

# Where do gays belong ?

July 9, 2014 | 11 upvotes | by [wantsanswers1](#)

---

I been hanging around the red pill / men's rights/dark enlightenment circles for a while now. And the one thing that bugs if the dark enlightenment, what would happen to homosexual spaces? Will it turn into the 1940-1950s time period again? I'm not trying to troll, but trying to find my place in this world if that makes sense.

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 July, 2014 02:19 PM

God damn, reading into what dark enlightenment or Neoreactionism is was not what I wanted to do with my morning, but you made me do it anyway.

From what I can gather the Neo-reactionary philosophy is essentially based around the idea that things were better in the past, and we only think our modern culture is better because everyone thinks their culture is best culture. It goes further into issues of how mixing of different cultures results in negative outcomes with little tidbits like:

Among the central principles of neoreaction – one of the top two, I'd say – is that long-separated human populations differ, innately, in significant ways, and that human cultures, when correctly understood to be part of our extended phenotype, reflect this underlying biological variation.

If culture is phenotype, then it's reasonable to expect that the well-being of any culture is affected, positively and negatively, by changes in the aggregate genotype of its host population.

There is actually one writer who, in the efforts of creating a counter argument, actually explained things pretty well.

This strategy, with the octopoid abomination metaphor replaced with a melting pot metaphor for better branding, has been America's strategy for most of the past few centuries – assimilation. It worked for the Irish, who were once viewed with as much racism as any Hispanic or Arab is today. It worked for the Italians, who were once thought of as creepy Papist semi-retarded mafia goons until everyone decided no, they were indistinguishable from everyone else. It worked for the fourth and fifth generation Asians, at least here in suburban California, where they're considered about as "exotic" as the average Irishman. It certainly worked for the Jews, where there are some people of Jewish descent who aren't even aware of it until they trace their family history back. And it should be able to work for everyone else. Why isn't it?

The Reactionary's answer to this is the same as the Reactionary's answer to almost everything: because of those darned progressives!

Sometime in the latter half of this century, it became a point of political pride to help minorities resist "cultural imperialism" and the Eurocentric norms that they should feel any pressure to assimilate. Moved by this ideology, the government did everything it could to help minorities avoid assimilation and to shame and thwart anyone trying to get them to assimilate.

Unfortunately this explanation, while enticingly sane, seems to contradict the intent of the previous writer. From what I've scraped together off the *hundreds of pages* on this topic, Neo-reactionism has something to do with keeping cultures and ethnicities separate - or together. I can't tell which.

So I'm going to put all that aside and try to answer your question. I'm guessing if culture were to take a step towards less social integration gay people would find themselves in hard times. If we moved away from the current "gay people are beautiful snowflakes" liberal progressivism towards "gay people are abominations" conservatism, that would be bad for gay people.

But if there's anything in all this reading I've done this morning that actually registered a blip of intelligence, it's the part about cultural assimilation. Because I think that cultural assimilation or integration is better than cultural dis-integration. I think gay people should be culturally integrated rather than stand apart as their own distinct culture resistant to change. And if you don't believe me that gay culture is resisting integration, just listen to

some people at a pride parade:

The purpose of Pride is not to normalize gay culture. We don't want our gay children to conform to straight culture. We want them to be accepted exactly as they are. If that's leather chaps and bare bums, then that's what we'll love.

That's horse scat and we should call it as such. We don't need gay spaces, we don't need a safe haven from *the straights*. We need to learn how to function in normal society. The gay ghettos are dying and justly so.

redgreenyellowblu • 1 point • 22 July, 2014 01:49 AM\*

I'll preface this by saying my perspective is that of a "collapsitarian"-- a gay one, of course!

I think it's impossible to predict how things will turn out for gays. But for certain, what would end would be the special and separate-but-equal gay "community", both ostracized by social conservatives and yet increasingly protected by the state and media. The ostracization is already dissolving, anyway. As straights start to give up marriage and gender roles become murky, gays are no longer so unique.

I had not known that the Dark Enlightenment was a classification of thought until you posed this question. On the other hand, I've immersed myself in red pill theory and in various collapse critiques of modern society/economics for a while, so it's not entirely new to me, either.

Having just read a little about dark enlightenment, a criticism I have is that some people seem to approach it as if it is a movement of thought that is reactionary against the thinking of the enlightenment. If that were the case, it would never gain much steam. What drives changing in thinking and political and social structures is economics, not philosophical discussions. Dark Enlightenment trends wouldn't go anywhere without a collapse of the current economic order. Now, I happen to believe that that very thing is on the horizon and underway.

But Dark Enlightenment is uniquely a product of the current order. It's possibly its last flowering. When the current order is fully collapsed, there is no more need for a reactionary thought opposed to it. Dark Enlightenment won't exist because there won't be a super-community discussing it over the internet based on abstract projections into the future. People will be sorting out immediate and pressing concerns that will determine their survival from one day to the next in the location that they live in.

People have argued over what the next stage looks like, but many agree that smaller, localized communities of interdependent and hard-working people will be the thing that remains. In these communities, people will be valued if they contribute and if they don't threaten social relations. So, a hard-working gay man or woman should be valued for their skills. Whether gayness is seen as a threat to the social order will depend on the locality of the community and how they treated gays to begin with. In the US, I'd probably NOT want to live in an area that was both socially/religiously conservative and at the same time does not have a strong tradition of "mind your own business". So, someone actually might do okay in conservative rural Montana, or at least better off than in rural Georgia where it's both conservative and where people tend to be busy-bodies. Many parts of the world have a long tradition of allowing a very specific place for effeminate gays (Latin America, Southeast Asia, e.g.) In these places, these traditions will probably continue since a "loud and proud" gay community in those places is very new and still not really accepted. In the US, black men will likely continue the practice of being married and on the "down-low" since they would have a hard time surviving as openly gay in that community. I just mentioned that as an example of how long-held traditions and new survival imperatives will create unique situations for gays very specific to their localities.

I think the key going into the future is to not get isolated in a gay ghetto or have only gay friends, but to live in a tight-knit community that values your social and economic contributions. The gay "community" is a short-lived blip that will go away. Also, there will be fracturing along ethnic lines. Being aware of existing ethnic tensions is important.

Lastly, at least from the point of view of collapse theory, the most important thing is thinking about survival as a *person*, not just a gay person. If you live in an urban area, you currently have a pro-gay bubble insulating you that makes life comfortable. But, urban areas are least fit for the coming economic changes and they are most dependent on state control and intensified population control measures. They will be tough to live in no matter if gay or straight. That's assuming we're headed for collapse--so take from this what you will.

Edit to add: What I was talking about was post-collapse, where there is no longer a super-state and interlocking corporations controlling things. As the collapse process intensifies, but while we still have a State and the corporate oligarchy, things could briefly turn to state sponsored dark-enlightenment inspired fascism as a way to maintaining control of the masses. But I don't see that as likely. I don't see western democracies turning against gays or against single moms, etc. They will try to mobilize public rage at people that can be painted as threats to internal security.