

Radical feminism changes men's perceptions of women in the workplace - Feminism does not allow women to prefer men who exhibit traditional masculine characteristics. So what's left? Get drunk and have sex with the hot bad boys. Then promote false accusations to get revenge against the hot bad boys.

January 10, 2018 | 298 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

Archived from [theredarchive.com](#)

Comments

Dmva100 • 98 points • 10 January, 2018 03:45 PM*

Assume all women lie about sexual assault unless due process reveals otherwise.

Use snapchat only, an alias, and only go her place and never meet any friends or room mates. AudioTape record sex, and ignore consent recording laws, the penalty for such actions are far lower.

False accusations cannot go anywhere with these safeguards.

davebrain • 6 points • 10 January, 2018 10:03 PM [recovered]

assuming the judge doesn't disallow the evidence from being presented on the basis that it would embarrass her.

party_dragon • 11 points • 11 January, 2018 09:58 AM

The judge presumes you're innocent. These days, the important bit of trial is "trial by media". Recorded evidence (released on YouTube) can't be ruled inadmissible there.

AussiecuntTRP • 17 points • 11 January, 2018 02:12 AM

AudioTape record sex, and ignore consent recording laws, the penalty for such actions are far lower.

Even if where you live doesn't allow recordings without consent in court you can still send her the audio if she threatens to cry wolf over text. That would probably shut her down.

Dmva100 • 12 points • 11 January, 2018 02:18 AM

Even moreso if the prosecutor is informed by your lawyer of such a recording. Just because it isn't admissible in court doesn't erase the 'oh shit' feeling that prosecutor will get because they will know the girl would crack under cross examination and fuck up her credibility when questioned on 'how it all went down.'

[deleted] • 6 points • 11 January, 2018 09:14 AM

If she didn't file a police report, but "was brave" enough to tweet this shit, she's lying.

econquest • 3 points • 15 January, 2018 02:50 AM

There's not a single comment anywhere on the internet of anyone who has ever recorded a woman's consent, where she later cried rape.

Why? Because anyone who goes far enough to get her to say verbally "I want it" or "put it in" etc is already doing the necessary for consent.

Prove me wrong. When have you, or anyone, ever had to use an audio recording? Never. This scenario doesn't exist.

Snozzberryz • 1 points • 11 January, 2018 09:52 PM [recovered]

Don't think any of you fat fucks need to worry about getting accused of sexual assault since you all spend all your time in the safety of your parents basement.

Girls are a scary thing if your only interaction with them is magazine covers and movies..

Dmva100 • 4 points • 11 January, 2018 10:46 PM

Dude chill out, you're wife is going to keep fucking other men. Don't take it out on the members of this sub.

Snozzberryz • 1 points • 12 January, 2018 12:18 AM [recovered]

She won't be fucking any of you cheeto fingered, fadora wearing, BO smelling, greasy skinned, clinically obese, man children.. it's a good thing you have a mom to make your sandwiches and clean up your piss bottles because you'll never have a girl/wife to do it.

CrazyHorseInvincible[M] • 2 points • 12 January, 2018 06:40 AM

Do you feel better now, sweetie? Or does your therapist want you to punch the pillow some more?

thefisherman1961 • 41 points • 10 January, 2018 04:35 PM

Sorry. If some innocent men's reputations have to take a hit in the process of undoing the patriarchy, that is the price i am absolutely willing to pay.

That is collectivist thinking - the idea that when the best interests of the individual conflict with the best interests of the group, then the best interests of the individual must take a back seat for the supposed greater good of the group.

Ironically, collectivist policies always have the opposite results originally intended. A forrest can't thrive if you're burning down half of the trees. Both the individual and the group end up suffering.

This is why Collectivism is a logically inconsistent ideology and fails. Individualism not only works, but it is logically consistent. The individual should always take priority over the group.

Collectivism is the same mentality that the Nazis used to justify exterminating the jews.

Sorry. If some innocent Jews' lives have to be sacrificed in order to strengthen Germany, that is the price I am absolutely willing to pay.

