

Elliot Rodger and the Denigration of Men

last update: 31/5/14

To facilitate their pursuance of advantage for women, feminists have two main tactics,

- (i) To conceal the victimisation and disadvantage of men, and to promote the image of victimised and disadvantaged women to the maximum degree;
- (ii) To promote the view that all men are guilty of the crimes committed by a few men, and to conceal or excuse the crimes of women.

The Boko Haram affair is an example of (i).

The reaction in the feminist press to the Elliot Rodger killings is an example of both (i) and (ii). There has been an explosion of newspaper articles, of great passion, insisting that Elliot Rodger's killing spree is proof of widespread and dangerous misogyny. The claim is spurious, as explained herein.

The Elliot Rodger affair also sees a new tactic being deployed,

- (iii) To blame the Men's Rights Movement (MRM) for a specific heinous crime - and hence to imply that the MRM will incite further such atrocities.

This new departure is disturbing. It has no factual basis whatsoever, as I shall show. It is simply an invention of the feminist press to discredit the MRM. We can expect more of the same to come.

Even more disturbing is that the interpretation of Rodger's actions as misogyny, encouraged by the MRM, gained such widespread support on Twitter, especially by women.

Firstly the facts. On 23 May 2014 Elliot Rodger, a 22 year old, went on a spree of violence in Isla Vista, California. He left 6 dead and 13 injured. Four of the dead were men, and two women. Rodger was receiving psychiatric treatment. He had a lifelong difficulty making friends and had been diagnosed with Asperger's syndrome. He had a history of being bullied.

I have been unable to ascertain the sex of all the injured. Having read the newspaper reports, one of the injured was a woman from the same "Triple Delta" sorority to which the two dead women belonged. After shooting her, Rodger fired at a nearby couple; the man was wounded, while the woman suffered a superficial graze wound. Later he hit a woman who was injured in the leg, and also struck a bicyclist and a skateboarder with his car. From a witness account I know the bicyclist was male because the witness said, "the guy went over the car". So, of the 13 non-fatally injured I know only that three were female and three were male.

How are we to respond to Rodger's violence? Should we see it as the action of one isolated aberrant individual, or as being symptomatic of a widespread societal malaise - misogyny and systemic violence against women? Feminist writers were quick to claim the latter interpretation. This is simply an example of Strategy (ii), above. The protestations by men on Twitter (#notallmen), namely that men in general should not be blamed for Rodger's violence, was met with an overwhelming angry response, mostly from women, that, on the contrary, all men should be so blamed (#yesallwomen).

Let us examine the case as rationally as we can. We can look at two aspects: what Rodger actually did, and what his motivations were. Do these suggest an aberrant

individual or an individual acting in a manner consistent with a widespread societal tendency? Is there any relationship between Rodger's actions and the MRM?

What Rodger Did

There has been a deluge of press coverage. I will take just a few as typical examples. Firstly, Jessica Valenti writing in *The Guardian* on 25/5/14, and Laurie Penny writing in *The New Statesman* on 25/5/14. Both these feminists refer to the killings as "the killing of six people" without mentioning the sex of the victims. They then proceed to claim widespread misogyny within society as the cause. Did they just forget to mention that most of the "people" whom Rodger killed were men? No one, surely, is so naive as to believe that. If all six dead had been female they would certainly have emphasised the fact. No, it was deliberate to ignore this awkward fact. This is Strategy (i). The sex of the victims is not mentioned because, of course, it hardly aligns very well with their determination to blame misogyny, which would mean they couldn't extend this to *widespread* misogyny - and hence all men (i.e., Strategy (ii)).

What Was Rodger's Motivation?

Unusually we know precisely what Rodger's motivation was because he has told us in his 141 page "Twisted World Manifesto", which you can find here <http://www.scribd.com/doc/225960813/Elliot-Rodger-Santa-Barbara-mass-shooting-suspect-My-Twisted-World-manifesto>. One of the remarkable things about this document is that it is well written. At a rapid reading I spotted no spelling or grammatical errors, which is unusual for internet stuff. Rodger was clearly articulate - at least in writing. The document would be merely tedious if you did not know the ending.

