

This frame of mind that when a couple fights, the guy has to sleep on the couch or leave the house and stay at a hotel is extremely sexist.

May 4, 2021 | 246 upvotes | by [BlindMaestro](#)

We're aware that in the age of gender equality, it really just means getting all the positive aspects but keeping the benefits conferred by the "patriarchy." We talk about lighter prison sentences and bias in family courts regarding custody or the splitting of assets, but we don't talk about how we are accustomed to this notion of kicking the husband/boyfriend out of the shared bedroom or the house in times of dispute. Why? Why is the default that the man has to leave?

The very notion that of a wife getting kicked out enrages people. Why is one infuriating and not the other? I won't pretend that I don't get infuriated by this additional double standard on the mountain of double standards that are unfavorable towards men and so are neglected.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Oncefa2 • 81 points • 4 May, 2021 01:38 AM

This is something I've always stood my ground on.

Unless I don't want to sleep with you and do want to be by myself. Which I think has only happened one time (from an argument anyway). I'm going to sleep in my bed. You don't have to. You can sleep wherever you want. But I'm not going somewhere else just cause you want me to.

a-man-from-earth • 44 points • 4 May, 2021 02:04 AM

Exactly. If you don't want to sleep in the same bed as me, that's your problem. I'm not kicking anyone out of a shared bed unless we're breaking up.

nocturnefox • 47 points • 4 May, 2021 02:51 AM

For sure. I like other men but I've always thought that about straight relationships.

At best it just seems entitled she's right at worst incredibly abusive and manipulative. I think it ties into the attitude of "the woman is always right". Also, usually in these situations they seem to both be equal homeowners so why should he leave when she's the one who's mad?

A long time ago I saw this fictional show where the wife told the husband to sleep on the couch because he didn't want to have sex again (she was initiating daily). It was entirely dismissed by his family. Even way back then I was disgusted.

Most of them aren't even that heavy of issues though and could be solved by healthy conversation and understanding.

Neveah_Hope_Dreams • 3 points • 5 May, 2021 10:19 AM

Oh my God, that's disgusting. That sounds really rapey. WTF?

ps3gamer15 • 38 points • 4 May, 2021 04:24 AM

Im not a man but I always found that so damn disrespectful & degrading. It's literally like saying to the man "ure a dog, dogs sleep on the floor". Honnestly idk how men can take it and "come back" and stay with the same person that kicked them out of their own house.

theCourtofJames • 12 points • 4 May, 2021 08:55 AM

My aunt used to make my uncle sleep in his van when they had an argument.

ps3gamer15 • 10 points • 4 May, 2021 09:18 AM

Damn that sucks.. I feel like back in the days it used to happen more often than it does now tho, because of the mentality (man provides, wife takes care of house). & Now it is becoming less and less common

What's even shittier is the kids growing up in an environment that tells them it's ok to get kicked out of ur own house by ur wife, u just have to deal with it and accept it. Then come back the next day seeking pardon.

theCourtofJames • 6 points • 4 May, 2021 09:27 AM

If it's any consolation my uncle was an asshole to his brother, my Dad on his death bed so he can sleep in his van the rest of his life for all I care but your right about kids growing up.

Out of all of my relatives, their kids are the most dysfunctional. They have two daughters and they are the most entitled kids I've ever met and it's things like this, the way my aunt treated my uncle that definitely contributed to that.

ps3gamer15 • 2 points • 4 May, 2021 04:12 PM

Im sorry u feel that way about ur own family, they mustve been awful people for u to "resent" them that way.

Damn thats sad, & chances are theyll perpetuate that cycle of toxicity with their own children in the future. Hopefully something will "wake them up" on time.

Also I mentionned earlier how this kinda conditions the boy to just "accept his faith of being kicked out and come back later on", but that also affects the girl, teaching her that it's normal & ok to treat ur "so" like that.

It's just shitty both ways

schmadimax • 5 points • 4 May, 2021 08:03 AM*

Believe me if a woman wants to kick me out of the house I bought she's the one landing out on the streets, I'm not taking any shit when it comes to that.

ps3gamer15 • 6 points • 4 May, 2021 09:15 AM*

Oh when I said "his own house" I didnt mean like "legally" his.

I meant that the house is theirs regardless of who "paid" for it cuz thats what marriage is about. So my point is even if it's the wife who paid for it I still don't think it's ok for her to kick the husband out after a fight. Unless theyre divorcing then that's a different story yes whoever doesnt own the house has to get out.

