

What happens when you drop a bunch of women on an island to fend for themselves?

February 7, 2014 | 925 upvotes | by [spicy_fries](#)

This is a great comment from an ROK article that proves that feminism is nothing but a collective shit test.

"Quite a few years ago, I had the pleasure of watching the Dutch version of Survivor with my feminist roommate. That particular series of Dutch Survivor would have two islands, one populated by men and one populated by women. The feminist roommate had been promoting that particular series to me and the other students in the house for weeks because it would show us, according to her, what a society run by women - free from the evils of Patriarchy – would be like.

And it did. Oh it did.

Here is what happened: Initially both groups were dropped on their respective islands, given some supplies to get started and left to fend for themselves. In both groups there was some initial squabbling as people tried to figure out a local hierarchy. The men pretty much did whatever they felt was necessary – there was no leader giving orders. Men who felt like hunting, foraging or fishing did so. Another guy decided he was fed up with sitting on sand and started making benches. Others built a hut that gradually grew and evolved. Another guy cooked every night. Within days a neat little civilization was thriving, each day being slightly more prosperous than the previous one.

The women settled into a routine as well. They hung up a clothesline to dry their towels, then proceeded to sunbathe and squabble. Because unlike men, women were unable to do anything without consensus of the whole group. And because it was a group of at least a dozen women, consensus was never reached. During the next few episodes, the women ate all their initial supplies, got drenched by tropical storms several times, were eaten alive by sand fleas and were generally miserable. The men on the other hand, were quite content. There were disagreements of course, but they were generally resolved.

Watching this with my feminist roommate was wonderful. Initially she tried to rationalize the differences, but her arguments became weaker and weaker. Eventually, the people running the program decided something had to change. In order to help the women out, three men would be selected to go to their island. In return, three women would take their place at the men's island. The look on my feminist roommates face during this episode was priceless.

Initially, the three men selected for the women's island were ecstatic, for obvious reason. But then they arrived at the island and were greeted by the women. 'Where is your hut?', they asked. 'We have no hut' 'Where are your supplies?' they asked, dismayed 'We ate all the rice'

And so on. The three men ended up working like dogs, using all the skills developed by trial and error in their first few weeks – building a hut, fish, trying to get the women to forage. The women continued to bitch and sunbathe.

The three women who were sent to the men's island were delighted – food, shelter and plenty of male attention was freely available. They too continued to sunbathe.

And that my friends, is what Patriarchy is. My former roommate is no longer a feminist."

You can see the actual comment here:

<http://www.returnofkings.com/27852/why-patriarchy-is-the-greatest-social-system-ever-created#comment-1233528862>

Comments

Whisper • 347 points • 7 February, 2014 11:37 PM

It is to be remembered that "patriarchy" doesn't literally mean "rule by men".

It means "rule by *fathers*". That distinction is super-important. Fathers are the subset of men who are most invested in society. It is they who are willing to sacrifice their personal welfare for that of society.

[deleted] 8 February, 2014 02:30 AM

[permanently deleted]

IllimitableMan • 43 points • 8 February, 2014 02:55 AM

Because feminists socially and politically charged the word to have negative oppressive connotations. Matriarchy comes from maternal, patriarchy comes from paternal - mother and father. Etymology exposing that bullshit.

[deleted] • -11 points • 8 February, 2014 04:27 PM

What? Come on, think it through a bit. If all the power is concentrated in the fathers hands, that means all the power is inevitably.. In the males hands. Are there many self proclaimed feminists who might not know what they're talking about? Sure. But don't act as if the initial feminists didn't understand the concept when they decided they didn't like it.

IllimitableMan • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 05:19 PM

It's always amusing how one can say one thing and another can infer something else entirely.

[deleted] 8 February, 2014 11:59 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] 8 February, 2014 03:32 PM

[permanently deleted]

mydarkmeatrises • 24 points • 7 February, 2014 10:15 PM

After reading the Wiki, the woman won. Did she contribute during the show? Did she have any qualities that justified her winning?

HahahahaWaitWhat • 57 points • 7 February, 2014 10:38 PM

No, but she had some qualities that justified her being selected as the winner in front a TV audience.

[deleted] • 40 points • 7 February, 2014 11:43 PM

Namely, a vagina.

RedBigMan • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 02:55 AM

So basically if it was her vs a guy in the finale she'd probably get all the votes from dudes with dicks and maybe a few feminista votes.

rebuildingMyself • 11 points • 8 February, 2014 03:24 AM

She'd get all the feminista votes and some white knights.

nshaq • 24 points • 7 February, 2014 10:58 PM

The thing about these "competitions" is like this... If someone is exceeding and is really successful, many of the other players vote him out, because they are no match against that person. They eliminate tough competition this way. So for example if you had two dudes and one chick in the semi finals, the weaker of the two would vote the strong one out because that way they both still have a chance to win. There is a very good chance you end up with the woman and the weaker of the two men in the finals.

FloranHunter • 8 points • 8 February, 2014 06:04 AM

Actually...

The women couldn't get anything done because they demanded consensus for everything. When it came time for competitions, wouldn't the female strategy then be useful? They'd vote as a bloc against the men who would vote piecemeal. Or so I guess.

junkiexxl • 41 points • 7 February, 2014 10:50 PM

The show isnt really about surviving skills. Its mostly a social game. Every episode one person has to leave by a voting system. So when you dont have any enemies you have the biggest chance to stay because nobody votes on you.

The men who claim leadership are usually voted away because they are in the spotlight and sort of responsible for anything that goes wrong. Also strong and productive people are voted away because they are the "biggest threat" in the endgame. Its usually a bunch of women who group up and put all their votes on one person. And the good men vote on each other because they want to eliminate competition.

This leads to the removal of the best contestants and leaves you with a bunch of women and suckups.

Also the endgame consists of games where you have to make fire, a raft then paddle 100 meters over sea, but Always ends with a silly game like slingshotting a coconut over a distance of 20 meters in a bucket, pure randomness. This way even the slow contestants can win if the first guy to arrive is unlucky.

neilmcc • 12 points • 8 February, 2014 12:51 AM

Bit like communism.

[deleted] 5 March, 2014 05:30 AM

[permanently deleted]

autowikibot • 0 points • 5 March, 2014 05:30 AM

Rupert Boneham:

Rupert Boneham (born January 27, 1964) is an American **mentor** for troubled teens, who became known to **reality television** audiences in 2003 as a contestant on *Survivor: Pearl Islands* where he placed 8th. He later appeared on the *All Stars*, *Heroes vs. Villains*, and *Blood vs. Water* seasons of *Survivor*, placing 4th, 6th, and 20th respectively. He was ultimately a fan favorite among *Survivor* viewers, who voted him the million dollar winner on *Survivor: America's Tribal*

Council, a special episode of Survivor: All-Stars. The prize was awarded after a nationwide popular vote in which Boneham received 85% of the votes cast.

Imageⁱ

Interesting: Survivor: All-Stars | Survivor: Pearl Islands | Survivor: Heroes vs. Villains | Indiana gubernatorial election, 2012

Parent commenter can toggle NSFW or delete. Will also delete on comment score of -1 or less. | FAQs | Mods | Magic Words

fihsined • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 12:19 AM

Women always win because the guys will vote each other out for invisible pussy and the women will all backstab each other at a 1-1 ratio. so it goes in order of least liked guys -> least attractive women -> guys -> most attractive woman wins. The only time men win are when the women are all 7's and 8's and he's mindblowingly productive/successful.

rebuildingMyself • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 06:22 AM

I'd rather the audience vote people out.

fihsined • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 06:25 AM

It would literally work the exact same way. The only difference is the pussy would be even distant, and thus higher on the pedestal.

