

Israeli feminists helped kill a bill that could charge women for rape of men because - get this - they're worried about false rape claims.

December 8, 2014 | 1032 upvotes | by [brotherjustincrowe](#)

Oy vey izmir. <http://www.jpost.com/Israel/Womens-groups-Cancel-law-charging-women-with-rape>

Here I thought one of the reasons Orthodox Judaism has persisted for so long as a relatively unchanging culture and tradition was due to strictly proscribed gender roles. Guess we can cross Tel Aviv off the travel list.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 113 points • 8 December, 2014 05:04 PM

Feminism is pro-women not pro-equality. Pro-women comes first. Equality takes a backseat. Feminists love pretending like it's the same thing hoping that we don't see through the smoke screen or that we're too passive to call them out.

brotherjustincrowe[S, □] • 57 points • 8 December, 2014 05:05 PM

I blame the betas who follow 100% what women say but turn a blind eye to what they do. Pussy-pedestal blinders.

cocaine_face • 27 points • 8 December, 2014 06:19 PM

Some Beta Orbiter Queen posted about how lonely she was on Facebook and how guys should come out and tell her if they have a crush.

One guy posted, "Well you rejected me, but at least I did! :)"

I responded (to the guy) with, "If you improve yourself and make yourself sexier, you'll never be rejected again" (obvious exaggeration, but the general principle is true). The girl responds with, "Wow."

Some other orbiter posts, "Wow, because women can only process sexiness in their tiny woman brains, isn't that right?"

And I just thought to myself, "Oh, poor beta, if only you knew how wrong your approach was, you'd drop it immediately".

There's no reasoning with these people. It's as if their logical reasoning is hijacked by their dick.

[deleted] • 61 points • 8 December, 2014 06:54 PM

[permanently deleted]

Archwinger • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 11:38 AM

A sad truth. Only in these crazy times is "improve yourself, get sexier, and you won't get rejected" somehow evil red pill misogynist advice.

cocaine_face • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 12:17 PM

That's more or less what I responded.

I was like, "Getting sexier is wrong? I would say the same thing about men and women, honestly" (though obviously knowing that increasing SMV for women is, besides losing weight, pretty much a crapshoot).

The beta said that I was, "incredibly shallow", to which I said, "yes I am", because I am.

He then said for me to be happy dating a bimbo (read: a girl out of his SMV range that he has decided are all dumb as bricks, to justify his sour grapes)

The read I got out of that situation was:

He instinctively recognizes I have more options than him, and rather than improving himself, he hates me for it.

Note, this was beta #2 that was attacking me (presumably to win points and favor with his

queen), the first never said anything.

systems shock869 • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 02:18 PM

I made that mistake with a friend that I assumed would be receptive. Instead of rational conversation I got emotional backlash, complete with straw man arguments and mockery. As a bonus he shares everything with his wife so now she especially isn't too fond of me and I'm the misogynist of the group.

It's pretty hilarious to say the exact same type of quip or joke involving women that my friend is known to make and watch the entirely different reactions I get. Once a misogynist always a misogynist..

LittleCraze • 4 points • 9 December, 2014 04:20 PM*

I find the duck and run attitude regarding feminist rhetoric to be pretty disgusting to be honest and I don't give one half of a fuck what people think.

You'll try to tell me how it will affect my life and my future dating, career, and life prospects and I will respond with "like feminism run rampant has?" so save it. I don't care. Allowing feminists to shove their message down everyone's throats without anyone presenting any counter arguments is what has allowed it to get to this point.

I had a pretty spectacular brouhaha with a bunch of feminist leaning women and I held court like a boss and actually disseminated some contradictory government statistics which refute the feminist dialogue at their request. Don't fucking care if they read it or considered it. I did something rather than huddle and whine to myself that we're already beaten.

Hate if you want but I personally find it unforgivable that a bunch of so-called Alphas think that the best thing is to tuck their tails and say nothing to curb a movement which affects us all.

Down-vote if I hurt your little feelings but it won't change a damn thing.

The funny thing is, I can't even count how many times people have told me that they like me for my blunt and often times brutal honesty. They know where I stand and know that I will defend my position vigorously and with intelligence. If they think I'm a misogynist, that's their problem for being idiots.

[deleted] • 3 points • 10 December, 2014 10:20 AM

[permanently deleted]

LittleCraze • 1 point • 11 December, 2014 03:29 AM*

I don't have the time or energy to respond very effectively so all I can say is that the ignore them and they'll go away tactic and blaming people who offer counter arguments to feminist bullshit is so fucking stupid it hurts my brain. Just because a bunch of redditors and manosphere gurus parrot this absolutely ludicrous strategy, doesn't mean it's true.