But yeah imagine owning the house and still getting kicked out of it.. that makes it even worse than it already is.

schmadimax • 3 points • 4 May, 2021 09:17 AM

Oh okay sorry, I was more thinking of long time partner but without being married.

McNultyLikesJameson • 1 point • 4 May, 2021 09:43 PM

I dunno, I wouldn't mind getting licked in public.

schmadimax • 1 point • 4 May, 2021 09:49 PM

Oh FFS I did not see that ☐

AmiablePenguin • 11 points • 4 May, 2021 07:40 AM*

Here's how I'm going about it:

If it's my place, you don't get to tell me where to sleep. I'm the one paying the bills, I'm the one who makes the rules. You take the couch, or I can call you an Uber until you've calmed down and we can talk properly in the morning.

If I'm at her place, then I'll leave. I don't need to ruin my sleep just because you're angry. That's selfish and narcissitic.

inagotable1986 • 4 points • 4 May, 2021 02:34 PM

I've never been forced to sleep on the couch or go to a hotel, but my wife has made it clear that if she decides that i need to then i would.

She has her methods, her favorite of which is too keep berating me when I'm trying to sleep. I don't sleep until she's placated. She'll nag, yell, bait me by saying the ugliest things, whatever it takes.

a-man-from-earth • 5 points • 4 May, 2021 03:25 PM

That's abusive and toxic. You should have a conversation about that at an opportune moment.

neutronstarr • 2 points • 2 June, 2021 01:04 PM

The tricky part about this is that the word "nag" will be perceived as sexist, even if its 100% true. There is a paradox wherein a wife is allowed to act toxic in certain ways, and you are a raging sexist if you observe and acknowledge that behavior.

asian_jared • 1 point • 12 June, 2021 10:36 AM

That's not a healthy relationship my guy

MelissaMiranti • 3 points • 4 May, 2021 04:35 PM

I wonder if it's why "abandoning the family home" is a factor determined in who gets to keep the property, since it's more often the man kicked out of the home.

amkmaker1754 • 4 points • 4 May, 2021 03:12 PM

Never go to bed angry!!! I know that's hard for some, but I'm a huge believer in diplomacy. Hubby and I have a system: pissed off about something? First of all, smoke a fuckin joint about it, then talk about it, apologize, and go to bed.

We haven't had a night apart in three years, save for a time I went shopping out of town with my mom.

fgyoysgaxt • 1 point • 4 May, 2021 02:40 AM

I think this is part of archaic patriarchal standards that the house is the woman's domain, and the workplace is the man's domain.

Clearly this is sexist and needs to stop. This is more far reaching than just kicking the male partner out, I think this dynamic is extremely pervasive. For example the woman in the relationship is often given control to furnish and design the house as they want, to solely make decisions for the household, and dictate what their partners can or can't do.

This is something we need to work on. More and more women are joining the workforce to some degree, we can't see the household as still being solely for women. Men shouldn't have to carve out a portion of their own home to use as a shed or a "man cave".

No_Acanthisitta_201 • 21 points • 4 May, 2021 03:57 AM

The patriarchy is a myth. This is just another example of women being allowed to by selfish by society. Stop talking feminist nonsense.

TheLWMA • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 12:32 AM

I think society is *technically* patriarchal by the fact that most leaders and CEOs are men. But only technically.

In reality, it's more gynocentric.

fgyoysgaxt • -18 points • 4 May, 2021 08:43 AM

The patriarchy is a myth?

75% of US senators are male, 90% of CEOs are male. These are easily verifiable facts, you can check them right now.

The society that created this situation IS the patriarchy. We are talking about the same thing.

problem_redditor • 20 points • 4 May, 2021 09:48 AM*

The only way your comment - about how men sleeping on the couch during fights is because of "the patriarchy" - makes any lick of sense is if senators and CEOs invent up social norms and social rules and impose them on the rest of the population in a top down way. Which is patently untrue.

fgyoysgaxt • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 01:59 AM

If society isn't dictating that "men sleep on the couch during fights", what do you attribute it to?

Biology? Pure coincidence?

problem_redditor • 3 points • 5 May, 2021 09:18 AM*

Ah, I see. So the rhetorical trick you're using here is to claim our society is a "patriarchy" because the majority of senators in the society are male, and therefore any social norms that originate from that society, regardless of how they came about or who they originated from, are "patriarchal norms".