GuideGhost90 points 7 February, 2014 10:28 PM* **[recovered]**

This perfectly illustrates the problem with the way women operate in groups of other women, and feminists' wish for society: **inclusiveness**.

"Everyone gets a say! Everyone gets to participate! Gurrri power! Yay!"

I see this fervor for inclusiveness pop up everywhere:

Wanna have a movie where the main character has long blonde hair? Better conveniently write in a plot point where she turns into a short-haired brunette so brunettes don't feel left out.

Wanna start a harmless joke movement within programming called "brogramming" where you jokingly brag about drinking beers while writing code? That's not inclusive to women; we need to [shame]

(<http://theweek.com/article/index/227356/brogramming-the-disturbing-rise-of-frat-culture-in-silicon-valley>) it repeatedly.

(I could go on and on, but I won't)

The problem with this mindset of inclusiveness, of course, is the simple fact that **less shit gets done**. It's poisonous to productivity. When you need to get the group's permission to do anything, people tend to just throw their hands up and say "fuck it, I'm not going to take any initiative; I'll just live with whatever the group decides."

The men on the show operated as autonomous agents, building shit, creating tools, making shelter etc because they knew their quality of life would be as high as the amount of effort they put in. It perfectly illustrates why the "patriarchy" has been - and will always be - in charge.

gekkozorz • 81 points • 8 February, 2014 12:00 AM

The problem with this mindset of inclusiveness, of course, is the simple fact that less shit gets done. It's poisonous to productivity.

I studied Economics in school, and one of the first things I learned was that "specialization increases the pie." If I'm great at fixing computers but shitty at fixing cars, I'd create more value for both myself and society at large by working as an IT technician, rather than an auto mechanic. If everyone in a given society does what they're best at, maximum value is created, the economy expands, and everyone's individual piece of the pie is bigger.

There's a reason gender roles exist. Sometimes people are better at some things than others.

fihsined • 30 points • 8 February, 2014 12:13 AM

I learn so much here. Fucking thank you.

RichardBehiel • 16 points • 8 February, 2014 07:05 AM

See also: comparative advantage.

rebuildingMyself • 21 points • 8 February, 2014 03:21 AM

Feminists only force inclusiveness on men. They have no problem with their women-only areas.

[deleted] 8 February, 2014 03:50 AM*

[permanently deleted]

phoneprofile • 5 points • 9 February, 2014 08:36 AM

I saw guys who posted saying quite a bit of the white men walked out on the meetings when it devolved into a massive circle jerk of feminism and minority rights issues. Feminism destroyed the occupy movement. All the leadership guys left early.

charlie_bodango • 10 points • 8 February, 2014 03:32 AM

Remember OWS? "We don't need leaders." Also feminists and "discriminated against" minority groups hijacking the discussion to complain. And look how well that went.

FloranHunter • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 05:55 AM

They really didn't need leaders but they DID need a mechanism to keep bullshit out. Leaders can do that though.

FloranHunter • 19 points • 8 February, 2014 05:50 AM

A little off-topic but y'all might find this interesting.

The way the men acted on that island is exactly how (good) worker cooperatives work - everyone is personally responsible for the whole but operates independently. People fill out niches as they need to. This is also how startups work.

The way the women acted was more like state socialism - everyone is *collectively* but not *individually* responsible for the whole. So no one took any initiative so nothing got done.

rebuildingMyself • 12 points • 8 February, 2014 06:09 AM

The women acted socialist, indeed. They just forgot that they needed someone (a man) to do all the providing for them.

FloranHunter • 10 points • 8 February, 2014 06:14 AM

The point of my comment is that there are different kinds of socialism. They embodied the worst kind while the men embodied the best.

rebuildingMyself • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 06:24 AM

Socialism only works with a very productive tax base supporting the non productive part. Women love socialism as long as they have another group doing the supporting.

The setup basically split a socialist society between productive and I non-productive groups.

FloranHunter • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 06:28 AM

tax

You're describing state socialism. Anarcho-syndicalism and even just a worker cooperative majority bypasses that bullshit while dramatically reducing inequality.

Unfortunately central planning and socialism grew to prominence together so people think they're synonymous.

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 10:46 AM

Who gives a shit about inequality. You get what you earn.

wiking85 • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 02:12 PM

The hereditary underclass cares. There is a reason you get revolutions like in Russia, France, Cuba, Vietnam, China, and so on. Hell, even the Nazis were a revolution against an entrenched system of inequality and privilege of the German ruling class. The New Deal was a Southern, economically liberal/social conservative movement to deal with US inequality that was unfairly baked in the cake, so that someone who was born poor almost always stayed poor.

[deleted] • -1 points • 8 February, 2014 02:33 PM

Just like feminism is a revolution against the patriarchy?

It is interesting to note that every one of those countries were worse off after their revolutions.

FloranHunter • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 01:40 AM

The US Revolution was also a revolution against an entrenched system of inequality.

Also, class is real. Patriarchy, as feminists envision it, is fantasy. Money is a store of power that passes down generations, producing actual strata. Patriarchy can't do that because men have female children that get more-or-less the same inherited power as male children.

FloranHunter • 2 points • 9 February, 2014 01:39 AM

No, you get what you can take. The difference is immense.

The rich overwhelmingly do not earn their wealth. Usually they inherit it. Occasionally they did something extremely useful to others and get rich.

vaker • 0 points • 9 February, 2014 02:05 AM*

And there's the whole thing about "just don't ask me about my first million". Which implies that some of those big fortunes have shady origins.

Heuristics • -1 points • 8 February, 2014 09:56 AM

The main issue here is cooperation vs non-cooperation. That's the point of a society (socialism), to cooperate. The issue is how much of it and in what form it should be done.

rebuildingMyself • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 01:29 PM

And what we're learning as women live socialism (government taking more care of you that private entities) as long as they are on the receiving end.

moltar • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 08:14 AM

Also bike shed effect

vaker • 2 points • 9 February, 2014 02:05 AM

Ah Parkinson is a goldmine.

antsugi • 1 point • 25 May, 2014 09:18 AM

Late to the party, but I feel that another driving force behind it is also a man's need to contribute to the group in his own way, especially a group where one respects the others.

[deleted] • 206 points • 7 February, 2014 09:37 PM

This reminds me of that article about the woman that set up the all female company, and it went to shit.

[deleted] • 125 points • 7 February, 2014 10:22 PM

Link to the thread:

Women in the workplace - an all-female disaster

Never fails to raise a smile.

[deleted] • 18 points • 8 February, 2014 12:23 AM

Christ, the video here is just difficult to watch: childish, entitled behavior as per the West's current social/gender contracts.

Clbull • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 04:39 AM

Oh dear, the stupidity.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 09:04 AM

Agree that they are retarded women but this is by no means the norm in the UK.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 01:06 AM

That was very entertaining.

Hormander • 73 points • 7 February, 2014 10:39 PM

We should put feminists in their own country, until it collapses miserably.

[deleted] • 54 points • 8 February, 2014 12:02 AM

There will still be white knights believing that they can't do wrong.

RedBigMan • 35 points • 8 February, 2014 02:54 AM

I would love to see how long it takes for white knights to collapse under the demands and absolutely lose their shit.

yourlogicisflawed • 32 points • 8 February, 2014 06:47 AM

Well it's already happening, slowly, in western countries.

RedBigMan • 17 points • 8 February, 2014 08:35 AM

I support anything that will make it collapse even faster.

The sooner feminists have to stand on their own two feet... The sooner feminism will be realized for the bullshit it is.

