

# "I would rather be murdered than raped" -- a theory on why sex is special

July 27, 2014 | 66 upvotes | by [Archwinger](#)

---

We put one of my wife's friends up in our guest room this weekend; he was in from out of town for a conference. We're all up late, drinking beers (wine for my wife), and this guy starts to open up a little bit. His situation is kind of interesting. His wife has a lot of problems with her female parts, and after a lot of issues, turned out to be unable to have kids. So the two of them decided to adopt, which is great, but also a real bear. While any drunken, drugged up idiot under the sun can procreate without restriction and abuse the fuck out of their own kids, there are extreme measures in place to stop normal, psychologically average, middle class people who badly want children from adopting and caring for an unwanted kid that's not biologically theirs. This seems pretty darn shocking alongside the state's zeal for making men pay child support for unwanted children that aren't biologically theirs, but whatever. Adoption requires you to pass more fitness and character tests than it takes to get into the FBI. And this guy and his wife are serious masochists. They're so gosh darn goodhearted that they decided they want to adopt an older child (you get a stipend from the state if you adopt a difficult-to-place child), who comes from a bad situation. And being authorized to participate in the foster system, then adopting an abused foster kid is even more of a bear than plain jane adoption.

After leaping through more hoops than a circus monkey, they were finally given permission to adopt the oldest boy from a family of three kids in the foster system. The kid had been beaten, sexually abused, neglected, passed off to a relative who did even worse things, passed off to a foster family who did even worse things, then ended up with my wife's friend.

So you'd think that the bar is pretty low and just about any placement anywhere would be better than the kid's past situations, but the state requires this guy to sit through countless hours of classes on child abuse to make sure he doesn't accidentally fuck up and abuse the kid somehow. So he's telling story after story of all kinds of disgusting sexual abuse from his latest class – with kids as young as 18 months. This shit really turns your stomach. I can't imagine what's going through a fucked-up guy's head when he has to take a baby girl's diaper off to get to her vagina – I'm getting nauseous just typing that.

And so this guy goes on to say that back in college, one of his previous girlfriends was sexually abused. As you can probably imagine from his desire to save an abused kid from the universe, despite how badly the universe seems to want to stop him (and the fact that this kid is going to have some serious and permanent problems and anything but a normal life despite this guy's best efforts), my wife's friend is a bit of a white knight. His college girlfriend story goes about the way you'd expect. This abuse victim he wanted to save and comfort just couldn't seem to get really close to him and form a proper relationship – definitely no sex. Eventually, she dumped him, citing her past abuse as an excuse, and he was happy for her. She went on to fuck a lot of guys in college, but she was working through her issues, so that was fine with him.

He commented that sexual abuse is the worst thing ever, and said that the absolute worst thing that could ever happen to anybody in his family or anybody he knows or cares about would be being raped. He'd rather someone he knows be murdered than raped. His words, not mine.

My wife, sitting next to me, agrees wholeheartedly and says, "Me, too. I'd rather be killed than get raped. And not just 'cause death is the easy way out. I'd rather be beaten within an inch of my life, no matter how bad it hurts or how disabled I end up, than raped."

Now I'm sitting there, and I agree that rape is pretty shitty, but you'd rather be dead? Nothing else in your

life has changed except for the fact that a man stuck his penis inside of you without your permission. It sucks, it's hard, but you still have family, friends, a job, a good life – nothing else changes. You'd rather give all of that up and be dead, never see your husband or daughter again, and have your daughter grow up without a mother, than be violated once by some man?

This conversation got me thinking out loud that night, so I went on to ask, what's the difference, really, between being beaten up and being raped? If I'm stronger than a woman and want to exercise my power and control over her, and I punch her in the face repeatedly until she's uglier than a horse's ass, against her will, while she screams and cries and is helpless to stop me, making her a victim of my evil abuse, what's the difference if I punch her face versus punching her vagina? And taking that a step farther, what's the actual, physical difference if I rape a girl instead of beating her up? They both violate her against her will, they both involve me exercising my power and highlight her weakness and helplessness, they both do lasting harm, they're both seriously illegal, they're both classified as kinds of abuse.

Neither my wife or her friend could really explain it. There's just something special and sacred about sex and our private parts, they say. Probably a cultural/societal thing.

So I proposed my theory: The difference between me punching a woman's face with my fist and shoving my penis into her vagina doesn't lie with her body. It lies with mine. I will achieve orgasm and have sexual gratification using this woman's body if I rape her. Not so if I just beat her.

The difference between rape and a beating is that the rapist has an orgasm. The reason rape is perceived as so much worse than any other kind of violence/abuse is because the perpetrator achieves sexual gratification. At the expense of his victim.

Countless wives in unhappy marriages across the world are disgusted by the thought of having sex with their loser husbands. They'll close their eyes and spread their legs for once-a-month duty sex just to keep the paychecks coming, but they feel dirty afterward. Violated. They didn't really want the sex. But it doesn't take long, doesn't cost them anything, it's not physically difficult or mentally challenging – they just lay there with their legs open. So what's so bad about it? The guy has an orgasm. That's what's so bad about it. A loser man achieving sexual gratification at the expense of a woman is something that unconsciously disgusts women, at the very core of their beings.

They're not hurt to any greater extent by unwanted sex than they are by a beating or a murder, but if you ask any woman on the planet what she'd prefer, she'd rather be beaten or killed than raped. She won't understand why rape is so special or so much worse, but when you think about it, there's only one fundamental difference between raping a woman and beating her: During rape, the guy climaxes. The sexual pleasure he achieved is something women feel that he "took" from his victim. The male orgasm is something women are supposed to dole out to worthy men. They hate whores, shame sluts, think porn is disgusting – that orgasm you have is something you're only supposed to get when a woman finds you worthy. That's the difference between a rape and a beating – not the victim's experience, but the perpetrator's.