I wish you all the personal glory and Pussy that all of your manly pursuits will surely result in, in the feminist hell that you tacitly allowed the world to become.

As for me thinking I'm more alpha for taking action, quite simply, I don't. I think the term as it is used in here is so nebulous that it is meaningless and I do not aspire to it. I aspire to be me. To fuck with stupid childish labels.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 December, 2014 06:00 AM

[permanently deleted]

LittleCrazee • 1 point • 11 December, 2014 01:25 PM

Fair enough I suppose. You seem like a bright guy (in all seriousness), I wish you the best.

Independentmale • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 11:34 PM

Once you're labelled as a misogynist it's very hard to change that reputation.

Yeah, I don't even give a fuck anymore. The only people who give a shit are white knight faggots and fat hamplanets, neither of which I care to have in my life. Now, I just agree & amplify when someone pulls the misogynist card. "You know it, sweet tits. Get me another beer."

This behavior has not put any kind of a damper on my sex life. If anything, the "bad boy" reputation I've inadvertently fostered has been entirely beneficial. It's really hard for crazy bitches to create drama with me when they know I'll just agree & laugh it off.

cocaine_face • 1 point • 8 December, 2014 08:00 PM

Oh I know in general that's a smart plan, but with her I'm just trolling. We have no friends in common anymore, I have no interest in sleeping with her really (if she made it easy enough, sure, but she lives 45 minutes away now and she's not anywhere near attractive enough for real effort or desire). I see it as a funny game.

bicepsblastingstud • 4 points • 9 December, 2014 12:42 PM

It's facebook, anybody can read it. When you post shit like that, you're yelling off into a public forum.

Don't be a moron, conceal your hand.

cocaine_face • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 04:16 PM

You're really far more worried about the opinion's of my Facebook friends than I am. I do agree that as I become more influential, I'll need to curtail that behavior.

bicepsblastingstud • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 05:14 PM

I do agree that as I become more influential, I'll need to curtail that behavior.

Why wait?

You're really far more worried about the opinion's of my Facebook friends than I am.

Reputation is *everything*. I'm guessing you're fairly young, and haven't really experienced how important it is to have a good rep with that friend of a friend.

cocaine_face • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 05:36 PM

I haven't been waiting, I've gradually been decreasing the behavior over the past two years or so. But I used to really like attention and validation, and every once in a while I'll still swipe for it. I consider it a moral failing when I do, of course - though in most contexts, not a huge one.

Actually, I'm moderately old. I'm just now getting to the point in my life where I

care about reputation. I've never had a value add from reputation thus far though. Everything I've gotten has just come from working harder/learning things for me.

cocaine_face • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 06:02 PM

Another reason why I'm not too bothered by it is because I know it is temporary - zeal of the convert and all that. Eventually the desire to save other men will die out.

krakosia • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 03:45 PM

Listen to what the other poster said.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 December, 2014 07:19 PM

Don't blame them. Educate them.

TylerX5 • 3 points • 10 December, 2014 07:28 AM

Suzanne Summers and other feminist have come out against the gender feminist movements, and have made a space for what they call equity feminists. The 2 groups are vastly different in terms of goals and methodology

blue_27 • 0 points • 8 December, 2014 10:06 PM

If they believed in actual equality, then it should be perfectly OK to hit women. I'm not suggesting that it be made so, because I don't believe that men and women are the same. And I do not believe that it is *ever* OK to hit a woman.

But, if we were truly equal, then there should have been **zero** national outrage at the Ray Rice video, and he shouldn't have been ostracized like he was.

Kaelteth • 15 points • 9 December, 2014 05:04 AM

And I do not believe that it is ever OK to hit a woman.

I know this is a belief, but I call bullshit on your belief.

If a woman comes at you with a knife, or a gun, and you're unarmed, will you hit them to defend yourself? How about if some bitch threatened your kid (assuming you do/ever would have kids)? How about if the cunt in question outweighs you by 150lbs and trains MMA in the gym?

Of *course* it is ok to hit a woman, *if the situation calls for it*. I realize that in this culture we really *shouldn't*, if for any other reason than self-protection in a legal sense, but to say that it is never acceptable to hit a woman could put you in a world of hurt.

