

The narrative of universal historical female oppression is quite insulting to men

February 14, 2020 | 60 upvotes | by [thereslcjg2000](#)

The whole idea of a patriarchal system where men hold all the power which they use to the detriment of women just doesn't hold ground. It's been discussed ad nauseum how the men with the most power are isolated examples and not representative of most men, and that they do not tend to use their power to the benefit of men as a whole. It's also been pointed out that women have tremendous social power. And of course, it's been established that gender roles help and hurt both sexes in significant ways, and that they emerged for reasons totally unrelated to oppressing anyone. On logical grounds, the epidemic of female oppression never really held water.

But in my opinion it's just as abhorrent on a moral level. When you look at how much painful labor men have historically been forced to do, all so their wives and children wouldn't starve, I can't even fathom how you can take away that they must have had so much privilege just because they weren't stuck in the kitchen. Men have throughout all of time been expected to sacrifice so much just so others can live easy lives. Ironically enough this was especially true in pre-industrial, so-called "patriarchal" times. It's insulting to look at all the men dying in battlefields and coal mines so that their families can live and say that these men were fiendishly oppressing women all while pursuing their passions.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Egalitarianwhistle • 33 points • 14 February, 2020 06:35 AM

It's a great theory if you want to maximize your own victimhood as a woman.

funnystor • 2 points • 17 February, 2020 09:36 PM

As a human, I demand reparations for 50% of my ancestors being oppressed!

5th_Law_of_Robotics • 29 points • 14 February, 2020 12:54 PM

Feminist theories aren't based on fact.

They're based on getting the conclusion they want.

In reality most of history has sucked for most people.

The fact that Kings had a penis benefited the average male peasant exactly as much as the queen having a vagina benefited the average female peasant.

[deleted] • 21 points • 14 February, 2020 08:09 AM

The really ironic thing is that the same demand is on you today, and it's also coming from feminists. You're to sacrifice for women. It's even a worse deal than the one conservatives gives you since there are no benefits for your labour, only futher demands for betterment, yours, though, never theirs. Funny that.

LeftNatTay • 7 points • 14 February, 2020 05:26 PM

Women (of all colors): Get paid more and are more likely to be hired than Black and Hispanic Men.

Feminists: "Black and Hispanic Men need to check their privilege uwu"

Strikester101 • 3 points • 15 February, 2020 09:36 PM

Are women paid more than MOC? Can you provide evidence?

LeftNatTay • 1 point • 15 February, 2020 09:58 PM

I had read something on the line of that, I could be wrong, but rn I'm not finding what I'm looking for, but I do know that Black Women go to College and complete it at higher rates than Black Men and if that trend continues along with our incarceration rate, if WoC aren't being paid more than us... they will be in the foreseeable future.

LacklustreFriend • 14 points • 14 February, 2020 03:35 PM

Having read a lot of feminist literature recently, I think people really don't understand how vile and malicious the vast majority of feminist theory is. At best, men portrayed as inherently selfish and cruel. At worst, men are portrayed as violent sadistic beasts who are just itching to rape and abuse women at every chance they get.

I honestly don't understand how any sane individual can read one of those books and agree with them.

It's hard to describe just how venomous feminist theory is without reading it for yourself.

drpepper02 • 1 point • 24 February, 2020 03:27 PM

It's called projection. Even today feminists look for every reason to be selfish, yet the most important thing building and maintaining the infrastructure is done mostly by men, so if not for their labor they wouldn't

have the relatively cushy life they have.

Egalitarianwhistle • 5 points • 14 February, 2020 06:46 PM

I think there is lack of acknowledgement that marriage used to be a very powerful political unit. The idea was that not even the king can interfere in matters between a husband and a wife. This made the family the atomic unit of government for centuries until quite recently. Obviously not a perfect system but arguably better than inviting government in as the all wise mother..

The idea of not having the government involved in the bedroom is anathema to feminism.

1TrueScotsman • 14 points • 14 February, 2020 08:44 AM

It's such a bad hypothesis that even the history subs that refuse to say a bad word about feminism refuse to play along...they are just really careful not to use the f word and call them out. The feminist patriarchy metanarrative is easily disproven but they won the war and so write the texts.

my_work_account_shh • 9 points • 14 February, 2020 10:38 AM

I agree that there is a lot of effort to rewrite that narrative along those lines. A lot of people, supported by the media, just take that to be granted.

I'm curious if anyone knows of any reliable sources (preferably written and published) that analyze this from a neutral and historical point of view. I would really like to learn more.

Oncefa2 • 7 points • 14 February, 2020 06:03 PM*

There was a discussion here a couple months ago with a bunch of sources.