---

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

---

## Comments

---

[deleted] • 47 points • 27 July, 2014 03:21 AM

I don't think we should overlook that she risks bearing a child of a man she found unworthy.

Archwinger[S] • 23 points • 27 July, 2014 03:25 AM\*

Even non PIV assault is regarded as a fate worse than death. A creepy guy getting excited about fingering you against your will? She'd rather be stabbed.

DexterousRichard • 13 points • 27 July, 2014 04:11 AM

By some it's regarded that way, but I should note that our legal system generally sees it as less severe than murder. Because it is.

CaribaLd • 2 points • 28 July, 2014 12:11 AM

Yes, and because if it wasn't, a rapist would have something to gain from murdering his victim afterwards - she wouldn't be able to tell what happened. By punishing murder more severely than rape, you are less likely to kill the victim afterwards.

platochronic • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 08:54 PM

Doesn't that go against your 'orgasm' theory though? The perpetrator of sex abuse who is only fingering doesn't necessarily achieve orgasm. So it's got to be something besides an orgasm.

Archwinger[S] • 1 point • 28 July, 2014 02:18 AM

Sexual gratification might not necessarily include cumming in or on the woman. There's still something more about some skeezy loser fingering an unwilling woman versus a thug punching her lights out to steal her purse.

platochronic • 2 points • 28 July, 2014 06:21 AM\*

I just don't think your sample size is high enough to make a such a claim that rape is worse than murder. I'd rather get raped be murdered. And I'm saying that from the vantage point of someone who was raised by a sexually abused mother and someone who has a sexually abused brother. I suppose this is getting very personal now.

I know that I probably shouldn't ever have children because I believe that my mother's sexual abuse has severely affected me and it's probably hurt me in ways that even I can't possibly see. I'm afraid I might continue the cycle onto my potential children. Not necessarily through sexual abuse, but I don't see myself becoming a good stable father because I'm at a point in my life where I can barely take care of myself. In fact, I don't talk to my mother to this very day because of how much it's affected our relationship. I'm also currently a recovering benzo addict and sometimes I wonder whether I'm repressing sexual abuse memories of my own.

I also can see how sexual abuse turned my brother into a raging alcoholic. It destroyed him for a period. But he's overcome it. He's a new person. I'm still detoxing off my addiction, which has been hell, but I'm on the path to a better life. And through it all, if you'd ask me, I'd still rather those things have happened to my mother and my brother than have them murdered.

First and foremost, I never would have been born if my mother was murdered. I still have a very

close relationship with my brother and I've seen how much he's improved as a person. But if you ask me, I'd rather be raped 100 times than be murdered. And I'm not trying to undermine sexual abuse because I've seen firsthand the damage it can do to people and I've certainly been indirectly (and possibly directly) affected by it.

We've all suffered greatly, but we're all working towards becoming better people. It's something that we've never given up on and it's brought us together (for the most part) as a family and it's taught me how you should never give up on family.

I know someday I'll forgive my mother for the damage she's done to me (I think I've been more so narcissistically abused by her). But my brother and I are striving to become musicians and I believe it's helped our art. I know that may sound fucked up to say, but I think the reason we've been able to find so much artistic progress is because we've suffered so much.

I'm not saying you have to suffer to become an artist, but often times you see the best artists coming from damaging backgrounds. Sure, many of them do much self-harm through drug abuse, but the world would be without much of its great art if it weren't for much suffering. I'm not saying that the suffering causes art, certainly not, but I've personally seen how the human spirit can use art to transcend their suffering, if only as a way to escape the pain they've endured. And I'd rather those things have happened for the sake of art than for them to never have happened at all.

You can just say I have a dissenting opinion, but I've been lurking on TRP for a while and agreed with much that I've seen, but this is one post that I wholeheartedly disagree with and I think it adds nothing to the theory. I find it disgusting because it doesn't acknowledge what the human spirit is possible of overcoming. Suffering of this nature may cause a lot of pain (God knows I've seen the thick of it), but it can also create the world's most beautiful things, like bringing people together as family and creating art.

Maybe I'm just taking this a little too personally, but I don't see how this adds to TRP theory. If anything, I think it's saying if you're going to rape someone, you're better off killing them than not. I know that's probably a fucked up way of reading it, but I think this post is garbage and the whole theory should be disregarded in its entirety. And that's saying a lot because I've found a lot of truth in this subreddit, but this post makes me sick.

Lastly, and most importantly, notice how the two people you've referenced haven't directly suffered from sexual abuse themselves, but they're speaking from an outside perspective. Sure, your wife's friend may have seen other people affected by it, but I don't know how much of your sample has really seen what sexual abuse has done to people. He may have brought this upon himself by adopting, which I think is noble, but take notice how he's not letting it stop him from creating a family, which is a beautiful thing. I think you should reconsider your theory, as someone who has been around these sorts of people all my life.