One quickly tires of Rodger's self pity. And it is hard to feel much sympathy for someone so showered with money and opportunity but who has so little fortitude, grit or determination. I have met people like this. Every little set-back that life offers them is a personal affront, never in any way their own fault nor simply the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune. Such people are a pain. Rodger was one of those people you would shy away from; one of those people who come across as not being quite right. Whether he had Aspergers or something else, who knows.

But at least one thing is absolutely clear. His motivation is simply that he never got a girlfriend. I do believe, based on the contents of his Manifesto, that if he had managed to acquire a steady girlfriend then no atrocity would ever have happened and his whole life would have been different. How can his malaise be regarded as misogyny if it would have been neutralised by the friendship of a single girl? Does a Nazi pine for the friendship of a Jew? Would a Nazi suddenly convert to being pro-semitic if a single Jew were nice to him?

Rodger hated *couples*. He hated anyone who had a sex life, which he could not achieve. He hated both sexes. He hated the "jocks" for being successful with girls, and he hated the girls for liking the jocks. This is made absolutely clear by being repeated over and over again, tediously so. He cannot even remain in a class in college if there is a girl-boy couple there. It is a different matter if there is a pretty girl who appears unattached. That is a positive attraction to a class - until he finds that she has a boyfriend. The sight of a boy and a girl having a relationship fills him with rage because he cannot achieve this himself. This is why he kills both males and females.

Misogyny? No. If you want a one-word summary of Rodger's motivation for his killing it is simply this: jealousy. Old fashioned, plain ordinary - but grossly out of control - jealousy.

But feminist writers selectively quote from Rodger's "Manifesto" in order to support the claim of misogyny, e.g., his intention to "*slaughter every single spoiled, stuck-up, blond slut I see*". There is certainly no shortage of threats of violence against women in the document. There is plenty for the feminist commentators to choose from. A veritable goldmine for them. But what they omit to mention (Strategy (i)) is that there is just as much nastiness directed at males. The talk of skinning men alive, torturing them and chopping off their heads as trophies, for example. And he also mused on the idea of killing all men (a fantasy he shares with feminists): "*If you could release a virus that would kill every single man on Earth, except for yourself because you would have the antidote, would you do it? You will be the only man left, with all the females. You would be able to have your pick of any beautiful woman you want, as well as having dealt vengeance on the men who took them from you. Imagine how satisfying that would be.*" I think you must agree: what we are looking at here is jealousy, not misogyny.

So let us summarise where we have got to,

- Rodger killed four men and two women, and injured 13 more, who were of both sexes;
- Rodger was motivated by jealousy of men and women who had formed a relationship because he so strongly desired such a relationship but could not manage to achieve one.

The feminist writers claim that misogyny was the cause of Rodger's violence. Valenti writes, for example: "*California shooting spree: further proof that misogyny kills*", "*To dismiss this as a case of a lone "madman" would be a mistake*"; "*If we need to talk about this tragic shooting in terms of illness, let's start with talking about our cultural sickness – a sickness that refuses to see misogyny as anything other than inevitable*"; "*Dismissing violent misogynists as 'crazy' is a neat way of saying that violent misogyny is an individual problem, not a cultural one*"; "*The truth is that there is no such thing as a lone misogynist – they are created by our culture, and by communities that tells them that their hatred is justified*".

Similarly, Penny writes: "*For some time now, misogynist extremism has been excused, as all acts of terrorism committed by white men are excused, as an aberration, as the work of random loons, not real men at all. Why are we denying the existence of a pattern?*"; "*We are told, repeatedly, to ignore it (misogyny). It's not real. It's just "crazy", lonely guys who we should feel sorry for.*"; "*As soon as women began to speak about the massacre, a curious thing happened. Men all over the world - not all men, but enough men - began to push back, to demand that we qualify our anger and mitigate our fear. Not all men are violent misogynists.*"; "*But if you think for one second, for one solitary second, that demanding tolerance for men as a group, that dismissing the reality of violence against women because not all men kill, not all men rape, if you think that's more important than demanding justice for those who have been brutalised and murdered by those not all men, then you are part of the problem. You may not have pulled the trigger. You may not have raised your hand to a woman in your life. But you are part of the problem.*"

The above quotes are very clear statements of Strategy (ii): all men are guilty. Or, to be more accurate, not quite all men but a widespread hatred of women (misogyny) by many men, promulgated by "communities" within "our culture". It is wrong, they claim, to see Rodger's violence as an individual act. It is actually produced by a widespread, societal sickness - misogyny. This is, of course, the same Strategy (ii)

perspective that feminists have been deploying for half a century. All men are guilty of the crimes of individual men. All men are rapists, all men are wife beaters, all men are paedophiles, all men are Elliot Rodger.