Ibex3D • 16 points • 9 December, 2014 06:41 AM

"Dont hit anyone unless you have to." No gender, no bullshit.

blue_27 • -2 points • 9 December, 2014 03:14 PM

How about if the cunt in question outweighs you by 150lbs and trains MMA in the gym?

I can guarantee you that a 310 pound woman has zero chance against me in the ring, or anywhere in hand to hand combat of any form.

And I do not expect a woman to be overly skilled in knife fighting, so I wouldn't consider that a viable threat. If she had a firearm, punching her would be my last course of action. If she *threatened* my children? No. I still wouldn't hit her for that. I would remove the threat.

No, it is *not* OK to hit women. We are bigger and stronger, and should be capable of controlling the situation where hitting a smaller and weaker opponent is never necessary. If you have found yourself in a place where you feel the need to beat women, then you need to perform a serious inward look to try to figure out why your world is so fucked up.

You can call bullshit all you like, but ... it doesn't change anything.

Lt_Muffintoes • 5 points • 9 December, 2014 03:47 PM

Yeah man, knife attacks are no threat

Maybe your whiteknight armour will save you?

blue_27 • -1 points • 10 December, 2014 08:17 PM*

That's not a chick.

I don't sport whiteknight armor. I'm not putting anyone on a pedestal, I'm specifically stating that at no point should a man lose control enough that he has to resort to punching a woman. They are smaller and weaker than us, therefore not a significant physical threat.\

Pro-tip: (I'm guessing you are a bit light on hand-to-hand combat experience, so allow me to help ...) - if your opponent has a knife, and all you have is two bare hands ... *punching* them is a real shitty plan. Remove yourself or the weapon from the equation, but you still shouldn't ever need to punch a girl.

EDIT: removed name-calling.

Lt_Muffintoes • 2 points • 10 December, 2014 08:42 PM

I have to admit that I've never been attacked with a knife, but if someone truly means to kill you with a knife, you're probably already dead.

I'm specifically stating that at no point should a man lose control enough that he has to resort to punching a woman

I'll agree insofar as you shouldn't be around women who will come after you physically, but man, come on. Someone has a knife in their hand, you pretty much have permission to do anything and everything against them.

blue_27 • -1 points • 10 December, 2014 11:30 PM

I will repeat my original statement that has spawned all of this shit:

... I do not expect a woman to be overly skilled in knife fighting, so I wouldn't consider that a viable threat.

Not one single rebuttal has actually shown me a depiction of a female who was highly trained in edged weapons, and fits into this discussion.

Someone has a knife in their hand, you pretty much have permission to do anything and everything against them.

Sure. They have now shown themselves to be a legitimate threat. However, at *no* point in time does punching them become the proper course of action. Your primary focus

should be to secure that weapon, and at that point, why would you then resort to punching if you have now disarmed your opponent. You should now be in full control of that situation, and I am not sure that moving back within arms reach of that person is the best of plans. I wouldn't do it, and I consider myself very well trained and highly experienced.

But what we are discussing now has absolutely *zero* to do with the concept of not hitting women. Don't be a fucking victim, and if anyone says that they were scared of a little girl, then ... they are playing the victim role.

krakosia • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 03:48 PM

Watch the video of the bouncer in the train getting verbally and physically abused by some girls in the NY subway. He ends up beating the girls are one of the white knights. The judge let him go free.

trp222 • 23 points • 8 December, 2014 10:47 PM

They know from personal experience how easy it is to falsely convict someone of rape.

[deleted] • 194 points • 8 December, 2014 03:57 PM

Let it not be forgotten that feminism is and always has been a sexual strategy.

sir_wankalot_here • 131 points • 8 December, 2014 04:08 PM

For most groups that demand equality, the 50/50 split always seems to be you get the front half of the cow, they get the rear half of the cow that makes the milk. Then they complain you are not feeding the cow enough and the milk is poor quality.

[deleted] • 76 points • 8 December, 2014 07:01 PM

Quote from the article: "The law treats men and women as being equal"

This is framed as a problem with the law.

colovick • 5 points • 9 December, 2014 05:12 AM

The law in its supreme equality punishes both the rich and the poor equally for sleeping in the streets and stealing bread.

And before someone corrects me, yes I'm sure I butchered some part of that quote.

Dorrog • 5 points • 9 December, 2014 07:00 AM

You see the demagoguery in that quote right?

The problem is not equality in front of the law or that stopping people from living in the street is bad. The problem is that some people don't have anywhere to live but in the street.

