore Milo's account, the message is loud and clear: If your message doesn't meet the requirements of the Social Justice Agenda, you are not safe on social media. Any branding or following that you build is always in jeopardy. Invest your time in this at your own peril.

The truth is, whether we like it or not, social media has become a very important part of brand building and communication. How many people would still be in the dark about TheRedPill had we not build an easily accessible forum on reddit? More still, how could Milo build his following without the tools to communicate with his followers?

The ongoing war against men continues. The message is clear that we are simply guests here at the mercy of those in charge. Feminism has changed the landscape to make being male a liability and risk on every level. From building your brand online, communicated much needed information with other men, to simply having sex with a woman. Every single action taken by men today is a risk. A risk of losing your work. A risk of losing connection and communication to others. A risk of losing your livelihood due to association with misogynists. A risk of a false rape accusation if a woman regrets the sex. RISKS.

This is one of the primary reasons the mod team have been working so hard on launching <https://trp.red>. To ensure we don't fall victim to some of these risks. If Reddit boots us, we have a place to stay in touch and communicate. And now, people like [Milo](#) have a place to stay in touch with followers on a site that values inconvenient truths and differing opinions instead of censorship.

EDIT: UPDATE Milo's Account Re-instated.. but wait.. there's something wrong. Twitter admin removed 118,000 of his followers.

- 6/8/16 - 253,000 Followers [Archive Link](#)
- 6/15/16 - 135,000 Followers [Archive Link](#)

This is the time for anybody to recognize exactly what Twitter is doing.

Edit 2: UPDATE He's down to 98K Followers. You [can't make this stuff up](#)

Edit 3: Ongoing Updates Can Found here: [#FreeMilo](#)

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

taracus • 419 points • 15 June, 2016 04:07 PM*

For comparison, ISIS accounts arent banned

Edit because topcomment: Apparently they do ban them at times and/or they let them post under the idea that they're incriminating themselves (pointed out to me by alot of other people dont know if its true)

FamineX • 96 points • 15 June, 2016 04:15 PM [recovered]

the bigotry behind this is sheer beyond me

conspiracy_thug • 19 points • 16 June, 2016 02:37 AM

Hey! Stop being islamaphobic!

EvrythingISayIsRight • 17 points • 16 June, 2016 07:22 AM

Its not their fault they're extremist and terrorists! You should be more accepting of their culture.

theflyingscotsman01 • 2 points • 17 June, 2016 10:30 PM [recovered]

It's called cultural enrichment, you racist bigot!

EvrythingISayIsRight • 2 points • 17 June, 2016 10:34 PM

I'm not a racist! I'll kiss All Sharptons ass to prove it.

thismaytakeawhile • 2 points • 18 June, 2016 03:01 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Troll_Name • 127 points • 15 June, 2016 04:57 PM

ISIS accounts arent banned

I've been saying this for ages - they'll let all kinds of porn and gore slide including IS but dissent against the media establishment is an unforgivable crime. I've seen every age group being killed and butchered, I haven't been looking for it, and that's just in the past few months. *I've been subjected to dead babies being cut up for soup but I'm not allowed to say Hillary Clinton doesn't have our best interests at heart.*

There seems to be a massive push to normalize invasive militancy while banishing opposition to the above. If you ask me, this is what it looks like when 1984 is in a late phase of construction.

For all the love big internet and TV companies show for Islam, they don't share very much of it with people who are NOT radicalized militants. Anyone who isn't hardline pro-IS only gets to be used as a poster child for someone else's cash cow cause *after they're dead.*

Either Wahhabism secretly controls all the world leaders, or NWO has much to gain by replacing freedom-loving peoples of the world with angry goat herders who embrace slavery and murder dissenters of all kinds.

jav253 • 37 points • 15 June, 2016 06:13 PM

Indeed it's hard to see the endgame here with their promotion of Islam into the Western world, and

covering up their sexist, and homophobic beliefs. But it is absolutely undeniable that there has been a pivot shift lately towards promotion of Islam. We just saw the worst terrorist attack since 911 with a Muslim shooting up a nightclub full of gay men. And they barely wanted to talk about it, and if they did they tried to downplay the Islam connection. Or in some cases even try to shift the blame onto conservative christian groups.

IMO it's part of a larger agenda to destabilize the Western world. Feminism is just another part of that. They intentionally promoted the worst traits in Women knowing it would break up the family.

captainaryan • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 07:48 PM

"Then join hand in hand, brave Americans all! By uniting we stand, by dividing we fall!" -John Dickinson

We hear George Washington's ideas being thrown as big, red warning flags, but I think this sums it all up even better.

vagbutters • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 11:38 PM

promotion of Islam.

Ehh you're kidding yourself if you seriously think this is the case. Between jewish news agencies slandering the religion at large, and a presidential candidate calling for a ban of them immigrating into the states, Islam is definitely being lambasted in the public.

Any "promotion" you see will stem from liberalism, which capitalizes on marginalized groups' support (e.g. gays, hippies, etc.)

[deleted] • 1 points • 7 July, 2016 05:36 PM

[permanently deleted]

vagbutters • 1 point • 7 July, 2016 05:48 PM

Yeah because reporting little kids killed by drone strikes as "militants" and creating a propaganda campaign against a religion isn't slander.

If the same thing were done to jews, I'm sure you'd speak up about it, Goldstein. Oh wait, the jews are still crying about the Holocaust

[deleted] • 1 points • 7 July, 2016 07:19 PM

[permanently deleted]

vagbutters • 1 point • 7 July, 2016 07:25 PM

What does a "propaganda campaign" have to do with reporting Islam? I know you jew scum like to play stupid, but you can do better than that, David.

It's just funny that you automatically assume that I'm Muslim. I like to point out what abject failures nationalists are, and what vermin jews are. The more people that know about the jewish hegemony, the less the kikes can use their media hold on them.

[deleted] • 1 points • 7 July, 2016 07:35 PM

[permanently deleted]

vagbutters • 1 point • 7 July, 2016 07:45 PM

It's not even close to being alpha-- it's the opium for the beta male failures who

have nothing in their life to look forward to, so they jump on the easiest scapegoat that they can.

It's not a matter of a "possibly." Most jews are scumbags, and their manipulation is a subtle one. Their media campaigns target the small-minded losers who don't think critically- the same people willing to go off and die so that capitalist masters can make money off of wars.

sedecim_02 • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 09:53 PM

Yo that Muslim was gay as well (no, seriously). He was probably just made cause he couldn't get no ass.

plebbit_guy • 13 points • 15 June, 2016 09:59 PM [recovered]

I don't buy that 'he was gay' shit **at all**. Seems like too good of an excuse for the media to frame it was a pissed off gay dude going on a rampage rather than having to call out Islamic extremism.

rubenbrasil • 22 points • 16 June, 2016 12:20 AM

According to some close sources including his ex-wife, they said he was VERY anti-gay to the point where people were worried about his passion and angst against homos. Hes not gay, its just the media scrambling to take Islam out of the picture.

fakenate1 • 4 points • 16 June, 2016 05:12 AM

In my personal life, the people who have been blinded by hatred towards gay people were secretly gay themselves. Of course I'm just one person,

alisonstone • 12 points • 16 June, 2016 02:11 AM

Yeah, the guy ended up on the FBI's terror watch list and was surveilled by the FBI for a long time (but they couldn't arrest him for any actual crime). You don't end up on that list because you are gay. You end up there because you are an active participant in the extremism (e.g. you keep posting about it online).