VaginalAssaultRifles • 7 points • 8 February, 2014 03:44 PM

The collapse would be due to "internalized misogyny".

rebuildingMyself • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 06:04 AM

And willingly move there and be second class citizens to help the fair maiden.

[deleted] • 12 points • 8 February, 2014 01:02 AM

I would gladly pay to see that.

puaSenator • 21 points • 8 February, 2014 07:35 AM

There is a modern urban legend of a town in Sweden somewhere with like a population of 2000 that is entirely female. It's actually something that's debated with good arguments supporting it's existence. However, once you take off your tinfoil hat, you realize A) that if they did exist, we'd have found that village eventually and B) No village of just women can sustain itself without men.

But I still like to believe it exists... Because maybe one day -- ONE DAY -- I'll drunkenly stumble into it as the only man in a cock deprived village of nothing but Swedish women...

uhuhshesaid • 41 points • 8 February, 2014 12:01 PM

The Umoja Village in northern Kenya is a village of just women that actually sustains itself quite well. The men they left behind, which they accused of raping and beating them, tried to set up rival village across the way. However, in this case the woman's village has flourished, as they've taken advantage of the global economy, marketing their traditional beading skills around the globe. The village receives new members all the time, whereas the male village has become a place where their ex husbands get drunk and threaten to kill them.

The Witch Villages in Ghana's Volta Region also have towns of mostly women and children that work together and thrive. Most of these women were thrown out of their original villages for practicing Vodun (Voodoo) and sent away with their kids. When most arrive they are devastated, however, after a few months, they settle in and it's created societies that are almost completely without theft or hunger. Something very rare for the African continent.

Further, if you look at development in Sub-Saharan Africa you will see that micro-loans are given exclusively to women in 99% of the cases. And this isn't because banking companies hate men.

But it's because loan companies realized that men tended to spend the loans on booze and clubbing, without paying it back. Meanwhile loans to women are often recouped as the women tended to plant bananas or create self-sustainable businesses out of them.

In Kenya's Maasai, the men hang out in fields with cattle (who don't do a whole lot of moving on the Mara) talking or playing on their cellphones all day while women do the brunt of food collecting, fixing homes, and taking care of procuring most goods. In fact, most women in that region agree that the men contribute so little, it would be easier if there wasn't another mouth to feed when they eventually amble home.

In Mukono, Uganda women were offered the opportunity to get micro-loans and the men in their villages laughed at them and said they would never build a successful business and drive their families into debt. This was about 3 years ago and to date, 100% of loans have been repaid on time, and the women are now purchasing new houses in the region, filling it with furniture, and paying for their children to attend school, and receiving proper medical care for the first time in their lives. It's actually astounding how many of these women thought 'being in pain' all the time was normal, with many suffering chronic UTI's and kidney trouble. Now, finally relaxed and in good health, many have expanded their businesses into the capital, Kampala.

One of my jobs in investigating finance and community projects in Africa. And I'm not saying that African women are better because it's 'feminist' or 'woman's lib'. Women here have shit hard lives that most Western women could not even begin to comprehend.

That said, it's been pretty thoroughly recognized, from finance companies to governmental and NGO policies, that men tend to get in the way, and cause far more conflicts on this continent. And when women are left to rule, things tend to stabilize out with a focus on education and community development. It's not my opinion, it's universally recognized trends developed by corporations and fiscal enterprises that don't want to put stock in a bad return (in this case, the bad return is men).

While this program might say something in particular about Western women, if we're talking about social issues with men and women from a more global standpoint, actually there's a lot more to it that's worth considering.

rhettd • 10 points • 8 February, 2014 02:04 PM

I really liked this post, and I found it very interesting. It's a nice counterpoint to the idea that a lot of people often get from this board that we're all just women-hating shitheads.

I think one point is a question of allegiance. Who do you empathise with more easily, a stupid, violent, alcoholic man or a poor but hard-working and ambitious woman? to me, the answer is clear, and it's not because I'm a white knight.

It's also important that many subsaharan cultures and communities are so different from our own that it may be incomparable. I was told once about how in Nigeria polygamy is common - I'm sure that's the case in a lot of other places as well. When I asked what happened to all the excess men - those who could not "acquire" wives - it was almost as if they didn't exist or didn't matter, I couldn't tell which. My suspicion is that a lot of them emigrate, or start causing trouble.

Family has a stabilising effect on people. Women with children are going to want the best for them. Men without hope of even getting married are going to blow their cash irresponsibly. Even if it isn't true 100% of the time, it's true often enough to weigh the expectations of each. Incidentally, as I understand this (although you seem to be very knowledgeable so maybe you

can correct me), when it comes to herding communities, a family's wealth is its animals. You can see why the men would go out with the herd to graze because the family's survival depends on it. They're there to guard the herd not to sunbathe.

uhuhshesaid • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 03:07 PM

You are correct that herding and guarding animals is important, and they aren't there to sunbathe. That said, in other regions like South Sudan and Ethiopia, you see men actually guarding their cattle. The Dinka, for instance, are often in skirmishes with cattle thieves and tribal wars can be started on the basis of a goat theft, so their job is important.

However, the Maasai Mara is highly commercialized and a protected area for that particular tribe. If you go there, not as part of a tour group, but on a random Tuesday, you see most men sleeping or playing 'snake' on their old Nokias while women are breaking their backs in the home. It causes a fair amount of resentment and it's easy to see how it causes conflict. There's a saying that Africa was built on the backs of women. Most men here would agree to that.

Men who can't get a woman are rare. Polygamy is popular here, not just in Nigeria but all over West Africa and East Africa as well. In a number of areas, thanks to wars in the past 10 years, there is often more women than men, so actually most men don't have that much trouble finding a partner. In fact, it can be considered an act of charity to take on a second or third wife, especially if she's a widow, born of rape and somewhat ostracized (common in Northern Uganda/DRC), or has no prospects for a job or income.

Men who work in prostitution (and plenty of men in coastal areas --locally referred to as Beach Boys-- do this for Western women) usually end up marrying female prostitutes and scamming Westerners together. One couple I interviewed near Mombasa had a two story house, a Range Rover, and a very comfortable lifestyle thanks to their combined prostitution efforts. Others, who cannot find a female prostitute, end up living out a life of poverty and booze.

However, a man without a wife is considered a man who hasn't worked for anything. Most men are taught that this is such a high shame, very few suffer that fate. In fact, out of all the men I've met and interviewed in West, Central and East Africa, I've never met one who just never got married. Most always find a mate, even if it's an arranged match, their parents will make sure of that.

It should also be noted that monogamy here (in both men and women) is considered a 'good thing' but not a static thing. Cheating on your partner is something along the Western equivalent of forgetting to pick up your spouse at the airport. They will be pissed, but it's probably not a deal breaker. That said, combine that with a lack of proper sexual education and you can figure out exactly why the HIV rate here has been so high.

[deleted] 8 February, 2014 02:16 PM

[permanently deleted]

KingofRiders • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 11:22 PM

Why were the comments about women thriving in africa without men deleted? Were they deleted by a mod? Seems pretty misogynistic and hypocritical to me to delete valid arguments like that.

puaSenator • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 11:32 PM

No idea why; I missed it. But it could be that he was trying to NAWALT. The truth is, most societies w/o men are going to fail. Whatever exceptions he gave probably had exceptions he wasn't talking about. It's simply impossible due to a woman's frame and build up to hunt, develop an infrastructure, and so on. They likely have some sort of govt assistance.

toothbrush_your_anus • 8 points • 8 February, 2014 02:43 AM

they are too fat to fit in a country. send them all to the sun. but lets change the name to the daughter so they will get behind the idea. i would have recommended a black hole but that is a gendered slur

rapreaper • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 05:03 AM

They'll become dirt poor and worse than the worst African nation and then you know who will bailout that nation? A fucking patriarchal nation that's prospering.