In that case every feminist change to social norms are also "patriarchal norms" because feminists are part of a society which is, by your definition of patriarchy, patriarchal, and since the society is patriarchal every social norm which originates from it can't help but also be patriarchal.

It also means countries which have majority women in power, such as Rwanda where women are 62 percent of the legislature, are matriarchal, and therefore Rwandan social norms are inherently less patriarchal and more matriarchal than the norms of a country with mostly males in the legislature like the US.

fgyoysgaxt • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 11:55 PM

Ah, I see. So the rhetorical trick you're using here is to claim our society is a "patriarchy" because the majority of senators in the society are male, and therefore any social norms that originate from that society, regardless of how they came about or who they originated from, are "patriarchal norms".

It's not a rhetorical trick, that's what the patriarchy is by definition. There is no suggestion that the senators themselves engineered patriarchal norms, but they are norms that exist within the patriarchy.

In that case every feminist change to social norms are also "patriarchal norms" because feminists are part of a society which is, by your definition of patriarchy, patriarchal, and since the society is patriarchal every social norm which originates from it can't help but also be patriarchal.

Essentially correct, which is why the patriarchy exists in the context of radical feminism. Radical feminism advocates for complete destruction of the patriarchy wholesale, at least partially for the reason you stated.

It also means countries which have majority women in power, such as Rwanda where women are 62 percent of the legislature, are matriarchal, and therefore Rwandan social norms are inherently less patriarchal and more matriarchal than the norms of a country with mostly males in the legislature like the US.

Feminism typically operates in the west. I am not aware of the nuances of Rwandan politics, they may well be a matriarchal society.

It sounds like this is perhaps your first time hearing about radical feminism, which is where the idea of the patriarchy comes from. I would advise you to look it up and at least read the wiki article, it will answer your questions!

problem_redditor • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 08:54 AM*

It's not a rhetorical trick, that's what the patriarchy is by definition. There is no suggestion that the senators themselves engineered patriarchal norms, but they are norms that exist within the patriarchy.

The definitions of patriarchy you yourself linked in that other thread contradict your definition. Also, feminists do not use the term "patriarchy" in that way in practice, as I have already demonstrated. You are basically insisting that your definition of "patriarchy" is *the* definition of patriarchy despite all available evidence contradicting you.

Essentially correct, which is why the patriarchy exists in the context of radical feminism. Radical feminism advocates for complete destruction of the patriarchy wholesale, at least partially for the reason you stated.

Okay, so feminist inspired reforms to law and social norms are patriarchal norms as well. Good to know that they've simultaneously contributed towards what they're fighting against.

It sounds like this is perhaps your first time hearing about radical feminism, which is where the idea of the patriarchy comes from. I would advise you to look it up and at least read the wiki article, it will answer your questions!

The Wikipedia page on radical feminism literally states "Radical feminists view society as fundamentally a patriarchy **in which men dominate and oppress women.**"

"Early radical feminism, arising within second-wave feminism in the 1960s, typically viewed patriarchy as a "transhistorical phenomenon" prior to or deeper than other sources of **oppression**, "not only the **oldest** and **most universal form of domination** but the **primary form**" and the **model for all others.**"

And this isn't my first time hearing about radical feminism. I've heard radical feminists spew their awful bile for years and made the mistake of perusing a few radical feminist writings. It's actually crazy how unhinged these people are, in my opinion. And their

ideas of the patriarchy are much more than a description of "men occupying most positions of political authority". Patriarchy is basically just a bastardized marxist model where "bourgeoisie" is replaced with "men" and "proletariat" is replaced with "women". Where the system is created and dictated by men to serve men's needs and interests at the expense of women's.

It's a crap theory that makes zero sense in the context of gender relations, paints men as a group as completely sociopathic and ignores the power and ability to shape society women have always had. It's pure shit.

Beljuril-home • 0 points • 4 May, 2021 01:33 PM

That's not how feminists define patriarchy.

ASKFEMINISTS: "Patriarchy should not be conflated with "men." The Patriarchy is "a system of society or government in which men hold the power and women are largely excluded from it."

a-man-from-earth • 3 points • 5 May, 2021 02:11 AM

So we do not live in a patriarchy, since women are not excluded from positions of power. Women can vote, can run for all political offices, and can become CEOs.

fgyoysgaxt • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 01:51 AM

Yes, US senators and CEOs are examples of the majority of power being held by men.

