

“Toxic masculinity” in advertising: keeping women scared and men shamed. | "A baby shower for a girl. A gift is passed to the expectant mother. It's a rape whistle. Cut to a black screen: "1 in 2 girls will be physically or sexually abused." Fifty percent of women will be beaten or raped? PARDON?"

116 upvotes | 29 January, 2019 | by redpillschool

<https://www.thepostmillennial.com/toxic-masculinity-in-advertising-keeping-women-scared-and-men-shamed/>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

redpillschool[S,M] [score hidden] 29 January, 2019 03:43 PM stickied comment

Reddit censorship alert: thepostmillennial.com is auto-banned by the administration reddit-wide.

Imagine hating ideas so much the only way to deal with them is to prevent people from sharing them.

atticusfinch1973 • 52 points • 29 January, 2019 03:54 PM

If it wasn't for fear mongering and inflating statistics to serve their agenda the feminist movement wouldn't even exist except for the extreme fringe.

"One in five women are assaulted by their partners!"

"One in five men are assaulted by their partners too."

Oh.

Even the whole #metoo thing inflated statistics because suddenly every woman who had been looked at wrong jumped on a bandwagon. Probably a high percentage of actresses (who were the ones who started the virality) have had illicit offers given (and accepted them) due to the nature of the industry. It's like asking sex workers if they have ever been touched against their will.

But it sure gets hits on the internet.

Imperator_Red • 38 points • 29 January, 2019 06:30 PM

The actresses were just hookers who sold their bodies for roles. That's what we should all be disgusted by but nobody cares.

It actually makes perfect sense that this would happen if you consider the market for actresses. There are tens of thousands of women with the talent and looks to be in Hollywood films, and Hollywood needs what, maybe 100 A-list female stars?

Once you get into that top pool of women who are capable of doing it, you start getting into massively diminishing returns to acting ability. If you pick the 50th best actress in the country instead of the 500th best actress, the difference in the final quality of the movie will be so negligible that it will barely be noticed by anyone. So if you are a big shot producer, it really doesn't cost you anything in the bottom line to pick between to pick the actress that will blow you if you have 10 of virtually interchangeable quality sitting in a room.

This is not like professional sports where management is going to pour \$50 million into analytics because squeezing that last 1% of talent out of the market is the difference between winning 60% of your games instead of 50% of your games.

Proto_Sigma • 3 points • 30 January, 2019 11:31 PM

Saved. I wish I was in a position to give you more than an upvote.

CountVP • 41 points • 29 January, 2019 04:57 PM

This is a controversial opinion, but modern 21 century western world women are not very bright. They listen to stupid music, are attracted to stupid things and believe in stupid ideologies. It's no wonder all this fear mongering works. This shit would never fly back in 1950

Imperator_Red • 26 points • 29 January, 2019 05:22 PM*

| This is a controversial opinion

You don't need to qualify your statements here. All we care about at TRP is whether it is true or not. We don't care if it's controversial.

Women in general aren't very bright, or rather we should say that their IQ is clustered around the mean and has much less dispersion than male IQ.

Whisper • 28 points • 29 January, 2019 11:11 PM

| This is a controversial opinion, but ~~modern 21-century western world~~ women are not very bright.

Fixed that for you.

They aren't very bright because they don't have to be. 87% of all women who were ever alive have living descendants today. The comparative figure for men is somewhere in the thirties.

That means that all a woman has to do, to be successful enough to breed, is not be in the bottom 13% of womanhood (actually, the number is lower than that, because some of that 13% is successful-breeding women whose descendants died out later).

Imagine how lazy, slovenly, and functionally stupid *you* would be if the bar was set so low for you. Imagine if your society was full of people praising you merely for existing, writing news article about you for doing ordinary shit because you did it while being male, and creating political campaigns around the notion that they were going to give you free money from cradle to grave.

Imagine if people were so protective of you that you got to be first in the lifeboats, yet the same society constantly berated itself for not being protective enough yet, and called that a "war on men".

You'd be dumb as a sack of hammers... because you never would have had to think about anything more complicated than what you wanted to wear that day. Abstract thought is a skill; use it or lose it.

Women are precisely as dumb as they can get away with being.

TheRealBrotherLouie • 4 points • 31 January, 2019 06:27 PM

Well guess what, in the 50s you would have had to actually learn to work and take care of yourself. Now all you need to do is copy your homeworks from wikipedia and copy-paste someone else's code from the internet then let the computer fix your mess and you're good to go. Or if you're a girl just post your tits on the internet.