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 June, 2016 10:42 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 11 points • 15 June, 2016 10:52 PM

If he was muslim, dude probably tried to hide his sexual preferences by being with women. I see it all the time in mormonism, just visit their page, bunch of lesbians and gay dudes marry because religion. Religion makes people do strange stuff, like shooting a gay club.

DiscerningDuck • -4 points • 15 June, 2016 11:15 PM

Religion makes people do strange stuff, like shooting a gay club.

This is an Islam thing, not a religion thing.

fiercealmond • 12 points • 16 June, 2016 12:29 AM

Nope. It's an ideology thing, doesn't matter which religion. More likely some sort of identity crisis perhaps influenced by religion.

offensive_tv • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 02:28 PM

It's an Islam thing. I will agree it is an idea loony when Mormons start throwing gay men off roofs. Worse thing they do is cut ties with you and that isn't even bad. You stop receiving all the missionaries and crappy casseroles.

osman300 • -5 points • 16 June, 2016 12:40 AM [recovered]

The dude was gay, was an alcoholic, visited gay clubs, not a fucking muslim.

Original_Dankster • 5 points • 16 June, 2016 04:03 AM

He was as much a Muslim as the Taliban - another gang of chronic bumfuckers, whose degeneracy was inspired by Muhammad himself.

fakenate1 • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 05:13 AM

That's an interesting question. How much beer does it take for a person consume before they are no longer Muslim.

[deleted] 17 June, 2016 06:28 AM

[deleted]

fakenate1 • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 05:12 AM

Other than him being on a gay hookup app.

sedecim_02comment score below threshold • -5 points • 16 June, 2016 01:25 AM

Yo I could get you interviews, CCTV recordings and the a sample of another man's sperm recovered from his dick-loving ass and you still wouldn't believe me cause it goes it against your life long philosophy that all Muslims are the root of all evil.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -9 points • 15 June, 2016 10:49 PM

I hear your dad gives up easy tho! Tell your dad I said hi!

ryno55 • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 09:50 PM

The agenda is the same as it's been for decades - global communism. They will direct any enemy they can to destroy the land of the free and home of the brave.

fakenate1 • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 05:11 AM

IMO it's part of a larger agenda to destabilize the Western world

how does media stand to benefit from this destabilization? I mean... A destabilized society doesn't seem like one that would Twitter or consume as much as a stabilized society.

skoobled • 6 points • 16 June, 2016 07:27 AM

The (not entirely implausible theory) is that political resistance requires common ground. If everyone is mixed, muddled and isolated then the state has more power.

Personally, I'm less inclined towards "men in smoky room" theories these days, mostly because it's not always necessary to explain what happens. Just incentives - states are bureaucracies, and all bureaucracies try to preserve and grow their power

WeedDaddy • 2 points • 17 June, 2016 03:38 AM

states are bureaucracies, and all bureaucracies try to preserve and grow their power

Officials cannot inherit their office to their sons, so that would be pointless.

Rather the most ambitious of those with 100s of millions or more, seek out to shape the society into a passive and exploitable underclass. Especially if they are of different ethnicity or religion and therefore feel no kinship to the working class.

thismaytakeawhile • 1 point • 18 June, 2016 03:07 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

rubenbrasil • -3 points • 16 June, 2016 12:06 AM

I might get downvoted here but I have a theory that the NWO is the devils kingdom. It says so in the Bible. The devil is also the greatest deceiver, and i think the devils religion is Islam. Explains the bloodshed and backward ideology right? I think were living in times where spiritual warfare is taking place: Christianity vs Islam. Its just getting more intense. I think globalists want their followers to be Muslim as that would appease the devil. He gets to control the world by having one giant nation praising his name.

gives_heroin_to_kids • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 03:02 AM

more intense

People have always been killing each other in their god's names, but "intense" may be a good way to illustrate the fact that they now have far more advanced technology (from weaponry and communicative ability), which is a bad thing.

I'm upvoting your comment because you put so much thought into it; that being said, I completely disagree, but I'm also not religious/spiritual.

skeletonized • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 12:39 AM

Paging u/neoreactionsafe

NeoreactionSafe • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 04:18 PM*

First...

I absolutely **hate** the name "New World Order".

That's the actual name these psychopaths use to glorify what they are doing. Remember the first globalist mafia boss... George Bush 41... he even used the phrase in a speech to legitimize the idea.

So let's be real here, we are taking about the:

Globalist Tyranny

There is nothing "new" about what they are doing it's straight up old school tyranny and we shouldn't glorify it at all. Frankly we should spit on these psychopathic bastards.

Our Blue Pill is based around a newer god called ***Baphomet*** which is this concept of Androgyny.

The Red Pill is based on polarity or the division of masculine and feminine energies to generate attraction which then guides humanity towards the Natural Laws which are used to build civilization.

Basically we want truth (Natural Law) and the Blue Pill creates myths that invert truth.

Enjoy the Destruction of the Blue Pill mythology.

And we use "glitches" of truth to destroy the myths.

Myths die when exposed... the magic spell is broken.

"Kill the Beta"

redpillnexus • 0 points • 16 June, 2016 01:08 PM

Promotion of Islam? Are you fucking stupid or something? Muslims are being demonized in this country. They're worse victims of the system than any other religious group. Get your head out of your ass.

[deleted] • 0 points • 18 June, 2016 02:41 PM

Indeed it's hard to see the endgame here with their promotion of Islam into the Western world, and covering up their sexist, and homophobic beliefs.

They are trying to remind people that most westernized Islamic people don't agree with these foreign groups. They are covering up their sexism and homophobia just like they do for all religions intolerance of others. It isn't like any of the other major religions (except maybe Jainism) aren't sexist/homophobic as well.

But it is absolutely undeniable that there has been a pivot shift lately towards promotion of Islam.

Or at least an attempt to normalize the second largest religion which is less common here. If Muslims are not marginalized they are less likely to radicalize. This is why despite our much larger population the USA sees less radicalized muslims per capita than most of Europe who tends to isolate them.

We just saw the worst terrorist attack since 911 with a Muslim shooting up a nightclub full of gay men. And they barely wanted to talk about it, and if they did they tried to downplay the Islam connection.

That's because Islam does not favor attacking unarmed people who have not directly harmed you. This is true to all Abrahamic faiths though Christianity takes it to the extreme. This wasn't something Islam would call for hence the reason why the news is reminding people of this fact. Obviously the haters will seek to justify their hate in any fashion but that doesn't make their claims legitimate.

Or in some cases even try to shift the blame onto conservative christian groups.

Do you have evidence of this at all?

[deleted] • 10 points • 15 June, 2016 10:48 PM

I shared and posted info about the boston bombing and immigration, etc. My posts were deleted in minutes! I got a warning from a facebook bot.

vagbutters • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 11:36 PM

IIRC they didn't ban those accounts because they provide some sort of operational help.

TalesAround • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 08:49 PM

or NWO has much to gain by replacing freedom-loving peoples of the world with angry goat herders who embrace slavery and murder dissenters of all kinds.

