

# Why there cannot be equality

August 28, 2013 | 39 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

---

[http://np.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/1l6lu4/why\\_is\\_rmensrights\\_so\\_opposed\\_to\\_rtheredpill/cbw\\_ee6h](http://np.reddit.com/r/MensRights/comments/1l6lu4/why_is_rmensrights_so_opposed_to_rtheredpill/cbw_ee6h)

---

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

---

## Comments

---

VZPurp • 31 points • 28 August, 2013 05:31 PM

There will never be equality because they are trying to negotiate with women who want superiority. Disposability aside, MRAs are trying to rationally engage a group that would try every trick in the book to get rid of them. Many MRAs seem to conveniently ignore the animosity and deceptiveness their opponents employ, and the utter contempt they have for MRAs.

Put feminists in their place or continue to fail the giant shit test. One way or another the movement will be put to rest, and I'd rather that be before it's allowed to wreck society further.

Nutz76 • 9 points • 28 August, 2013 08:10 PM

Put feminists in their place or continue to fail the giant shit test.

Paul Elam discussed that in his latest video. You cannot be calm and factual, you have to get indignant and nasty or nobody will take you seriously on the grand scale. It's the squeaky wheel that gets the grease after all.

Sub8male • 0 points • 29 August, 2013 02:41 PM

That just gets you called a bitter neckbeard loser. Explaining it to them like a child works a lot better.

Whisper • 9 points • 29 August, 2013 12:28 AM

That's one way to look at it.

Another one is to ask the question:

**"What the hell does equality mean, anyway?"**

Does it mean everyone should treat everyone else the same?

Ridiculous. People aren't interchangeable.

Does it mean we all treat everyone equally well?

Also ridiculous. What is a unit of good treatment? How do we measure it? If we can't measure or compare two things, we can't make them equal.

Does it mean everyone has equal power?

Same problem. How do we measure power? How do we compare it?

Does it mean the law treats everyone the same?

Fine... but people are different. Men and women are different. Can't treat them the same because you have to legislate about, say, for example, reproductive issues.

Does it mean that everyone has equal protection of the law?

Sure could, but equal protection of an unequal law isn't equal.

*So what possible definition of equality between men and women can possibly exist?*

Answer is, none. We just have to try to use our judgement about, not what is equal, but what is *fair*.

Demonspawn • 3 points • 29 August, 2013 04:59 AM

Answer is, none. We just have to try to use our judgement about, not what is equal, but what is fair.

I'll be honest... I don't even give a shit about what's *fair* because *fair* is meaningless. I care about what advances the goal.

What's the goal? To have a society which continually advances such that the next generation can, overall, enjoy a better life than the previous generation.

I'm sick and fucking tired of the last few generations (yakno.. post women's suffrage but it really picked up post modern feminism) shitting all over their children to get what they wanted now. They're trading long term losses for short term gains. How dare they talk about morals while they're selling their children into debt slavery.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2013 08:08 PM

while they're selling their children into debt slavery.

Do you really think most of them even realize that?

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2013 08:01 PM

You make such good points and then slip at the end :/

Wanting life to be fair is kinda childish. Nature isn't fair (fairness would counteract evolution). The world isn't fair and it doesn't need to be.

That's what we have society for. We made such things as insurances, to spread the costs of high damage risk on multiple people so life becomes more bearable.

Also [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Just-world\\_fallacy](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Just-world_fallacy)

Whisper • 2 points • 1 September, 2013 06:23 PM

You mistake me.

Using the word "fair" isn't the same as wanting the universe to be fair, and wanting the universe to be fair isn't the same as thinking that it is.

The notion of justice is a piece of social and mental technology, one of the oldest we have. It is in fact, so old that it is ingrained in hominds... studies show that chimps and spider monkeys will forego a personal reward to deny one to others who have behaved "unfairly".

Without this notion of fairness, we do not have a model for incentivizing the behaviours we desire in others.

This not the same as believing the universe is just.

In more concrete terms, what I mean by fairness to both women and men is that both women and men have different needs, and are suited to make different contributions to others, individually or collectively. But if we expect them to do so, we must match incentives to contributions, and the nature of those incentives to needs. Neither men nor women will participate in your "society" if it does not give to them at least as much value as it extracts from them.

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 September, 2013 06:43 PM

I see, I made a wrong assumption of what you meant by it.

High five

Clauderoughly • 18 points • 28 August, 2013 05:11 PM

MR is full of male feminists these days who think female feminists can be reasoned with or dealt with like

adults.

