

# **A feminist takes off gloves and debates "sexual objectification" with me. Interesting read.**

28 upvotes | 15 April, 2013 | by redpillschool

---

[http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/1c9ngz/only\\_white\\_knights\\_women\\_and\\_feminists\\_objectify/c9f5v50?context=1](http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/1c9ngz/only_white_knights_women_and_feminists_objectify/c9f5v50?context=1)

---

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

---

## Comments

---

roe\_ • 14 points • 15 April, 2013 06:27 PM

I think it's great that this subreddit upvotes people who disagree intelligently.

nicethingyoucanthave • 12 points • 15 April, 2013 05:58 PM

There's a cute little game they play:

there's like a lot of different views on sex within the feminist movement.

And even then, it's not like the movement is monolithic. And these are just two feminist fields, there are many more. (That is by no means a complete list. Here is Wiki's, but I'm a little iffy on the accuracy of it.)

Feminism is extraordinarily broad.

This is as dishonest as a christian, to whom I might say, "my problem with christianity is the homophobia and anti-science policies" retorting: "nu uh! because there's lots of different christianity! some christians actually believe in evolution!!"

All you're really saying is that feminism is this magical thing that nobody can ever criticize because we'll just point to the one exception.

roe\_ • 12 points • 15 April, 2013 08:24 PM

Also - it's worth pointing out that TRP and the mansphere is also a big tent and growing. We're going to have at least as many problems with internal consistency.

I already find myself telling feminists I don't have to defend or agree with everything a particular MRA says.

redpillschool[S] • 4 points • 15 April, 2013 09:11 PM

Unlike MRAs we're not a movement so much as a group of guys with similar interests.

Newbie\_Sedditor • 10 points • 15 April, 2013 07:43 PM

Come on, it's totally reasonable for her to say, "That's not what *I* think; I can't speak for other people, only for myself," and then tell us what she thinks.

The problem was that her description of her own opinion ("I take sort of a middle ground here") was really vague. It did seem like maybe she was just trying to avoid being pinned down. But the problem was that she wasn't clear about what *she* thought. It's not her fault that "feminism" in general has a bunch of different factions.

30303030303030 • 5 points • 15 April, 2013 07:12 PM

NAFALT

\_Molon\_Labe\_ • 1 point • 16 April, 2013 03:46 AM

Then feminism is not an ideology at all [c'mon we already know this; you can't have an ideology with unfalsifiable precepts and claim it as fact,] and thus it is defunct.

GeorgeGordonByron • 2 points • 15 April, 2013 07:40 PM

the true origin of 'objectification'

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XJfe-948GYE>

p3ndulum • 2 points • 16 April, 2013 12:15 PM

My response: "Bees are attracted to flowers for a reason."

redpillshooled • 6 points • 15 April, 2013 10:39 PM\*

Since this is an obvious dummy account I feel a short disclaimer is warranted:

This is my sincere, non-trolling response to these discussions about the agency and objectification of women.

This is an important conversation for TRP which is frequently accused of objectification and misogyny. Even if you cannot answer these claims to *my* satisfaction, I think the sub can benefit from the discussion as it can be a resource to answer those claims for yourselves or others.

I am sure that (some) feminists and others in society will (sometimes) deny female agency, or otherwise objectify women, too. They can also objectify men. They should be criticized when they do.

Finally, TRP is not monolithic. That's one reason I included some citations. But try to avoid shifting the goal posts--these are all popular and sometimes central beliefs I have chosen, arising naturally from core material, so I know I won't be persuaded if you tell me that NATALT--not all TRPs are like that.

---

I believe TRP does objectify women. It does deny their agency, which fits /u/redpillschool 's framing of objectification, and also objectifies women in other ways.

### **1. Objectification by denying intrinsic value.**

Another characteristic of objects (besides lacking agency) is lacking intrinsic value. Objects have the value we give them, no more or less; a computer is valuable to me but not to someone who cannot use it. We can objectify women by saying they lack intrinsic value too.