It is staggering that such a claim can be made when we have Rodger's own 141 page account of his motivation as evidence. Yes, there is a brief mention of the pick-up artist site PUAHate (one paragraph in the 141 page document). I know nothing of this site and it may very well be objectionable. But it is clear that Rodger took an interest in the site only after he had become committed to his distorted worldview. His jealousy driven anger was well established before he gravitated to PUA. Any interest in PUA he might have had (and it seems not to have figured very largely) was a symptom and consequence of his anger, not its cause.

It is the case that acts of violence are more commonly carried out by males than females. In particular, this type of incident is specifically male - though not common. But it is also a fact that men are the majority of the victims of violence, just as they were in this case. So it is reasonable for men to advise that women should not be unduly fearful. Men actually have greater reason to be fearful - but that does not mean that they should go through life in a state of fear either. But feminists do not even notice violence against men. That they interpret the killing of four men and two women as misogyny is yet another demonstration of that. Their brains are equipped with a filter which does not allow male victimisation to reach their consciousness and hence to challenge their worldview. You can find any number of videos by women on the YouTube which describe Rodger's actions as simply "the killing of women" (Strategy (i)). What should we call a society which fails to notice violence against men - as demonstrated in this very case? It is misandry. If women insist on seeing the world through a filter which prevents them seeing any misandry, then of course all that is left is an apparent misogyny. If you don't see the dead men, of course you only see the dead women.

These feminist writers spare no thought for the families of the murdered men, such as Richard Martinez, the father of 20-year-old Christopher Michaels-Martinez, one of the six killed http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/father-of-victim-in-santa-barbara-shootings-to-politicians-i-dont-care-about-your-sympathy/2014/05/27/8a030d10-e5ad-11e3-a86b-362fd5443d19_story.html.

Penny talks of "*demanding justice*" for the victims. What justice does she want? And from whom? Normally justice would mean punishing the perpetrator. But he is already dead. So what does she want? I don't know, but she makes clear upon whom this justice is to be exacted: anyone "*demanding tolerance for men as a group*". No such men will be regarded as innocent: "*You may not have pulled the trigger. You may not have raised your hand to a woman in your life. But you are part of the problem.*" That will be me, then. I demand rather more than mere "tolerance" for men as a group, and I have never "raised my hand to a woman" in my life. So just what form am I to expect my punishment to take? I provide the answer below.

There are a number of issues raised by the Elliot Rodger case which seem not to have been discussed in what has been written so far. Firstly, there are plenty of other 22 year old male virgins They are commonplace. The difference from Rodger is that, unhappy though they may be, these men don't go killing people. Most go on to become 30 year old men with kids, or at least girlfriends. A few end up as virgin old age pensioners. But how many do what Rodger did? Vanishingly few. Every few years there is a case like this. Whilst the result is unspeakably tragic for the victims and their families, we are looking at a handful of deaths in a society, the USA, where

there are around 16,000 homicides per year. Of course, three-quarters of these are merely murders of men - so who cares. But my point is, even if we accept the feminist line that there is misogyny at work in the Rodger case, just how widespread can it be? Such atrocities account for a vanishingly small proportion of homicides.

Another question is this: since Rodger was desperate for sex and proved himself to have no compunction against violence, why did he not rape? We are repeatedly told that we live in a rape culture. Surely, this young man was a dead-cert for a rapist - an extreme misogynist (we are told) willing to use violence of an unlimited severity. But nowhere in his brutally frank "Manifesto" is any interest in *sexual* violence expressed. The reason is clear. Rodger wanted the warmth, friendship, kindness and companionship of a relationship with a girl. He did not just want sex, though, of course, sex is for men a manifestation of such desires. That's right. Shocking, isn't it? Men's sexual urge, invariably portrayed as entirely bestial, is actually inextricably linked to their feelings of protectiveness, tenderness and reverence for women - what used to be called love in a less benighted age. But this fact rarely now emerges, the representation of male sexuality having been debased to brute physical acts. This is another manifestation of universal misandry.