Ding ding ding! We have a winner! What have we got for him, Johnny?

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 10:22 PM

It's not any sort of conspiracy, it's just that there is a lot to be gained by being able to influence the thoughts and actions of millions of people. Certain types of people will be drawn into owning those companies, and certain types will be drawn into working for them.

They show that shit to make sure people think isis is the enemy, to distract us from whatever else is going on. It also makes the rapefugees more credible, and notice how little they cover that realistically.

mcavvacm • 21 points • 15 June, 2016 08:40 PM

Not all ISIS are terrorists! /s

tranalyzed • 7 points • 15 June, 2016 10:06 PM

Hahaha, that would make a great hashtag.

[deleted] • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 10:54 PM

And some I imagine are good people

eccentricrealist • 13 points • 15 June, 2016 08:41 PM

Correct me if I'm wrong here, but wouldn't it be beneficial to let ISIS post in order to track them?

vengefully_yours • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 09:59 PM

There's some merit to that. Let the stupid breed, let them get complacent, and then kill the heads of the hydra until no more want to be heads.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 10:54 PM

That's how they catch alot of drug dealers etc.

vagbutters • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 11:39 PM

You're absolutely correct, and the guy who posted a long diatribe above just to act like a victim is stupid. The ISIS twitter is allowed for a specific reason, not an exception to Twitter's retarded PC move recently.

ISBUchild • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 08:42 PM

The prevailing theory is that this is to provide them opportunities to leak information that can be used against them.

recon_johnny • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 08:58 PM

Since I don't use twitter, do the number of followers make a difference? Outside of having to go and manually re-follow again?

ryno55 • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 09:51 PM

It's a public measure of one's reputation & status

recon_johnny • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 01:59 AM

And we give a fuck about that.....why?

ryno55 • 6 points • 16 June, 2016 02:33 AM

Because some people use it to make money and build their brands and careers, like this fag @Nero.

TheStumblingWolf • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 06:01 AM*

I think the general consensus is they're left there for intelligence purposes. Whether that's actually the case or not I don't know.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 10:30 AM

Now that's just bullshit. They ban ISIS accounts whenever they come across them. The obvious problem is that they can just always make a new one.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 04:26 AM

There's a good reason for that. Keep an eye on Isis followers.

CopperFox3c • 131 points • 15 June, 2016 04:19 PM*

It has been odd seeing all the NAMALT (Not All Muslims Are like That) stuff on Facebook and the like since the Orlando thing happened. People saying it's just radicals or we should change gun laws. Now agree with homosexuality or not, **it's interesting to see people (i.e. Progressives and SJWs) defend other people who literally want to kill them.** Like some sort of strange Stockholm syndrome.

Of course, they omit the fact that homosexuality is outlawed in pretty much all Muslim countries, and a capital offense in several countries like Saudi Arabia and Iran. People are publicly executed if suspected of homosexual behavior. In Syria they like to bind their hands and throw them off rooftops. Even amongst British muslims, surveys show about 61% think homosexuality should be outlawed ... and the rates are actually *higher* amongst younger muslims.

The thing is that Islam as practiced is not compatible with western Liberal democratic principles. It's just not. Which all underscores the fact that, by defending them, Progressives and SJWs show that they not really liberals, not in the Classical Liberal sense of the word. They are simply what happens when Totalitarian behavior in any vein becomes socially acceptable.

A final side note: it's interesting seeing all the calls for changes in gun laws, since none of those changes would have prevented the Orlando shooter from obtaining weapons (he had no criminal record and was not on the no-fly list at the time) ... but moreover they have stricter gun laws in places like Europe, *so terrorists just use bombs.* Seriously, dumbasses.

mugatucrazypills • 17 points • 15 June, 2016 05:02 PM

it's interesting to see people (i.e. Progressives and SJWs) defend other people who literally want to kill them. Like some sort of strange Stockholm syndrome.

Not strange at all ... decades old behavior by the left ...visit a campus Student Union/SJW staging area if you want to see this in practice

Read "The Rage and the Pride" if you want to know how it works politically

VasilyZaitzev • 23 points • 15 June, 2016 08:48 PM

They have ZERO fucking clue that they are going to be the FIRST people put up against the wall and shot, just as soon as the Muzzies have enough power. DUMB, DUMB, DUMB.

vandaalen • 15 points • 15 June, 2016 09:23 PM

I don't think that they will waste bullets. They've shown a preference for blades and necks, nooses and burning people alive.

tranalized • 7 points • 15 June, 2016 10:25 PM

They have some clue but they are cowards. They think if they appease the Islamists enough they will be shown mercy once they take over. Just cowards with no backbone, that's all they are.

darkrood • 4 points • 16 June, 2016 01:48 AM

Have you seen the beta white knight sneak punch a buff guy attending Milo events?

He flinch and coward like a tiny animal when the buff guy just turns his face towards him.

I wonder if Sjw wk would ever win against MR if you put both group in physical arenas?

darkrood • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 01:46 AM

Nah, they will be happy if "Radical" Christian and MR activists get the first chop

[deleted] 16 June, 2016 01:17 AM*

[deleted]

mugatucrazypills • 5 points • 16 June, 2016 02:28 PM*

summary:

The left and hard left made a deal(marriage of convenience) with the islamics starting in the 1970s, as they shared a common enemy/villain/strawman in western civilisation.

Despite having completely different values, theory and priorities, the cognitive dissonance of this alliance has continued on the part of the former people who would rally behind "communist or marxist-socialist, social" movements.

As "communism" has fallen on the dust heap of of history and seen to be demonstrably losing everywhere, not functioning as a political force, the embittered losers and ex-hippies that once would have joined these groups now are drawn to a group that is visibly successful against their old enemy "westernism" that has not weakened but in fact strengthened and remained politically relevant and gets the attention they crave (Islamism).

So formerly or officially still atheist leftists are drawn to Islamism because of Triumphalism. They've re-wrapped their ideology so far to fit (because they want to be on a winning team for once) that their writers and theorists are now convinced that the Intellectual Jew, Karl Marx was a repressed Muslim, that Islam means love in all situations, that the Burka is liberation from the oppressive stares of men, the prophet Mohammed was an brilliant economist and central planner, Sharia is a valid interpretation of efficient social justice, and that Islamic Terrorism is a positive force doing the ongoing good work of anti-colonialism, and muslims killing white people is a valid form of empowerment.

It's a rabbit hole.

VasilyZaitzev • 51 points • 15 June, 2016 04:59 PM*

It has been odd seeing all the NAMALT (Not All Muslims Are Not like That) stuff on Facebook

I have been using "NAMALT" in a mocking way for a couple of years, now. There are, as I call them, the "Twin Pillars of Dhimmitude"

A. "*NAMALT! YOU HATE ALL MUSLIMS, YOU BIGOT!!!*"

B. "*WHITE GUYS DO IT TOO! MCVEIGH WAS A CHRISTIAN!*"

Our liberal friends are *TERRIFIED* that they might be racist. After all, they are constantly told that they are automatically racist for being white, yada-yada, even though we would *never* talk about "Islamic Privilege" in Muslim countries, where it's done by LAW, or "Black privilege" in Nigeria, or "Asian privilege" in Japan, etc.