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 February, 2014 09:09 AM

It won't collapse because they will beg, plead, pout, vaginate, do whatever it takes, basically seduce, some powerful nation's leader into a ballout. I mean, bailout.

Basically, SeekingArrangementForCountries.com

[deleted] 8 February, 2014 06:28 AM

[permanently deleted]

SatanSmiling • 2 points • 9 February, 2014 03:50 AM

According to Roosh, Denmark is that country. Read Don't Bang Denmark for his take on the ethos of the country.

dimmy666 • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 06:13 AM

Man, that book is such a hilarious read. It makes me feel bad for the Danish men though.

vaker • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 04:34 AM

You mean for a whole afternoon?

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 01:02 AM

Feels like Christmas all over again

FreudJesusGod • 18 points • 8 February, 2014 03:05 PM

Hah. My boss is female. She has repeatedly told me she would preferentially hire men over women, if she had her druthers. More productivity day to day. More productivity over time since men take *much* less time off (even when you remove pregnancy). *Much* less "intangible" stuff like drama and infighting. In her words, "men get more done, in less time, and I don't have to adjudicate stupid shit all the time".

As someone who's had to work with mostly women for the past 8 years, I have to agree. Women, in my experience, are terrible at consistent and predictable work over time. **Especially** when they work with other women. Their workplace "tenor" is seemingly inevitably toxic and counter-productive. Ugh. Managing them is fucking *tiresome*. Don't get me started.

It's like working with teenagers. Except they're 30+.

edtofe01 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 02:51 AM

Try working under them dude it's a fucking nightmare.

2comment • 98 points • 7 February, 2014 09:26 PM*

You know, I predicted the outcome before even reading it (although I figured the guys would have a clear cut leader). It might also be revealing why Congress is such an eternal clusterfuck.

Not to NAWALT, but I do wonder though if it could be somewhat cultural, in that do all women feel the need to do consensus based bullshit or is that more of a western thing with democracy and all that shit. Wonder what would happen if they threw a group of asian tiger moms on an island. Perhaps a few catfights to the death before the rest fall in line and make do?

Edit: Too bad the 3 guys didn't go Jamestown on their asses and told the women that if they wanted to eat, they had to move their asses and work. What are the women going to do, vote them off and be miserable again?

Lightning14 • 25 points • 8 February, 2014 01:05 AM

To add on to your question about cultural: Because this was on television I am assuming the people involved were generally of high attractiveness. For women to become attractive they just have to have good genes, be young, and don't be a glutton. Meanwhile, for men, they require actually working out to develop an attractive muscle build. Additionally, attractive women are used to having others (men) cater to their needs. It would be interesting if this was done with a random selection of women. (ie. Would below average attractive women be more self sufficient?)

Stopher • 27 points • 8 February, 2014 02:30 AM

Yeah. It's not liked they picked those women based on survival skills. They probably just looked for a bunch of hot chicks who would look good sunbathing on TV.

vaker • 14 points • 8 February, 2014 04:33 AM

Don't forget the important skill of excellent blow jobs for director and producer.

lightpath7 • 19 points • 8 February, 2014 08:43 AM

The casting hammock.

erich_von_stalhein • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 04:17 PM

You made my night.

zheiroh • 23 points • 8 February, 2014 04:56 AM

"Wonder what would happen if they threw a group of asian tiger moms on an island. Perhaps a few catfights to the death before the rest fall in line and make do?"

Being in China myself, I can tell you what would happen: a lot of bitching. Tiger moms are very good at giving orders, but most of the time they derive their success from those around them. Tiger moms are parasites.

erich_von_stalhein • 7 points • 8 February, 2014 04:07 PM

A little more bitching, a little less sunbathing.

[deleted] • 36 points • 7 February, 2014 10:01 PM

Those guys were awash in value. They had the ability to organize and develop a livable society using their acquired skills.

They could have just sat on their butts, given the women piecemeal instructions (first steps) and told them to do it or else they wouldn't contribute.

If they don't cooperate, build a small hut with enough space for one person and fish for yourself.

Offensive_Brute • 29 points • 8 February, 2014 12:57 AM

I wonder if its cultural too. I have a hard time seeing non-entitled women from say Cambodia, Ghana, or Guatamala sitting around doing nothing.

RedBigMan • 27 points • 8 February, 2014 02:48 AM

Oh I'm sure it's cultural. Cultures that are closer to a primal existence realize red pill truths innately.

rebuildingMyself • 31 points • 8 February, 2014 06:18 AM

No time for Feminism when there's shit to be done on the farm (and it's not like the husband is reading the paper while she slaves away) . Feminism is born out of boredom of entitled wealthy women.

thecajunone • 10 points • 8 February, 2014 07:56 AM

And fat men hating lesbians who are only gay because no man would ever touch them.

wiseclockcounter • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 09:35 PM

fat, men-hating lesbians

ftfy

lookingatyourcock • 0 points • 8 February, 2014 03:19 AM

Why do you think that?

Offensive_Brute • 14 points • 8 February, 2014 10:43 AM

because in places where life is hard, the people are made of harder stuff. They tend to have more practical skills, to go along with the tough sinewy meat that comes from squatting in the creek and doing laundry with a washboard, and tending a garden and livestock, not as a quaint retro hobby, but to provide your family with necessary nutrients to maintain their vital bodily functions. Also these people are used to being busy, even if its with menial tasks. These are the kind of people who do things just to keep busy.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 February, 2014 04:30 AM

I know this is a week old, and I'm new here.

Just would like to say, don't you guys have the saying 'nawalt?'

I know girls, my mother included, who can hunt and clean animals, garden, can, all that stuff. These aren't pretty girls, so they wouldn't end up in a show, but give them an old-fashioned farmstead somewhere and they'll do fine. Put them in a strange environment, with no male supervision, and they would be lucky to barely get by. They will still freak out over nothing, fight and bitch at each other, and find all sorts of dumb things that would get them killed in real life.

Just saying.

pcadrian43 points 7 February, 2014 11:43 PM* **[recovered]**

but I do wonder though if it could be somewhat cultural

You raise a valid point. Culture also has a big influence on the skill set of these women. I'm sure if they had put women from an African tribe on that island, the outcome would've been quite different.

[deleted] 8 February, 2014 03:02 AM

[permanently deleted]

erich_von_stalhein • 8 points • 8 February, 2014 03:58 PM

If these were normal, urban Dutchmen they probably had about as much experience in building, hunting and fishing as the women. They were probably using common sense or copying what they'd seen on TV.

The women just couldn't (or didn't want to) think five minutes ahead of the present.

LaLongueCarabine • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 06:44 PM

But to the point, the women in African tribes aren't the social justice warriors.

vaker • 11 points • 8 February, 2014 04:30 AM*

In other words the average young western female is worthless these days.

I remember my granddad's female ideal included strength for farm work.

rebuildingMyself • 7 points • 8 February, 2014 06:15 AM

Lol yep. My rancher grandmother (grandpa died when I was a baby, RIP) was the toughest woman I ever knew. Herding cattle around and doing ranch stuff like it was nothing, could fish (and clean it), hunt a deer (and help clean it), and could cook like nobody else I knew. If she was on that Island she would have been queen bee in no time.