Sexual abuse is tragic, but humans can overcome tragedy, but they can't overcome death. We'll all die someday, and we'll all suffer, but to say I'd rather be dead than to suffer is, in my mind, akin to saying I'd rather have never lived at all than to have lived a tragic life, which is a fundamentally distorted perspective IMO, whatever that's worth. I don't think your wife and her friend know what they're saying and it's wrong of you to apply this to TRP theory. That's coming from someone who's found much inspiration (and personal success ;) ) from TRP.

edit: and before this becomes the issue, I know there's been a lot of talk about how TRP is not designed to cater to those who are offended. While I am offended, and I'll readily admit that, I just want to acknowledge that my contention with your idea is not based around the fact that I'm

offended, but I straight up believe that your theory is wrong and I have provided an argument against it. So I want to acknowledge that my dissenting opinion transcends the fact I'm offended and perhaps I should have focused more on the fact that I simply disagree with the idea and that my disagreement is not grounded on me being offended, but I simply believe that your proposed idea is false, and I hope the offense I've taken from your idea has not diluted the strength of my counterargument, even though some may inevitably argue that it has.

[deleted] • -4 points • 27 July, 2014 08:06 AM

I'd rather she be stabbed as well.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 05:49 PM

In your pussy. With a finger.

theozoph • 2 points • 28 July, 2014 02:20 PM

I think OP is onto something, our psychological gears are not related to long-term consequences, but to immediate feelings : we have sex because it feels good, we dislike rotten food because it tastes bad, we feed our children because they trigger our protective instincts. None of that is mediated by our long-term projection capabilities.

The disgust women feel at low SMV male sex might be in the same category : an evolutionary mechanism that ensured only the most competent males would pass their seed, hence ensuring high quality offsprings, therefore more children, and starting off a positive feedback for the selection of "digusted by low SMV male sex" instincts.

Burner1701 • 1 point • 28 July, 2014 02:27 AM

She risks bearing the child of a fucking rapist.

redpillshadow • -1 points • 27 July, 2014 08:48 AM

she risks bearing a child of a man she found unworthy.

In today's western world we can overlook that.

We\_Are\_Legion • 34 points • 27 July, 2014 04:22 AM\*

Nope. Doesn't explain it. Averseness to losing control of your sexuality is instinctive, unconscious and too uniform for that. Even very young children experience the trauma from the extreme stress and fear, even though they can't handle it as well as adults nor have much concept of being revolted on the basis of SMV.

One of the ways I think about and explain it is through the way consent is obtained. Human beings have an extraordinarily elaborate mating process. Involving a myriad of conscious and subconscious behaviours and fitness checking. If any one part goes wrong... the entire thing is compromised or set back significantly. The *actual attraction fades*.

Most of these rituals involve the male qualifying to the female. Since he has fewer markers he looks for.

Now notice, not only does a woman's body involve a carrot to make her properly carry out this long drawn out process(attraction, eventually love)... it involves a deep psychological stick to make her never want to engage in sex outside of it. Even people who've never been raped, they know the fear of it. We can all **empathize** with the victim. Even though rationally like you said, we're just rubbing bits together. The key difference is you're doing it outside the script your sexuality has set for you. Similarly with men too. If you have zero homosexual

tendencies, you might feel violated by a kiss from a man.

The reason I think this strong averseness evolved is a woman who lost control of her sexual choice, was doomed to a terrible life. Not only would she be pregnant with a potentially unfit child, she'd be helpless and have to provide for it alone. She'd be ostracized from potential mates who want chastity. She might be hurt during it. Her other children might suffer. Just a world of pain.

This does not apply to violating someone else's script though in favour of your own. Men generally are raped less... less strict script, but for women... not so much.

Rape has been such a central theme of human history that the whole race has evolved nightmares of it. And you get evolution's nice surprises everywhere too. For example, some women have adapted ways of loving it. While another subset have evolved ways of loving their rapists(Stockholm's).

trias\_e • 15 points • 27 July, 2014 05:26 AM\*

I wouldn't take most people's opinion on this seriously. It's easy to say 'I'd rather die than X', but when actual death is imminent, one's actual reaction would be much different. People can't mentally put themselves in extreme states like this by just imagining it. Only if someone has experienced both a life or death situation and rape could you take them seriously when they say this.

tallwheel • 2 points • 28 July, 2014 03:17 AM

Plus, we can't ask dead people if they would have rather been raped than killed.

[deleted] • 9 points • 27 July, 2014 08:20 AM

There is an evolutionary explanation to it (and there is a book on it:

[http://www.amazon.com/Natural-History-Rape-Biological-Coercion/dp/0262700832/ref=sr\\_1\\_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1406448750&sr=8-1&keywords=natural+history+of+rape](http://www.amazon.com/Natural-History-Rape-Biological-Coercion/dp/0262700832/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1406448750&sr=8-1&keywords=natural+history+of+rape) ). Rape hurts a woman psychologically, because in the past it meant involuntarily giving up her mate choice and 9 months of her time and energy through pregnancy. And for men, being raped by a man hurts psychologically, because it reduces their status.

[deleted] • 15 points • 27 July, 2014 05:20 AM

I had a horrible childhood. For a nearly a decade of my life (5yo-13yo) I was routinely beaten and sexually abused (homosexually, to clarify I am a straight guy). The part that I dreaded and detested the most were the beatings. Although the humiliation of some of the sexual encounters was unpleasant, it was never as painful as the vicious beatings.

It's because of that experience that I never bought the argument that rape is worse than murder. I am very much glad to be alive.

Later on when I finally saw therapists regarding some anxiety problems, predictably they got hung up on my past sexual abuse. They were quick to lay the blame of every problem in my life to those experiences and simply would not accept that to me it was not the most unpleasant part. One female psychologist actually refused to see me after I openly told her that I do not see the connection between my current anxiety and past sexual abuse here.

theozoph • 1 point • 28 July, 2014 02:24 PM

One female psychologist actually refused to see me after I openly told her that I do not see the connection between my current anxiety and past sexual abuse here.