[deleted] • 21 points • 8 December, 2014 06:38 PM*

Sorry for being a little TRP off-topic but:

There's so much scarcity mentality when there need not be. Knowledge is the cheapest and most available it's ever been but somehow there are more victims than ever. Africa is an entire continent ripe for development that can create huge amounts of wealth but instead of making a farm for yourself people want to squat on someone else's. Do people realize Liberia was successful until the natives toppled the americanized government? That South Africa was far more productive and safe under apartheid?

When things got bad for the European "barbarians" they packed up all their shit and went marauding to start a better life, sometimes at the end of a sword. That drive to improve is gone and in place of it people just whine and complain and lament their situation on the fat of their ass.

Do not think it is a good thing when first-world countries take in third-world refugees. We are taking their smartest and most productive people from those countries and robbing them of their revolutionaries.

[deleted] • 13 points • 8 December, 2014 06:49 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 4 points • 9 December, 2014 06:16 AM

We also reward apathy. There is no reason to acquire knowledge or apply it.

[deleted] • 18 points • 8 December, 2014 09:01 PM

You want to go start up a successful business in Africa? Go ahead, just don't say you weren't warned when the guerillas come to take your shit and rape your wife.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 December, 2014 09:05 PM

[permanently deleted]

jmottram08 • 12 points • 8 December, 2014 11:18 PM

How much longer are we going to wait for Africa to pick themselves up before we conclude that they're incapable of it?

As long as people have a problem with racism.

Because to do what you said would require people to admit that Africans aren't great at progress, and white european descendants are.

AFPJ • 6 points • 10 December, 2014 07:12 PM

If I had a penny for every time a geneticist doing good scientific work lost his career, funding & had his study shrieked on by shills I'd buy a Land Rover. "Africans" are the only remaining pure Homo sapiens. They interbred with Deniova hominis 40K years ago, forming the genetic substrate for Hispanic and Asian Races as well as Homo Neanderthalensis about 60K years ago, creating Nordics & Scandinavians. Everything else is a mix of the big 3.

I'm just as happy as ya'll to see the occasional actually scientific study on here but you've got to realize that science is just as distorted, twisted & undermined by Political Correctness as anything, sometimes even more so.

[deleted] • -5 points • 8 December, 2014 11:30 PM

[permanently deleted]

jmottram08 • 9 points • 9 December, 2014 12:21 AM

Africans haven't been good with progress for whatever reason

Only severe cognitive dissonance and strict adherence to politically correctness would fail to associate "Africans" with a certain race.

Let's be clear... the continent is geopolitically *spectacular*.... close to all the major

players with varied climates and regions.... yet it has failed to develop.

Why do *you* think... honestly? (and, btw, you can't say "Teh africans"... that is a racial distinction)

[deleted] • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 06:56 AM

[permanently deleted]

jmottram08 • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 07:20 AM

It's not because of race, it's because their society never set the groundwork for a rational government.

A society that was created ... by a race... oh.

Mucj of the continent is simply inhabitable, or barely habitable.

Give me a god damn break.

Stop making excuses and face facts.

Africa developed much quicker in some aspects than everywhere else in the world (mathematics, for example).

You mean Egypt.

Tell me, socially and ethnically... are the egyptians closer to europeans or Africans?

Power shifted away from africa and the middle east, and never really returned.

You mean that is stood fucking still for two millennia.

Criticize as you see fit, I like polite, intelligent, discourse

Fine. Stop trying to have a discussion. This isn't a discussion. Not everything is a discussion. If I said $2+2=4$, you shouldn't try to have a discussion about it.

The facts of the matter (even setting aside history) is that Africans are a very backwards people. Its 2014 and they still deal with warlords. The world has thrown so much money at them to try and help... but they still just don't get it. They don't understand how to be a civilized, modern society. And what is nuts is that they are sitting on some one the world's most valuable resources... and they still can't fucking figure out how to get their shit together.

By any objective measure they are just failing. again and again.

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 December, 2014 12:36 AM

Why do you think... honestly? (and, btw, you can't say "Teh africans"... that is a racial distinction)

No fucking stability. Consistent civil war, coupled with colonizations and western interaction, and religion. What part of that has to do with race?

Africa is a large continent with a many different racial groups and religions.

Lumping it all together and asking why "it has failed to develop" is like grouping

the Americas together.

jmottram08 • 6 points • 9 December, 2014 01:37 AM

What part of that has to do with race?

The fact that it doesn't happen in other countries/continents with different racial makeups.