Killing Jews did not strengthen Germany, it resulted in them get taken over by Americans and Soviets. Just like putting men's reputations on the chopping block will not dismantle the non-existent patriarchy, but will turn most of the reasonable mainstream against this radical agenda.

RunawayGrain • 14 points • 10 January, 2018 09:35 PM*

That is collectivist thinking - the idea that when the best interests of the individual conflict with the best interests of the group, then the best interests of the individual must take a back seat for the supposed greater good of the group.

Women want a collectivist society for everyone else, including most women, but also want an exemption from the collectivism for themselves.

Come to think of it, the Borg queen is pretty much every westernized woman's societal ideal.

GayLubeOil • 10 points • 10 January, 2018 10:59 PM*

The problem with individualism is that if one group isn't playing by individualist rules it wins. Weimar Germany and actually modern Germany is/was getting gang banged from the outside. by international banking Elements.

How can an individual German today stop Merkle from filling the country with Akbars? He can't and that's

the point. The only thing that can stop a collective is another collective.

The Red Pill isn't the most individualistic formulation.

thefisherman1961 • 2 points • 10 January, 2018 11:45 PM

The Red Pill isn't the most individualistic formulation.

Collectivism requires the initiation of lethal coercion against the individual by the collective in order to force their will on the Individual. Individualism requires no such thing, and neither does TRP.

Sure, we tend to categorize people into collective groups (man/woman, bluepill/redpill, feminists/anti-feminists) but we don't advocate initiating violent coercion against other people to impose our will on them. In fact its the opposite - we advocate holding frame and voting to eliminating the violent coercion (laws) that the feminist collective has imposed on men through the state so that the Individual (man) can prosper more.

And I don't need to lecture you on how unhappy feminism has made both men and women, because as I said before, collectivism always has the opposite results of what was originally intended. They wanted female happiness but they got the opposite, and much more.

The only thing that can stop a collective is another collective.

That may be true, but collectives can be made up of Individuals voluntarily joining and identifying with a collective like TRP. Or to individual voters banding together to eliminate unjust feminist laws. So collectives can exist within an Individualist framework, but Individualism cannot exist within a collectivist framework BECAUSE the individual must either submit to the will of the collective or be murdered.

Feminism is collectivist and bullshit because it requires the use of force against Individuals. If it were such a good idea, it wouldn't require force. But it does, because it's wrong. TRP does not require initiation of force and advocates the opposite. That is why it's an Individualistic philosophy.

GayLubeOil • 6 points • 11 January, 2018 02:06 AM

We ban people all the time for not adopting our values. Thats about as violent as we can get around here. Next Violence isn't a necessary condition for collectivism. I really have no idea how you came to the conclusion that it was. Plenty of religons are nonviolent but definitely are collectivist in philosophy.

Voting to eliminate violent coercion is a Blue Pill boomer idea. Mr. 1961 thinks that he can vote away tyranny. Lol ok.

thefisherman1961 • 1 point • 11 January, 2018 02:52 AM

Banning people is not coercion or an initiation of force, nor is there any call for initiating violence against blue pillers in the sidebar.

If membership of any group is voluntary - as in, the individual has the choice to opt out - then it is not truly collectivist because the individual having the freedom to opt out means his good is still ultimately prioritized over the good of the group. In any true collectivist group, the individual can not have that choice. Not having a choice means violent coercion is necessary to enforce the individual's lack of choice. That is why the state is often necessary for collectivist philosophy to be implemented, because the state is the only means by which force can be "legitimately" initiated against the individual.

There has never been any truly collectivist organization in society that did not rely on violent

coercion. Including the non-violent religions you refer to. If they are non-violent, then they prioritize the good of the Individual (his freedom to opt out) over the good of their own group, which means they are ultimately Individualist in nature.

I never said I think I can vote away tyranny, that's a straw man. And I'm not a boomer.

GayLubeOil • 4 points • 11 January, 2018 02:58 AM

If we examine the values of Judaism Hinduism and Islam they are completely collectivist and anti individualistic. Now obviously Islam openly condones violence the other two do not.

Your absolutist definition is flawed because under it's criteria collectivist philosophies somehow arnt collectivist.