This is how bad it is: David Sirota openly hoping that the Boston Marathon Bomber was a white American - obviously this was before the Tzarnaevs were killed/captured. The libs can't *STAND IT* that it's the Sand People and their backwards-ass religion who are into terrorism.

With McVeigh/the IRA/the Unabomber/etc., I acknowledge their whiteness, point out that for a nation of 320M (in the US) we don't seem to produce all that many of them, and then pressure flip back by asking how McVeigh and other outliers possibly make up for Islamic terrorism.

McVeigh, incidentally, was a lapsed Catholic whose faith (or agnosticism/atheism) does not appear to have played a role in his crime.

Oh, and the libs were pissing all over themselves, hoping that Craig Hicks, who shot the 3 Muslim students at Chapel Hill, was an evangelical. Turns out he was an atheist. It was like taking away all their toys.

Anyway, for those interested, a British friend introduced me to Pat Condell on youtube. He is a voice of when it comes to both radical Islam and intolerant liberal morons.

vengefully_yours • 23 points • 15 June, 2016 10:23 PM

I'm atheist, more or less anti theist, but I'm not going to try to impose my ideas on anyone. To me religion is limiting human advancement, divisive, and destructive with few tangible benefits, and not just islam. I was raised lutheran, learned islam in 90-91 because I was engaged to an Arab girl from Dubai. I'm neither conservative nor liberal, and I think for myself rather than follow some party dogma or sjw bullshit.

I know muslims who look at this shit and realize it's poking the bear. That doesn't stop the problem of muslims killing people because the religion advocates it. It is the religion, and the people using it to justify fucked up shit. The religion is the law where they come from, that's the problem.

A few years ago atheists were getting outspoken, Dawkins, Hitchens, etc. Then the sjw crowd jumped in and decided to take over. The elevator bullshit was the first big thing. Now they want to dominate the discussion, and completely ignore the islam problem in Europe. Sjws and feminists are still religious, they follow a dogma, they want to force everyone to fit their idea of what the world should be. They're like North Korea or Stalinist Russia where the religion is the law, but it's not based on supernatural fairy tales. It's based on the erroneous idea that everyone is or should be equal, that the have nots should get what people who work for it have, and it doesn't fucking work.

Any idea how rare it is now to find an environmentally friendly white male who is into fast cars, capitalism, firearms, anti feminist, and anti religion?

Sigma353 • 4 points • 16 June, 2016 05:38 AM

We are out here, and probably not as rare as most people think.

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 09:56 PM

I don't find many others. It's usually one extreme or the other.

[deleted] 17 June, 2016 02:24 AM

[deleted]

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 17 June, 2016 06:19 PM

I don't juice, but I have a propensity for muscle mass and hand to hand as well. It should be a given here.

ItsTheHomeWrecker • 2 points • 17 June, 2016 04:24 AM*

deleted

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 17 June, 2016 08:30 PM

On June 20th, 2011, feminist and atheist blogger Rebecca Watson of Skepchick uploaded a video to YouTube in which she complained about a man asking her for coffee in the elevator at an atheist conference in Dublin, Ireland.

AnOddSeriesOfTubes • 7 points • 15 June, 2016 07:52 PM

My grandpa showed me Pat Condell YEARS ago and I've been following ever since. He is so goddamn funny and well spoken.

TedTheAtheist • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 10:11 PM

He reads from a prompter but says he doesn't. :)

bsutansalt • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 01:40 AM

They're also ALMOST ALWAYS Democrats. Funny that.

VasilyZaitzev • 5 points • 16 June, 2016 04:32 AM

Progressives in particular. It's like a genetic defect.....

beginner_ • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 06:54 AM

Our liberal friends are TERRIFIED that they might be racist.

It has actually proven in studies that people are racist. Black people in the west for example are treated with more suspicion. And it also makes tons of evolutionary sense because the black guy visibly looks like an outsider and it was beneficial for small tribes to be suspicious of newcomers (outsiders) in their tribe. Trust must be earned. You don't want the new guy steal your food and bring it to the competing tribe.

Way_Of_Man • 12 points • 15 June, 2016 08:51 PM

it's interesting to see people (i.e. Progressives and SJWs) defend other people who literally want to kill

them.

It is literally madness. Someone on my social media the other day posted a comment that basically said the Orlando shootings were a result of Christianity and "unchecked straight male aggression in society."

I think part of the issue, is that in order to admit that Islam is at fault for a lot of this mentality it would mean eating a giant slice of humble pie. Democrats have spent the last 10 years defending Islam. So they basically have to pull an about face and admit that their is a problem where they said one did not previously exist.

and the rates are actually higher amongst younger muslims.

This is frightening. It shows that the trend is going *away* from progress and prosperity. Our own youth is headed down a slippery slope as well. In the U.S. some 25% or so of people polled said they felt that the 1st amendment didn't apply to "hate speech" and had no problem with censorship of anything deemed as such. What was scary, is that that number climbs closer to 50% when you look at just the college age people who were polled.

but moreover they have stricter gun laws in places like Europe, so terrorists just use bombs. Seriously, dumbasses.

Number of guns used on 9/11/2001 = 0

[deleted] • 40 points • 15 June, 2016 04:50 PM

We can't judge the entire Muslim population because of the actions of a few radicals.

We need to ban guns because of the actions of a few radicals.

The double-think is incredible.

[deleted] • 10 points • 15 June, 2016 06:24 PM

The mass shooters don't even kill in the name of gun ownership. What a mess.

bornredd • 4 points • 15 June, 2016 05:25 PM

We can't judge the entire Muslim population because of the actions of a few radicals.

If you'll notice, he provided points to support that Muslim persecution of homosexuals is not the actions of "a few radicals" but rather a pervasive belief central to core of Islam.

[deleted] • 9 points • 15 June, 2016 05:58 PM

I wasn't quoting the post above mine but parroting a typical progressive talking point.

Troll_Name • 16 points • 15 June, 2016 05:02 PM

It has been odd seeing all the NAMALT (Not All Muslims Are Not like That) stuff on Facebook and the like since the Orlando thing happened.

It's been happening since September 11 2001.

Terrorists have been getting away with mass murder, mass kidnapping, mass slavery, mass conquest of land, destruction of ancient historical sites, mass invasion and violence in western countries; the only time you'll see today's western powers lift a finger is **when anyone tries to stop them.**

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 04:31 PM*

[deleted]

CopperFox3c • 17 points • 15 June, 2016 04:33 PM

Sure, or obtain guns off the black market. You get the idea. If people really want to kill you, they will find a way. The only way to stop them is to grow a spine and stand up for yourself.

Mgtowredpillonroids • 20 points • 15 June, 2016 04:44 PM

German here. Obtaining a gun illegally is no problem at all. If you know a shady guy or two you'll have zero problems with obtaining them. Then there's also zip guns and 3d printed guns, the dark web etc. Gun control won't work to stop those with malicious intentions from carrying out whatever they have planned. All it does is render the native population defenseless (who DO actually care about getting caught with an illegal weapon, unlike a Muslim ready to kill who will be more than ready to spend a few years behind bars for illegal gun possession. All it does is delay his plans after all) To address your first point though, this should not come as a surprise to you. It is *deliberate* manipulation. At some point even the dumbest fucker has to understand that there is something inherently wrong with this stone age religion we call Islam, religion of peace. But since the world's full of idiots I guess we're stuck with the NAMALT narrative.