Fusion_Health • 2 points • 30 January, 2019 02:49 PM

No, it's not just women. Everyone is dumb, and it would be no different in the 50's - people back then bought into the societal norms and guess what? People today are still buying into the societal norms. It's a social paradigm, and that changes every 10 years or so. It's not that women are dumber today ☐

CensorThis111 • -2 points • 29 January, 2019 05:23 PM

| This shit would never fly back in 1950

You think people were smarter back then? Sounds like you missed out on your doctor recommended cigarette-a-day.

CountVP • 6 points • 29 January, 2019 05:29 PM

Tomorrow reasearches can find that taking a shower everyday is bad for you health. Are we being dumb right now? Who know's. I just think people restrained themselves more from destructive behaviour

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 January, 2019 05:46 PM

Are we being dumb right now? Who know's

Puts an apostrophe in "knows"

"Are we being dumb?"

Lmao

CountVP • 8 points • 29 January, 2019 05:51 PM

Not a native english speaker, but i won't argue with you. It is clear that you have no response, so you attack my grammar

[deleted] • 7 points • 29 January, 2019 06:10 PM

I agree with you, I just found it funny

Imperator_Red • 9 points • 29 January, 2019 06:12 PM

Yes, people were smarter back then.

It's funny because your post actually proves the point. Your confusion in using their lack of knowledge about one specific medical fact as a proxy for the general intelligence of the whole people is something that never would have flown as an argument back then. Lots of people today are completely unable to follow the simplest logical progression, or like in your case, make specious arguments that the average person in 1950 easily would have recognized for its logical flaws.

Fatstupidvirginboy • 32 points • 29 January, 2019 07:10 PM

On my college login page for a few years it has had this really large infographic that says 1 out of 4 women will be sexually assaulted in college.

If that was true, the campus would look like some mad max shit. Come on.

TheRedPillMonkey • 14 points • 30 January, 2019 02:03 AM

That's an old stat. I heard in in college over a decade ago, and it wasn't new then.

The history of it is that it comes from research done at one college awhile ago. It was a survey that asked campus girls a list of questions. From that list, the researchers determined if they had been raped or not.

The main issue was the question: have you ever had sex and then regretted it? - was counted as rape.

All studies since them have cited this one study. No law enforcement keeps stats on this and considering the amount of under reporting that happens, there is no way to know the real stat.

Fatstupidvirginboy • 8 points • 30 January, 2019 02:11 AM

... would i get anywhere if i sent administration an email explaining they are using false information that results in people having irrational fear?

This really does irk me. Not because im a man but because i think its fucked up to make a bunch of dumb barely literate 18 year old girls think their vaginas pull in sadistic monsters at a rate of 25% over a 4 year degree program.

How does it break down in peoples mind, do they think its like one guy raping hundreds of girls and getting away with it or do they just think that normal random guys all have some dark secret of running a

train on a roophie girl one time when they were on spring break

TheRedPillMonkey • 8 points • 30 January, 2019 02:30 AM

That's a 3rd rail. First of all, the conversation has to define rape. Good luck with that. Then you'd have to convince administration their gender studies or title 9 office is wrong. Then you have to come up with the real number.

Do some googling on that number. So interesting stats on it on Reddit from another sub and another survey.

It's important to remember that there are actually a fuck ton of sadistic monsters looking to get in every girls snatch. Also, rape is, as a matter of fact, very under reported. So good luck convincing anyone of anything.

[deleted] • 5 points • 30 January, 2019 11:35 AM

I actually calculated how many women would get raped every semester at my university if that stat was true and I don't remember which number I came to exactly but let's just say that I should have seen women getting raped almost everyday. Like imagine just walking into class half an hour early and some dude is raping a girl on a desk while the professor is writing "boys will be boys" on the board.

chumjetze • 2 points • 29 January, 2019 07:50 PM

Wtf lol... Really sad to see where this world is going

StellarMemez • 2 points • 29 January, 2019 08:20 PM

Every time I piss at a urinal I have to read a poster that says "LET'S BE CLEAR: Securely harassment is NOT OKAY"

thelandofdreams • 2 points • 30 January, 2019 02:20 AM

ah the good old "scientific facts" that are actually based on this one vaguely worded, anonymous survey of 100 people.

FlyingSexistPig • 10 points • 29 January, 2019 08:53 PM

If asking a girl what time it is can be construed as sexual assault, then sure, 1 in 2.

AllahHatesFags • 7 points • 31 January, 2019 04:45 PM

I'm sure "rape" in this stat includes every time a beta male made a pass at or looked too long at a thot.

Ceeda • 4 points • 2 February, 2019 01:52 PM

This is the entire point of #metoo. Simply getting Alpha dick while extracting resources from desperate betas is not enough. They want to make sure the betas are kept down and in line, because it's easier on their feefeas.