Once more, the uselessness of female psychologists is demonstrated. Sorry for what you had to go through, man.



slfnfld • 1 point • 28 July, 2014 03:04 PM\*

One of the many unpleasant truths in our time is that statistically, a large majority of therapists you meet blind will be mostly useless to you. From my own experience and that of many others, it seems like less than half are what I would consider basically competent-- and even those are going to have uneven specializations, it's just human nature. Kinda funny for a job where most of what you need to do is keep your mouth shut.

Edit: What I'm saying is, without a quality referral (and maybe even with one), someone who's looking into therapy should probably check out a few for a better chance at finding one they click with.

riverraider69 • 4 points • 27 July, 2014 07:28 AM

Rape is actually well documented as causing prolonged (and sometimes irrecoverable) depression in its victims in many many cultures and societies. It's a small mystery in anthropology - or at least I wasn't able to find a proper explanation at the time. Whatever the root cause is, it is clear that the damage is real and usually huge. The obvious explanation would be that it's somehow related to the virgin female's value in the society. Marrying a virgin is pretty much the only way a man can be sure her children are his, so he is free to openly invest in the relationship (which men actually do want, btw). This is usually much appreciated by the girl's family too, who is quite happy that she is in this kind of relationship etc. But there are still steps missing - it's bad to lose that, but the psychological effects are still worse, and are there even for older, married women.

[deleted] 27 July, 2014 03:20 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 9 points • 27 July, 2014 03:56 AM

Sex as power, is at the core of feminist ideology. That sex is an act of power and to be a man acting with sexual power is oppressive to the woman he's fucking.

Untrue. It's not the sex that is disgusting to women (in regard to OP's post). Remember, most radfems are lesbians and they crafted feminism to suit their ideals. In fact, their view of sexuality shows the twisted nature of their mental state.

They are unattracted to men on an intellectual level but I don't doubt many still have biological urges towards men, especially if there is sexual trauma at an early age. They have to justify their "oppression" (biological feelings) with their intellectual desire (lesbianism). They don't feel satisfied unless around attractive men but, hate men for this "power" they have.

This is why their ideology tries to undermine male sexuality, to give them an advantage over people that they think has power over them. This feeling of powerlessness comes from internal biological hard-wiring that drives them to still be stimulated by men on a sexual and intimate level, despite their lesbianism.

Very rarely do radfem lesbians start out as lesbians. If you look at feminist history, many early members were either married or dated men before converting to their new ideology. They weren't lesbians to begin with. It's why the crazy is always getting ratcheted up, because so long as men exist, there can never be enough control for the radfems...Because any male exercising his sexuality MUST be punished for it.

It could be mandated, by law, that young boys have to dress like girls and learn to put on makeup, and they STILL wouldn't be happy, because the internal concepts of feminism arise from trauma and perceived culpability.

"You are responsible for my oppression because your penis is oppressive to me on a sexual level! You can fuck me and I can't fuck you back! If I am the fuckee of this relationship, then I have no power!"

Relationships at their core are not about power but cooperation and trust. Authority is the role of the man, who has the best interests of the woman at heart. Devotion is the role of the woman, who will seek to support the man who has her best interests at heart.

These relationships happen naturally and have been screwed up by the philosophy of sexual authority, in and of itself. Sex isn't about power...It's about Sex! Nothing more, nothing less.

Reproduction risk/reward is the nasty obstacle that we've been trying to work around in regards to Sex but, that's a whole different story.

OP's post is food for thought at least.

[deleted] 27 July, 2014 04:59 AM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -4 points • 27 July, 2014 08:35 AM\*

Rape is considered so heinous because it removes a woman's agency to choose the most powerful available man.

And just because you're pithy doesn't mean you know what you're talking about.

You cannot hold up rape as an example of human sexuality specifically because it is not the normal way that humans reproduce. Rape in and of itself is about power but that does not mean that Sex is a matter of Power.

Yes, biology is a big part of sex but it does not govern sex, it only facilitates it. Biology can show us but it can't speak and tell us why it does what it does. Ultimately, the interpretation of what our biology means is arbitrary thus, it makes more sense to view sex as sex, and rape as rape. Both are sexual acts but fundamentally different in their execution and results.

The natural aspects of rape shouldn't influence our views on healthy sex, it should only stand out as a testament to what is not healthy sexual behavior.

Power is the capacity to participate in the ongoing shaping of our reality.

That is a definition of power that is so fucking broad and vague that it renders the entire idea of "Sex as Power" pointless. Let me see if I have your bullet points straight:

"Evolution and natural selection help us shape our reality and as a consequence, this includes sexual selection. Since sexual selection is tied to our reality and survival, the ability to control Sex is Power, in the sense that it practically shapes the future of our species. Thus, Sex is Power."

This is a third grader's understanding of evolution. Sexual reproduction does not guarantee successful offspring, regardless of whomever is fucking whom or why. Every successful conception is a roll of the dice. This is why evolution encourages the species that reproduce THE MOST! Genetic fitness is a factor but only in so far as what is needed to produce more.

The other factor to take into consideration is childbirth killing both the mother and baby. The rate of mortality for birthing women was around 1 in 4 for most of human history. Rape wasn't heinous because of agency or genetic fitness, it was heinous because it could result in a pregnancy that could literally fucking kill you.

History is full of examples of women engaging in sex without agency but, marriage is the most stable because it ensures that even if the mother dies, the offspring will live.

Regardless of whether a rapist cares about offspring, he's putting the woman's life at risk by taking her against her will. A rapist also won't devote resources to raising the child, meaning the child will



most likely die as well. Most kids didn't make it to 13 years of age for most of human history as well. In many cases, making it to that age was considered a right-of-passage in and of itself.