Troll_Name • 18 points • 15 June, 2016 05:06 PM

Getting illegal guns was easy in the 1920s, and it will only be orders of magnitude easier in the 2020s.

People VASTLY UNDERESTIMATE the power of 3D printing. A gun doesn't need to be 100% plastic; it can be 95% plastic and 5% simple metal chunks from a hardware store. The ak-47, best insurgent weapon of all time, is mass produced in 3rd world garbage dumps.

And then there's the thing we're not allowed to talk about: Orlando shooter had security credentials.

trp-grasshopper • 4 points • 15 June, 2016 09:08 PM

And locks only keep out the honest..

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 04:42 PM*

[deleted]

vengefully_yours • 10 points • 15 June, 2016 10:27 PM

And here we are, getting perilously close to exactly that situation.

[deleted] • 4 points • 15 June, 2016 10:08 PM

should they become tyrannical at all

the founding fathers didn't even want standing armies (militarized police) in America, which is why they advocated for everyone to have a gun, and for every community to double as a militia

TedTheAtheist • 0 points • 15 June, 2016 10:13 PM

I was making the point that the ban on guns in France did little to stop them from getting them.

I think I read that they did some ban or strict gun laws in Australia, and there hasn't been any mass shootings there for decades...

[deleted] 16 June, 2016 04:26 AM*

[deleted]

TedTheAtheist • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 01:37 PM

What exactly was the ban? All guns?

Way_Of_Man • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 08:55 PM

Sure, or obtain guns off the black market.

Which is even easier when our own government gives those weapons directly to the gangsters themselves

Overkillengine • 7 points • 15 June, 2016 11:01 PM*

And then the citizens get victimized by the criminals, wring their hands, think of the children, and ask for more of their rights to be taken away for something as worthless as the perception of safety.

Way_Of_Man • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 12:04 AM

You'd think people would look at the TSA or Department of Homeland Security or the Patriot Act and remember how shitty reactionary legislation can be.

fixingup • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 02:48 AM

Sometimes I like to bother people on Facebook. Your comment reminded me of something that happened yesterday.

<http://m.imgur.com/DsspHWS>

marinewannabee97 • 5 points • 16 June, 2016 12:37 AM

Look at the Paris attacks. Guns are highly restricted in France yet a whole bunch of people still died. Media just found something else to blame.

ericdimwit • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 09:28 PM

Yeah, if a moron gang banger can get an AK47, a bunch of PHD's at the top of these terrorist organizations will have no issues. People forget how intellectually stacked the 9/11 hijackers were.

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 06:29 PM

Yep. Even if the gun bans did work, people can make their own diy guns pretty easily, or various explosives, or just use sticks with nails in them.

They are hard set in their belief that banning weapons is what will stop violence. It never has, it never will.

mrp_1844 • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 12:20 AM

There are mass killings in China with knives.

beginner_ • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 06:51 AM

A final side note: it's interesting seeing all the calls for changes in gun laws, since none of those changes

would have prevented the Orlando shooter from obtaining weapons (he had no criminal record and was not on the no-fly list at the time) ... but moreover they have stricter gun laws in places like Europe, so terrorists just use bombs. Seriously, dumbasses.

It's also more a cultural thing. Where I live In Europe, we still have conscription, meaning you need to go to the army unless you have some medical issues (but then you pay). You keep your rifle and ammo at home. These are fully automatic rifles (eg M16 not AR-15). So there are many people here that have a fully automatic rifle at home. Yet hardly ever anything happens. They are usually used in suicide / family drams which is very tragic but not for "terrorism". So yeah, gun laws are useless. If I want to buy a fucking AK-47 or AR-15 I'm sure I can get it off the dark net. Or as you say just built a bomb with standard home chemicals.

adam-1 • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 03:04 PM

The thing is that Islam as practiced is not compatible with western Liberal democratic principles.

Well, you've got an problem with your argument there, because western Liberal democratic principles as practiced, are not compatible with western Liberal democratic principles either...

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 06:03 PM

[deleted]

CopperFox3c • 16 points • 15 June, 2016 06:54 PM

Define "mentally ill"?

Are schizophrenics mentally ill because they believe they hear/see things others don't? Are transgenders mentally ill because they believe they are a gender other than what they obviously physically are? Are otherkin mentally ill because they think they are a species other than what they physically are (e.g. cats trapped in human bodies)? What about depressed people? That is like 20% of the U.S. population nowadays.

And you may say, well only if they are "violent" or have "violent thoughts" ... okay then define those. The problem, you see, is in the definition, and who gets to do the defining ...

The entire reason the 2nd amendment exists is because once you start saying who can and cannot have guns, it becomes a slippery slope. And there are perverse incentives for the government to define those in ways that curb the power of those that disagree with it.

If you read classical liberal or economic theories of "government", you'll find that it is often defined as a **group that holds a near monopoly on violence within a society**. The point of the 2nd amendment thus, crafted by our classically liberal founders, was to curb that monopoly on violence, by ensuring individual citizens have the right to bear arms.

Does that come with risks? Sure. But the alternative is a fascist state that wields violence to curb all opposition.

Overkillengine • 10 points • 15 June, 2016 11:05 PM

And to piggy back on that, ever notice how the recent propositions include some way of circumventing Due Process?

This is not a fucking accident. The ones up to this shit damn well know it is too early to openly revoke rights since it will incite revolt, so they are trying to slip in ways to ensure they can nullify dissenters with no route to appeal.

sir_wankalot_here • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 07:32 AM

Are transgenders mentally ill because they believe they are a gender other than what they obviously physically are?

This is where the feminazis/libtards are shooting themselves in the foot.

Feminazis used fags to further their agenda. Mental illness or not, fags have always been over represented in the arts, literature, creative fields possibly even computing. This split is going to hurt the feminazis badly.

It also brings up questions, what is mental illness? Pretty much anything can be defined as mental illness.

jav253 • 10 points • 15 June, 2016 06:21 PM

I have seen them floating the idea on the news of a "no gun list" now. Similar to the no fly list. Sounds good in theory until you realize they are going to put all of us on the no gun list.

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 09:30 PM

[deleted]

vengefully_yours • 10 points • 15 June, 2016 10:30 PM

The professionals. You mean or government? Yeah they hey paid to do the shit they do, but it doesn't mean they're competent, nor does it mean they have *our best interests in mind*, but they sure as fuck want us to think they are and do.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 04:14 AM

The only people banned from owning guns will be those "mentally ill" who actually wish to buy guns...

vengefully_yours • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 09:44 PM

My point is what constitutes mentall ill? Depression? Anxiety? Ptsd? Schizophrenia? Bipolar? Wrist does it begin and end?

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 10:49 PM*

[deleted]

vengefully_yours • 8 points • 15 June, 2016 11:37 PM

So you hey an anti gun doc, and now he has that power over your life.

Fuck that.

I have ptsd, I'm a war veteran, yeah I have suicidal thoughts often, none of that means I am going to act on the thoughts or go kill people. Though some would claim I am too high of a risk. Almost 50 now, have owned guns since I was 12, have never killed anyone illegally nor committed a violent crime. Why would I start now? To be honest, if I were going to kill a bunch of people, it wouldn't be worth my guns, it would be far more epic than that, and I would not only survive it, I would never be considered a suspect in it.