90% of the posts in MR is "Look how mean feminists are to men ! Boo hoo hoo !"

Ill\_mumble\_that • 24 points • 28 August, 2013 06:04 PM\*

Those poor confused betas.

You know who doesn't complain? An alpha male who is getting ass on a daily basis while out there manipulating the system to his advantage to churn a profit.

That's reality. The current leaders who are men don't give a shit about other men, they have the current system wrapped around their fingers. Feminists don't give a shit about men. Women don't care about men until they end up as mothers with sons.

That's how it is. Complaining is going to do absolutely fuck all because nobody is going to listen. It works for women because that is all women know how to do, but even whitenknight-tards are starting to ignore it because of what listening to it has caused.

Lok\_Die • 2 points • 28 August, 2013 10:40 PM

The more savage and brutal you are, the more women will fall into traditional gender roles.

The more they bend over like good girls, knowing what they are actually worth.

LaserSoundMusic • 1 point • 28 August, 2013 06:03 PM

They are a bunch of pussies, gigantic pussies.

Ronfar • 6 points • 28 August, 2013 08:05 PM

They've got Steven Pinker's *The Blank Slate* on their sidebar's reading list, but a lot of the members at /r/MensRights still believe in egalitarianism and the blank slate...

no\_game\_player • 2 points • 28 August, 2013 11:53 PM

Probably just read the title and not the book...

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2013 08:11 PM

A subreddit is not a classroom nor a gang nor a tribe (and not a single person).

It's a very loose form or organization.

[deleted] • 9 points • 28 August, 2013 05:09 PM

In the interest of fairness, I have to say: I have legitimately had conversations with people who do in fact argue for equality of rights, responsibility, and disposability. I have.

The problem as I see it comes back to this: It is instinctive for the vast majority of people to realize that a woman is NOT as disposable as a man.

Sperm is cheap, eggs are expensive.

Paraphrasing /u/girlwriteswhat from a blogpost a good while ago: One man with ten women equals ten babies. And every human being instinctively knows that flipping those numbers to the reverse is a terrible, terrible survival strategy.

Demonspawn • 14 points • 28 August, 2013 05:28 PM

It is instinctive for the vast majority of people to realize that a woman is NOT as disposable as a man.

Another one of my other soundbites that didn't make it into that post:

Might makes right; numbers make might; women make numbers.

Without treating women as less disposable as men, a society that faces any type of conflict will be out-breed and conquered. It's even more true today in the many western multicultural societies which exist... the wars are being fought with wombs rather than with guns (for now).

dropit\_sphere • 4 points • 28 August, 2013 06:49 PM

I gotta say, you really nailed it in /MR. Thanks.

HumanSockPuppet • 7 points • 28 August, 2013 10:24 PM

Women are the evolutionary bottlenecks.

elheretic • 2 points • 28 August, 2013 07:35 PM

The reverse ten women and one male sounds like an optimal survival strategy in theory.

Until another group of males shows up and simply out muscles the single guy.

The equation is far more complicated than what is being presented.

Although sperm is cheap men provide much greater utility than women.

[deleted] • 7 points • 28 August, 2013 08:48 PM

No, I agree. What I wrote is a hyperbolic oversimplification.

The point being: In a given society, the ability of a woman to produce children will provide more of a benefit in most situations than the utility offered by a single male. With exceptions, and the obvious need for a reasonable balance.

All I'm saying is that that principle is probably the evolutionary reason for a lot of what is viewed today as benevolent sexism.

I won't even claim that it's a particularly useful principle in today's world, it may prove not to be. But I think our brains are wired to more easily believe it than not.

soapjackal • 2 points • 28 August, 2013 10:04 PM

It makes more sense considering the number of children actually survive past 3 without modern medicine.

Lok\_Die • 4 points • 28 August, 2013 10:41 PM

For a re-population strategy after victory, having men die works.

If you didn't win, you don't have to worry about re-population.

tallwheel • 2 points • 29 August, 2013 02:21 AM

Doesn't matter whether the single guy gets all the women pregnant or other guys muscle in and do it instead. Either way, the number of offspring the women have won't change much.

<http://youtu.be/l4E57To2Jxw>

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2013 08:30 PM

yep, more guys than the others and you outmuscle them and take their women, next iteration both sides have more men which reduces the overall reproductive capability though

maybe the natural birth rate is already a nash equilibrium?

puaSenator • 1 point • 28 August, 2013 05:16 PM

Exactly. I think just the nature of our species will never allow for equal disposability. No matter how hard it's fought for, disposability will always rest on a man's shoulders.