Rape may be about Power but it is because of this that it is an ineffective mating strategy. Having children within a family and community results in many more offspring (resources and care) and ensures that a man's genes survive. Rape is a direct threat to both family and community.

How we contextualize rape and whether we combine it together with sex is a different matter entirely...It's why feminism is so fucked up. It tries to see ALL sex in the same power dynamic as rape, an adversarial interaction. One cannot have a family and community if one views sex and sexuality through the lens of power. It disrupts family cohesion by making every reproductive encounter a battle and simultaneously spreads the idea that family and community are oppressive forces that conspire to create this Rape-Power dynamic.

Feminists don't understand biology because they are fucked up in the head.

What's your excuse?

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 09:24 AM

Rape in and of itself is about power  
you say that as if its a fact.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 09:27 AM

you say that as if its a fact.

And you say that like you know something. So say something.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 09:35 AM

what i know is that you are repeating something somebody claimed at some pint and you treat it as gospel.

women get off on power, for them its about power, thats why women think a rapist is all about having power over a women. in reality hes just following his basic animalistic instinct: attractive woman -> fuck her.

thats it. hes turned on and doesnt care that she doesnt want it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 10:06 AM

what i know is that you are repeating something somebody claimed at some pint and you treat it as gospel.

Alright, I'll hear what you have to say.

women get off on power, for them its about power, thats why women think a rapist is all about having power over a women. in reality hes just following his basic animalistic instinct: attractive woman -> fuck her.

And you went off the deep end.

You're confusing Rape fantasy for Rape and Power for Authority.

Women do get off on authoritative power but it's not the same dynamic as a rapist. It is the mistake of women to assume that the power in rape comes from an authoritarian source (patriarchy). It is still a dynamic of power but in this case is a matter of physical

force, which is fundamentally different from socially substantial authority.

This is where the idea that men are only acting on instinct comes into play; the man is physically stronger and therefore more inclined to rape because biology has made him so. It excuses the individual responsibility of the man for his rape, while simultaneously damning ALL men for it. It's just in our nature to rape, so we must be fixed. It's not our fault but, we are to blame.

I argue against this logical fallacy on the basis that rape is about physical power, not social power. "Power" at a term is too vague and leads to confusion. I know that you are talking about authoritative power and partially physical presence but, you are also inadvertently feeding into feminist fallacy because the words are so opaque that we could talk in circles about the subject and not get anywhere.

You repeat a line that feminists constantly use but in reverse. The result is the same, only the conclusion is warped.

thats it. hes turned on and doesnt care that she doesnt want it.

And this is the unsettling conclusion. No accountability and the acknowledgement of a hypothetical crime as though it is natural. This is what feminism wants, to have us throw our logical brains out the window and buy into shit that doesn't make sense.

Oh shit, we might accidentally rape someone if we get turned on enough. No sir, no control on the masculine end of the spectrum, right?

[deleted] 27 July, 2014 06:28 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 08:13 PM\*

Biology is one of my passions. I have vast reservoirs of knowledge concerning it.

What good is biology if you throw history, social behavior, practical experience, and human physiology out the window to reach your conclusions?

I can speak at length about the reasons for the existence of gender, why sex (genetic recombination) exists, even the circumstances revolving around the 2 billion years of relatively similar (and boring) microbial life and the sudden rise of eukaryotic organisms thereafter--eukaryotes such as us are great cosmic accidents.

I don't give a fuck.

Don't denigrate my knowledge and go on to say nutty things.

I'll criticize your conclusions so long as I think they are fallacious. You have the right to criticize mine. That's debate, get used to it.

Biology doesn't govern sex? Then what does?

We do. We bear the responsibility and consequences of our biological behavior, because biology cannot speak for itself. Regardless of whatever evolutionary theory we trot out to explain sex or rape, we are still responsible for our own behavior.

Yes, the interpretation of the meaning of our biology is arbitrary, so we should totally

make a distinction between something that is arguably objective (sex) and something that exists solely in the minds of humans (rape).

So you're saying that rape is subjective while sex is objective. Okay.

All rape is sex, all sex is not necessarily rape.

If rape is subjective...and all rape is sex, then rape can be objective...And subjective and sex is objective...but not necessarily objective at all times, because sometimes it can be subjective.

This is some backwards ass logic because it allows you to bounce back and forth in your points while seemingly remaining cogent in your arguments. This is what feminists do, they create these circular arguments that no one can pin down because they change their definitions to suite their arguments.

who makes the distinction? The female of the human species!

And lo' and behold, you make the same claims they do, the only difference is that you reject their authority to make the distinction of rape itself. The point is ultimately moot though, because it is THE COMMUNITY that decides what rape is or isn't.

If you were a slave, you were, by societal law incapable of being raped because you were of low status. When the community made slavery and sexual servitude illegal, rape in that context became a crime as well.

Women have nothing to do with distinctions of rape, they can only influence the community in regards to said distinction.

What's my definition of power? For an organism, the capacity to shape the reality of the future!

Again, that is such a vague definition that it can mean whatever the fuck you want it to.

Crying "Rape!!!" has always been a psychological weapon for women.

How the fuck do you know? Have you been there for every single rape on planet Earth and know the exact ratio of "crying" rape vs reporting real rape? Just like the feminists, you have no fucking clue and rely on your prejudices and biases.

It is their primary method of maintaining their agency to choose a mate and consequently her freedom of sexual selection.

...Except for MARRIAGE?! God this is a fucking asinine argument. Women rarely had the agency to choose their mate in the first place.