[deleted] 16 June, 2016 02:47 AM

[deleted]

vengefully_yours • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 09:56 PM

My focus is protection of my rights, life, and liberty, because I fought to defend them for all of us here. It's not something you can get well from, and I manage it very well, to the extent that I utilize certain aspects of what we call with in every day life. I don't need someone throwing a blanket on us and claiming I am dangerous when everyone who is not a threat to me or anyone else is perfectly safe.

The problem is not guns nor ownership of them, and to be perfectly honest, violent crimes and deaths involving firearms is a rather small issue blown out of proportion in this country. The focus of all this mountain from a molehill shit is to strip is of the means to protect our other rights.

Think about it, sjws want to limit what we can say and who we can say it to, they want to control our thoughts and speech. First amendment covers that, right? They want it to fit them and fuck everyone else.

The war on drugs is justification for illegal search and seizure of assets, civil forfeiture cash grabs and incarceration of men for profit.

The patriot act throws out due process, representation, and legal counsel simply by applying the label of terrorist. They can illegally search whatever they want and hold you as long as they wish and there's not a damn thing you can do about it.

The problem is the bigger picture, and if we have more restrictions on guns and private ownership, we won't be able to do a damn thing about losing the rest of the bill of rights.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 04:14 AM

The only people banned from owning guns will be those "mentally ill" who actually wish to buy guns...

[deleted] • 8 points • 15 June, 2016 10:15 PM

Leave it to the professionals

Worried about your 1st amendment rights? Leave it to the 'constitutional scholars' like obongo. I'm sure they will protect you. Worried about illegal search and siezure? Leave it to the cops, they do this stuff everyday and surely know what's best.

aguy01 • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 10:16 PM

Right. The only exceptions on the no gun list will be police and military.

aguy01 • 4 points • 15 June, 2016 10:14 PM

People with certain mental conditions aren't allowed to buy guns. If he wasn't diagnosed it wouldn't show up.

truthyego • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 11:30 PM

Dude, there are already laws in place for that. This wasn't a failure of no law, it was a failure to apply the existing laws.

And I'm guessing u won't be able to accept that someone high up probably okayed the purchase for the exact reason that they had a good idea what he would do, and wanted an event like this to further politicize the gun issue.

JDiculous • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 06:13 AM

Increasingly stringent gun laws may not have prevented this massacre, but it would've made it more difficult. This guy had previously been on an FBI watch list, beat his wife, and had been described as "unhinged" and extremely homophobic. Thus the fact that he was able to legally purchase a military-grade semi-automatic rifle that shoots 45 rounds/minute without even a waiting period is absolutely fucking absurd. It should not be that easy to access such a deadly weapon.

The_Best_01 • 0 points • 16 June, 2016 07:57 PM

NAMALT? Shouldn't that be "Not All Muslims Are Like That" instead? You do know that if you include the "Not" part, that means the opposite right?

[deleted] • 28 points • 15 June, 2016 04:11 PM

The best part is that suspending him and removing his badge just proves his point.

hamsterbator • 5 points • 16 June, 2016 04:19 AM

What's amazing to me is that no "legitimate" news sources think this is news-worthy...

beginner_ • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 06:42 AM

That's because in the big picture people that have heard about Milo is a tiny minority. I don't think I would find any person with the hour that has heard of him.

FeeFeeFeaster • 26 points • 15 June, 2016 04:28 PM

Will Milo be starting his own blog on trp.red?

redpillschool[S] • 16 points • 15 June, 2016 04:36 PM

That would be fantastic.

-Anteros- • 8 points • 15 June, 2016 05:12 PM

It would also be fantastic if our fellas here started one too. TRP.red will remain immune to the SJW weakness infiltrating reddit/twitter/facebook

[deleted] • 25 points • 15 June, 2016 06:27 PM

Not to rain on the "holy shit Twitter is corrupt" parade but I'm pretty sure his account was just automatically banned because he's currently being brigaded by Muslims/ISIS/whatever. They likely mass reported his account and it automatically banned him.

And the thing with the followers is likely just because when they ban an account obviously everyone who followed the account won't be following it anymore. When they reinstate a banned account it just takes time for the followers of that account to "refollow" it. As you can now see all his followers are back.

redpillschool[S] • 26 points • 15 June, 2016 06:28 PM

So legitimate users get removed at the call of ISIS terrorists on Twitter... doesn't that seem *worse* than just the admin being stupid?

alanthemanofchicago • 20 points • 15 June, 2016 07:54 PM

Basically. From the looks of it, a internet-famous muslim tweeted a "call to action" that basically meant mass-report Milo until the system auto-banned him. Chances are a real person looked at it later and re-enabled it.

Also, leaving ISIS accounts up can be beneficial - in the right hands, they can be used to track the operators.

Still, Twitter's fucked for different reasons.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 06:30 PM

I don't think it's because they're ISIS, it's just because there were so many of them. That's my (and Milo's) theory anyway.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L9YknJzsoRI>

RichardBelmont • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 12:21 AM

Fair point, but that still doesn't explain why they removed his verified account status.

[deleted] • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 01:56 AM

Yeah I agree. I don't think being "unverified" really hurts Milo at all but it's still weird they'd bother removing it at all. Seems like some sort of petty jab at Milo or something.

"We won't ban you because the backlash would be too strong, but... we're taking away your verified badge!"

Okay, Twitter.

aBitClearer • 11 points • 15 June, 2016 04:09 PM

reinstated

RedditAdminsSuck_88 • 9 points • 15 June, 2016 04:22 PM

Reinstated but they are deleting his followers.

redpillschool[S] • 11 points • 15 June, 2016 04:31 PM

He's lost 118,000 of his followers now.

AspiringMathsGuy • 9 points • 15 June, 2016 08:45 PM

When you deactivate Twitter or get suspended, it takes a while for your profile to come back. They didn't delete anything

Apostrophe • 7 points • 15 June, 2016 08:18 PM

He is back up to 293,000 followers now.

redpillschool[S] • 7 points • 15 June, 2016 04:16 PM

A prudent man will see this as writing on the wall and not give them a second chance at it.

Troll_Name • 17 points • 15 June, 2016 05:11 PM

The Streisand effect is a force of nature on the internet.

In case you haven't been paying attention to SJW politics the past 2 years, they haven't been very subtle

or sophisticated. Their strategy resembles beating both fists on the same button like it's a full time job. People are waking up to their brute force hostility faster than those in power are capable of adjusting themselves.

8n0n • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 12:16 PM

Like this subs backup site, good luck to Milo when he sets one up (or joins yours).

As for me, Twitter account deactivated. Used it for free steam game shit on gleam io for relatives (had no interest in using it otherwise, had to do the forgot password dance to login) but not worth it for that now.

throwaway320_ • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 04:16 PM

Guess the backlash was simply to big too sweep under the rug.

seeing_red_ • 9 points • 15 June, 2016 04:15 PM

Time and time again. Social Justice Warriors directly oppose free speech. They can say whatever the fuck they want, but if you look at their actions, you will see this pattern.

RPRedhead • 8 points • 15 June, 2016 06:26 PM

“Great spirits have always encountered opposition from mediocre minds. The mediocre mind is incapable of understanding the man who refuses to bow blindly to conventional prejudices and chooses instead to express his opinions courageously and honestly.”