Your narrow definition of collectivism is therefore seriously flawed.

thefisherman1961 • 2 points • 11 January, 2018 03:17 AM

If we examine the values of Judaism Hinduism and Islam they are completely collectivist and anti individualistic. Now obviously Islam openly condones violence the other two do not.

Lol @ Judaism not condoning violence. Yahweh commits outright genocide in the Old Testament and sometimes tries to get his followers to do his dirty work for him. There are plenty of orders to kill disobedient women, slaves, homosexuals, and non-believers. Along with a seemingly endless string of nonsensical rules that are contradictory and impossible to follow, with the punishment of death for disobedience. The kind of rules that only a delusional, insecure madman could come up with. Yahweh's followers continue to do his work to this day killing brownies over a several thousand year old territorial dispute for a wasteland.

Your absolutist definition is flawed because under it's criteria collectivist philosophies somehow arnt collectivist.

No, I'm saying the groups don't follow collectivist philosophy if the individual has the freedom to join or opt out. Like Hinduism, they might have a collectivist leaning in that they *suggest* that the individual prioritize the group over himself, but they still ultimately fall within an individualist framework if they do not require it with lethal coercion.

The idea that collectivism can ever be voluntary is communist propaganda. Communism cannot actually ever exist because it needs a government to forcibly prevent individuals from acquiring privately owned capital and entering voluntary contracts to protect private property.

GayLubeOil • 3 points • 11 January, 2018 03:24 AM

Modern Judaism isn't violent but it's definitely 100% collectivist. Likewise Hinduism is definitely not individualistic which is why your definition doesn't fit.

redditer0 • 1 point • 10 January, 2018 05:11 PM

"This is why Collectivism is a logically inconsistent ideology and fails. Individualism not only works, but it is logically consistent. "

I'm not really sure that "it works".. it produces inequality and is going in the direction of destroying the

planet.

But I agree collectivism has logical flaws. For example, it's clear than individual rights is better than "group rights", which I see as insane but weirdly a lot of people are ok with that.

thefisherman1961 • 6 points • 10 January, 2018 06:20 PM

inequality is inherent to nature. there will always be inequality, it's just a question of how much. history has proven that individualist economic systems reduce income inequality more efficiently than collectivist systems.

redditer0 • 1 point • 5 February, 2018 07:05 PM

history has proven that individualist economic systems reduce income inequality more efficiently than collectivist systems.

I think the opposite is true. Anyway I'm not a fan of 100% equality. But I like equality of opportunity. Which doesn't exist in capitalist societies. If you inherit millions you won't have equal opportunities with somebody that was born in a favela in Brazil.

Is not that economic liberalism is wrong, but the actual implementations of it (inheritance, private education, etc.) is not the best for "equal opportunity".

thefisherman1961 • 1 point • 5 February, 2018 08:45 PM

I think the opposite is true.

Your opinion is irrelevant of whether it's true or not is irrelevant. 19th century America saw the most rapid advancement in the poor's standard of living in history, and there was no welfare state. Collectivist systems forcibly transfer wealth from the bottom-up, that's why income inequality is so high today.

But I like equality of opportunity. Which doesn't exist in capitalist societies. If you inherit millions you won't have equal opportunities with somebody that was born in a favela in Brazil.

Is not that economic liberalism is wrong, but the actual implementations of it (inheritance, private education, etc.) is not the best for "equal opportunity".

Brazil is nothing close to an individualist economic system. Their country is riddled with central economic planning and socialist policies

Private education is far better than the joke that is public education

The-Devilz-Advocate • 1 point • 10 January, 2018 08:32 PM

I think you are confusing terms here, just because there is inequity does not necessarily mean there is inequality and even if there was inequality who's to say that it is wrong?

Even if we remove society from the equation (in respect of it being an unequal society) humans are still governed by the laws of nature. That's the whole point of this subreddit.

redditer0 • 1 point • 5 February, 2018 07:03 PM

"it produces inequality"

The ones that more have will obtain more, the ones that have less will obtain less, that's a cycle. For example, you can see wealth inequality graphs in the US or any other country... in general inequality is increasing in the world. Probably because -> inheritance.

seius • 1 point • 10 January, 2018 10:32 PM

Just like putting men's reputations on the chopping block will not dismantle the non-existent patriarchy, but will turn most of the reasonable mainstream against this radical agenda.

