

You Don't Have To Be Right

August 25, 2013 | 48 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

<http://www.returnofkings.com/16114/you-dont-have-to-be-right>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

HumanSockPuppet • 33 points • 25 August, 2013 05:57 PM

Of course, the feminists who argue that men going their own way is wrong don't mean "wrong" in the sense of factual falsifiability.

They mean wrong in the ethical sense of the word.

It's *unethical* for men to go their own way without considering what might happen if we withdraw our tax money from the cuckolded state-husband.

It's *unethical* for men to throw off their gender responsibility of being providers (nevermind that women have thrown off their gender responsibilities of maintaining family integrity and unity).

It's *unethical* for men to try and game women for sex rather than make wives out of them.

The argument is absurd, but it is internally consistent when you consider other ways in which they selfishly rationalize why they should be provided for without expectation of incentive or remuneration.

amatorfati • 13 points • 25 August, 2013 08:00 PM

It's perfectly consistent when you realize by "ethical" they just mean whatever suits them.

ss_camaro • 4 points • 26 August, 2013 12:14 PM

Nevermind that women have thrown off their responsibilities...

Two can play at that game.

Chorus: *That's not fair !*

[deleted] 25 August, 2013 11:05 PM

[permanently deleted]

Max__Power • 4 points • 26 August, 2013 02:51 AM

Also give them the "What the fuck are you gonna do about it?" look.

[deleted] • 9 points • 25 August, 2013 09:02 PM*

One of my favorite recent articles talks about the difference between modern discourse (used by red pillers) and post-modern discourse.

Modern discourse characteristics

"personal detachment from the issues under discussion," the separation of participants' personal identities from subjects of inquiry and topics of debate;

values on "confidence, originality, agonism, independence of thought, creativity, assertiveness, the mastery of one's feelings, a thick skin and high tolerance for your own and others' discomfort";

suited to a heterotopic space like a university class, scholarly journal, or session of a learned society conference, a place apart much like a playing field for sports events, where competitors engage in ritual combat before returning with a handshake to the realm of friendly, personal interaction;

the best ideas are thought to emerge from mutual, merciless probing and attacking of arguments, with resultant exposure of blindspots in vision, cracks in theories, inconsistencies in logic;

the truth is understood not to be located in any single voice, but to emerge from the conversation as a whole.

Post-modern discourse characteristics

"persons and positions are ordinarily closely related," with little insistence on keeping personal identity separate from the questions or issues under discussion;

"sensitivity, inclusivity, and inoffensiveness are key values";

priority on "cooperation, collaboration, quietness, sedentariness, empathy, equality, non-competitiveness, conformity, a communal focus";

lacking "means by which to negotiate or accommodate such intractable differences within its mode of conversation," it will "typically resort to the most fiercely antagonistic, demonizing, and personal attacks upon the opposition";

"will typically try, not to answer opponents with better arguments, but to silence them completely as 'hateful', 'intolerant', 'bigoted', 'misogynistic', 'homophobic', etc.";

results in "stale monologues" and contexts that "seldom produce strong thought, but rather tend to become echo chambers."

I also wrote along similar lines in my post on Materialism vs. Idealism in politics. The TL;DR is that Idealism is for attempting to convince your opponent of what you think is true. Materialism is for winning at any cost. Often post-modern debate tactics can be an effective piece of a materialist strategy.

veggie_girl • 3 points • 25 August, 2013 11:48 PM

When I studied debate in college, for class work I had to compete in several debates. We were given the topic a week in advance but we did not know which side of the argument we were going to take until the day of the debate when we would flip a coin to decide.

Tackling topics with this approach made me open my mind to the idea that to properly learn everything there is to know, you must detach your personal bias from the study. And you really need to know both sides in order to properly convince others that one is better than the other.

It's much like you mentioned and I agree with you 100%.

I do not understand why people take post-modern debate seriously.

[deleted] 25 August, 2013 11:48 PM

[permanently deleted]

veggie_girl • 5 points • 25 August, 2013 11:53 PM

Thanks coin flip bot, you're a true hero.

VZPurp • 2 points • 25 August, 2013 11:57 PM

So she's not getting the sex change, after all :(

jaketesnake76 • 9 points • 25 August, 2013 08:51 PM

Hyperbolic charge wins..... in Congress a few years ago a congressman actually said that the charge against another member was so egregious (serious) that it just had to be investigated. When asked if there was any evidence to support this serious claim he said no but because it was a serious charge that is all that mattered. In the New Normal just make outrageous claim and evidence doesn't need be supplied. Wow..

[deleted] 25 August, 2013 11:31 PM

[permanently deleted]

jaketesnake76 • -2 points • 26 August, 2013 12:03 AM

unfounded rape allegation can destroy someone's life.

Some times this and spousal rape even being possible ,just blows ones mind..

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 August, 2013 05:28 PM

High five!