Human females don't have spermicide to guard against unwanted sperm, or labyrinth vaginas like some ducks, or sharp teeth or claws or speed or other physical defensive weapons against rape like other species.

Which is why sexuality became tied with fidelity and family. It didn't happen overnight but, humans realized that marriage was the best option over time.

Also, there has always been primitive forms of birth control. Some of the ancient plants that prevented pregnancy were farmed to extinction as a result of this need. You don't know shit about history.

How do you define "healthy"?

Where both partners are willing participants in the act and acting in a non-zero-sum interaction.

The "natural" aspects of rape are the same as regular sex

Incorrect. Rape is Zero-Sum. There is a victim and a aggressor.

the only difference is the woman's ability to choose the act of procreation in particular.

More feminist dogma.

We aren't discussion agency, we are discussion the biology of rape and sex and how they are related to a vague definition of "power". Agency keeps coming up because this is how feminists hijack discussions about sexuality. Evolution does not give a shit about agency, so why keep bringing up agency as a factor!?

Again, no difference between consensual sex and rape here. All pregnancies-

**RAPE IS NOT ABOUT REPRODUCTION. GET THAT THROUGH YOUR FUCKING HEAD!**

Ineffective for the female. She (her genetic code) loses because her offspring will be worse. Less intelligent, less strong, less sexy, less fast, etc. Less adapted to the environment.

There is no guarantee of this ANYWAY!!! For fuck's sake, how can you claim to know so much about biology and then trot out arguments that have been proven false THOUSANDS OF YEARS AGO!?

Plato discussed this in his ideas about "gold souls", "silver souls", and "bronze souls". Two top tier parents does not guarantee a top tier child, EVER! Evolutionary science backs this up.

Let's also not forget that power, whether physical or authoritative, is subjective in and of itself. An army can roll into a city and rape all the women, only for another army to march in to counter them, kill all of the men and take their women back.

It's inefficient as fuck to rely solely on power for reproduction as it will lead to more conflict than is necessary and reduce a community's capacity to care for offspring (war and power games often bring on shit like poverty, disease, starvation, social stratification etc).

If rape is a valid method of reproduction, than we wouldn't bother with courtship at all, because a direct method of insemination is so much easier. Yet, even the most patriarchal of civilizations didn't see rape as the sole means (or even a valid means) of reproduction.

We'd be at each others throats all the time if that were the case.

tl;dr - Oscar Wilde was bitter that society exerted authoritative power over his sexuality, just like feminists. He also incorrectly concluded therefore, that sexuality must be about power. He rejected the religion that condemned his sexuality and thumbed his nose at the establishment. Oscar Wilde wasn't a great thinker, he was just a bitter smart-ass.

[deleted] 28 July, 2014 09:54 PM\*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -2 points • 28 July, 2014 10:32 PM

Glad to see you've given up.

exit\_sandman • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 07:23 PM

Sex as power, is at the core of feminist ideology. That sex is an act of power and to be a man acting with sexual power is oppressive to the woman he's fucking.

I think feminists aren't entirely wrong about it, but more because they're projecting.

There are rapists for whom rape is about power (or at the very least as much about power as it is about sex), but there are also those for whom it actually *is* about sexual gratification. In fact, by widening the definition of "rape" (spousal rape, drunk college rape etc.), I dare to say that the vast majority of rapists aren't in it for exerting power over an unwilling female, but simply to bust their nuts.

However, for a woman, being raped is usually almost always power and never about sex, because her most powerful tool - her sexual agency - is taken away from her, thus depowering her.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 08:28 PM\*

Again, your parroting feminist dogma.

Rape is about physical power, violent power, yes. That doesn't make it authoritative and it shows in their projections because of an inferiority complex.

"Power" is such a vague term it loses all meaning when used out of context. It has something like nine different definitions and archaic as well as "modern" meanings. It's that nebulous nature that keeps us from realizing how full of shit they are.

"It's about Power!"

"What, like government power? Physical power? Authoritative power? Societal power? Technological Power? Will-Power? Sexual Power?"

"Yes!"

"I meant a specific idea of what power you're talking about."

"It's all of the above! That's PATRIARCHY!"

"And what is the Patriarchy?"

"THE OPPRESSION OF MEN!!!"

They lump it all together and at the same time disavow the authority (The Big Other/Big Brother/Patriarchy) of any blame in the rape, shifting all of the blame onto men as a whole.

In fact, by widening the definition of "rape" (spousal rape, drunk college rape etc.), I dare to say that the vast majority of rapists aren't in it for exerting power over an unwilling female, but simply to bust their nuts.

That's the point. By broadening the definition of rape, we have come to view male sexuality, in and of itself AS RAPE. Getting drunk and making mistakes in college doesn't constitute rape but, laws and social norms have been twisted to classify it all as rape.

Rape is physical, not mental...That's the delusion that women are under that allows them to justify an uninspired one-night stand as RAPE.

exit\_sandman • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 08:43 PM

Again, your parroting feminist dogma.

No, I said they're projecting. Which they are doing by equating the depowering of a raped woman

(and the subsequent empowering of the rapist) with the rapist's desire to experience power.

trias\_e • -3 points • 27 July, 2014 05:31 AM

"Plenty of things in the world are not about sex, and sex isn't about power (although rape does take away the power of sexual selection from women)." - Me.

juanqunt • 4 points • 27 July, 2014 05:08 AM

Game theory in practice. By game theory, I mean actual game theory from math and economics. Apparently Lose-Lose is preferential to Lose-Win.