--Albert Einstein

[deleted] • 7 points • 15 June, 2016 07:37 PM

A Saudi prince now owns more of Twitter than Jack Dorsey - the CEO - does. Very telling.

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 05:00 PM

[deleted]

sirmadam • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 08:16 PM

He edited his name on Twitter to include that as a sort of lash out at the fact his nice tick had been removed.

redpillbanana • 4 points • 15 June, 2016 05:23 PM

Hopefully the suckage of centralization (i.e. Twitter) will lead to more decentralized systems such as Bitcoin. A decentralized version of Twitter would be great. Imagine a messaging system that is as resilient as BitTorrent. When SJWs try to shut it down, new servers pop up to take on the load.

SubbaHubba • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 06:33 PM

We already have such system. The Internet.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 07:56 PM

Which relies on the root name servers.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 05:03 PM

Milo have now 20k followers and it is going down with every minute

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 05:07 PM

It started going up and now it is 21k

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 05:10 PM

30 thousands followers now

redpillschool[S] • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 05:19 PM

I was removed from Milo's followers list. I'm going to see if it automatically adds me back. Then we'll know if the rising number is a server fix, or if it's people re-adding themselves manually.

[deleted] • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 05:44 PM

100 thousands, it seems too stable t for the latter, but let us know

648262 • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 08:47 PM

Any changes? He's at 293k now.

redpillschool[S] • 3 points • 16 June, 2016 12:40 AM

I'm still not following him. Weird.

[deleted] • 1 point • 17 June, 2016 04:59 AM

Milo was banned again two hours ago, but he is back, and he is getting his followers back too - now it is 250 k. Are you following him now?

[deleted] • 5 points • 15 June, 2016 05:22 PM

50 thousands, i think it was a test to see how people would react

Hunter2isit • 5 points • 15 June, 2016 05:46 PM

he should get 1,000,000 fake followers like Hillary did

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 09:25 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Olipyr • 3 points • 15 June, 2016 08:53 PM*

This comment has been overwritten by an open source script to protect this user's privacy. It was created to help protect users from doxing, stalking, and harassment.

If you would also like to protect yourself, add the Chrome extension TamperMonkey, or the Firefox extension GreaseMonkey and add this open source script.

Then simply click on your username on Reddit, go to the comments tab, scroll down as far as possible (hint:use RES), and hit the new OVERWRITE button at the top.

Also, please consider using an alternative to Reddit - political censorship is unacceptable.

RedditAdminsSuck_88 • 7 points • 15 June, 2016 04:14 PM

Can't wait to see Twitter start banning the accounts that wish death upon Trump and his supporters at his rallies, or the muslim accounts that were saying they were going to stick a bomb in Milo's pants this past Sunday when he was tweeting about the attacks.

Can't wait to see Twitter ban all the militant atheist accounts that shit on Christians every chance they get. Nah, won't happen. The globalist elite interests that run Twitter(as well as all other social media, television networks, newspapers, movie studios, and banks) have their agenda they must carry out and protect. The same globalist elites that are pushing forced diversity, feminism, degeneracy, smut, forced mass migration and refugee resettlement, globalism, open borders, and the likes.

snorted_the_red_pill • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 05:07 AM*

Damn Jews!

Everyone knows that the Jews are responsible for the globalists. Thanks to their high interests in banking and media they're manipulating the content (that, according to their Terms of Service, they own) for their selfish benefit.

RedditAdminsSuck_88 • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 02:10 PM

Well yeah, if you want to get right to it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 02:51 PM

shrug, the brigading at the_donald isn't even official. i didn't think anyone actually ever said "upvote everything in this thread." maybe someone should start a bot for pulling up anti-conservative hate speech on twitter, and then reporting those people en masse.

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 05:38 PM

[deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 4 points • 15 June, 2016 05:44 PM

Luckily, we'd never play a game like this with people's followers...

<https://www.trp.red/follow/gaylubeoil>

[deleted] • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 06:04 PM

I can imagine that quite a few of his followers were there to hate on anything he did. I can see them scurrying off, since losing their social media accounts as collateral damage would cripple their ability to feel human.

I do wonder how many were true followers, would be good in the next few days to see the numbers start coming in.

Gumpool • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 07:43 PM

The problem is all the beta cuck white men who holds this system on its shoulders

yummyluckycharms • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 08:28 PM

Twitter is cancer. Outside of celebrities/companies trying to sell a product, the service doesnt add anything of value over pre-existing alternatives. Plus - the amount of bigoted SJW's is probably one of the main reasons why so few normal people use it and why it hasnt turned a profit at all.

B1tfury • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 11:32 PM

Of course they have and of course they allow ISIS pages to stay up...

Saudi Prince Alwaleed Bin Talal Bin Abdulaziz Alsaud owns the most shares of Twitter in the world...

Xakarath • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 01:11 AM

Step 1: rip off what zuckerburg ripped off from the winklevos'

Step 2: don't have ridiculous censorship policy

Step 3: market and siphon off users

Step 4: ????

Step 5: profit

If they keep this up, this will happen, and in ten years it'll look like MySpace.

Dean_Oliver • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 01:57 AM

Feels like he's using this tragedy to shamelessly enhance his own brand

reddditreddditredd • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 09:20 PM

I just recently posted on "askTheRedPill" if Milo is the new Christopher Hitchens.

In response to one comment, I wrote:

In time, Milo might reach Hitchens level. Hitchens was 62 when he died.

Hitchens was more well-read than Milo, but that might be a product of the times in which they lived.

Hitchens was raised in a much more literate time.

Hitchens attacked from the Left, and Milo attacks from the Right. However, Hitchens came of age in an era when the Right controlled the culture, while Milo came of age in an era when the Left controls the culture.

Both of them are brilliant debaters, incredibly quick and witty. I think Milo needs to find himself a little more, but that will come with age and experience. I also think Milo needs to attack other cultural shibboleths aside from just Feminism, but again this will come with time.

I think Milo has the tools, the wit, the charm, the intelligence to be a major public intellectual at the caliber of Hitchens, but it's going to take some work. Let's see if Milo is up to the challenge.

You know you've won the argument when they stop debating you and just ban you.

Lakey91 • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 10:08 PM

Peter Hitchens is a perfectly good Hitchens of the right. If anything he's better than his brother.

staggerman • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 11:20 PM

I'll definitely have to check some of his work.

phibetared • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 06:57 PM*

If it's true that some Muslim guy with 1.2MM followers did the "brigade" thing... and it caused Milo to get on the front page of Drudge... it's hilarious.

I just looked on Twitter, he's over 290,000 followers now.

PLUS: a great periscope video on his twitter feed of a news conference from him held this afternoon in Orlando. Recommended.

Planner_Hammish • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 07:08 PM

It also seems they removed 8000 (all) of his likes.

prodigy2throw • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 08:24 PM

It's so painfully obvious that people within Twitter are conspiring to delegitimize and silence Milo. Truth always comes out. Whether we learn the truth of what happened today or 5 years from now.

lawr11 • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 09:05 PM

I've been suspended before. When you come back from suspension it takes a while for your followers to come back.

