

**Peer Reviewed Research: The Holy Grail of Truth? | The fundamental basis of feminism is that gender is a social construct; tabula rasa, blank slate. The reason that women did not figure prominently in history, science, or philosophy is the innately misogyny of men (which refutes tabula rasa).**

February 21, 2019 | 34 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

---

<http://masculineprinciple.blogspot.com/2015/03/peer-reviewed-research-holy-grail-of.html>

---

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

---

## Comments

---

AutoModerator[M] [score hidden] 21 February, 2019 05:53 PM stickied comment

**Why are we quarantined? The admin don't want you to know.**

**Register on our backup site: <https://www.trp.red> and reserve your reddit name today.**

*I am a bot, and this action was performed automatically. Please contact the moderators of this subreddit if you have any questions or concerns.*

redpill77 • 8 points • 21 February, 2019 11:47 PM

Compelling arguments, but what the fuck is this:

Did you know that Albert Einstein did much of the groundwork for the Theory of Relativity not while at a university, but rather while working at a patent office? He also got mediocre grades when he was in school.

Einstein did very well in school.

TheDevilsAdvokaat • 1 point • 22 February, 2019 01:45 AM

Yes. Most people are aware this is a myth now; apparently the writer has yet to catch up.

TheStumblingWolf • 4 points • 22 February, 2019 05:02 AM

But if you put that in academic material it tarnishes the rest of it.

Imperator\_Red • 21 points • 21 February, 2019 08:57 PM

A well functioning academia with peer review is the best way to produce useful research, but like any institution, if you fill it with shitty people, it will be shit. The modern academy is completely corrupt, self serving, and downright dangerous to the health of our civilization. They are comparable to the late Medieval Church in so many ways that it's downright laughable.

They have a monopolistic stranglehold on anyone who wishes to advance economically in the white collar world through the credential system and government subsidies that prevents competition.

They fund themselves on forced tithes (ridiculously overpriced tuition that you can't escape).

They are shielded from the normal economic forces that most of us have to worry about.

They have their own parallel government structure and even their own kangaroo courts.

They waste money on ridiculous frivolities and bloated administration rather than their purported mission.

Quite frankly, the majority of them ought to be lined up in front of shallow ditches and shot. That's a fate far kinder than what they actually deserve.

red\_philosopher • 7 points • 21 February, 2019 10:12 PM

I always thought it was laughable that you pay tens of thousands for a piece of paper that says you can stick something out for 4+ years.

[deleted] • 4 points • 22 February, 2019 05:58 AM

Why are most prisoners men?

"Men are innately more aggressive."

Why are most CEOs men?

"Institutional sexism!"

Rupturednutsack • 1 point • 22 February, 2019 06:07 AM

It's almost as if they know better than us- they know the exact reason for any male related statistic, be it punishment from the law, career advancement, or just general common sense and perception of reality.

You know, more so than the men that actually go out and do this shit

TheDevilsAdvokaat • 5 points • 22 February, 2019 01:43 AM

Science has been polluted by women. Their lack of objectivity contaminates anything they touch; even to the point of their elevating non-objectivity to primality ("EVERYTHING is subjective!)

Hence "studies" showing masculinity is toxic.

Modern psychology and sociology have been damaged by women.

largepaycheckaddict • 6 points • 22 February, 2019 12:20 AM

I can understand the deconstruction of social roles merely for the purpose of studying the functioning of society and culture.

However, this idea of "it's just a social construct" is asinine and needs to be viewed as asinine seriously as well as unapologetically called out as destructive nihilistic nonsense.

Social constructs give us good families, mother's and father's, soldiers, police, mailmen, fire fighters etc.. vital roles for civilization. What happens when women decide to stop having babies cause it's just a social construct? What happens when cops stop enforcing the law because the law is just a social construct? Personally I hypothesize it might be similar to a chemical concoction blowing up in a scientists in a very cartoon-like manner. Nature always seems to mercilessly punish us when we're so foolish.

You can't just fuck off and identify as a gender queer Denny's lumberjack slam and do whatever you want your whole life. You become deadweight to society and everyone eventually develops a resentment toward you and thus alienate you from the group.

If a group, tribe, or civilization has no social constructs, it is disorganized, chaotic, and probably has plenty of violent infighting. This paints a big target for the overall culture to be conquered and enslaved by another with a sense of Order.

1st world college snowflakes don't understand this because they've never gone beyond their picket fence into the world where mommy and daddy aren't constantly telling them how special and unique they are.

TheDevilsAdvokaat • 5 points • 22 February, 2019 01:47 AM\*

We live in a society. EVERYTHING in our culture is a "social construct" - hence by saying something is a "social construct" feminists have in fact said nothing.

Hell, even the meaning of words is a social construct and changes over time.

The idea that one truth is as good as another because "they're all social constructs" reduces all ideas to equal value - and equal worthlessness.

And is typical feminist nonsense.

TheDevilsAdvokaat • 3 points • 22 February, 2019 01:51 AM

While there are some interesting points in this link, the writer has a hard-on for religion.

Religion is not the way forward. Religion is the way back.

farendsofcontrast • 2 points • 22 February, 2019 04:42 AM

Not necessarily. For example, "Christianity" is redpilled but "Churchianity" is extremely bluepill and dangerous to society. Believe it or not religion does have some merit in civilisation.

TheDevilsAdvokaat • 0 points • 22 February, 2019 09:02 AM

Sorry, but I completely disagree. Religion has no place in a modern society - and no merit too.

FKaroundNfindOUT • 3 points • 22 February, 2019 06:45 PM

Not necessarily. For example, "Christianity" is redpilled but "Churchianity" is extremely bluepill and dangerous to society. Believe it or not religion does have some merit in civilisation.

