

The Sexual Revolution and its consequences have been a disaster for the human race.

February 2, 2023 | 13 upvotes | by [MegaGigaTeraBased](#)

I will start off with a very based quote from Michel Houellebecq, a renowned French author:

In societies like ours sex truly represents a second system of differentiation, completely independent of money; and as a system of differentiation it functions just as mercilessly. The effects of these two systems are, furthermore, strictly equivalent. Just like unrestrained economic liberalism, and for similar reasons, sexual liberalism produces phenomena of absolute pauperization. Some men make love every day; others five or six times in their life, or never. Some make love with dozens of women; others with none. It's what's known as 'the law of the market'. In an economic system where unfair dismissal is prohibited, every person more or less manages to find their place. In a sexual system where adultery is prohibited, every person more or less manages to find their bed mate. In a totally liberal sexual system certain people have a varied and exciting erotic life; others are reduced to masturbation and solitude. Economic liberalism is an extension of the domain of the struggle, its extension to all ages and all classes of society. Sexual liberalism is likewise an extension of the domain of the struggle, its extension to all ages and all classes of society. [...] Certain people win on both levels; others lose on both.

However, I will take this even further regarding the societal implications of the sexual revolution. As Houellebecq stated, modern society essentially operates on two hierarchies: the socioeconomic hierarchy, and the sexual hierarchy.

The socioeconomic hierarchy has always been brutal and capitalistic, but with the advent of modern advances in technology, it has become far more closely tied to societal contribution. In the free market today, money is primarily rewarded to people who create value in society, which incentivizes productivity and innovation as well as for people to be functioning, law-abiding citizens. While the free economic marketplace does have many problems (e.g. extreme wealth inequality, exploitation of workers, etc), it has had a massive net benefit to society overall.

On the other hand, a free sexual marketplace has precisely the opposite effect. With the sexual market being liberalized, the same market dynamics that apply to the economic apply to the sexual market as well; but in contrast to the economic market, value in the sexual market is primarily tied to genetic worth and entirely orthogonal to societal contribution. In fact, sexual success is often *negatively correlated* to societal contribution- for instance, consider the statistics that poorer and less intelligent people have more kids, men in prison have a higher fertility rate than the general population, IQ is negatively correlated to partner count, etc.

Finally, as sexual liberation continues to grow more pervasive throughout society (and the world), we continue to witness greater emphasis placed on the sexual hierarchy over the socioeconomic hierarchy. Even without cultural conditioning, it would make sense for this to occur, as the socioeconomic hierarchy is tied primarily to the satiation of socially conditioned needs, while the sexual hierarchy is tied to primal, biological needs. But with the influence of the hypersexualized Western media, this difference is greatly magnified, which is only a further detriment to the state of society. Indeed, one can simply witness the degeneracy of American culture, where (for instance) players and fuckboys are celebrated while shy, awkward programmers are mocked and demonized.

So to sum everything up, I am making the point that the liberation of the sexual market has led to a

massive reduction in the incentivization of functional behavior and societal contribution among men, as well as a culture of degeneracy and depravity. And as sexual liberation grows more pervasive, this trend will only be further exacerbated.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

puririnpa • 4 points • 2 February, 2023 09:02 AM

Poorer or less intelligent people aren't being choosen compared to richer or more intelligent men/women, they just use cobtractions less tgan chad or normies who slut around not having kids then settle at 35, abortion is behind dysgenics more than anything(and just some of america's dynamics overall, america celebrates people behaving like animals)

[deleted] • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 10:34 PM

I'll concede that the disparity in reproductive success I mentioned is in part due to lower rates of contraception usage among poor/less intelligent people. However, it's unlikely that lower rates of contraception use account entirely for this disparity, so it's very possible that higher rates of sexual success are a factor as well. Of course though, there's no way to prove this unless you control for every other (relevant) factor that varies significantly based on intelligence and wealth, which is impossible to do.

Moggedagain • 3 points • 3 February, 2023 10:22 AM

I hope that this unregulated hypersexuality and degeneracy results in everything eventually collapsing spectacularly. I want to sit back and watch it burn. They're all animals.

TryLambda • 2 points • 4 February, 2023 02:27 AM

It's already burning

RatDontPanic • 1 point • 5 February, 2023 06:01 AM

Like the coal seam fires *under* Centralia, Pennsylvania.

TaxNegative161 • -1 points • 2 February, 2023 05:56 AM

Well you'll be happy to know that while your concerns are real (it's really hard to date when you're poor) your actual knowledge about all this is really embarrassing. People don't have more kids if they're poor and stupid. They have more kids if their country's infant mortality rate is high or if their socio-economic status does not afford them the ability to pay for abortions (if they live in a civilised part of the world where they are actually permitted).

So while your concerns are real you can sleep soundly knowing that you have no idea what is going on.

[deleted] • 2 points • 2 February, 2023 06:07 AM*

Well you'll be happy to know that while your concerns are real (it's really hard to date when you're poor)

If this is what you think I'm saying, then you should go back to grade school to work on your reading comprehension.

People don't have more kids if they're poor and stupid. They have more kids if their country's infant mortality rate is high or if their socio-economic status does not afford them the ability to pay for abortions (if they live in a civilised part of the world where they are actually permitted).

If it's not clear already from the content of my post (which it would be to anyone but a total dunce), I am exclusively referring to Western civilization. It's also funny that the second part of your statement 1) never refuted my point and 2) is incorrect, because there are many more factors to this correlation than "poor

people can't pay for abortions". If anything, you are the ignorant one for simplifying it down to one single factor.