In the ranch world, there is always work to be done. A woman moving out there expecting horse riding and shopping for new cowgirl outfits would not last a week.

gopher88 • 8 points • 8 February, 2014 10:53 AM

Remember my Nana(the whole family grew up in country Victoria, Australia) twisting apples in half for our entertainment and teaching us to split logs (Pa had a stroke at 50)

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 01:42 PM

Yup that's basically the point I was trying to make. For everyone who is going to get hit in the feels by our statement: shut the fuck up and LOOK at the skill set of an average woman. What do they do all day? Could they bring those skills into a survival situation, or would they just leech off everyone else?

lookingatyourcock • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 03:22 AM*

Why would it be different? I have done a lot of traveling around the world, and the thing that always strikes me is how similar the gender differences are. I too used to think there would be more variation, but I just haven't seen it. The only culture I have experienced where genders seem significantly different is Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jewish/Israeli culture. But I personally think that has to do with them breeding among them selves, with an artificial selection process.

FloranHunter • 10 points • 8 February, 2014 06:00 AM

The only culture I have experienced where genders seem significantly different is Ashkenazi and Sephardic Jewish/Israeli culture

Can you elaborate on this? It's extremely interesting.

lookingatyourcock • 4 points • 9 February, 2014 12:21 AM

For sure. I'm a bit busy this weekend, so I will make a second response on Monday. This is the kind of topic where I need to be free from distractions in order to get into detail.

FloranHunter • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 01:37 AM

Fair. I look forward to the write-up.

phoneprofile • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 08:31 AM

Same here. Let me know as well

Lady_Motido7 points 8 February, 2014 11:41 PM **[recovered]**

RPW here. I'm from a small fishing/hunting community in one of the maritime provinces in Canada and I'm certain that if myself and a dozen of my classmates from when we were in our 20's had been dumped on an island we would not have just sat around sun bathing. Most of us know how to hunt, fish, build etc.

I'm also certain we would never have matched the men but we could have held our own. Having the men introduced to our island would not have made us stop working either but we most likely would have appointed them leaders and waited for instructions. That's just the way we were brought up.

If I would have been one of the girls sent to the men's island I would have asked for a job and would have taken great pride in trying to do my very best at it.

So I also think culture would have something to do with this too. Besides none of the girls I grew up with would ever be on such a stupid show like that anyway. It's just a tits and ass show.

vaker • 3 points • 9 February, 2014 01:56 AM*

Yup, this is why I mentioned *average young* western female in my post above. (should have added urban) A generation ago girls still had some idea how to do things other than Facebook. Esp those who grew up outside of big cities.

cheez_Ina_pan • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 08:26 AM

Do you think the "group think" mentality of women may have some sort of evolutionary basis and probably served as a survival mechanism at one time? I do.

erich_von_stalhein • 0 points • 8 February, 2014 04:18 PM

I don't. I think it's motivated by incentives and disincentives. Change those, and you'll change the behaviour.

hermit087 • 61 points • 8 February, 2014 01:52 AM

In military boot camp men and women are almost completely separated from each other the entire time. You spend those 8 weeks(Air Force) learning to work as a team with the same group of 50 people, its a bit like one of

those reality shows.

What every T.I.(aka drill sergeant) told us was that the female groups are much better than the men for the first two weeks or so. They were better organized, learned to fold clothes and make beds faster, and just had less conflict than the male groups.

Then gradually over time this dynamic flip-flops. The females experience more and more cat fighting to the point where they are all just assaulting and sabotaging each other by the end. Meanwhile the men have learned to work together and become like a well oiled machine.

erich_von_stalhein • 10 points • 8 February, 2014 04:21 PM

I suspect the TIs went a bit softer on the women.

phoneprofile • 3 points • 9 February, 2014 08:40 AM

I wish i could read stories about this. It sounds hilariously interesting.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 February, 2014 04:38 AM

I trained with women (not air force). I can't think of anything that women did better except hoovering up food. I spent a summer shoving a fat girl up every hill we ran on, so maybe I'm biased. *I* was held responsible when she dropped out of a run.

They can scream at you like none other though.

I don't remember any real conflict between guys.

Kepaso • 70 points • 7 February, 2014 10:06 PM

that's gold. I would have continued the experiment with 100% women till the end though, just for science, like a social machiavelic test, maybe it would have ended with a lord of the flies scenario, but i guess they would probably let themselves die of hunger and cancer from sun bathing.

frequentlywrong • 75 points • 8 February, 2014 06:59 AM

Actually I think it's genius for the three men sent to the other island. They should have all built a hut with three rooms (or three smaller huts) with a king sized bed in them for themselves and 2 women.

Upon arrival ignore the women completely. Build the hut and hunt for food. Whichever women want to join them have to sleep in their beds.

Watch them compete amongst each other for male resources. I would pay to watch that shit.

erich_von_stalhein • 69 points • 8 February, 2014 04:22 PM

You don't have to pay. Look out the window.

madamayb • 29 points • 7 February, 2014 11:15 PM

Either the women would have quit or they would have invaded the other island

through_a_ways • 52 points • 7 February, 2014 11:39 PM

they would have invaded the other island

Thank you for that hilarious mental imagery.

[deleted] • 45 points • 8 February, 2014 12:33 AM

Oh shit, an invasion of prostitutes.

Offensive_Brute • 29 points • 8 February, 2014 12:59 AM

I couldnt help but notice you have some bird meat. I'll trade you some beaver for it.

theredslap • 9 points • 8 February, 2014 01:26 AM

<British accent> oh shit...there goes the planet

FloranHunter • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 05:57 AM

or they would have invaded the other island

Hahahahahahaha. That is wonderful. Thank you.

rebuildingMyself • 12 points • 8 February, 2014 03:22 AM

That was probably the intention but the white knight brigade realized the writing on the wall and made it more faiiiiirrrr

zirzo • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 06:15 AM

There is an episode in stargate sg1 where the sg1 team lands on a planet where there are all women. Quite an interesting episode. Here's a working link

vaker • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 02:07 AM

TLDR?

zirzo • 4 points • 9 February, 2014 04:56 AM

power and control issues between the women and absolute resistance to the sg1 unit consisting of 3 guys and 1 girl who come over to give them a permanent solution to their problem(requiring a Goa'uld symbiote for survival) and over turning their leader who falls for the strongest guy in the sg1 team and tries to get other women to accept their solution. There is a coup eventually and they try to kick her out

vaker • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 05:34 AM

THX!

[deleted] • 3 points • 7 February, 2014 11:22 PM

They couldn't- there would have been lawsuits when they started dying off or getting seriously ill and/or injured themselves trying to get what they should have been doing all along done all at once.

rebuildingMyself • 7 points • 8 February, 2014 06:10 AM

Them screaming that they give up would be enough for me.

vaker • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 04:39 AM

trying to get what they should have been doing all along done all at once

What makes you think they'd have tried to do anything at all?

ThePrince_ • 16 points • 8 February, 2014 02:07 AM

For those who don't speak Dutch, Survivor did a similar thing in a recent series. Two tribes, one male and one

female. Located on opposite sides of a beach.

It was incredible watching the women fail, rely on the men to support them and then complain about the men and refuse to repay the favour when they were fortunate enough to gain any advantages. Supplicating betas as far as the eye can see.

Can't remember which season but it was called Survivor One World.

rebuildingMyself • 13 points • 8 February, 2014 03:32 AM

Survivor: Briffaults Law

Theophagist • 41 points • 7 February, 2014 11:48 PM*

I've been noticing this kind of thing myself. Living in the Bay Area one can't go far without finding an all-girl business. They don't have to wait long for it to close down either.