**A.** "Women are only valuable for their pussies" [x]

"The value a woman has beyond the sexual only becomes relevant after she's been sexual." [x]

(To be fair I should handle the pre-emptive response from that article as well:

The binary response will be to presume I mean women are worthless beyond sex; that is not my premise. What I am illustrating is that there will always be a condition of sexuality between the sexes that influences our dealings with each other.

So, women aren't worthless beyond sex, they're only worthless to EVERY PERSON beyond sex because every person is subject to the sexual condition that influences our dealings with her. That is to say, a cat, for example, might find non-sexual value in a woman. You can't have it both ways. For all endeavors that we have with them, women are only valuable because of sex, so stick to your guns. Or if not, at the very least this criticism still applies within the more limited context argued for here.)

Pussies and child-rearing: Women rely on men for this value. When there are no cocks able/willing to penetrate them (and no bio children to raise), they have no value. This is extrinsic.

**B.** Women cannot bring "masculine" value (ie, all other value except for pussy) to a marriage/relationship

TRP recognizes the value that men brought to marriages by providing, but denies any value to the same provisions when brought by women. [x]

Men today are still expected to earn and provide. But women have found a way to renege on the only feature they brought to the marriage: the womb and access to it.

C. Women and social value: [they should not vote and cannot contribute to society]. Men can inherit value from the historical accomplishments of their gender; women do not.

As in marriages, so in society: women do not accumulate value from achieving the very same things that would accumulate value for men.

## 2. TRP denies the agency of women

### A. Spousal rape

Paraphrasing: "Because spousal rape is only a legal concept, then at least some women lack agency in sex (those who married their agency away, either before this legal concept existed, in places where it is not recognized, or outside of the context of a legal discussion). Moreover, all married women *ought* to lack agency in sex, and marriage has suffered because of the perverse legal concept undermining this reality."

In contrast: agency/consent is continually present-progressive. Agreeing to sex yesterday does not imply consent to sex tomorrow. Agency even allows us to break previous agreements (which is why most well-crafted agreements specify terms for breaking them).

### B. Date rape, and the Shotgun Wedding

(Paraphrased) "Rape is not the crime of violating the agency of women, but of reducing the respect and modesty value they carry." [x]

Feminists understand rape, however, not as a violation of a woman's chastity or marital fidelity, but of her merely personal wishes. They are making use of the ancient law against rape to enforce not respect for feminine modesty but obedience to female whims. ... The date rape issue can be solved overnight by restoring shotgun marriage—but with the shotgun at the woman's back. The "victim" should be told to get into the kitchen and fix supper for her new lord and master.

This denies both agency in sex *and* agency in marriage/partner selection! That's wonderfully convenient since once a woman is forced into a marriage, she is (per above) forced into sex for the rest of her life.

### C. Evolutionary psychology

Paraphrased: "Women are programmed, by genetics (evolutionary psychology) and culture (feminism). They cannot rise above this programming. Men receive programming from the same sources, but can rise above it to change their behavior." [x]

This idea is also present in the overwhelming majority of official & suggested reading for the sub.

And it is a direct denial of agency in regards to rising above our programming. Men have it, women do not.

EDIT: And then of course there are just the direct, explicit denials of women's agency. Women have no agency, no explanation needed--they're objects.

redpillschool[S] • 10 points • 16 April, 2013 03:34 AM\*

#### 1. Objectification by denying intrinsic value

A. "Women are only valuable for their pussies" [x[4] ] "The value a woman has beyond the sexual only becomes relevant after she's been sexual." [x[5] ]

Nobody denies that women have intrinsic value to themselves or society. The poster corrected what he said later in that post, which was "they are only valuable *to me* in that capacity. This could span men and women. If you, as a man, do not provide something of value (friendship, laughter, goods, services) I also see no value in you. It just happens my value for men is different for women. But if you are to say that value judgement is objectifying, then let's be honest- all human interaction is objectifying (and therefore the term is meaningless

under this context).

B. Women cannot bring "masculine" value (ie, all other value except for pussy) to a marriage/relationship

It's not that men would deny them the right- it's that once we do, we find quickly we are no longer able to do so. Being the stay at home dad as the mother brings home the bacon is the quickest way to lose her attraction. Mind you- her value to us as men is access to the womb, so a stay at home dad wouldn't be in the same position of losing attraction.