CarpeDiem807 • 4 points • 27 July, 2014 01:27 PM

It should be mentioned here that a woman's self-worth is, generally, entirely sexual. Rape is, therefore, a capital form of theft on the woman's person.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 08:26 AM

I hate when they say "rape is worse than death". In the west, it's not even what it used to be. You don't have to give birth to a rapist's baby, any STDs can be taken care of. To say that rape is worse than death is like saying "Been raped? Might as well kill yourself".

Burner1701 • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 10:48 AM

I'm pretty sure I'd rather be beaten up than anally raped. I guess that's the male equivalent.

As for the idea that all women might be of the opinion they would rather die than be raped I just asked two women and they both independently ranked it raped rather than murdered but beaten rather than raped.

GhostInTheRedPill • 2 points • 28 July, 2014 11:46 AM

"Rather be murdered than raped" is an emotional response to a horrible hypothetical situation which for a small minority of individuals may actually be true. Rape is a violation and it is really awful but to suggest that it is a crime worse than murder is outside of the realms of reality.

How dare anyone ever mention that people recover from being raped but never from being murdered, right?

If I had the choices of being stabbed in the guts, shot in the leg, have my throat slit or anally raped, I would begrudgingly choose the latter (i.e. choose one or be killed outright).

Revenge would then be swift and terrifying.

BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 29 July, 2014 04:35 AM

A loser man achieving sexual gratification at the expense of a woman is something that unconsciously disgusts women, at the very core of their beings.

I have pondered the same question. Quick factoid: MORE MEN ARE RAPED THAN WOMEN IN THE USA. It is true. Men in prison are raped so frequently it is larger than the rape of females outside prison. Of course that is just laughed about. Don't bend over to get the soap. No big deal with men getting raped.

So why is it such a big deal if a woman is raped? Seriously, you would rather be DEAD than let a man have his way with you? Five minutes of your life and you would rather die? Really?

The answer is one word: P-O-W-E-R. Giving up the pussy- that orgasm to the unworthy male- deprives women of their POWER. They would rather be dead than powerless- never knowing that accepting that premise, even just a little bit, is one of the keys to the tingles.



BluepillProfessor • 2 points • 29 July, 2014 05:02 AM

On a related note that supports OP from another angle. His theory also explains why women are so averse to giving a HJ/BJ- it is not about the violation, it is about actually giving pleasure to an unworthy (in HER mind) man.

In our last fight my wife told me she felt like she was being 'raped' for years because I was like a petulant little boy always demanding sex even though I made her 'do it all the time.' In the spirit of spreadsheet guy (who gave his wife a spreadsheet of her denials) I exploded in rage. I have a written record of those years when she was "raped" to show that "sex all the time" was twice a month. (luckily I regained frame and ordered her to never think about those times again).

But here's why OP is correct. Bad shit went down in those years when she felt like she was being raped. In those years I was Blue Pill, defeated in business and several areas of life. That was when the grudging sex felt like "rape" because an unworthy man was getting pleasure, albeit only twice a month.

Then after TRP, and worshiping at the iron temple/studying seduction and pickup artistry, my SMV went up. Hers went down. I hit her with the hard dread and an ultimatum- submit or somebody else will. Suddenly when she sees that I have options- and more to the point I know I have options- that twice a month "rape" metamorphasizes into 2-3 times a week of eager participation in joyful union.

All of it happens when she no longer sees her man as a loser.

Theophagist • 4 points • 27 July, 2014 06:09 AM

Well the feminists play up rape like it's worse than death by fire. I had a "discussion" on reddit a while back in which I asserted much of what you said on it not being so horribly terrible.

One responder laid out this wall of text describing the aftermath with melodramatic flair such as "scrubbing and scrubbing in the shower and never being able to wash the memory of his touch from you.." and on and on... Get over yourself. There comes a point when any victim has whined too much and people start telling them to move on.. But not rape victims. "You'll never be able to wash his touch off you. Rape is FOREVER! You're RUINED! FOREVER!!!"

It's a load of shit, crapped out not to help rape victims but to keep the women's lib racket funded.

Burner1701 • 1 point • 28 July, 2014 02:41 AM

Just wondering, if you were held down and anally raped how long would it take you to get over it?

Theophagist • 3 points • 28 July, 2014 02:48 AM

If you missed the point completely how long would it take for you to notice?

Burner1701 • 0 points • 28 July, 2014 02:51 AM

My point was how do you know how long it takes to get over being raped, or whether you necessarily do ever get over it. You're confidently judgemental about it, so you better have been ass raped or you're just talking shit.

Theophagist • 1 point • 28 July, 2014 03:21 AM\*

So we're back to "you're ruined forever!!!"\*

\*if you want to be.

And I'm back to get over yourself, because every victim needs to get past their history or it will destroy them. Sometimes the beginning is when your best friend grabs you, slaps you in the face (figuratively) and tells you it's time to move on. Or, your "friend" can feed your misery and help it

dissolve your ability to enjoy life by telling you how ruined you are and that you should mourn as long as you want.

That's the difference between a friend and an enabler.

you better have been ass raped or you're just talking shit.

By your logic, you better have been too.

[deleted] 29 July, 2014 07:46 PM

[permanently deleted]

Burner1701 • 1 point • 30 July, 2014 06:27 AM

Yes, obviously. I wasn't taking issue with rape being better than death, I was taking issue with your confident statements around rape victims just needing a jolly pep talk from their friends and if that doesn't work they are losers.

VaginalAssaultRifles • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 01:29 PM

I suspect that's why they have a problem with porn, as well - a loser guy is having an orgasm, and a woman was "involved", albeit very indirectly.