One of the businesses I know of which survives is a Vet hospital with all female doctors and staff. They killed my beloved guinea pig through incompetence and overcharged me for the service.

fihsined • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 12:23 AM

This pisses me off.

Theophagist • 17 points • 8 February, 2014 12:40 AM

Me too, he was the best animal ever (right)

Elonine • 8 points • 8 February, 2014 03:38 AM

They must be pretty badass pets if you let them walk on your strat, man!

Sorry for your loss...

fihsined • 17 points • 8 February, 2014 01:16 AM

I know it's not masculine but I'm about to fucking cry man, I had to put down my first dog when i was a little kid and it was so fucking upsetting. I spent the whole day fucking curled up next to him and I didn't understand why he was sick and sad. FUck man.

87GNX • 20 points • 8 February, 2014 04:26 AM

Crying over a fucking dog is about as legit as it gets.

rebuildingMyself • 17 points • 8 February, 2014 06:20 AM

A dog is about the closest thing a man will find to true loyalty. If I ever marry I will definitely want a large dog (or two) and a field for him to run around in to go with the package.

fihsined • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 05:42 AM

i can't tell if you're insulting me or saying it's okay, but i don't really need your permission or acceptance so i don't mind either way.

thecajunone • 9 points • 8 February, 2014 08:04 AM

He isn't mocking you, we red pillers are mostly dog people.

fihsined • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 08:41 AM

Good people*

I'm only playing haha. I like cats too, don't get me wrong, but where cats provide comfort in tragedy, dogs provide comfort in monotony.

Theophagist • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 07:07 AM

It's tough, I miss him a lot but I'm mostly sad for Princess (left in the photo). She still calls out for him and searches her C&C for him whenever I return her after lap time. (don't worry she'll be getting a cage mate)

I knew he was on the way out so I was emotionally prepared. But when I found her curled up against his dead body grooming his fur I lost composure.

thecajunone • 9 points • 8 February, 2014 08:05 AM

Damn dude, that's rough, any dude would be sad. Being alpha doesn't mean not having feelings.

erich_von_stalhein • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 04:29 PM

Animals are the best people.

When one of my rats was terminally ill the other would bring her salad.

FloranHunter • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 06:02 AM

It shows you care.

Women may not understand but other men, at least, do.

erich_von_stalhein • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 04:30 PM

Indeed. Many women just miss having dolly to play with.

MasterGolbez • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 04:04 AM

Oh shut the fuck up. Crying over sad shit isn't "not masculine."

ThisisMalta • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 04:34 AM

YOU SHUT THE FUCK UP

Hugs MasterGolbez and fihsigned and starts crying.

erich_von_stalhein • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 04:27 PM

He's beautiful. Such expressive eyes.

ibuprofiend • 11 points • 8 February, 2014 02:29 AM

I'd rather live alone on top of a mountain than live in San Francisco. It seems like the center of everything that's destroying our civilization.

stupid_fucking_name • 22 points • 8 February, 2014 03:53 AM

San Francisco is the white man's Detroit.

draketton • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 07:36 AM

interesting parallel

<http://www.worldstarhiphop.com/videos/video.php?v=wshhNIAWR4m95TaGZBFP>

wiseclockcounter • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 09:57 PM

that was one of the most depressing things i've ever seen. just degrading that guy to the lowest possible level, there's no pride in that.

jjshinobi • 1 point • 8 June, 2014 05:33 AM

He kept denying he didn't steal it when everyone knew he did. There is no pride in robbing someone's dignity, perhaps not even justice, but there is a traumatic lesson to be instilled upon such persons and the general viewers who don't know how things are done in Detroit.

Lesson learned.

wiseclockcounter • 1 point • 8 June, 2014 05:45 AM

didn't seem like he stole anything to me... If he was that willing to take off his clothes and take fists to the face, i'd imagine he'd be willing to apologize.

btcnr • -2 points • 8 February, 2014 03:36 PM

California is #1 state by GDP. It's one of the most progressive states. It's definitely #1 state when it comes to technology and innovation.

Hardly "destroying our civilization".

I'd say most republican-run shithole states are destroying our civilization.

vaker • 2 points • 9 February, 2014 02:15 AM

CA has a whole bunch of geological advantages from climate to sea ports that have nothing to do with political views. It's not possible to know what CA's GDP would be if it was dominated by people with different political positions.

ibuprofiend • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 03:43 PM

Well I guess if you think that Facebook, Instagram, and "progressive" politics are valuable contributions to civilization you can see it that way, but I don't.

vaker • 2 points • 9 February, 2014 02:22 AM

"The best minds of my generation are thinking about how to make people click ads." link

btcnr • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 04:15 PM

And yet you're on Reddit, spending tons of your time. Hypocritical much?

And yes, I do think tech companies are valuable contributions to the civilization. Facebook and Instagram aren't the only companies that tech sector produced, but even they are used by a billion+ people, who do find them useful.

Seriously, it's like talking to a Luddite who bitches about technology, and still uses it.

ibuprofiend • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 05:11 PM

Using a technology doesn't necessarily mean that you like it or think that it's a good thing, and your "progressive" politics is a big reason why we need TRP in the first place.

btcnr • -2 points • 8 February, 2014 05:41 PM

If you dislike it so much and deem it regressive, why use it?

Don't backpedal now.

TRP is the results of last wave insane feminism, not progressive politics. Just because women/gays have equal rights, doesn't make it a bad thing or equivalent to feminist insanity.

You clump everything together. Yes, last wave feminism is insane, but just because it latched onto the progressive politics, doesn't mean progressive politics is bad.

They tried the same crap with atheism, when it became a popular movement in the recent years with Atheism+, though that pretty much backfired on them after atheists revolted.

RS73 • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 06:47 PM

In 1985 California had the worlds 5th largest economy. It is now 9th and sinking. California has the highest poverty rate in the nation. Let me repeat that: California has *the highest poverty rate in the nation*: <http://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-poverty-20131001,0,60926.story>

California also has 32% of the nation's welfare cases even though it has only 12% of the nation's population: <http://online.wsj.com/news/article/SB10001424052702304537904577277242682364690>

Only two states have a worse unemployment rate - Illinois and Nevada. Of the American states, California has the 5th highest gap between rich and poor and currently has the largest rich/poor gap in 16 years.

California has the second worst bond rating in the US (after solidly left Illinois), has a more than 20% high school drop out rate and many of the lowest ranked school systems in the nation, worse than liberal boogeyman states like Texas and Alabama.

I've lived here all my life and I can tell you the California of movies, legend, and song is dead and gone. It has been destroyed by massive illegal immigration, onerous taxation, and tribalized ethnic politics that have driven out the middle class, particularly the white middle class who are constantly derided and hate-mongered against for their alleged lack of "diversity." All while the wealthy white liberals live in gated communities and jerk off to progressive politics as they're sheltered from both the "undesireables" and the very policies of destruction the wealthy left inflicts on everyone else.

"Blue pill politics" is a smoke screen and a lie that blocks people from seeing reality, just like blue pill sex and gender myths. That doesn't mean the right is correct about everything but far too many people are conditioned like Pavlov's dogs to slobber obediently for whatever the we-know-best progressive media and culture tell them to slobber for.

btcnr • 0 points • 8 February, 2014 07:28 PM

California doesn't have the highest poverty rate in the nation.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_U.S._states_by_poverty_rate

Welfare cases mean the social programs work there, unlike in Republican-ran states, where poor people can't get that same help.

But more importantly, what does any of this have to do with "destroying civilization"?

I can a dozen republican programs that actually do contribute to the destruction of the environment, pushing anti-science, pushing anti-education, etc.