Yeah, it will make everyone side with Islam and put women back where they were before they had the right to vote. Sadly, they are fucking over their own rights, which aligns with most female dominated thinking.

refunkulation • 1 point • 12 January, 2018 02:52 AM

I heard a great point recently, people toss the conspiracist tag around quite often if the narrative is merely connecting a few dots that logically make sense outside of a media collectivist mindset.

However, the idea of the patriarchy is about as conspiracy driven as it comes. Some shadowy group of men that are trying to keep women down at all times? It's completely illogical beyond belief, as illogical as America is a White Supremacy nation. Neither could be further from the truth. Democrats love to keep the black man down though because it allows them to further the fears of people that the right is racist and full of Nazis who are out to kill minorities.

I would love to hear more theories on collectivism in corporate oligopoly economies and how they fall apart. Individualism is definitely logically consistent given that the choice is mere individualism vs. collectivism. However, its very challenging to have individualism when Corporations erode the very constitution that protected the individual.

People fear we're going down a path of communism / socialism in America, they could not be more wrong. We're just merely being dominated more and more by corporate entities. They're everywhere. I highly suggest people go to Cuba and see real communism. It certainly sucks, but you don't have advertising in communist societies. The big lie the corporate world sells to the public via Fox News & other right media corporate outlets is that Democrats = Socialism. Its very wrong, Democrats = Corporatists. And for the most part, Republicans = Corporatists too, but they're limited more than Democrats because of the right base in America has the decency to threaten representatives jobs in DC enough to make them fear. And the Democrats can never stay around too long because the left literally eats itself alive from the inside out. Their problem is collectivism is what they want, but their many factions all rip each other to shreds and they lack moral clarity via religion that they end up just accepting a shitty representative who will be perfectly happy to have a govt. job the next 20 years in DC.

redpillschool[S] • 15 points • 10 January, 2018 03:18 PM

Quotes from this article:

Do men want to work with women who hate men and make false accusations against people they disagree with? I'm a conservative, Christian, pro-life virgin. I disagree with all premarital sex. If this woman worked with me and found out my views, she would almost certainly get me fired.

In my experience, young, unmarried progressive women are progressive because they want taxpayer-funded abortions, taxpayer-funded contraception, no-fault divorce, single mother welfare, student-loan forgiveness, etc. Taxpayer-funded bailouts for problems caused by their own free choices. They feel that if society is paying for something, then it's "normal" and they don't have feel guilty about making poor choices. Their primary concern about politics is being able to do what they feel like without anyone disapproving. Everything bad that happens is "unexpected", and so society should have to pay for it.

I believe the only way to evaluate all harassment claims is to assess what the upside / downside risk would be for the man & woman.

Honestly, this whole #metoo could not have succeeded without a Harvey Weinstein. He was the only vessel they could use, because he was one of what, 10 men in the world who have the insulation to get away with what he did? Power does not equal insulation the way Harvey had it. He had the advantage of being in an industry full of dumb young women trying to achieve their "dream" and could utilize enough legal, business, political & media pressure to pay off people or at minimum create plausible deniability.

There is a reason they didn't go after other rich guys out there. The men with real wealth & power in this world are in finance, technology, medical, legal, etc. Media, entertainment, and Hollywood are the only industries crawling with women everywhere, and they're all ambitious as fuck. So if you aren't in these industries, you have less to worry about. Most men work in pretty male heavy environments. Sure they probably stack HR with a bunch of millennials, and marketing departments, but other than like NGOs (full of betas who will do anything for women), fashion (mostly gay guys) or other industries, its just very rare to have a high number of women in offices. You rarely see women going into the Oil & Gas industries, or shipping. You'll just never ever see the Port of Newark stocked full of women.