C. Women and social value: [they should not vote and cannot contribute to society]. Men can inherit value from the historical accomplishments of their gender; women do not.

Historically women did not contribute, but that doesn't mean we view they cannot now. A more realistic view would be simple: Women can contribute, but understand that with a shorter window of opportunity for mating, they may have to chose between social contribution and familial. (Life ain't fair, is it).

As for voting, the only argument you'll get from me is not one of value. Women shouldn't have been given the vote without the responsibility attached to it (conscription). Neither should any group be given the right (illegal immigrants) if they do not share our responsibilities to our country.

1. TRP denies the agency of women

A. Spousal rape

Consent to sex during marriage is in the bible. Women have all the agency in the world, and can choose not to get married. This does not deny the agency of women any more than a man who joins the army voluntarily is denying the agency of men, despite the fact that he will be kept in service, sometimes forcibly, until his contract is finished. He may lose bodily autonomy via this contract, he may even lose his life.

B. Date rape, and the Shotgun Wedding

Sexual Utopia in power is a masterpiece at helping us understand the social and legal climate we live in today. Not by any means a guidebook.

C. Evolutionary psychology

Paraphrased: "Women are programmed, by genetics (evolutionary psychology) and culture (feminism). They cannot rise above this programming. Men receive programming from the same sources, but can rise above it to change their behavior." [x[10]

First of all, I'm not going to comment on content that's not on therepill, but I will say that anybody who believes this would get an argument from me. Both men and women have a certain programming, yes. The difference here is whether men or women have the necessary pressures to need to adapt. Everybody has the ability to override their lizard brain. The question is, what causes people to do so, and are those pressures at work in certain scenarios?

By and large your questions/arguments are a mischaracterization of the general values here. And I do speak on behalf of the red pill, as one of the main curators I ensure we stay on focus in these ways.

Edited: missed a few bullets.

redpillsschooled • 2 points • 20 April, 2013 07:30 PM\*

Nobody denies that women have intrinsic value to themselves or society. The poster corrected what he said later in that post, which was "they are only valuable to me in that capacity."

That capacity is "every relationship anyone has with a woman" because of the "sexual condition" that inevitably moderates those relationships; his own words.

So as I said: at the very least, in the context that you're trying to limit this to, you are objectifying women. That means at best, you don't objectify the waitress that you're not remotely interested in, but always inevitably objectify any woman you have any relationship of any kind with.

In contrast, men (and any non-object) can do things completely independently on their own that increase their own value to others, to their partner. They do not rely on the whims of women to give them an opportunity to provide value.

If you, as a man, do not provide something of value (friendship, laughter, goods, services) I also see no value in you. It just happens my value for men is different for women.

Yes. Where TRP missteps is in arguing that your personal experience (your personal valuation of women more specifically) here is or ought to be universal to all men (which even seems to deny the existence of your very own, dearly beloved Betas). Many men have female friends, and can even have "friendships" with their girlfriends/wives--ie, a sexual partner that they value for more than their sexual value.

If the friendship, laughter, goods, services etc of women are never valued (as they are for men), or never ought to be valued (I suppose because it ruins your dating game strategy and makes you a beta/less attractive)--then you are arguing against the intrinsic value of women and reducing them to sex-tools.

It's not that men would deny them the right- it's that once we do, we find quickly we are no longer able to do so. Being the stay at home dad as the mother brings home the bacon is the quickest way to lose her attraction.

This is a radical shift of the goal post. The discussion before this said that marriage was undermined because only men are bringing anything to the table now that women have weaseled out of their only/sex obligations. Men are bringing material goods, and women can too--but only a man's contribution has value in the context of the marriage, apparently. A female provider is not contributing to the marriage. Marriage cannot survive then because it is one-sided.

If you're really walking back from that, instead saying that those marriages are fair and good but have a higher failure rate, I am thrilled. It would require you to say that marriage is not ended by the legal concept of spousal rape, that it exists just fine so long as both bring something of value to it. But I doubt that is your intent because you contradict it in your very next sentence:

Mind you- her value to us as men is access to the womb, so a stay at home dad [sic] wouldn't be in the same position of losing attraction.