Here's some stuff you can look through though:

<http://www.faculty.fairfield.edu/dcrawford/rogers.pdf>

<https://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199582174.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199582174-e-036>

https://ora.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid:2e88e3f6-b270-4228-b930-9237c00e739f/download_file?file_format=application/pdf&safe_filename=Item.pdf&type_of_work=Journal%20article

<https://anthrosource.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1525/ae.1975.2.4.02a00090>

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/3a01gq/refutation_of_womens_historical_oppression/

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/edyrf5/a_compilation_of_evidence_debunking_feminist/

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/c9tsso/one_of_my_favourite_comments_from_girlwrite_swhat/

<https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1855/f217b082603d0ab37ea80c4741fceb8a4a23.pdf>

<https://archive.org/details/legalsubjection00baxgoog>

Prohibition is a good example of women wielding power in society, even before they had the right to vote. It was very much a gendered issue and women "won".

I wrote a little about that here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/e5ihjr/the_role_of_false_accusations_during_the/

problem_redditor • 2 points • 14 February, 2020 09:06 PM*

Here is another link about the topic.

<https://www.marxists.org/archive/beard/woman-force/index.htm> This is a transcript of a 1946 book, written by Mary Beard, called "Woman as a Force in History" which is pretty interesting reading and debunks a lot of feminist dogma about women's oppression. She even concludes in one chapter "It seems perfectly plain that the dogma of woman's complete historic subjection to man must be rated as one of the most fantastic myths ever created by the human mind."

Strikester101 • 1 point • 15 February, 2020 09:47 PM

Can you do one about the "Matilda effect"?

I've seen it brought up many times in "women in science" discussions.

Oncefa2 • 3 points • 16 February, 2020 02:17 PM

Nothing is ever going to be 100%. There are black, white, and grey areas almost everywhere.

When it comes to gender, both men and women are victims of gender roles that are also enforced by both men and women.

There are areas where women get the short end of the stick, and areas where men get the short end of the stick. My opinion is that men tend to get the short end of the stick more often, but you're not going to find that this is the case 100% of the time.

I remember discussing the Matilda effect with you a couple weeks ago, and I think part of my post was, "it might actually be true that this happens on occasion". That's not the end of the story of course because women often get unfairly promoted as well, especially today. Meaning the work of female scientists is held in higher esteem and is publicized more often than the work of male scientists. Which is kind of like the opposite of the Matilda Effect.

Of course nobody ever talks about that, but there are quite a few examples, and in at least one instance, a female scientist had to downplay her contributions to a project because she was one the one getting all the credit for it. Which is something that happened mainly because she was a women, which people thought was cool. Look up female scientist takes picture of black hole for that example.

Strikester101 • 3 points • 16 February, 2020 02:32 PM

I kinda asked because there is a trend where people try to downplay male achievement and uplift female achievement. In effect, it's basically attributing all scientific breakthroughs to women while continuing a narrative where they are still oppressed by men, who had to steal their inventions.

Strikester101 • 1 point • 16 February, 2020 02:28 PM

I am familiar with the incident. You're right that this incident is pretty much an example of the reverse Matilda effect. I have to recall, wasn't there an incident as well where Winona or Naomi Wolf chastised a bunch of boys for a "sexist" comment, when it turns out that the one who did made it was a girl?

Mens-Advocate • 1 point • 25 February, 2020 08:46 AM

Useful list. Thanks.

excess_inquisitivy • 4 points • 14 February, 2020 12:41 PM

History is divorced from NOPV.

History is recorded by human beings who have their own biases, some of which are visible to them, based upon primary, secondary, and tertiary sources that were also recorded with the biases of the human beings who chose their words to describe events.

Egalitarianwhistle • 1 point • 14 February, 2020 06:41 PM

Sure but acknowledging such bias is the first step to a transparent effort to document reality.

Thucydides did a good job with "The History of the Peloponnesian War" by acknowledging his bias, (He had fought for the Athenians,) and always following up to confirm second and thirdhand accounts of a battle.

wasbinichdenn • 2 points • 14 February, 2020 09:18 AM

Can you give an example of such subs refusing to play along? Just curious.

1TrueScotsman • 5 points • 14 February, 2020 09:34 AM*

r/history and r/askhistorians regularly deflate patriarchy narratives. Hold on...I may have a thread saved as an example....

Edit...nvm. apparently all I ever save is porn.

LacklustreFriend • 6 points • 14 February, 2020 11:47 AM

A quick search through askhistorians suggests they don't deflate patriarchy - on the contrary, a few threads I've read conflate familial patriarchy (fathers as head of household) with the neologistic feminist societal patriarchy (social structure where men oppress and exploit women). Several of the comments have the simplistic reasoning of "well there's good evidence fathers led the household, therefore women were oppressed by men".

AskingToFeminists • 6 points • 14 February, 2020 12:06 PM

Several of the comments have the simplistic reasoning of "well there's good evidence fathers led the household, therefore women were oppressed by men".

I would have probably answered something along the lines of "well there's good evidence adults led the household, therefore children were oppressed by adults".

[deleted] • 11 points • 14 February, 2020 02:10 PM

It's talked about on reddit as if it's a law of nature or something.

Men have always been the privileged malevolent antagonist and women have always been the oppressed benevolent protagonist.

Dumbasses cannot fathom that things may have been more complex than that or that maybe the concept of men = privileged and women = oppressed may have had more nuance to it.