They didn't go after athletes either, not since Kobe (also complete BS). Athletes have the advantage of being completely insulated with a labor union, and have the advantage of being completely alpha by mere nature of being an athlete. It assumes you have alpha behavior being in the NBA or the NFL, its far more primal. Cam Newton went out and laughed at a female journalist because he thought it was funny she asked a technical football question that was unexpected to him, but he just catches a few days worth of flak and its forgotten, because these guys need Ray Rice level beating the shit out of a woman on tv in an elevator, AND in the press in order to get canned. That's rare beyond rare.

You didn't hear names coming out in these other industries or places of wealthy men because not only there are going to be less women in these industries as a whole, the women in these industries also assess risk differently. There are a few isolated cases like the Bumble girl who went on to create an utterly failure business idea under the disguise of being pro female.

They rather try to paint the male dominated industries as "anti-women workplaces" when a soft spoken guy writes a paper about his research on gender differences and why there are less engineers. Let me tell you, Google could not be happier to have this criticism levied, they can own a very fixable issue, just hire more women. This is great news for them, they can sacrifice Damore, hire a bunch of women for useless work with the barrels of cash they have, and don't get pinned with the "toxic male culture" slogan. Its great news for them.

Finance probably a lot less male dominated than tech, but its harder to play these high stakes games in an industry swarming with sharks on either side, its a difficult game to play when the men in media & entertainment are so easy. I don't even need to go into legal, not even a peep out of this industry, they're obviously the best suited to protect their own interests.

Honestly this whole #metoo could have been heavily brokered and influenced by media & high powered law firms working in tandem, who benefits the most from #metoo? Clicks / TV viewers + more legal bills, I bet you could draw a graph showing a heavy increase in legal paperwork. Lawyers win yet again.

Point being, some industries the risk is very low to go after the power structure, and in other industries, the risk is very high. In technology, it's a hell of a lot harder to claim Mark Zuckerberg assaulted you. You need critical mass of harassment claims to take down real power, it took critical mass to take down Weinstein.

Not many powerful men are surrounded by an army of women each and every day with high ambitions, and the ones in these industries can spot situations a few moves ahead.

Politics doesn't count, because everyone is slandering everyone at all times that Franken was just collateral damage, in any other period of time that photo comes out, he lives on. Politics is knifing people left and right, day by day, and none of it sticks. It took probably the worst possible person you could pick in the state of Alabama for the GOP to get knocked down, mainly if you just deny, deny, deny, its never going to stick. Only if you pretend to be morally better than everyone else in politics do you get knifed, like John Edwards.

To sum everything up, those in companies with a lot of women, you all need to start adopting a strategic mind, learn to play chess. Women are actually terrible chess players, but they are playing chess. You just have to be way better. The game teaches your mind how to view situations 5 moves ahead. Be stoic, but be strategic in everything you do. Understand the motivations of others, and ward attacks off by being aware at all times what the game the opposition is.

Remember, women are socially far more conditioned than we are. They are not strategic at these games, often don't understand ramifications for overplaying or underplaying their hands. What women bank on is male stupidity, they can pick up points of weakness in a moment far better than we can. To give a chess metaphor, they're playing move by move, you need to be setting up long-term moves to win the game. Women only win the game when you make a dumb move, think long-term, think strategically, don't think moment to moment because women will kill you in the moment. Or for the non-chess players, think with your head, not your dick.

[deleted] • 3 points • 11 January, 2018 09:26 PM

It's not a sacrifice when someone else is paying the price.

[deleted] • 16 points • 10 January, 2018 03:26 PM

Stopped reading when the author of the piece identified as a virgin awaiting marriage.

redpillschool[S] • 47 points • 10 January, 2018 03:30 PM

People with different viewpoints can still have something worth saying. I'm not religious but the war on men attacks traditional men as the primary target. Whether you like it or not, religious men make up a large portion of traditional men.

[deleted] • 17 points • 10 January, 2018 03:52 PM

Total respect for mods, I love what you did yesterday.

A Red Pilled lifestyle isn't exactly appreciated by traditional men. Dad understands the logic but hates that I spin plates and refuse to cohabitate.