(And it is contradicted above, and below when commenting on spousal rape, as well)

So, because *you* only value women for their wombs, and a womb is the only thing of value a woman can contribute (for you) to a marriage, you are objectifying women (at least within the context of all relationships) by forcing them to rely on you to have value. Any moment that husbands do not want sex, wives are completely valueless to them--even if they can find someone else in society that values (does not objectify) them.

Consent to sex during marriage is in the bible.

So is a lot of fucked up shit that we know you don't agree with, like polygamous marriage, buying and selling women, forcible gang rape of women as an ideal of hospitality, treatment of slaves, prohibition against mixing fabrics, chastity (for men), pi equaling 3, creation happening in two different orders. As always, this is a selective text.

It's not a Christian nation/world, nor is marriage a Christian concept.

This does not deny the agency of women any more than a man who joins the army voluntarily is denying the agency of men, despite the fact that he will be kept in service, sometimes forcibly, until his contract is finished.

Actually you're using this example exactly backwards--it demonstrates perfectly what I said. Agreements are "made to be broken." Even after signing up voluntarily for military service, the only thing the government can *force* you to do is serve out jail time if you decide not to serve, which is exactly what the agreement stipulated. They can't force you to pull triggers or push papers.

Similarly, marriage contracts can have failure clauses (prenups), but women cannot be forced to have sex even if they signed an agreement that had stipulated to it generally (or even specifically)--which marriage contracts do not do.

Sexual Utopia in power is a masterpiece at helping us understand the social and legal climate we live in today. Not by any means a guidebook.

This masterpiece explains that women lack sexual agency and ought to lack agency in choosing partners. It is selected reading for the subreddit. Will every or any TRP live by it?--no, NATALT! but if your selected TRP masterpieces are objectifying women, that's a problem for your movement.

First of all, I'm not going to comment on content that's not on the redpill, but I will say that anybody who believes this would get an argument from me. Both men and women have a certain programming, yes. The difference here is whether men or women have the necessary pressures to need to adapt. Everybody has the ability to override their lizard brain. The question is, what causes people to do so, and are those pressures at work in certain scenarios?

This seems to either apply evolutionary psychology only when it is convenient and discard it otherwise, or use it to reach contradictory/any outcome required.

Dating game landscape makes "beta strategy" a loser for men that lowers their SMV, so (enter TRP) they evolve. Feminist-endorsed strategies: "cock carousels," and "spousal rape" which permits women to withhold the only thing of value (making them literally valueless) are losers for women, also lowering SMV. So women are devolving in the same direction men are evolving. TRP cannot hold simultaneously that "cock carousels reduce SMV of women" and "women do not have evolutionary pressure to adapt away from them"--it's a contradiction.

[deleted] • 2 points • 16 April, 2013 07:02 AM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 16 April, 2013 01:15 PM

Quoting the bible regarding a religious institution doesn't help my argument when discussing said institution?

Listen, by all means, nobody has to enter into marriage. But if you decide you're going to, why would you do so if you don't even believe in it?

redpillschool • 2 points • 20 April, 2013 07:25 PM

You need a history lesson. Not only do plenty of other religions have no such bones about marriage, but marriage was secular long before it was Christian, and

Marriage in the United States has always been a civil matter. Civil authorities may permit

religious leaders to solemnize marriages but not to determine who may enter or leave a civil marriage. Religious leaders may determine independently whether to recognize a civil marriage or divorce but that recognition or lack thereof has no effect on the relationship under state law. a. Tr 195:13-196:21 (Cott: “[C]ivil law has always been supreme in defining and regulating marriage. \* \* \* [Religious practices and ceremonies] have no particular bearing on the validity of marriages. Any clerics, ministers, rabbis, et cetera, that were accustomed to \* \* \* performing marriages, only do so because the state has given them authority to do that.”); b. Cal Fam Code §§ 400, 420.

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 20 April, 2013 07:30 PM

Son, my conversation was about Christian marriage. I never denied any other forms of marriage.

Don't like your tone.