

Opposing Andrew Tate for the Right Reasons

Andrew Tate is a controversial figure. A former pro-kickboxer turned masculinity guru, he's on record criticizing COVID hysteria, feminism, and open borders—all things the powers that be don't want us thinking critically about. And with an [audience in the millions](#), it's safe to say that Tate has proven greatly troublesome to them.

As such, it isn't surprising that many would chalk up Tate's recent [arrest](#) to his political advocacy. We all know the system is corrupt, but his situation is far more complicated—not to mention sordid—than that. Still, despite his valid critiques of the liberal order, Andrew Tate is not the hill for conservatives to die on.

First let us examine the charges against Tate. Andrew Tate was arrested in Romania on Thursday, Dec. 29 alongside his brother Tristan and [two other suspects](#). He faces charges of human trafficking, rape, and organized crime and is currently sitting in pre-trial detention.

I can't say whether or not Tate is guilty. I've never been to Romania, let alone familiarized myself with Romanian law. However, these charges are clearly not without substance, and we should bear in mind Andrew Tate's past statements when evaluating his present legal woes. On why he left Britain, Tate [said](#), "40 percent of the reason I moved to Romania was because rape laws are more lenient there."

Not the most exonerating statement for a man facing rape charges.

And by Tate's own admission, he was indeed running some sort of shady pornography business, which he has [described](#) as a "total scam." It involved a number of women, some of whom

[lived](#) in a Romanian mountain retreat owned by Tate, engaging in all sorts of questionable behavior on seedy webcam sites.

Their business model revolved around these camgirls creating sob stories to siphon as much money from their lonely viewers as possible. Sometimes, as [explained](#) by Tate in this viral clip, the women would pretend to want to meet the man with whom they were chatting—for \$4 per minute—to scam them out of more money, with no intention of actually meeting them.

That sounds like textbook fraud. But again, I am no attorney. Tristan Tate seems to believe their business model was perfectly legal, [arguing](#), “One [line in the terms and conditions] is broadcasting is ‘for entertainment purposes only’. That means if a model says she has a sick dog or a sick grandma it doesn’t have to be true. The next is that all cash given to models is ‘a voluntary sign of gratitude for their time broadcasting’.”

I can’t say whether or not Tate and his team forced these women to participate in these jobs. But [according](#) to Romanian prosecutors, Tate and his team “appear to have created an organized crime group with the purpose of recruiting, housing and exploiting women by forcing them to create pornographic content.” Officials also [stated](#) that “They were essentially kept under house arrest 24/7 like prisoners. They were deprived of their freedom and followed everywhere.”

Andrew Tate appears to have lured some of these women in through false displays of affection. In a since-deleted post on his website, Tate [outlined](#) his method. “My job was to get women to fall in love with me,” he wrote. “Literally, that was my job. My job was to meet a girl, go on a few dates, sleep with her, test if she’s quality, get her to fall in love with me to where she’d do anything I say, and then get her on webcam so we could become rich together.”

In light of the above, can one really say with confidence that

the charges against Andrew Tate are *entirely* baseless? After all, the fact remains that he did indeed run a shady pornography business, one which involved many women, likely under some degree of manipulation, living in a large house he owned, scamming desperate men out of their money. At best, Tate's operation seems to have operated in a legal gray area; at worst, it was illegal.

But legality is only one angle here. Morality is another. Regardless of whether or not Tate broke the law, his behavior was clearly depraved and reprehensible. Conservatives therefore should neither elevate him as a hero or a martyr; he is unworthy of such support.

At the end of the day, nobody's perfect. We can't expect everyone who criticizes liberalism's sacred cows to be a saint. Still, we have to draw the line somewhere—and as far as I'm concerned, Andrew Tate is beyond the pale.

—

Image credit: Twitter-Piers Morgan Uncensored

[ITO](#)