CyclopeWarrior • 9 points • 4 May, 2021 06:07 AM

Ah yes the invisible hand that forced women and men into their *preferred gendered roles* is at fault here right, funny how there's always someone trying to deflect any responsibility from women every step of the way.

Oncefa2 • 18 points • 4 May, 2021 06:27 AM

I mean I do think these gender roles are real.

They're just also enforced by women. Maybe even moreso than men on occasion.

I can't tell you why parent used the word patriarchy instead of traditional gender norms but I think their comment was spot on in a number of other ways.

CyclopeWarrior • 5 points • 4 May, 2021 06:36 AM

It's still a terrible start for a point to be made as gender roles are *not the cause of the issue in discussion*. Female entitlement is not an unfortunate side effect of people doing what they like doing.

fgyoysgaxt • -6 points • 4 May, 2021 06:43 AM

I'm not clear what you are saying.

You don't believe gender exists?

You don't believe gender roles are the product of society?

You don't believe that women are members of society?

Honestly there's a lot to unpack and I'm not sure where you are going with this or what your point is.

Threwaway42 • 3 points • 5 May, 2021 03:41 PM

Only idiotic extremists think gender itself does not exist regardless of gender roles or gender expression

fgyoysgaxt • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 12:20 AM

I agree with your sentiment but let's not go around calling people idiotic extremists :/

Threwaway42 • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 12:22 AM

Fair point, guess I was just frustrated and seemingly smart people thinking gender was completely a social construct which I just find so ignorant

fgyoysgaxt • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:25 AM

Hm, gender (in feminist framework, and every day English as of some point after the mid 20th century) is by definition a social construct. As contrast to "sex" which is biological.

Eg "men wear pants" - gender, "men have a penis" - sex.

Are you saying that we shouldn't understate cultural values when talking about gender? I feel that's societal. Or perhaps you are saying that sex influences gender? In which case I'd say yup, but it does so through the construction of social norms.

Threwaway42 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:27 AM

I think culture definitely relates to how we understand gender and gender roles but gender itself is not a social construct. Gender expression and gender roles aren't, and I understand for many there is a fuzzy line between gender roles/expression and gender, but they are still separate IMO.

I think of it like time, time itself is 100%, but the ways we measure it and the ways we observe it are all socially constructed to be able to understand it.

fgyoysgaxt • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:36 AM

I think of it like time, time itself is 100%, but the ways we measure it and the ways we observe it are all socially constructed to be able to understand it.

What if we had one word specifically talking about the natural phenomenon of "time", and another word referring specifically to the way we measure, observe, and interact with "time"?

I don't think that's an unreasonable thing to exist.

Threwaway42 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:51 AM

I feel like that is gender vs gender roles/expression but I get what you are saying

a-man-from-earth • 4 points • 4 May, 2021 01:27 PM

It is because you use feminist jargon that is open to widely varying interpretation. Which is why we recommend against using it.

fgyoysgaxt • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 01:56 AM

I disagree, you can find very similar definitions of the patriarchy wherever you look.

Oxford dictionary: " a system of society or government in which men hold the power and women are largely excluded from it. "

Wiki: " Patriarchy is a social system in which men hold primary power and predominate in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege and control of property "

Geek Feminism: " Patriarchy is a term used in feminism to describe the system of gender-based hierarchy in society which assigns most power to men, and assigns higher value to men, maleness, and "masculine traits". " (a little vaguer and more technical than others).

etc.

There's a strong agreement on what the patriarchy is. Please do not misunderstand a lack of understanding with a lack of a definitive answer. It's there if you want it.

problem_redditor • 4 points • 5 May, 2021 09:29 AM*

I don't know if you've noticed but these definitions of patriarchy are rather different with the exception of "political power". This does not, to me, characterise "strong agreement" as to what the term means.

Oxford dictionary: " a system of society or government in which men hold the power **and women are largely excluded from it.** "

Given that women are not excluded from positions of power and are just as likely to win when they run for elections, our society would not qualify as a patriarchy.

Wiki: " Patriarchy is a social system in which men hold primary power and predominate in roles of political leadership, **moral authority, social privilege** and control of property

Men do not have more social privilege than women nor do they have greater moral authority. In fact, it's the opposite. Thus, this definition of patriarchy does not fit either.