RS73 • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 08:09 PM

From the third paragraph of the LA Times link that you didn't read: "The new analysis set California's poverty rate at 22%, the highest in the nation, compared with the official rate of

16%."

There's no point in debating someone who can't read or process information. Enjoy your blue pill world.

btcnr • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 08:18 PM

Yeah, you linked to an article, and I linked to the numbers for every state. Indeed, no point in debating with you, you prefer something a journalist wrote over facts. Fox News is perfect for people like you.

And you didn't address the main questions - what any of that has to do with the destruction of civilization, even if your cherry-picked factoid were true, and all the republican programs that actually destroy the environment, push anti-science and anti-education.

RS73 • 0 points • 9 February, 2014 10:16 PM

The numbers aren't from a "journalist," they're the latest report from the Public Policy Institute of California and the Stanford Center on Poverty and Inequality. You linked to *Wikipedia*, you fucking idiot.

And what does Fox News have to do with anything? Christ, you are a fucking moron.

I was specifically addressing your ignorant masturbating over California. You've been unable to refute my points and yet you continue babbling.

basketofbread • -1 points • 8 February, 2014 09:13 PM

Wow, downvoted for truth eh?

btcnr • -1 points • 8 February, 2014 09:17 PM

Yup.

TRP got overtaken by wingnuts, they always insert their anti-liberal politics, but if you respond and point out the bullshit, the downvote brigades come.

They will whine about political comments, but only when it's not pro-conservative.

basketofbread • -1 points • 8 February, 2014 09:28 PM

Fucking morons. Imagine being so crazy that you believe that all of your unsubstantial opinions are accurate reflections of reality, combined with being so crazy that you believe all of your interests (TRP, lies about California) are related and part of a coherent understanding of things.

ClearlySituational • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 08:44 PM

There's an orthodontist office that I go to that's an all women business (save the boss who's a guy). And to be honest, it seems like it's working out quite well for them.

And this is in the bay area, too.

redditor15729 points 8 February, 2014 04:43 AM **[recovered]**

Interesting that she just caved and stopped being a feminist (although it doesn't directly say it was because of the show). Feminists I know would have probably said something like "Oh well those girls came from a culture of patriarchy so they were at a disadvantage from the start" or some shit like that.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 11:46 AM

Yep, I don't buy that bit either.

Fitch0y • 15 points • 8 February, 2014 02:13 AM

Let us step a bit back.

<http://heartiste.wordpress.com/2011/11/15/feminists-are-afraid-of-evolutionary-psychology-and-with-good-reason/>

So feminism, along with Communism, multiculturalism and egalitarianism, falls victim to the same tropes that all human nature denialists share: namely, the belief that people behave in upsetting ways because some nebulous cultural mind ray tells them to behave in upsetting ways.

Now that this is said. Culture and our society are like trees that don't grow without a seed and soil. Culture grew out of our genes. Patriarchy is the natural system. ... Would keep on writing but I just remembered that this is not MRA.

rebuildingMyself • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 03:32 AM

MRAs usually deny patriarchy as well to appeal to feminists

nninja • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 10:51 AM

What does multiculturalism have to do with anything?

Fitch0y • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 11:25 AM

Heartiste believes in the end of the western world and he wanted to bring that up.

I is just an example...

nninja • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 05:24 PM

kind of dumb considering the US was built on multiculturalism, british, irish, scottish, german, italian etc.

Fitch0y • 1 point • 10 February, 2014 11:26 AM

actually it is kinda true.

We do not treat people from other cultures differently because we were taught that behavior. No cultural mind ray tells us to dislike other cultures, actually a cultural mind ray tells us to like them.

This comes from our inbuilt survival instinct. Other tribe = death.

+I maybe misworded that a bit, with western world I mean the world of the white men. Heartiste sounds like a white supremacist. Actually his blog sucked really hard in the past 2 months. But that doesn't make his older posts worse. They really helped me.

Affengeil • 13 points • 7 February, 2014 11:39 PM

Well, how about that?

A shortsighted observer once predicted what a world without men would be like: "Full of fat, happy women -- and no crime." Yeah, right.

rebuildingMyself • 13 points • 8 February, 2014 03:27 AM

Once the supplies run out the fat women would eat the skinnier women and not in the porn way

FinalEquin0x • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 04:57 PM

I honestly doubt there would be any fat women.

If men aren't providing food for them, in what way will they obtain it?

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 February, 2014 08:33 AM

fat and happy alone is bullshit enough

fiat_lux_ • 18 points • 7 February, 2014 08:53 PM

Anyone know or have links to this Dutch Survivor show?

[deleted] • 16 points • 7 February, 2014 09:39 PM

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expeditie_Robinson

Edit: I believe that it was the season from 2006

Mooshaq • 15 points • 7 February, 2014 10:13 PM

Yeah, it seems that the whole thing is on Youtube. Damn I wish I understood Dutch right now.

[deleted] • 4 points • 7 February, 2014 10:20 PM

There is a captioned version, that makes a modicum of sense I think

[deleted] • 13 points • 7 February, 2014 10:38 PM

I just tried watching it, its pretty useless. I would love to have someone caption it.

YouDislikeMyOpinion • 14 points • 7 February, 2014 11:56 PM

Reminds me of Hell's Kitchen. 95% filler bullshit. 5% entertainment. If someone were to compile the funny parts, I would watch it. But I'm not watching reality commentary bullshit and wasting my time.

SgtBrutalisk • 3 points • 9 February, 2014 02:47 AM

I found these, "Hell's Kitchen Uncensored Extended Highlights", editing style is a bit frantic, but other than that, it's all the good stuff.

The same user just added seasons 8+9.

pokemonlvr • 2 points • 20 February, 2014 07:55 AM

This is amazing.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 10:32 AM

I never got the chance to properly look at it. Damn

MockingDead • 7 points • 8 February, 2014 06:05 PM

So women under patriarchy were treated as aristocrats, and men under matriarchy as slaves.

[deleted] 8 February, 2014 02:23 PM

[permanently deleted]

dvrzero • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 07:02 AM

Did not expect dice in the mirror. Got a real laugh for spot on reference.

ALexusOhHaiNyan • 7 points • 8 February, 2014 08:48 AM*

I've thought about this from time to time. In the sense that if things went tits up - feminism disappears overnight. I wonder if the only time that will ever get challenged is if/when we colonize Mars or some post apocalyptic Lord Of The Flies to straighten stuff out right quick.

greatGoD67 • 2 points • 9 April, 2014 07:04 PM

Or when the ship is sinking. Buildings on fire, Bear attacks, or muggers approach. As Bill Burr put it. "There are no feminists on the Titanic"

MasterTrollKing • 1 point • 21 July, 2014 12:11 AM

THANK YOU. I was hoping someone would reference that bit he did

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 12:13 PM

Or when mars colonizes us...

ALexusOhHaiNyan • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 11:06 PM

Dun-dun-duhhh!

But I think the more interesting thing to erode in that case would be nationalism, stateism, etc. US vs Russia/Iran/N.Korea? Japan vs China? Pfft.

Nigga - it's humanity vs martians now. We could so do with a good alien invasion...

vaker • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 02:30 AM

"The only good thing about Hammerfall, women's lib was dead milliseconds after Hammerstrike."

Lucifer's Hammer by Larry Niven

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 February, 2014 01:52 PM

Well at some point were going to run out of all these nice resources that were spending, might not even need to run out of them.

Just get to a good deficit. Expensive oil that's needed for actual living = say good bye to the lifestyle of average western society citizen.