Let's be clear, unlike incels and others who refuse to better themselves, I respect the hell out of traditional, hard working men, regardless of collar (or skin) color, and I berate women who ignore them. In fact, one of the better marriages I know of, she has an MPA and he is a landscaper.

I see how others might get value from the piece. I guess I'm putting my finger on a perceived disconnect between the Red Pill (which has greatly improved my life) and the broader men's movement. You've probably thought it further through.

One other point..... the traditionalists are most open to Red Pilled truths. I basically told my stepmother, "You have a stable, happy, 30 year marriage because Dad dreaded the everlasting fuck out of you" (in other terms, clearly) and she immediately assented.

JamesSkepp • 5 points • 10 January, 2018 04:49 PM*

the traditionalists are most open to Red Pilled truths.

It's correlation only.

The "traditionalists" (as in: men who want to return to m-f status quo we had before 1960 or before) are in most cases "fake RedPills" who want a return of state/society enforced roles for women without accepting the underlying problem that trad-con is BP practiced on state level, marriage is BP, and his obedient wife who can be caned for not being pleasing enough is going to suck Chad's cock when the husband is not looking.

Traditionalism is as guilty of current situation as feminism is and that's b/c the "traditionalists" don't understand female nature, thus their "control over women" is not going to work at all (in fact it's going to backfire into them) and will result in a false sense of power.

Had the "traditionalists" actually been correct in their approach, their message would be in high agreement with basic TRP concepts. The fact that it's not and they still cling to outdated simplistic ideas of "a woman should know her place" simply proves that they don't have the solution, on the contrary - they are a part of the problem.

I basically told my stepmother

This proves nothing. You told a woman how she works and she agreed it's true. Not a proof of traditionalism at all, just correlation of this being true and your dad being "traditional".

dr_warlock • 1 point • 11 January, 2018 02:17 AM

Depending on laws that are specifically created to control women is bluepill. What you need is TRP and no legal rewards for women's bad behavior. No reward means women are susceptible to punishment such as imprisonment, unemployment, poverty, no custody, and death which occur naturally as a result of their actions such as treating their partners bad, divorce without cause, false allegations, abuse, etc.

TonyZ554 • 2 points • 12 January, 2018 02:06 AM

Men who are traditionalist in this society essentially get less of a return for their sacrifice of choosing that lifestyle. It's just not worth it anymore to choose that path because of the minimal reward and increased punishment.

JamesSkepp • 1 point • 10 January, 2018 04:58 PM

but the war on men attacks traditional men as the primary target

Don't be traditional then. Adapt to modern m-f power ratio. Fuckboi alphas are always the last ones to be attacked (and mostly symbolically by shining how men should not be assholes or some other irrelevant bs) b/c women know they don't care, will not commit even under pressure or don't have resources worth extracting (either through marriage or accusations of sexual misconduct). They are also in the position of power over the women in their lives since it's them who are in demand. Someone once wrote here that "good dick is a commodity".

scootypebbles • -4 points • 10 January, 2018 03:53 PM

I'd wager religious men make up ALL traditional men. Religion is pretty much the basis for all things 'traditional.' I mean if you're not religious, by default you have to rely on reason, science, and experience to build your political views which pretty much puts you closer to the political left ideology. I agree with saying that men are under attack from the extreme left females but singling out your religion as the cause of it seems a little asinine. There extreme feminists just defy logic and attack everyone in my experience. They play the victim. They will even attack other women with no true argument for themselves.

nummersfarce_is_done • 2 points • 11 January, 2018 05:31 PM

If you rely on reason, science and experience; and the fact that traditionalism has worked so far for all civilisations in existence makes traditionalism worth inspecting and adopting as a lifestyle.

MoDuReddit • -3 points • 10 January, 2018 07:10 PM

A virgin talking about sex and relationships. Next week, toddlers explain how to Parkour.

foot_odor • 6 points • 10 January, 2018 09:02 PM

He was talking about the effects of feminism in the workplace. You should work on your reading skills.

mugatucrazypills • 2 points • 12 January, 2018 10:39 PM

Viable False rape accusations most typically do not accrue to alpha "bad boys" but as a way of disposing of betas.