Geek Feminism: " Patriarchy is a term used in feminism to describe the system of gender-based hierarchy in society which assigns most power to men, and assigns higher value to men, maleness, and "masculine traits". " (a little vaguer and more technical than others).

There is no hierarchy in society which assigns most power to men. It's not assigned. Women can do as well in this system as men do, they just choose to make different choices. And said society does not assign higher value to men, maleness, and masculine traits. Given that men, masculinity and masculine traits are constantly being shit on, I think it's safe to say there is instead a disdain for them.

This definition of patriarchy can also be wholesale thrown out the window.

My biggest issue with the word "patriarchy" is how the term keeps getting motte-and-bailed. Feminists will use "patriarchy" in discussions to refer to what they clearly think are societies built by men to oppress women. I'd refer you to u/LacklustreFriend's post "Examining Patriarchy Theory" for a better understanding of what feminists mean when they say patriarchy. Thus, the word "patriarchy" has an additional connotation attached to it in practice.

But the lack of clarity of what the term means means that when called out on these statements defenders of the term "patriarchy" can run back to the motte and firmly assert that "patriarchy" only means a society where men predominate in positions of political power. Them keeping the words they use so poorly defined that they can be constantly redefined whenever

convenient allows them an out every single time anyone tries to back them into a corner. They can always assert that X wasn't what they meant and that they really meant Y, even if everyone knows they were pushing X.

In other words, you can point to the dictionary definition however much you want and claim that it's an appropriate use of the term, but it's also misleading because the word "patriarchy" inevitably now also has an association with "male oppression of women" that is not a fair description or accurate description of societies, even those where men predominate in positions of formal authority. As u/a-man-from-earth was saying, it's the best way to create annoyance among people who do not subscribe to the feminist narrative.

LacklustreFriend • 4 points • 5 May, 2021 03:27 PM*

This is in reference to several comments you've made recently about the nature of power as it pertains to the sexes, and I think I might have mentioned something similar to you before but anyway:

I always find it so frustrating how extremely limited the feminist notion of 'power' is, which is as basic as "man in visible, formalized position of power, therefore patriarchy" (or occasionally, men bigger than women, so men physically force anything, therefore patriarchy" . Every other field, be it political science, organisational and management theory, public administration has moved way from such notions decades, if not centuries ago.

In one of my postgraduate subjects, I was reading about the relationship of Nixon and Kissinger in regards to leadership, and how leadership, authority and power are not synonymous. In regards to Nixon, Nixon may have been the leader in name, but there is good evidence that Kissinger often wielded the authority and power within the relationship, with Nixon often just being the "face" of decisions Kissinger made.

This is only one way of many that power and authority can manifest in relationships and society. We also increasing talk about the role of "bottom-up" power and organisation, or related concepts like input legitimacy. But such ideas are anathema to feminist theory, who still operate on the most basic, archaic understandings of power imaginable.

problem_redditor • 2 points • 12 May, 2021 01:43 AM*

Yeah I've seen you express these ideas before, I think we are largely in agreement on the topic of "power" and the different ways in which it can manifest, and how feminism by focusing only on formalised political authority neglects many covert forms of power that exist.

On a related note, I've been wondering recently how we could get society at large to reject feminist ideas and most notably "patriarchy theory" (the idea that society is created for the benefit of men and at the expense of women's interests) and reject the ongoing demonisation of men and masculinity. There's no sense arguing with or appealing to feminists because none of them will listen to any indication that their ideology is wrong - I've long ceased to try and really engage with them because few of them argue in good faith and few are interested to listen to any opposing views. The differences in beliefs are just irreconcilable.

Even many feminist scholars have their feet rooted in belief perseverance and only look for evidence that can be interpreted in favour of their theory (and rationalise away any contradictory information), though I would argue that as scholars they're obligated

to consider, publish and take into account information and opposing views which might contradict their ideology, instead of trying to dismiss them, and entertain alternative hypotheses. But they don't.

Ultimately what would be good is having more research around gender examining things from a non-feminist standpoint, and to have a good way to get this research to the public. Feminist theory is a very misleading picture of the relations between the sexes, but it's the dominant view. I want to see more alternative views of the relations between the sexes, both currently and throughout history, being presented. Very few anti-feminists or non-feminists or men's rights activists have such significant influence that they could push such a change through, though, and academia as it currently is is a write-off because it's long been infested by these ideas and is actually very responsible for the current popularity of feminist views.