Consistent civil war

What the everliving fuck do you think causes this? "The man?"

[deleted] • -7 points • 9 December, 2014 12:33 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -3 points • 9 December, 2014 12:39 AM

[permanently deleted]

jmottram08 • 8 points • 9 December, 2014 01:37 AM

I dunno.. why are you trying to pretend the world is perfect and people don't have intrinsic differences in a sub that knows they do?

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 11:45 PM*

Indeed but colonialism need not be so inhumanely exploitative. For some reason people seem to completely discount the benefits and presume any future colonization must include genocide. South Korea was a relatively successful endeavor and those people appear to be better off.

sir_wankalot_here • 5 points • 9 December, 2014 02:17 AM

TRP explanation.

Do not think it is a good thing when first-world countries take in third-world refugees. We are taking their smartest and most productive people from those countries and robbing them of their revolutionaries.

It is reverse colonization. European colonization served two purposes. First one is the obvious, it got natural resources. Second one is less obvious. It got rid of potential malcontents and revolutionaries.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 December, 2014 10:36 PM*

That South Africa was far more productive and safe under apartheid?

I'm going to assume you're white and would not have faced apartheid?

Do people realize Liberia was successful until the natives toppled the americanized government?

Also safe to assume that you have cultural beliefs and would fight to preserve them if a foreign country (Say China) decided to colonize the U.S.

These two examples are bullshit. Your initial point is interesting, but weak. Africa has lots of opportunity for development, but socio-political strife and civil unrest prevents that from occurring. A

scarcity mentality is definitely understandable. There's more mouths to feed and the pie isn't getting any larger. Every year there's a net gain (death-birth) of 75 million people. Combine that with recent technology eliminating jobs, and you'll understand scarcity mentalities.

[deleted] • -1 points • 8 December, 2014 10:47 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 8 December, 2014 10:57 PM

Your post shows a horrible understanding of human nature and a pretty ethnocentric worldview.

Do you really think things are that simple? Go in, create a wealthy city, and people will be ok with occupation?

thisjibberjabber • 4 points • 8 December, 2014 11:10 PM

It did sort of work in Hong Kong. Seems at least as promising as the NGO model of development.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 December, 2014 11:01 PM

The world is much more simple than we can possibly imagine. Who would have thought that after all our societal evolution women still just want to get fucked by a caveman?

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 12:15 AM

The world is much more simple than we can possibly imagine.

Some aspects are some are not.

Who would have thought that after all our societal evolution women still just want to get fucked by a caveman?

That's not particularly surprising. Most signs point towards this; women dating bad boys, animal interaction, etc.

Now look at occupations and the results of previous occupations. Most often it ends in a violent revolutions. What does that tell you about human nature and willingness to submit?

johnbranflake • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 01:00 AM

No, British colonies were all better off having been colonized, and people were mostly happy with it. In the US all they wanted was the same rights as British Citizens. Ghandi wanted India to be part of the British Commonwealth. AUS NZ CANADA are all part of the commonwealth.

666Evo • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 02:07 AM

I'd hesitate to include Australia in "...and people were mostly happy with it." The criminals the British sent to paradise? No shit they were happy with the situation.

The native people who were slaughtered en masse? Not so much. They're still not overly happy with it. Nor were they particularly better off until relatively recently and they still lag behind in the majority of metrics today.

I can't speak for the rest of the Commonwealth but the only people happy with colonisation in Australia were the people forming colonies.

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 December, 2014 01:16 AM

and people were mostly happy with it.

Until they felt that their culture (language, religion, worldview) was under attack. Then they were willing to fight and die.

AngriestBeaver • -4 points • 8 December, 2014 11:34 PM

Little new to trp, see a lot of good post about self I improvement, sociobiology, evolutionary evidence of human behavior. Was all refreshing and evidence based until I saw u/stumbles racist ethnocentric rant and his completely ignorant view of Africa. Holy shit. Aren't there mods to keep agenda spewing shit out, or does this come with the territory. And why the fuck does he have so many upvotes. Take that shit to r/politics

[deleted] • -3 points • 9 December, 2014 12:16 AM

Occasionally. I don't care that it's racist or ethnocentric, but it's just such a fucking stupid argument.

"Don't they know that if white people took over things would be better? Why won't they allow us to colonize and Americanize them? Why don't they understand that if we make their country like ours they'll be happier. All we need to do is make them wealthy and they'll allow their culture to die."