And a final question is: whence came Rodger's overwhelming need for girlfriend? Undoubtedly the innate male sex drive is the largest part of it. No individual can be blamed for the hand that evolution has dealt him. But there is also a societal element. Rodger was acutely concerned with how he was perceived by others, and the role that having girlfriend played in that image. Is US youth culture toxic? All I know of it is what I have seen in films and TV shows, but I have always thought that American schools seem dreadfully intimidating.

Rodger and the Men's Rights Movement

Let me make this absolutely clear straight away. Elliot Rodger had not the slightest interest in the MRM. For those who are confused, or at least pretend to be confused, let me give a brief description of the typical issues about which the MRM is concerned.

- The education system is failing boys and young men. There are now ~50% more women in universities than men, and the difference is growing (that's in the UK - in the USA women students are approaching double the number of men);
- Domestic abuse of men is little recognised and receives almost no public sympathy or government support;
- Men die at a younger age than women and yet far less is spent on research into male-only diseases than into female-only diseases;
- Men's suicide rate is increasing, women's decreasing, with men committing suicide at four times the rate of women, and eleven times the rate following break-up with a partner;
- It is a woman's "right to choose" regarding abortion, but men have no choice. They are often obliged to support a child they did not want for 18 years. Men have no paternity rights;
- The treatment of men in the family courts is outrageously inequitable as regards the custody of, or access to, their children;

- The criminal justice system treats men and women in a grossly inequitable manner. If men were treated like women, for every six men in prison five would not be there (UK data);
- 96% of workplace fatalities are men (UK data);
- Men are twice as likely to be made redundant as women (UK data) (<http://www.theguardian.com/news/datablog/2013/may/07/men-gender-divide-feminism>);
- Nearly 90% of the homeless are men (UK data);
- Despite the propaganda about the pay gap, actually women in their 20s or 30s without children now earn more than men of the same age (UK and USA both). In view of the greater number of women graduates, this disparity is set to increase;
- There are huge, well funded programmes aimed at encouraging more women into traditional male occupations, e.g., STEM areas, but nothing is being done to get more men into primary school teaching where they are currently 13% of the staff and dropping.

This is what the MRM is about.

The feminists writing on the Elliot Rodger killings would have you believe that the MRM is about being vile to women and encouraging people to be violent to women. This is lies.

Yes, it is actually lying.

Read Rodger's 141 page Manifesto for yourself. He had not a shred of interest in the above issues. He was far too self absorbed. He had no compassionate feelings for his fellow man. He only regarded other men as competitors in the acquisition of females. He would have been a wholly better person if he had taken an interest in MRM. It should be clear to anyone that a keen concern with MRM matters, as listed above, has no relationship whatsoever to encouraging violence against women, or any form of misogyny.

And yet the feminist press has made this claim. I will respond to some of these feminist writers point by point.

OllieGarkey (in the Daily Kos)

Writing in the Daily Kos, one "OllieGarkey" makes the claim that Rodger was inspired by the MRM. Noting that one of Rodger's rantings was "You will finally see that I am in truth the superior one. The true Alpha Male" OllieGarkey makes the following ridiculous assertion: "*The true Alpha Male. What those who call themselves the Men's Rights Movement aspire to be.* Wrong. It is preposterous to claim that men's rights activists (MRAs) aspire to be alpha males. In MRA circles, alpha males are regarded with the greatest suspicion since there is a strong correlation between alpha male status and being a White Knight (i.e., effectively a feminist male). Accusing MRAs of wanting to be alpha males is almost as silly as claiming they want to be feminists. So why make this absurd connection? It is simply that ***there is no connection*** between Elliot Rodger and the MRM. Absolutely none whatsoever. So the feminists have to make one up.