Every single time I look at academia, every single time I read the news, every single time I look at social media, I'm bombarded with hit-pieces painting women as oppressed and men as being at fault for this supposed oppression. We're drowning in their propaganda. I keep seeing ads about violence against women here in Australia (I think you're in Australia too, so you should know about this) which says "let's stop it from the start" painting men as responsible, and acting as if little boys need to be taught how to be decent people. As if little boys are potential future abusers. It's hard to combat because you're pushing against academia almost all of which has been infested with the feminist agenda and the almost entirely woke feminist media pushing out propaganda piece after propaganda piece about women's oppression. And for us, researching every single claim is near-impossible because none of us have the funding nor the tools to do so.

The problem is kind of self-sustaining because you need some significant social support to change the current state of things and to create an environment conducive to research outside of the feminist lens. But without such research, it's difficult to garner any huge significant support for such a push to happen. And even if you somehow single-handedly manage to get a lot of good information contradicting the feminist narrative and manage to get this information to the larger public there are additional barriers which are posed by our evolved instincts which make change hard.

What I want most and why I am even involved here in the first place is to shift the Overton window, but it's hell to shift, especially on this topic.



problem_redditor • 2 points • 28 May, 2021 01:31 PM*

Also, apart from the deficiencies in their ideas about "power", feminist ideology, especially its most mainstream incarnation, is a completely illogical worldview that makes zero sense.

Feminist ideas about gender and society in general contain a lot of doublethink. As someone on Reddit said, their ideas about the patriarchy basically requires one to think that men have an inherent ability and willingness to oppress women which led them to create and enforce gender roles to do it and women do not have similar ability or willingness to oppress men. But they also believe women are exactly like men and are as capable as men and any gender differences we see are due to socialisation.

But when pressed on that, they create these weird circular traps - part of which you briefly touched on in "Examining Patriarchy Theory" - in order to avoid the question of how "the patriarchy" came about in order to try and suppress the inherent inconsistency. "There are no innate gender differences between men and women and the differences between men and women's behaviours and choices and outcomes only exist because of patriarchal norms!" "If there are no innate gender differences how do the patriarchal norms even exist in the first place?" "Because everyone is socialised into adhering to patriarchal norms!" and it soon starts sounding like infinite regress, which has no real explanatory power.

In an attempt at sanitising their beliefs to make them more defensible and palatable to the larger public while still preserving their aims and objectives "We don't think men are inherently bad! Also, there are no differences in capability between men and women which would justify any level of differential outcomes! Also, patriarchy exists!" they've essentially created an ideology rife with internal inconsistencies which are never and can never be addressed in their circles, otherwise the entire thing will fall apart.

Forgetaboutthelonly • 1 point • 11 May, 2021 02:05 AM

Would you be OK if I made this into a post? I think it deserves more attention.

problem_redditor • 2 points • 11 May, 2021 07:20 AM*

Sure, go ahead.

Though I bet you'll see the crowd of feminist-sympathetic male advocates and feminist lurkers trying to aggressively attack the post and deny that the term is ever motte-and-bailed in a dishonest way and argue that patriarchy just means men occupying most formal positions of power without any additional baggage. And if MRAs ever have any problems using the word to describe society, they're just evil and bad.

It'll be both infuriating and entertaining. You son of a bitch, I'm in.

fgyoysgaxt • 0 points • 6 May, 2021 12:00 AM*

I've actually addressed these concerns elsewhere in this thread, I'd recommend you go take a look.

a tl;dr for you:

Men occupy more positions of power than women, there's no need to be afraid of the term patriarchy because you are worried someone will use it to have multiple meanings, instead keep an eye out for when someone ACTUALLY DOES that and then address the problem. The lack of clarity you perceive is lack of understanding on the topic, perhaps fueled by over-analyzing and prejudice. Perhaps instead approach the topic with the knowledge that the meaning is well agreed on, and see that if you don't get it when you think you should, that's the Dunning-Kruger Effect.

problem_redditor • 6 points • 6 May, 2021 08:38 AM*

The lack of clarity you perceive is lack of understanding on the topic, perhaps fueled by over-analyzing and prejudice. Perhaps instead approach the topic with

the knowledge that the meaning is well agreed on, and see that if you don't get it when you think you should, that's the Dunning-Kruger Effect.