When it's completely the other way around. Most people are willing to give up wealth and fight to the death to maintain their culture (aka identity).

johnbranflake • 5 points • 9 December, 2014 12:56 AM

Go to Africa, people beg you to take you with them. They want wealth and culture, but will choose the former if they could.

[deleted] • -3 points • 9 December, 2014 01:14 AM

Just the way you phrase your statements shows your bias:

They want wealth and culture

This clearly implies:

1. American culture is the best. Cultures different from American are inferior.

they want wealth

Yes they do. All people want wealth. What does that have to do with American culture?

they want culture

No. They already have culture. They have the sports, stories, religion, jokes, and language that they grew up with and are used to.

Go to Africa, people beg you to take you with them.

You're telling me poor people who struggle to get food and healthcare would move to prosperous areas? No shit.

Go to wealthier parts of Africa without war or famine. Areas where families have a surplus of food, leisurely time, and strong social/family ties. They will almost always prefer their own culture to American. Just like you prefer American culture.

wiseclockcounter • 0 points • 9 December, 2014 02:54 AM

it's pretty much the same deal with conservatism on here. Just down-vote and give a simple retort so that people can see the other side and make their own decision.

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 December, 2014 03:07 PM

[permanently deleted]

AngriestBeaver • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 03:45 PM

realists base their opinions on facts and evidence. you are giving your opinion on an issue you have a limited understanding of. stumbles for president /s

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 04:04 PM

The irony is that I envision a much more prosperous future for blacks than you do. Yet I'm the racist.

jmottram08 • 0 points • 8 December, 2014 11:20 PM

No, they won't be okay with occupation. But they are occupied by drug and warlords now, so I don't think its a huge problem.

At least with white people in charge they won't be getting murdered and raped as they currently are. And their standard of living will skyrocket.

[deleted] • -2 points • 9 December, 2014 12:26 AM

Such blatant racism and stupidity.

No. With white people in charge, violent regimes and dictators will be elected and thousands of innocent people killed.

<http://www.historyisaweapon.com/defcon2/world.html>

Browse around South America and Africa.

Good examples are Nicaragua, Somalia, Libya, and Congo.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nicaragua_v._United_States

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sandinista_National_Liberation_Front

jmottram08 • 5 points • 9 December, 2014 01:34 AM

No. With white people in charge, violent regimes and dictators will be elected and thousands of innocent people killed.

Are you aware of what africa is like currently?

[deleted] • 0 points • 9 December, 2014 06:37 AM

[permanently deleted]

2comment • 1 point • 8 December, 2014 10:04 PM

Do not think it is a good thing when first-world countries take in third-world refugees. We are taking their smartest and most productive people from those countries

If they come here for college or training, perhaps.

But the typical Euro "asylum" seekers and refugees are far from the "most productive". They're just chasing welfare state cash and are often quasi recruited by the european governments themselves (not even self-initiative).

[deleted] • 1 points • 8 December, 2014 11:32 PM

[permanently deleted]

Hirudin • 9 points • 9 December, 2014 01:10 AM

The US probably has much more strict immigration rules for everyone else *because* so much of the available infrastructure for taking in immigrants is innundated with Mexicans.

nived321 • 0 points • 9 December, 2014 06:29 AM

At least they're not Muslims...

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 December, 2014 06:56 PM

Can you briefly explain what you mean by this?

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 03:30 AM

It's a strategy women adopt to secure the best mates for themselves.

Areimanes • 94 points • 8 December, 2014 03:40 PM

Some key elements from the post:

“The law treats men and women as being equal when it is obvious that in these matters, the men are the stronger ones.”

Something, something, animals are more equal than others.

According to the Justice Ministry, the amendment is necessary because the current wording applies only to men. **Although it is rare, there is a possibility that a woman may rape an adult male** or female and therefore the law should stipulate that this, too, is forbidden.

Those people sound like rape apologists to me.

neoj8888 • 6 points • 9 December, 2014 02:59 PM

They should play Benny Hill music over feminist news these days.

BluepillProfessor • 6 points • 9 December, 2014 04:41 PM

That is perfect! The Benny Hill theme music paired with modern feminism. Show feminists running

around, protesting, and always imagine them on the hamster wheel.

[deleted] • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 09:55 AM

Wasn't rare enough to exclude what happened to me.

Kekeramitu • 49 points • 8 December, 2014 04:17 PM

Funny how the fact that most women lap up feminism and never question a thing has really had the most negative effect on my view of women. It's really hard to believe they are at all intelligent when they follow this shit.

anonlmouse • 112 points • 8 December, 2014 04:46 PM

Feminism has never turned any actual misogynists into non-misogynists, but it has made new misogynists.