[deleted] 28 August, 2013 06:00 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S,M] • 11 points • 28 August, 2013 06:16 PM

Please make sure you do not vote. If you did accidentally, I encourage you to go back and unvote.

no\_game\_player • 6 points • 28 August, 2013 11:56 PM

One thing I've always been curious about on this topic: what if a person considers themselves a member of both communities in question? Is it supposed to be against the rules to participate in a thread under any circumstances if you were linked there from another subreddit? Or is it only "foreign", moblike behavior that's being targeted?

Like in this case, I'm subscribed to both. I read both. I certainly wouldn't consider myself representing TRP views in MR or MR views in TRP. If one links to another, do I need to make sure to ignore the linked thread?

I know this shouldn't be confusing but I've never really understood exactly where and how firmly the line should be drawn on such things...

tallwheel • 2 points • 29 August, 2013 02:25 AM

I say, if you're a subscriber of both subreddits, you can vote in both. Just don't subscribe to a subreddit so you can vote in a particular thread and then unsubscribe after or anything shitty like that.

no\_game\_player • 2 points • 29 August, 2013 05:04 PM

Aye, makes sense. That's basically how I've done it, apart from accounts where I find to my surprise I haven't yet subscribed where I meant to.

I did find it interesting to read a redpillschool comment over there after I made this comment...I'm not criticizing, really, just makes it a little more clear to me how complicated this all is.

MockingDead • 1 point • 29 August, 2013 01:05 AM

I was an MRA, but recently I have decided they are less useful to me than TRP.

no\_game\_player • 0 points • 29 August, 2013 01:16 AM

I wouldn't call either one "useful", personally, but I'm killing a bit of time here for a bit.

Not meaning to be insulting; I just find both to be somewhat like political philosophy: hyperbolic and entertaining but literally exaggerated. And mostly concerned with issues that aren't my everyday experience.

But as I wait for hits to build where they need to and other projects, may as well read a bit more of something from a different perspective.

And I like to talk. But am quite used to having to censor for one reason or another to avoid offense and bans...

MockingDead • 3 points • 29 August, 2013 01:51 AM

TRP solutions seems more and more useful everyday. MRAs just seem to whine.

TRP instructs you to be your best you. MRA just whine about how much better women got it.

VZPurp • 2 points • 29 August, 2013 05:10 AM

Well, you could have MRA who have swallowed TRP. They would stop engaging feminists - at least with any seriousness - and instead focus on acquiring power to achieve their goals.

MockingDead • 1 point • 29 August, 2013 02:31 PM

How do you know so much about me!

no\_game\_player • 2 points • 29 August, 2013 05:06 PM

Hey, I get it. I'm not trying to be a jerk (though succeeding without trying, eh?), and I do find it entertaining. It's just that, like I said, it doesn't really connect with how I actually live my life.

Yeah, I get that more people are doing self-improvement based on TRP than MRA, and I think that's great.

I'm just saying I'm not going to end up an alpha butterfly banging chicks every night anytime soon...

If I were looking for something that were my everyday, practical experience, I'd be in some online marketing subreddit or something.

MockingDead • 1 point • 29 August, 2013 05:14 PM

Oh, sure. I am more MGTOW using red pill to inspire self-improvement . I go out for sex very infrequently. Maybe once every other month. Perhaps in the next year I'll increase it to 5, but I really don't know what that would, so let's just work with what we got.

no\_game\_player • 2 points • 29 August, 2013 05:19 PM

Every other month = 6 times a year. So either that 5 is going down or you mean 5 times every other month or...probably reading too much into this. ;-p

Anyhow, yeah, I'm basically MGTOW but I don't identify as such. And that doesn't seem especially TRP to me. TRP seems like the "what comes next" part. Like MGTOW is unplugging; TRP is waking up. I'm still quite comfortable dreaming and waiting.

MockingDead • 2 points • 29 August, 2013 05:25 PM

I was shoehorning a Princess bride quote in the post. yeah, I just meant I am going to increase my frequency of going out.

SacreBleuMe • 2 points • 28 August, 2013 07:28 PM

I voted there, but it was before this thread was posted.

elheretic • 7 points • 28 August, 2013 07:37 PM

Vote brigading is needlessly passive aggressive and petty. Don't fight a pig in shit.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 August, 2013 07:54 PM

It is a fallacy to talk about MR as if it exists as an entity. It is not even a fixed set of people. Individuals change. People interested in MR are potential TRP material.

Generalizing them all as pussy betas doesn't do any good.