So basically I should nod along and say that the definition is well agreed on, and ignore how all the dictionary definitions of patriarchy you linked differ from each other and do not fit our society like you previously claimed it does. Ignore how feminists continually bandy around the word "patriarchy" to describe societies not only where men occupy most formalised, overt positions of authority, but where men oppress women. Ignore how using the term in that purportedly "agreed upon" context can cause misunderstanding among everyone due to the way in which feminists commonly use the term. And if I don't, I have the Dunning-Kruger Effect.

a-man-from-earth[M] • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 07:33 AM

Stop the gaslighting.

problem_redditor • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 08:47 AM*

This user is definitely trying really really hard to dodge any and all arguments against them. It's pretty funny to watch the mental gymnastics. They're doing it here, too.

a-man-from-earth • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 10:23 AM

They're doing it all over the place. They went on to deny it, continuing the gaslighting, so they got a temp ban.

Oncefa2 • 2 points • 4 May, 2021 01:42 PM

The patriarchy and gender roles are not the same thing.

At best what feminists call the patriarchy is a product of gender roles that women are just as guilty of enforcing as men. And that often benefit women over men on average in society.

Being a senator isn't the end all be all here. If you're only chasing power to gain favor with women, which is a gender norm called hypergamy, then that's because by default you do not have power. If women don't seek power as much as men do then that is because, by default, without doing anything besides being born the correct gender, they already have more power (social capital) than the average man. So they don't have to chase formal positions of power. They can just marry and select from the men who put in all the hard work to get there.

You're like 75% of the way to understanding this. Just open your eyes and think about this for a little bit.

fgyoysgaxt • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 01:49 AM

The patriarchy and gender roles are not the same thing.

Correct.

At best what feminists call the patriarchy is a product of gender roles that women are just as guilty of enforcing as men.

Correct again.

And that often benefit women over men on average in society.

I don't see a way you could measure that, I don't think that's possible to prove nor that it would be useful to even try.

So it seems we agree that the patriarchy is real, I'm not sure what the rest of your post is about basically :/

Being a senator isn't the end all be all here.

Correct.

If you're only chasing power to gain favor with women, which is a gender norm called hypergamy, then that's because by default you do not have power.

Hypergamy just means partnering with someone of higher status...

Regardless, I think it's possible to have power, and chase more power to gain favor with women. Your logic doesn't follow.

If women don't seek power as much as men do

I'll stop you right there. Women absolutely do seek power, so the rest of your paragraph is based on a faulty assumption.

Oncefa2 • 2 points • 5 May, 2021 08:24 AM

Women seek power second to seeking a man if they don't think it's a viable option.

Source:

Durante, K. M., Griskevicius, V., Simpson, J. A., Cantú, S. M., & Tybur, J. M. (2012). Sex ratio and women's career choice: Does a scarcity of men lead women to choose briefcase over baby?. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 103(1), 121.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22468947>

fgyoysgaxt • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 11:51 PM

Glad we are in agreement.

Neveah_Hope_Dreams • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 10:25 AM

Gender does exist. Women are members of society.

But gender roles are useless and controlling and it's, well, sexist.

I have no idea how you got all of that out from that one comment.

fgyoysgaxt • 0 points • 6 May, 2021 12:04 AM

I have no idea how you got all of that out from that one comment.

Just trying to establish what exactly the user is disagreeing with, that's all. In these kinds of discussions I always find it's a good idea to establish where exactly the disagreement is, especially

when someone makes a vague statement.

FWIW the user never responded, but one user responded saying that they believe women simply do not want power, and another that they didn't understand feminist terms.

a-man-from-earth[M] • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 07:41 AM

Way to twist words. We do not appreciate this kind of bad faith participation here.

adam-l • 2 points • 4 May, 2021 07:22 AM

the woman in the relationship is often given control to furnish and design the house as they want

I think there's something more than "*archaic patriarchal standards*" at work here. Imo, it's an animalistic ritual - and, of course, humans *are* animals. You can observe, for example, dogs, pissing around an area they want to secure as their own.

fgyoysgaxt • 7 points • 4 May, 2021 08:39 AM

Humans are also more than not just animals, we have the power to decide if something is harmful or not.

Animals don't think twice about being sexist or racist, but humans can and should.