Cyralea • 59 points • 8 December, 2014 05:49 PM

If you think about it, there's no greater organization devoted to the idea that women are simply adult-sized children with no agency of their own. Literally every one of their ideas boils down to "We have it badly but we can't fix it on our own. Men...fix it for us".

cocaine_face • 86 points • 8 December, 2014 06:11 PM

This was part of what ultimately made me take the pill.

I had learned PUA, and I had a plate who was ardently feminist. I, at the time, arguably agreed with feminist principles.

Then at one point, we got into an argument, I don't remember what it was about, but it directly contradicted my experiences. I told her, "I don't agree with that, you'll have to convince me if you want me to change my mind."

She responded with, "That's not my job. It's your job to educate yourself."

I was like, "That makes no sense - if you want people to come to your cause, it's your job to convince them."

We had the same argument a couple more times, with her telling me to educate myself.

So I did.

Now I'm here.

[deleted] • 35 points • 8 December, 2014 09:26 PM

educate yourself!

Fem-speak for "because I said so!"

ddundly • 18 points • 8 December, 2014 09:54 PM

Yep. And what is so hilarious, is that there is no "education" involved at all. It always boils down to what some other feminist told them.

wiseclockcounter • 8 points • 9 December, 2014 03:02 AM

that's the thing, they feel they are educated because they blithely believed some bullshit they hear everyone regurgitating. The spread of feminism is two-fold: women's tendency to follow the crowd and conform and be accepted, and the fact that the truth makes them feel bad about themselves because it requires they place blame and/or responsibility on themselves. And we

can't have either of those because feelz.

through_a_ways • 7 points • 9 December, 2014 04:58 AM

She responded with, "That's not my job. It's your job to educate yourself."

I was like, "That makes no sense - if you want people to come to your cause, it's your job to convince them."

Dat entitlement mentality.

Wants you to believe something, doesn't want to do any of the work to convince you, despite you saying you are open minded.

It's the rhetorical version of "give me free shit"

cocaine_face • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 12:25 PM

That was honestly what really started pushing me down this path. It was the moment I realized that feminists were not arguing in good faith. Also my counter-arguments to her points were always met with, "You sound like an MRA", which previously to that point, I had only a vague knowledge of them as "horrible misogynists". I read up on them, found the Redpill more to my liking (I'd already taken responsibility for my life during my 3 year PUA transition), and boom. There we were.

[deleted] • 28 points • 8 December, 2014 04:21 PM

[permanently deleted]

brotherjustincrowe[S, □] • 16 points • 8 December, 2014 04:23 PM

If they didn't keep 'em that way, they wouldn't be able to recruit new feminists.

Dorrog • 4 points • 8 December, 2014 06:49 PM

So they follow a movement that has effectively given them more rights than men while still being seen as the victims and you find them stupid?

Who is really bring stupid here?

mrp3anut • 14 points • 8 December, 2014 11:37 PM

It has given them rights and power but if they use said power they end up miserable and alone.

I.e. divorce rape average guy making 40k or do a year and take half of the shit which amounts to some IKEA stuff and a small house in the burbs. She gets 10-20k a year in child support/alimony but for the rest of her life she'll be a pump and dump or plate for men of lower and lower smv.

Or she works and party's through her 20s gets a leg up in promotions etc but hates her job and worries about finding a man she wants. She he grudgingly ends up with beta boy at 30 has 2 kids and side tracks her "career" the divorces at 38 and tries to pick it back up but doesn't feel truly happy at any point in her life.

Hoodwink • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 04:57 PM

The refrain of any attack or charge of inequality is that feminism IS about equality.

Also, most **people** generally don't follow news - it's a very small percentage - and even a smaller percentage with the education, intelligence, and time to sort it out and read up.

Intelligence is just one factor in actually being aware of what's going on and proper interpreting.

redpilltom • -1 points • 8 December, 2014 10:20 PM

Probably the same reason non Jews didn't really question Nazism, or why most white people didn't question Jim Crow laws. It's easy to follow something without question when it does nothing but help you.

runnerrun2 • 30 points • 8 December, 2014 05:23 PM

“What will happen now is that every time a woman files a criminal complaint against a man for rape, he will countercharge that the woman caused him to penetrate her body, that he did it without wanting to,” she said. “He will then make a counter complaint, so that there will be two files in court, his against hers. This will block women, silence them and prevent them from going to the police.”