OllieGarkey continues, "*The Men's Rights Movement as they call themselves is a nebulous group of pickup artists and misogynists who've found each other on line, and are attempting to create a movement based around their hatred, disdain, and fear*

of women. Wrong. The MRM is based around the genuine disadvantages to men which are endemic in all modern industrial societies, as listed above. The MRM does indeed have harsh things to say about feminists (as opposed to women). The MRM position is anti-feminist because feminism is seen as a pernicious philosophy based on hatred of men and a determination to promote female supremacy with no regard for fairness between the sexes. This is a criticism of a philosophy not of people. However, MRAs may well also express harsh criticisms of some women (not all women!). Feminists cannot distinguish between criticism of women and misogyny. Misogyny is always wrong. Criticism of women can be justified, even necessary, when there is a valid reason. No one should be placed beyond criticism.

OllieGarkey continues, "*We know for a fact that Rodgers was influenced by this movement, as he is subscribed to multiple "pick up artist" or "mens rights" channels on YouTube*". This is a deliberate, and mendacious, conflating of pick-up artists with men's rights activists. It is outrageous. There is, I believe, an active community called pick-up artists (PUAs) on line. They are rather dubious men who exchange strategies for picking up women, for the purposes of sex. The linking of the MRM to the PUA community is preposterous. Many MRAs have been burnt by women and picking up women is the last thing they are interested in doing. Some MRAs are MGTOW (men going their own way) who eschew all intimate relations with women. Other MRAs may enjoy good relations with female partners. It is a broad church. But to my knowledge - having read a great deal on MRM sites - PUA interests never feature at all. The MRM is about male disadvantage, nothing whatsoever to do with picking up women.

OllieGarkey claims Rodger subscribed to MRM sites. Again false. You can see here what YouTube channels he **subscribed** to. Some of them are PUA sites, none are MRM. OllieGarkey deliberately conflates the two. She says, "*Don't be surprised when you all get painted with the same brush. Despite your protestations to the contrary, I cannot tell the MRAs apart from the PUAs from The Red Pillers and Incels and all the other disparate groups. And that's your image problem for failing to make yourselves distinct from each other, not a problem with our perception.*" Well there is indeed an image problem for the MRM - but that's precisely because OllieGarkey and her kind deliberately misrepresent it. And it is because the whole narrative, the press, the TV, all the media, are in the pockets of the feminists, all determined to prevent the MRM voice being heard. This is cold blooded black propaganda. And it is disingenuous of OllieGarkey to pretend not to be able to tell PUA and MRM apart for the reasons given above. The only similarity is that both are liable to say non-complimentary things about women. Criticising women is not misogyny.

I repeat, there is not one shred of evidence that Rodger was a member of, or had any interest in, the MRM. This is confirmed by his own 141 page Manifesto.

Jessica Valenti (The Guardian)

"There is no such thing as a lone misogynist – they are created by our culture, and by communities that tells them that their hatred is justified. Rodger was reportedly involved with the online men's rights movement: allegedly active on one forum and said to have been following several men's rights channels on YouTube. The language Rodger used in his videos against women – like referring to himself as an "alpha male" – is common rhetoric in such circles. I have refuted these claims above. Valenti is uncritically repeating the groundless claims of OllieGarkey. Notice how Valenti covers her bottom using the qualifiers "reportedly" and "allegedly".

*"These communities are so virulently misogynist that the Southern Poverty Law Center, an organization that tracks hate groups, has been watching their movements for years." The implication is the MRM is a hate group. The feminists have indeed attempted to get certain MRM web sites, such as AVFM, closed down using this as a pretext. They may yet succeed. They openly boast of how they have obliged FaceBook to exercise censorship on their behalf. As for MRM sites being subject to surveillance by government agencies, I am not in the least surprised. They are welcome to eavesdrop as much as they wish. Hey, pull up a chair, gentlemen. Listen to our case. But the reds are not under the beds, gentlemen, they are *in* the beds - and wearing nighties.*

Laurie Penny (The New Statesman)

"We have allowed ourselves to believe, for a long time, that the misogynist subcultures flourishing on- and offline in the past half-decade, the vengeful sexism seeding in resentment in a time of rage and austerity, is best ignored." Yes, indeed, it is true that the MRM is "seeded in resentment". It is valid to be resentful when men live in a world in which the injustices listed above persist whilst at the same time men are told that they are privileged and they should be bending every sinew to transfer ever increasing advantage to females. But the likes of Penny refuse to recognise the genuine grievance of men and instead interpret the MRM as misogyny. But asserting one's rights is not misogyny.