So while your concerns are real you can sleep soundly knowing that you have no idea what is going on.

Funny how you say that when you don't even know how to read a reddit post. Come talk to me again when you graduate from elementary school.

TaxNegative161 • -6 points • 2 February, 2023 06:44 AM

Lol

debatelord_1 • 2 points • 2 February, 2023 08:34 AM

Even in the US people in the lower class have more kids than the middle class

TaxNegative161 • 2 points • 2 February, 2023 08:54 AM

Wow! I wonder if it's to do with the cost of getting rid of unwanted children? Or attending schools in poor neighbourhoods without the luxuries of things like sex Ed!?

too_lazy_to_register • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 12:44 PM

Even morons know that raising a child costs a bit more than an abortion.

TaxNegative161 • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 12:52 PM

Stupid poor people! If they'd just by a brand new lexus instead of a busted ass Chevy, they wouldn't have to keep pouring hundreds and thousands of dollars into it every year just to get you to your minimum wage job.

too_lazy_to_register • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 01:12 PM

That's just bullshit. I don't believe someone who can't afford an abortion can support a child instead. Those who can afford neither, use the worse ways to get rid of a child or a fetus.

Being from a poor (though not American) family myself, I can say that the societal pressure into having kids affects the poor people much more than the difficulties of abortion.

Also, an unrelated note: if you're making a minimum wage here, you either walk or take a bus.

TaxNegative161 • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 01:16 PM

That's just bullshit. I don't believe someone who can't afford an abortion can support a child instead.

They can't you buffoon. That's what happens when you're fucking poor.

Google 'being poor is expensive'. Seriously, do it. You can't go through life being so ignorant.

too_lazy_to_register • -1 points • 2 February, 2023 01:29 PM

I know that being poor is expensive. I also know that the people who can't support kids but still choose to have them are idiots. But then again, even the idiots either understand this simple truth after a kid or two, or get their children taken away, because it's basically child abuse.

I knew families with a lot of kids (one of my classmates was from family like that, for example). It has nothing to do with the costs of abortions. Even the archaic reason to

have a lot of kids for them to financially support you when you're old applies more to this situation.

TaxNegative161 • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 01:32 PM

I know that being poor is expensive. I also know that the people who can't support kids but still choose to have them are idiots.

Wow! Like a busted education system might produce with zero sex Ed! Amazing brain working from you, genius.

too_lazy_to_register • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 01:41 PM

Why do you need sex ed to know if you'd be able to support a child? A quick advice - if you can't afford an abortion, you wouldn't. It's common sense ed.

ElectricBugs • 1 point • 3 February, 2023 01:33 AM

You know shit about abortions and the choices women face. Why is this once again about the women dealing with the consequences but not the men who don't use protection. Abortion is a difficult thing for women. There are physical, medical, spiritual, moral and mental aspects that men gloss over because they will never understand what being a woman with a child inside their womb is like

too_lazy_to_register • 0 points • 3 February, 2023 06:52 AM

First, if we change "the cost of abortion" to "the cost of protection", my point still stands. Those are bullshit arguments to explain having a lot of kids. I started talking about abortions because the commenter above me did. I absolutely agree that not conceiving is better than aborting. But if someone has kids only because there were spiritual aspects to having an abortion, they don't deserve those kids, and I refuse to believe that's the case with the majority of large families.

Second, I don't know how difficult it is for women to decide to get an abortion. But I know that before the modern medicine the abortions were horrible and very dangerous (and sometimes banned), and there still were women trying. If a woman prefers drinking a concoction that may kill her as well as the baby, or getting literally kicked in the stomach, I think the consequences of having a child can outweigh all the aspects you've listed.

ElectricBugs • 1 point • 3 February, 2023 09:07 AM

They aren't arguments. They are literally the reasons it happens.

puririnpa • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 09:08 AM

That's mostly because chad and stacy would rather whore around then have 1-2 kids when they get at 30's, (also just some of america's dynamics, they celebrate a certain animalistic behaviour that comes with being low class or trashy) I think it's mostly abortion which is behind dysgenics

I think probably tried to ban abortion in murica due to lower class (and generally brown or hispanic) people were threatening as their fertility surpassed that of whites, the reason why they promoted abortion in the first place had a racial reasoning too

no_bling_just_ding • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 09:39 AM

cope people have more kids if they're poor and stupid i see it all the time when i "touch grass" as bloopers say, people who literally can't read or write with 6 kids

TaxNegative161 • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 12:11 PM

Wow! I wonder if poor education and without the means to afford abortions had something to do with it?! Again.

OberOst • 0 points • 2 February, 2023 08:22 AM

Permitted abortion is as civilized as involuntary euthanasia.

TaxNegative161 1 points 2 February, 2023 08:54 AM **[recovered]**

Lol you will never have a girlfriend.

no_bling_just_ding[M] • 1 point • 2 February, 2023 09:41 AM

don't make things personal

ElectricBugs • 1 point • 3 February, 2023 01:30 AM

Lower socioeconomic backgrounds usually have poorer education. This has a two pronged effect: lower sex ed rates and less options for careers. More women will choose to just have children because they don't have the education required to get a good paying job. They can then be useful as parents. Whereas sex education lacking means men are out there fucking around and getting women pregnant. People are too poor to access abortion if they want. So lots of babies.

TryLambda • 1 point • 4 February, 2023 02:27 AM

Women are the gatekeepers of sex and reproduction, what the sexual revolution did was, turn society into a modern matriarchy of women acting like men.....