Sorry, but I completely disagree. Religion has no place in a modern society - and no merit too.

1. Don't be sorry.
2. Neither of you gave any reasoning.
3. I replied because I believe the former comment. Religion is the vehicle by which a group imparts it's ethical code. It discourages destructive social behavior while encouraging the constructive (from the POV of it's leaders). It fills the social learning gaps left by the migration from sub 250 person groups who would raise their children as a tight knit society and helps fill the need to belong to something larger than yourself in a very tangible way.

Why do you think it has no merit?

If it's because religious organizations are corrupt and mislead people, fine. This doesn't warrant an absolute separation with no replacement in my opinion.

Every "progressive" movement has serious issues with religion because they are attempting to change or destroy the ethical code that religion serves to enforce. Religion is a holder and progressives are agents of change. Sometimes things need changing but far less often than they need to be held stable from a societal perspective.

TheDevilsAdvokaat • 1 point • 23 February, 2019 12:56 AM\*

"1. Don't be sorry".

I do like to be civil, but ok.

"2. Neither of you gave any reasoning"

Yes, because I didn't feel it necessary. I'll give a little more now. It's 2019 and we live in a society that would be impossible without technology based upon science. If you can still have "faith" and yet live in this era then there's no point reasoning with you about it. The evidence that there is no god is all around you, the arguments for and against have been proved and disproved for centuries (for example Pascal's wager is a dead argument, original sin conflicts with the idea that the soul is created anew, etc etc) and I'm really not going to go into it. If you still believe in god now in this day and age, there's no hope for you, and I'm not going to waste my time discussing it. ("you" in this case means the original person I was discussing things with)

As to why I believe it has no merit...I'm sorry, but I'm not going to go into that either. The time is

past for people to discuss things such as this. It's kind of like arguing about how many angels can fit on the head of a pin; pointless.

You *should* be able to see for yourself, by looking at history, that religion is meritless. It certainly had uses in the past..but so did yeomanry and nine men's morris. If you can't..well I regret I see no point in discussing it further..

I do think your points (1) and (2) were reasonable though.

FKaroundNfindOUT • 1 point • 26 February, 2019 12:23 AM

That was possibly the best non-answer I've ever encountered.

Most people with absolutely nothing to say and no understanding on a topic who wish to feel superior simply say "woooooooooow" and walk away.

You really went for maximum word count here. Nice.

TheDevilsAdvokaat • 1 point • 26 February, 2019 10:43 AM

I was polite and gave you reasons - which completely contradicts what you said. Your sarcasm is unjustified.

I have no interest in talking to you any further.

FKaroundNfindOUT • 1 point • 26 February, 2019 12:01 PM

I was polite and gave you reasons - which completely contradicts what you said.  
Your sarcasm is unjustified.

Hahaha! Three separate times you said you refused to give any reasoning. It's fine if you have no argument... simply don't argue.

I have no interest in talking to you any further.

I bet you don't. Cowardice is easier.

NorthernWarriorRP • 0 points • 25 February, 2019 05:34 PM

Believe it or not religion does have some merit in civilisation.

Religion has extreme value "in civilization." That value being the lifelong conditioning of a population for autonomous subjugation. "In civilization," having a majority of the populace primed for obedience greatly simplifies the process of controlling them.

All religion depends on the suspension of critical thinking in some way or another. If it is *not incompatible* with testable and quantifiable reality, then it is simply *philosophy*. If it *is* incompatible with objective reality (i.e. dependent on "faith",) then it is also inherently counterproductive.

TRP philosophy goes a long way, as far as I've interpreted, to emphasize making ones self ones primary mental point of origin. A belief that a deity or pantheon is ones point of origin is simply an intellectually juvenile deflection of responsibility outward into the universe. All while one continues to mistakenly attribute their own inner dialogue to some external "voice" or "spirit."

I can understand a parallel between theists praying and agnostics/atheists meditating, however, anyone who seriously believes they *literally hear* the *voice* or *word of god(s)* as an actual conversational response to "prayer" **should be institutionalized as schizophrenic.**

The takeaway? Let the masses do what they want. Would you choose slavery for yourself? Slavery to a

cunt wife? Slavery to an authoritarian state? Slavery to an exploitative employer? Religion is simply self-imposed slavery to an (often ancient) hypothesis. Break the chains. Be a slave to no one or no thing. Let the shepherds have their flocks, while you become the wolf among the sheep.

farendsofcontrast • 1 point • 25 February, 2019 06:00 PM

I guess being “a slave” is subjective. Not everyone considers themselves enslaved in religion. Some people actually find freedom through it. Religion/s(certain) may have sometimes produced bad but there has also come a lot of good from it. The reason men exceed their limits and aim higher and higher is rooted in their subconscious need to reach God. You cannot disprove God and science can neither prove nor disprove it. But do consider that every single civilisation on the planet so far has had priests before it has had kings, leaders, scientists etc. That should show you that humanity has a strong sense of connection with what it considers supernatural.

NorthernWarriorRP • 1 point • 25 February, 2019 09:07 PM

I more see that common connection as evidence of humanity demanding certainty in the absence of evidence, or (historically) considering as evidence that which was merely coincidence.

I understand that "the supernatural," by definition, can be neither proved nor disproved.

I refuse to accept that anything in our existence is cosmically designed or preordained.

For me, becoming closer to *god* is simply better understanding *myself*.

farendsofcontrast • 1 point • 26 February, 2019 06:02 AM

Ofcourse friend you can believe what you like. But when speaking of matters like this we must remember that we are voicing opinions and we shouldn't attempt to pass it off as a fact, especially when it is unproven.