"We have allowed ourselves to believe that those fetid currents aren't really real, that they don't matter, that they have no relation to "real-world" violence. But if the Isla Vista massacre is the first confirmed incident of an incident of gross and bloody violence directly linked to the culture of 'Men's Rights' activism and Pickup Artist (PUA) ideology, an ideology that preys on lost, angry men, then it cannot be ignored or dismissed any more." Penny and her kind are simply using the killings as a propaganda opportunity. There is no link whatsoever between the MRM and the killings. The frightening thing is that 1.5 million women have accepted these feminists' false perspective on the affair by Tweeting their outrage, see <http://www.vanityfair.com/online/daily/2014/05/yesallwomen-visualization-hashtag-tweets-spread>.

*"Who are these people? Where do they live? If any man is capable of this, is every man capable of it?": Women are very ready to claim "fear" as a complaint against men. Well, the phrase "where do they live" is redolent with threat. I do genuinely find it frightening. Especially when linked with Valenti's observation that MRM's are subject to government surveillance (for the unforgiveable crime of wanting equal rights for men). And the meaning of *If any man is capable of this, is every man capable of it?*" could not be clearer - it is Strategy (ii). The MRM has attempted to counter Strategy (ii) with the dumpster poster campaign. This campaign ostensibly*

asks women - all women - to stop throwing their babies in the garbage. Hey, if some women do, can't every woman be capable of it?

"At least it is implied that feminism is to blame": Nowhere was feminism mentioned in Rodger's Manifesto. Feminism is not to blame for the killings, any more than is misogyny - because actually it was just down to an aberrant individual.

"The bigger and stronger the new feminist movement gets in all its glorious variety, the more vicious and committed the backlash becomes. The backlash is real. There is ideology behind it." Essentially true, except for the biased slant of the wording. The feminist movement is getting stronger but it is not glorious. It is a disgrace and the opposite of equality. So it is now being opposed by the MRM. Call this a backlash if you wish. But the opposition is justified. Part of the reason that Penny is so outraged is that the growth of the MRM as a mainstream movement has been a shock to her. Previously the extent of opposition to feminism was slight. The princess does not like her vassals being uppity. And, yes, there is indeed an ideology behind it. The ideology is this: equality of opportunity and equality of respect. Radical, I know.

"But if you think for one second, for one solitary second, that demanding tolerance for men as a group, that dismissing the reality of violence against women because not all men kill, not all men rape, if you think that's more important than demanding justice for those who have been brutalised and murdered by those not all men, then you are part of the problem. You may not have pulled the trigger. You may not have raised your hand to a woman in your life. But you are part of the problem." How outraged she is that men should "demand tolerance". Oh dear. We are demanding a great deal more than just tolerance. It is equality we are after. And finally, the bottom line: just what justice will Penny and her kind be demanding - and from whom, the actual culprit being dead? Well, they have been making the spurious claim that it is the nasty things the MRM are saying about women on the internet that is to blame. We can anticipate that the feminists will be mounting a campaign, using the Alta Vista killings as impetus, to outlaw the likes of AVFM - and any other MRM oriented sites. So much for free speech. But feminists don't believe in that. Ask Warren Farrell. Ask Janice Fiamengo.

Summary

- The killing of four men and two women is being presented by the feminist press as misogyny.
- This (non existent) misogyny is being blamed on the MRM, with absolutely no basis whatsoever.
- The feminists are likely to use their political muscle together with this spurious reading of the Alta Vista killings to attempt to get MRM web sites outlawed. This would defeat the only opposition to feminism.

If this happens, the feminists will have stuffed an oily rag into a blowing safety relief valve.

Further reading

<http://judgybitch.com/2014/05/25/deeply-disturbed-man-kills-4-men-and-2-women-and-then-himself-and-is-declared-a-violent-misogynist-because-the-deaths-of-men-dont-count/> (Janet Bloomfield)

<http://www.crikey.com.au/2014/05/27/razer-misogyny-not-to-blame-for-santa-barbara-massacre> (Helen Razer)