When that happens, feminism is going to fly out the window because women can't be "strong independent womyn" anymore and will need someone to help them live.

[deleted] • 13 points • 7 February, 2014 11:50 PM

I think this really displays the high survival value that men naturally possess, and that women naturally do not possess.

The interesting thing to note is that neither group would survive long term without the opposite sex. Sure the men would die out in relative comfort at a ripe old age while the women would have inevitably died much much sooner, and not from natural causes.

ArcadesRed • 11 points • 8 February, 2014 02:58 AM

Starvation is very natural, billions have died from it!

[deleted] • -1 points • 8 February, 2014 09:16 AM

The point: you missed it

j_arbuckle2012 • 8 points • 8 February, 2014 08:10 PM

The joke: you missed it.

awsum_possum • 12 points • 10 February, 2014 03:58 PM

I'm sorry, but I'm a Dutch male and I worked in television for 9 years, and I can tell you, because I know, that show is entirely scripted (by men). Whichever way it would've happened it doesn't say anything about men, women or society. It says something about B-list Dutch celebrities' ability to follow simple scripts, written by men. The point OP has raised, is what's known in the logic business as "moot".

[deleted] • 7 points • 14 February, 2014 04:22 AM

Like anyone here cares...

wiseclockcounter • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 08:51 AM

I can't tell if this is the right season, or what the hell they're saying because it's not subbed in english, haha. but i found a youtube channel that's uploaded all the episodes, it's called Expeditie Robinson

Edit: video link for all you ctrl F-ers

WAFC • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 07:19 PM

It takes a lot longer to get to the good stuff, but a season of American Survivor broke down into a gender war, too. The women initially thrived at the social game, knocking the men out after the merge pretty quickly.

Except one man, who proceeded to play them like a fiddle and use their attempts at stabbing each other in the back to win a million dollars. Such schadenfreude.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 10:24 PM

I kind of want to watch this.

WAFC • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 10:51 PM

Survivor: Vanuatu. Plenty of torrents available in the usual places.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 February, 2014 09:59 AM

Thank you very much

[deleted] • 13 points • 8 February, 2014 12:36 PM

I'm not surprised at all. Have you ever seen an all-female construction site? Me neither.

Men build and run the world. Always have, always will. We know how to get shit done. Women know how to be lazy and compete against other women for men/attention.

[deleted] • 4 points • 7 February, 2014 11:20 PM

Catfight, and then . . . cannibalism?

Aerobus • 3 points • 7 February, 2014 11:37 PM

OP please I need a link to this video. PLEASE.

Ididerus • 10 points • 8 February, 2014 06:14 AM

Look, we all seem to be jumping on the "women can't get anything right" bandwagon, but one of the strongest lessons I acquired via TRP was to forgive women their "failings". Amused mastery, no?

Sure, put your average woman in a survival situation and they will fair quite poorly, and a group of women in front of cameras and a primp-fest will ensue. A group of men will build a village and then quickly become bored to tears while they dream of children to take over the plow.

This anecdote only reinforces my belief of the duality of the sexes. Men lead from the front, but that does not remove the need nor pride of womanhood.

MockingDead • 9 points • 8 February, 2014 05:57 PM

We forgive them their failings, but we don't ignore them.

Amused mastery means we treat them like children. You are insinuating that they should have pride in being children?

erich_von_stalhein • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 04:24 PM

"Pride" in their "failings"?

[deleted] • 1 point • 14 February, 2014 03:57 PM

In their role of producing offspring. I'm just afraid what gonna happen when we learn to clone and grow people in a lab.

FloranHunter • 4 points • 8 February, 2014 06:08 AM

The men didn't have any leaders? That means they didn't have a hierarchy, just a collective.

Did they form a hierarchy once they gained a few female members?

It's interesting because it means that general male hierarchy (not just during specific missions like hunting) may be due to female interference, not inherently male.

Heuristics • 6 points • 8 February, 2014 10:15 AM

Hierarchy is needed when the tribe is larger then a typical member of it can handle to overview for themselves. At that point it is better to outsource the overview, the high level decisions to the most competent. -> to an aristocracy.

The typical example is the scenario of an invading tribe. A non-hierarchic society would then be slaughtered for military commands get an enormous power multiplier the more authoritarian and competent the central power is.

[deleted] • 2 points • 14 February, 2014 03:59 PM

It is possible that they all were beta. Also possible hierarchy was unnecessary in such conditions. Hierarchy only becomes beneficial when there are at least two large groups competing, and there were only one small group.

FloranHunter • 1 point • 14 February, 2014 04:11 PM

Whether or not hierarchy is beneficial isn't important, is it? High schools are extremely hierarchical but it serves no purpose. Humans seem to create hierarchies in a vacuum. Though admittedly high school is a strange enough place that it's unlikely that it's a bad example.

87GNX • 4 points • 7 February, 2014 11:15 PM

This is wonderful.

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 February, 2014 09:47 AM

You should watch the US version of apprentice. It goes something like this;

- Men and women split into teams, men on one, women on the other. There are 8-10 people on each team.

- Women begin to fight, bitch and plot against one another. One woman always comes out as a complete bitch that hates another women. The women break into cliques and sabotage each other. They lose all their challenges.

- Men win every single challenge until the women's team have 3-4 people left.

- Finally Trump puts some unlucky guys on the women's team. They win a few challenges but continue to plot.

In Celebrity Apprentice the teams are all various people. The men are has beens, a country singer or two, an athlete, b list actors, a wrestler, a comedian, etc. They all get along regardless.

The women's team is usually a talk show host, actress without a career, playboy model, comedian, athlete, etc. They all hate each other.

It happens every time. It's a fascinating study.

rebuildingMyself • 8 points • 8 February, 2014 02:57 PM

From what I saw of Apprentice (a long time ago), the women always won their challenges. Of course, to sell the most lemonade to guys on the street all they did was essentially whore themselves out.

Wear skanky short skirts

Put their phone number on the cup being sold

Flirting, etc

Then they all high five each other for their superior sales tactics. Didn't bother watching any other episodes after that.

[deleted] • 2 points • 10 February, 2014 01:25 AM

Celebrity apprentice is much different. Other than one or two the women on there are worthless.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 01:09 AM

I looked around for this but couldn't find it. Where is this dutch survivor series? I found the series, but no reference to the two islands and men and women

themasterof • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 05:40 PM

I would like to see this TV show. Is there any Dutch guys here who knows where I can see it?

CropDuster33 • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 06:17 PM

Should get a bunch of feminists and plant them on an island!

rockumsockumrobots • 2 points • 14 May, 2014 12:36 AM

Can I please have a link to the show? Also, is there an english Subtitled version? Thanks.

zigzag8 • 3 points • 7 February, 2014 10:42 PM

I would love to see this series any links around?

RidleySmith • 3 points • 1 June, 2014 02:40 AM

Doesn't actually PROVE anything, but is a fantastically interesting anecdote

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 February, 2014 12:20 AM

WAIT WAIT WAIT WAIT! What happened to his former roommate? xD I would *love* to know.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 09:40 AM

Saved.

SpecialBuddy • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 11:53 AM

They should do that with survivor on each season.

elevul • 1 point • 8 February, 2014 03:30 PM

Wow, this is pure gold. Thanks for sharing.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 February, 2014 01:11 AM

A society of men...dear God.

The driving engine of that society would be reason and understanding rather than gynocentrism; Imagine what mankind could achieve.

Sturmgeist781 • -3 points • 7 February, 2014 09:59 PM

I imagine this would be simliar to tossing five cats in a bag, tying the end of the bag and then throwing that bag of cats at a wall.

Absolute shit show.