I think we should aspire to being a little more than merely dogs pissing around their territory.

superzepto • -5 points • 4 May, 2021 05:57 AM

Men shouldn't have to carve out a portion of their own home to use as a shed or a "man cave"

I've been ranting against the idea of man caves for years but here in Australia, it's the gold standard for blokes. Any space that I want to be in is made better by my wife being there too, so I cannot fathom the idea of having an exclusionary space purely for my own benefit.

fgyoysgaxt • 11 points • 4 May, 2021 06:00 AM

I think you have misunderstood why some men have man caves. It's not so they can exclude their wives, it's because they need a place for their hobbies and interests. For example if a man is interested in having a home gym or playing video games or doing woodworking, this may not fit into the way that the woman has designed the house, and so in order to pursue their own hobbies and interests they need to make space for that. The problem isn't that they want to make a man cave to exclude their wives, it's that their wives have excluded them from the rest of the house.

superzepto • -2 points • 4 May, 2021 07:31 AM

Might be the case in other parts of the world, but there's an undoubtedly exclusionary attitude to how Australian men approach it



YooGeOh • 10 points • 4 May, 2021 09:55 AM*

The issue is that there is an exclusionary attitude *against* men when it comes to decorating and organising the rest of the *entire* house, to the point that a man cave becomes a thing that is the only place in the house where the man has any say on its aesthetic and functionality, because the rest of the entire house is the *woman cave*. The man makes it exclusionary because otherwise it'll

be usurped and just become another part of the womans domain.

Some men feel that without *man caves* they end up paying for a home that then becomes their wives. They end up paying for someone else's home.

A more collaborative effort in homemaking that involves the man and is open to his suggestions and preferences instead of just berating and belittling them because they're something a man likes, would go a good way to negating the need for man caves because the man already feels like he lives in a home he has a say in.

Going about arguing against the need for man caves by berating men for having them ignores the reason they exist in the first place.

fgyoysgaxt • 6 points • 4 May, 2021 08:26 AM

Maybe a little more thought is needed on this topic, why is it that these blokes are looking for space away from their spouses to enjoy their interests? Clearly there are some problematic dynamics at play.

SchalaZeal01 • -1 points • 4 May, 2021 04:02 AM

and dictate what their partners can or can't do.

Including going vegan or eating brown bread.

YooGeOh • 1 point • 4 May, 2021 03:16 PM

Brown bread is great lol

SchalaZeal01 • 3 points • 4 May, 2021 03:32 PM

Being forced by your spouse making unilateral choices about what you want to eat is different from yourself being talked into trying it, and liking it after.

YooGeOh • 1 point • 4 May, 2021 04:05 PM

I know. I still like brown bread!

SchalaZeal01 • 2 points • 4 May, 2021 04:17 PM

Well, I don't. I also don't like diet coke (but am fine with coke zero). And for some things its not even dislike, its inability to eat: cabbage, lettuce in any form (green veggie bitterness issue), tomato as is, but fine in juices or sauces (texture issue), mayo in any form (I'm unsure why, but it tastes extreme to me, I can barely withstand the smell too), mustard (unsure again, as I'm fine with curry that doesn't have it, even red curry).

I have very high difficulty eating sliced but hard fruits (texture+taste). And will not bite into fruit with skin (texture). But I can eat them processed (like apple pie), as long as the apple bits are tiny enough and have the mushyness of boiled veggies.

In short I can't physically eat salad or most sandwiches (because apparently its a compulsion to add mayo and mustard to them). And I eat my hamburgers and hot dogs plain. I could add cheese to them, but after trying, I simply prefer not to. I can only stomach cheddar and mozzarella, other cheeses much too strong for me.

Neveah_Hope_Dreams • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 10:24 AM

I've sorta recognised that stereotype in pop culture.

Also don't forget that when the woman cheats or has an affair, there's that one group of people that try to defend her and try to make her out as the victim. Like in one movie there was a young man who exposed the woman he was marrying for cheating during their wedding. The woman's bridesmaids comforted her when she started crying. Another example in real life. There's a video that was posted on Reddit of a guy who set up what looked like a public proposal in an outdoor restaurant when really he was exposing his girlfriend of cheating and officially broke up with her there and then. One Karen started going "That's so cruel! How mean!" Over what he did. What about cheating? Isn't that cruel and mean?

neutronstarr • 2 points • 2 June, 2021 01:07 PM

In my observation,

When a man cheats, it's his fault.

When a woman cheats, it's her husband's fault.

Either path leads to the husband taking a deferential and apologetic posture.

Threwaway42 • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 03:40 PM

Source on either of those?

Neveah_Hope_Dreams • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 11:13 PM

I've found the film scene.

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

But I can't find the other one as it's on reddit somewhere.