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 09:52 PM

[deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 09:54 PM

Milo is a major voice in the manosphere, specifically against feminists. He's done an AMA here before. If he gets blackballed, it's news here.

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 10:02 PM

[deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 10:13 PM

You can hop on over to <http://www.trp.red> and participate or start a free blog. There's a subscription donation feature if you'd like to support the site.

666Evo • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 10:28 PM

The real question is how do we profit from this?

Twitter is dying. And not slowly.

Facebook is the place where your mother spends most of her time now.

Can we create a "man friendly" social media platform that will also appeal to the largest user base (women)?

redpillschool[S] • 5 points • 16 June, 2016 12:37 AM

...Dude.. trp.red

666Evo • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 01:56 AM

Oh, don't get me wrong. That's a great site for us and should explode once Reddit decide we're too "problematic", but it's hardly got the widespread appeal of a Facebook or Twitter...

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 01:30 AM

Anyone know if Twitter can make you follow certain people? I swear I didn't go on one of my old accounts for a year, came back and I was suddenly following a bunch of celebs/athletes I never even heard of

enkae7317 • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 02:30 AM

Good fuck god. Good thing I don't have a twitter..and only use it to get money.

bsutansalt • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 02:39 AM

<https://youtu.be/L9YknJzsoRI>

WilliamBott • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 02:52 AM

Obviously, I have no inside information as to the situation, but in the past Twitter has suspended users with large numbers of "fake" followers (i.e. bots, hacked accounts, etc.) and/or removed the followers.

It's quite possible Milo had (knowingly or unknowingly) acquired 100k "followers" from one of the many spambots that advertise them for sale on Twitter and Facebook.

APotter12 • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 04:07 AM

Most Muslims are non-white, thus they rank higher on the progressive stack than gay white men.

Dildo_Saggins • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 06:16 AM

The single largest shareholder of Twitter stock is literally a Saudi Prince. This is why ISIS profiles stay up, and they persecute Milo for daring to be a gay conservative.

balalasaurus • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 07:01 AM

It's funny that Twitter can let ISIS continue to operate, yet take issue with Milo.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 07:01 AM

people are forgetting that the second largest owner in twitter stock is a saudi prince.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 08:02 AM

Makes my fucking blood boil.

We are in 1984.

jaysire • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 09:10 AM

Who else (with similar thoughts) should I follow on Twitter besides Milo? My feed is feeling a bit dry.

mugatucrazypills • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 04:17 PM*

Behold ye among the heathen, and regard, and wonder marvellously: for I will work a work in your days, which ye will not believe, though it be told you.

Habakkuk 1:5

The formerly marxist-left is *married* to political Islam. It's an violent abuse marriage, but because Islam give the leftists such tingles they'll NEVER leave untill ChadMohammed goes with his beatings too far and they brain bleed to death.

In the coming months you will be astonished to see the cognitive dissonance on the part of the majority of the leftists "intellectuals", left media establishment, political gay establishment, and the activist community to draw closer to and protect their abusers and killers.

tolerantman • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 05:49 PM

Twitter is trash, the only people you can criticize there are white straight men.

dark_g • 1 point • 17 June, 2016 01:46 AM

I just logged into Twitter, Milo now has 304K followers (including myself, I haven't been removed). Maybe the Streisand Effect reared once again its ugly head.

PM_ME_YOURE_FRECKLES • 1 point • 17 June, 2016 03:27 AM

He's been suspended...again

AGenuineAmerican • 1 point • 17 June, 2016 07:47 PM

As a gay man, wouldn't he enjoy being fucked over, even if it were just in the media?

Scizzler • 0 points • 15 June, 2016 07:17 PM

God forbid he can't use Twitter, what are we gonna do. I for one would kill myself if I couldn't use Twitter, omg, the horror.

Who the fuck cares.

cazzah123 • 15 points • 15 June, 2016 07:20 PM

Not caring about stuff like this is a slippery slope.

To you twitter might not matter, but its one of the biggest forms of public free speech going. Its huge. And to be banned from it says something about what the current situation is regarding free speech, social media and current popular affairs

beltwaytr • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 08:00 PM

BINGO! I've gone through this in prior posts but this man is one of very few major voices men have currently in the terms of men's rights.

Too many of us are oblivious to this fact because we can't see past our own noses. This man speaks for every man in this community whether we know it or not. Ignoring an attack on him or any prominent voice in the men's rights community should be met with our support.

All it took for me to support the dude was follow him on twitter and retweet one of his messages. It took 2 minutes out of my work out.

Galbert123 • 1 point • 15 June, 2016 07:52 PM

Comments like this pop up all the time about reddit to. "Who cares they deleted your post, if you dont like it leave". Pretty sure theyre shills or trolls.

gizmozed • 0 points • 16 June, 2016 12:08 PM

You "conservatives" can't have it both ways. Is Twitter a privately owned business? Then they can do whatever they want as long as it is legal. And favoring one message over another is most definitely legal, "conservatives" do it all the time.

Try to be consistent in your beliefs.

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 16 June, 2016 02:10 PM

Us "conservatives" are "free" to criticize businesses that purport to facilitate communication but censor our voices.

They're not above criticism. That doesn't mean they're not a private business. It means they're a shitty business with an agenda.

[deleted] • 0 points • 15 June, 2016 08:22 PM

twitter is probably in bed with IS, along with Obama and Hillary Clinton. It's all part of the globalist agenda. Do not be fooled.

knightSwolaire • 0 points • 17 June, 2016 08:50 PM

Just follow the money. This is happening because Saudis control the majority share of Twitter. They hate Milo

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 06:15 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] • 10 points • 15 June, 2016 06:34 PM

Why do people say this? Yeah, so what? They can do what they want, and likewise we can criticize what they do.

LittleSpoonMe • 6 points • 15 June, 2016 07:13 PM

Hahahah you read my mind. Lol the logic is there, it's just not being applied by the poster above.

[deleted] 15 June, 2016 09:36 PM

[deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 01:11 AM

Yeah, this is totally the same.

IDontKnowAnymore3456 • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 07:47 AM

Sufficiently big boycott meaning loss of revenue for company will make them care.

TheRedChemist • 2 points • 15 June, 2016 07:33 PM

Yes, I agree in principle - the issue with it is that a private company has become a significant part of the social landscape and as such operates a kind of feedback loop.

If it was run by a wise and benevolent dictator it could keep things on the straight and narrow. Unfortunately it's run by (at best) beta nerds who bow to the slightest pressure from SJWs, and Twitter's huge popularity nowadays gives the SJW cause more apparent credibility than it would have gained on its own merit. It's like if the President did celebrity endorsements for any company that asked.

robocopsboner • 1 point • 16 June, 2016 08:12 AM

They may have since deleted the accounts, but there was a lot of people angry Twitter would allow radical islamic accounts to literally promote and support ISIS. I don't know if they've deleted the accounts, but it's ridiculous they would allow that and yet clamp down on a gay Trump supporter.

SatinDoll15 • -2 points • 15 June, 2016 08:05 PM

This is a very interesting and truthful point about social media. It's very biased toward any liberal-leaning perspective. However, every other "risk" you pointed out is pretty much ridiculous. Most guys don't face those risks in their average daily lives if they are only participating in consensual sex, aren't harassing women, and aren't misogynists themselves.