Making shit up is something women do to abuse weak men and satisfies their natural small tribe instinct to prey on the socially weak and injured and keep kicking them while they are down. Women are disgusted by any extended show of weakness or vulnerability in men to the same extent that publicly solicit such behavior from them as a test.

A woman will feel physical revolted after fucking a weak man. As he fails he tests she will increase the testing and replay prior encounters in her memory. Reality and feeling are mixed in her mind anyways. As the disgust grows, her perception of the past can slowly change so that she edits this history to be congruent with her new emotion based reality and narrative.

Over time the new narrative, which makes more sense is that she could only have consented to such disgusting and unfulfilling sex if pressured, tricked, coerced or raped by an deceitful and shifty man. The rape narrative grows. It can be fed by the betas own entertainment of her gradually evolving inner narrative. Whereas an alpha would explicitly challenge such an emotional deviation from reality. The betas willingness to compromise on an understanding of past events to try to relate or work it out only feed into her confirmation bias that he is shifty and that reality is flexible to emotions.

By the time the false rape accusations are made the woman may have half convinced herself she was raped. This makes her a more convincing accuser accruing more social power to her and speeding the removal of the beta from society and the gene pool.

BruiseHound • 2 points • 15 January, 2018 04:33 AM

Exaggeration. Plenty of women like men with traditional masculine characteristics. Radical feminism hasn't been as successful as many claim.

canadianmooserancher • 1 point • 16 January, 2018 09:49 PM

Ya. I've noticed the boogie man too. It's not nearly as contagious as all the manosphere claims.

Throwaway_Old_Guy • 3 points • 10 January, 2018 08:55 PM

Sorry. If some innocent men's reputations have to take a hit in the process of undoing the patriarchy, that is the price i am absolutely willing to pay.

This is a very easy statement to make when you aren't being forced to pay the bill.

Guthix4Days • 1 point • 11 January, 2018 05:37 PM

Interesting, good read but I'd wish the author rather not bring his religious views into the argument.

dza76wutang • 1 point • 11 January, 2018 09:49 PM

Frankly, I don't think sex with coworkers is ever smart regardless of power dynamic (peer, subordinate, or superior). It's completely pointless risk.

Feminism and related left-leaning agenda items are having other insidious effects on corporate america that I think RP aware guys probably need to worry about (regarding progression, promotion, salaries, etc.).

blackenshtein • 3 points • 12 January, 2018 02:58 AM

Easy answer, work for yourself. As you grow only hire men, if you fear a lawsuit down the line of a pattern of not hiring women, be sure when hiring men its under the disguise of giving them small shares in the company, so as to say they're "partners".

As you grow more, sell the business, invest the money in Real Estate, and start over.

canadianmooserancher • 1 point • 16 January, 2018 09:51 PM

Insidious upon corporate america? Someone needs to be invited back to their life. Corporate america RUNS america. Ain't nothing hurting them, theyre the tail that wags the dog. What planet are you living on? The usa barely has a functioning democracy because of their corproations. Only 5 media outlets and all corporate. They own those guys down south.

dza76wutang • 0 points • 16 January, 2018 11:29 PM

A few thoughts:

1. FI is softening competition by promoting collective and equalizing outcomes. This is still early but I think it may have a long term unintended consequence of nerfing american competitiveness.
2. This is also leading to preferential treatment ranging from development programs to outright quotas.
3. They weaken the social culture of corporate environments.

It's getting really bad in consulting which used to be up there with finance as far as culture went.

canadianmooserancher • 0 points • 16 January, 2018 11:40 PM

Wtf are you talking about? No. Corporations own you. And if feminism is trying to stop that then maybe you gave yourself the best reason to shut up since that fight is in your god damn best interest. Unless youre a shareholding 10 percenter in deep of a mega transnational corporation.

HoundDogs • 1 point • 11 January, 2018 03:26 AM

I keep wondering why we haven't seen an uptick in revenge crimes among men. If someone accused me of sexual assault, knowing it was consensual, and destroyed my life it would take a lot for me not to make that right by any means necessary.