Pushnikov • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 12:28 PM

These are subconscious emotions dictating conscious reactions. The mind fills in the blanks when it doesn't have a good explanation. The take away here isn't the rationality of it, but that along the way rape became subconsciously programmed into our psyches through evolution.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 12:33 PM

Have you been beaten up?, have you been robbed of your power and autonomy by another man? Has your SO? Have you been cheated, tricked or robbed?

It is the same powerlessness, a womens sexual integrity is just conflated with her identity that robing one automantically negates the other. It is shattering for the ego, but unless you dwelle on it, it can be recovered from.(but some like victimhood and the attention it provides, so they revell in their new identity.)

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 01:09 PM\*

I think its like Rollo on therationalmale.com recently stated, on how women confuse their sexual market value with their personal value, they seem to generally be unable to see the two values as separate, and this also goes into partly why Feminism is obsessed with rape. Feminists objectify themselves worse than anyone else, because their primary concern is things like catcalls, and the little girl getting raped in a foreign country is just fodder to be brought up specifically for shaming people like MRA's and Women Against Feminism as though they are lesser egalitarians. I guess in this regard I am a Feminist, because I help support the split between sexual and non-sexual personal value in women by quietly and ruthlessly judging everyone by their intelligence, but then again that probably makes me a "Feminist Misognyist" for suggesting wide-scale logic.

MockingDead • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 03:45 PM

You can get over anything that doesn't kill you. When you are dead, you don't get to do anything anymore.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 July, 2014 09:13 PM

They're not hurt to any greater extent by unwanted sex than they are by a beating or a murder, but if you ask any woman on the planet what she'd prefer, she'd rather be beaten or killed than raped. She won't understand why rape is so special or so much worse, but when you think about it, there's only one fundamental difference between raping a woman and beating her: During rape, the guy climaxes. The sexual pleasure he achieved is something women feel that he "took" from his victim. The male orgasm is something women are supposed to dole out to worthy men. They hate whores, shame sluts, think porn is disgusting – that orgasm you have is something you're only supposed to get when a woman finds you worthy. That's the difference between a rape and a beating – not the victim's experience, but the perpetrator's.

This shows that women are disgusted by rape the most because it denies them the power of being sexual gatekeepers. It destroys their pussy power over men.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 04:04 AM

In my mind, rape is a form of torture; and I would definitely rather be just straight up murdered bang it's done than tortured.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 July, 2014 05:28 AM

Depends on how severe and damaging the torture is.

In the case of my eye balls being slashed, burns over my whole body, tooth pulled out, nails through my hands, drills in my ankles sort of torture... yeah death would be better.

In the case of torture with no lasting physical damage (i.e. rape, Chinese water torture, etc.)... I like my life enough to be willing to live through that.

juanqunt • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 05:13 AM\*

Not sure why people are downvoting this. It makes perfect sense. So perhaps slowly cutting up a person's face would be equivalent to rape, and be worse than just a few punches. In such a case, the turturer is probably also deriving some sadistic pleasure. Rape should be considered one of the milder forms of torture.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 09:25 AM

Wow really insightful. I was wondering where you were going with the sexual abuse thing for a moment, but, when you made the connection between dutiful sex being so disgusting for married women and rape, I think you might have made a really important point.

roskybosky • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 10:47 PM

Rape is gross, but death is permanent. I'd definitely live with rape rather than be gone forever.

Any woman who thinks she doesn't have sexual power is just missing the point. Women have ALL the power.

[deleted] • -5 points • 27 July, 2014 04:35 AM

Rape is profound domination due to being penetration, to having someone inside of "you." It's a violation of "you" rather than an attack on "you" from getting beat up. Punches and kicks don't go into your psyche.

hunotquite • 10 points • 27 July, 2014 05:17 AM

I bet 500 \$ you have never been beaten up on the floor with kicks to the throat for 5 minutes, feeling helpless and worthless. You have to be a mong to think punches and kicks don't affect your psyche.

[deleted] • -4 points • 27 July, 2014 05:27 AM

They affect your psyche, they don't go inside your psyche and undermine your entire ego and sense of

self.

hunotquite • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 07:38 AM

Oh I'm sorry I didn't realise you had an M.D in psychiatry...That's bullshit. Utter bullshit.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 08:07 AM

It's just my opinion for why rape is more disturbing than being physically harmed. I know that the mind and body is one entity and that our consciousness and body is one entity so to have something enter our body violently and painfully is a rape of more than the mind, but an undermining of our entire being.

It's just a theory, and if you perceive me as being pretentious for saying psychological words than that's just a mirror reflection of your own habit of showing off/trying to sound smart/trying to sound well learned or however you perceive me.

hunotquite • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 12:42 PM

First of all if you want to use scientific terms, use them properly. What you have is an hypothesis, not a theory, there's a big difference.

I don't try to sound smart, I don't pretend to perform a scientific analysis in a field that I don't master.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 July, 2014 06:03 PM

No thanks, using the words I did conveyed what I wanted, even if I did use the word theory casually. That's OK. What matters more than the literality of the words is what the concepts they're conveying.

A scientific analysis? You mean a 4 sentence theory/hypotheses on a discussion board? It is OK to share ideas with other people if you aren't a master, and especially ideas that are unacknowledged or contradictory to the consensus. There's nothing wrong with that.

There's no "pretending" going on. Everything is fine, quit trying to control your environment because of your own insecurity.

exit\_sandman • 1 point • 27 July, 2014 07:30 PM

I disagree.

Putting up a good and fair one-on-one fight may hurt as hell, but it won't hurt you psychologically if you won and not that much if you lose.

Getting jumped on by one or several guys and having no real chance at all, being beaten up and kicked in the dust afterwards... well, that feeling of utter powerlessness hurts your psyche as well.