Dorkfarces • 2 points • 14 February, 2020 08:46 PM

An analysis of gender roles without class will produce skewed results. Just like the conception of a dictatorship being the rule of one charismatic leader, and not a complicated web of power and loyalty with different people leveraging power in different ways, seeing power as a one way street in the context of gender is also inaccurate-- but it would not be accurate to say there was parity between men and women, just as there isn't parity between Generalissimo and his subordinate, even if there is trust, respect, and influence. We didn't evolve to be sexists, sexism is something we have to learn, and not everyone internalizes sexism the same. Not every man with legal

authority over his wife was a tyrant, but that doesn't mean legal inequality by sex isn't tyrannical.

So it is also not historically accurate to deny the kind of power that was typically reserved for men, especially wealthy men, after the rise of civilization, due to the happenstance of men's strength and its usefulness in producing surplus and stealing the resources of others, including enslaving them. It would be as inaccurate as ignoring class, because sex can be used as a cover for economic class, the same as race can. Like how racism can be a psychological wage for poor people to feel superior over others like them without the ruling class having to actually pay them more, sexism can do the same thing

SchalaZeal01 • 2 points • 15 February, 2020 03:21 PM

But you mostly mean rich men here. Peasant men had no recognized power about it. Peasant men were 95% of men.

Dorkfarces • 1 point • 15 February, 2020 11:31 PM

True, and we don't have a ton of info on poor people's daily personal lives before recently, because only the rich had the time and money for journaling

However there are court cases that were recorded and and records of custom and law.

A woman having the same property rights, or other legal rights, as a man wasn't necessarily a given in all societies. Being able to hold your husband or male relatives accountable for violence wasn't a given, either. You can find examples, like where a wife could leave her shitty husband and go live with her relatives, I can't recall the (African?) society that did this but I remember reading about it way back in sociology 101, or some pre-roman/Christian pagan European societies where woman could inherit and alienate property.

But this wasn't a given, there's a material basis to the issue of gender. It persists because bourgeois feminism (radical or liberal) can't solve it, so they double down on blaming men instead of class society

This isn't about men being bad and exploiting women because we're evil, anymore than a factory lays off workers because the board is evil and greedy. Exploitation and inequality are driven by how the economy needs to function, and in a society built around human manual labor, the discrete differences between male and female physiology is partly a basis for economic roles creating gender roles.

A marriage in a class society isn't just about two people who love each other and want to make each other happy. It's also an economic unit, and that's when inhumane calculation can step in. It's why as socialists we have to advocate economic measures for families that ensure the parents are freed as completely as possible from codependency to create healthy, free families, and less furries, radlibs, and incels

SchalaZeal01 • 2 points • 15 February, 2020 11:34 PM

Being able to hold your husband or male relatives accountable for violence wasn't a given, either. You can find examples, like where a wife could leave her shitty husband and go live with her relatives

Its weird how its never even thought about that husbands couldn't leave violent and shitty wives, and had no recourse for it.

Dorkfarces • 1 point • 15 February, 2020 11:41 PM

Oh, no doubt at all.

And because people in general but especially men can be ashamed of being victimized, it's hard to ever know how prevalent abuse is even in modern times. But, in the abstract, it is conceivable (but not at all guaranteed) that men would have more recourse to change their circumstances

(being able to initiate divorce because their wives aren't producing children for example), if it is true they have more power relative to women in societies with more explicitly gendered norms than we have today

But without hard data to support that, it's just an assumption, and we should be careful making those

SchalaZeal01 • 2 points • 15 February, 2020 11:47 PM

In post-Renaissance France society ridiculed and humiliated husbands thought to be battered and/or dominated by their wives. A battered husband was trotted around town riding a donkey backwards while holding its tail.

Dorkfarces • 1 point • 16 February, 2020 02:28 AM

That's something you don't see at the renfest

Svenskbtch • 2 points • 17 February, 2020 11:27 AM

As someone having followed the MRA debate for a few years, I think this is pretty well established by now. In fact, I would even submit that feminism (or the parts of it that some might call victim feminism) represents, as Elam put it, "patriarchy- dialled up. Way up."

This should be clear to anyone that makes the effort to scrutinise the implicit comparison of oppression of women versus oppression of blacks. Few whites have put themselves in harms way to protect their slaves; doing so to protect women and children has been part of the popular imagination since time immemorial.

What is true, of course, is that gender roles have been much stricter throughout history for both genders. This might have been a necessary evil in many cases and perhaps the leading reason why our species has survived in the first place, but it has indeed led to substantial suffering, especially for those whose predilections and inclinations did not conform. But it is hard to see how women has suffered more from this, although we are of course talking about times where humans suffered tremendously more overall, full stop.

drpepper02 • 1 point • 24 February, 2020 03:56 PM

Even as recently as 1970, 21 + women had the right to vote yet there were 18,19 and 20 year old men being drafted yet they had no say in electing the leaders who supported the war. But women of age could vote for the very politicians supporting the war yet they had no obligations to serve.

Mens-Advocate • 1 point • 25 February, 2020 08:40 AM

Refutation of "women's historical oppression," still mostly valid:

https://old.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/3a01gq/refutation_of_womens_historical_oppression/