Wtf this doesn't even make sense.. are they just trolling to see what they can get away with or something?

Newdist2 • 18 points • 8 December, 2014 07:36 PM

Maybe they are talking about drunk hookups? .08 BAC man and a .08 BAC woman have sex --> he raped her but she didn't rape him.

runnerrun2 • -3 points • 8 December, 2014 08:45 PM

I have a hard time believing this isn't some onion-style parody. First they describe that the law is about being able to charge women for facilitating objects being inserted into men/women. So dildoing a guy or taking part in the dildoing of a man (or another woman). To go from there to charging a woman with inserting a man's penis into herself is quite a bizarre leap.

But even if we take that this law can be used like that, I mean sure there have been cases where men reported being forced into sex they didn't like, it's not like a charge means a verdict. Since when it is wrong to be able to charge people with a crime? It's up to the judge to decide. If a man truly did rape a woman, a nonsensical counter-charge he was raped would be thrown out by the judge quite easily based on the evidence that is naturally needed to convict. How exactly does this silence women?

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 December, 2014 02:17 PM

Umm. That's all feminism ever was.

Vietnom • 35 points • 8 December, 2014 05:22 PM*

I've found that Jewish culture in general is very female dominated. I'm half Jewish half Christian. On the Jewish side, all my male family members who are married are subservient to their wives. The wives don't work and make all the decisions for the family. The men aren't in control. The others are divorced.

The Christian side has more traditional gender roles, where the guys are more dominant and in control.

UsernameIWontRegret • 35 points • 8 December, 2014 05:32 PM

Also Jewish here. Women control the family. However, men control the community. This is Judaism's way of giving equal power to men and women.

Vietnom • 19 points • 8 December, 2014 05:47 PM

I suppose in certain Jewish-centric communities it works that way, but all my uncles live in secular communities and have secular jobs. Thus, they don't really exert much control over their communities either.

Snivellious • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 01:27 AM

This is a really fascinating point. The "separate spheres" doctrine (men are dominant in some roles, women in others) generally works alright as long as those spheres are roughly preserved.

If one of those spheres is dissolved (or made "equal"), suddenly there's a fundamental imbalance. This makes a lot of sense for religious communities becoming secularized, but I think it can be applied more broadly.

We've very much seen egalitarianism grow in social and workplace settings without corresponding "balance" in the home. Chores are being *slowly* offloaded onto men, while domestic choices and control of children are largely reserved to women. The common feminist complaint of "Working full time and raising children is too hard!" is pretty much true, but the people saying it would never budge on giving up control of their homes and children to men.

cocaine_face • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 05:37 AM

Chores are drudgery, children and control over the home is power.

Snivellious • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 04:27 PM

Yep. It's a move towards "equality" to offload chores to men, but it's only made because it isn't a move towards power sharing.

zyk0s • 13 points • 8 December, 2014 06:59 PM

Funny, one could argue that in traditional Christian settings, it's exactly the other way around and women do indeed control the community.

It's the contrast of overt versus covert power. Men are usually more comfortable and better at overt control, and women have a natural for covert control over men. But in Judaism, there's a cultural emphasis on covert modes of influence through intellectual pursuits, so it would make sense this would translate in some sort of reversal of tasks in the family unit.

I'll have to give it some more thought, but feminism seems to affect Christianity and Judaism in very different ways, probably due to those cultural differences.

Snivellious • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 01:32 AM

This producing an interesting "splitting" effect, I think. In secular communities, there's a steady push to make extra-familial interactions gender-neutral. The result in that whichever gender's power was primarily social decays, and whichever gender's power is primarily domestic remains untouched, creating imbalance.

It's hard to see for Christianity because Christianity in secular communities is weakening and getting rarer, but I suspect that in "strongly religious" households, whichever side controlled household affairs has been steadily gaining power. Just spitballing, but it's interesting.

no_face • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 04:57 AM

Thus is born the shiksa appeal

WindowToAlaska • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 10:57 PM

There's a huge difference in religious and non religious Jewish families.

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 08:49 AM

It is very female dominated

[deleted] • 23 points • 8 December, 2014 06:05 PM*

I thought false rape claims, if they happen at all, are only like 1% of all claims. Also, according to one prominent feminist, Catherine Comins, people can often benefit from being falsely accused of rape.

edit: Holy shit! I didn't think this was necessary but /s

KyfhoMyoba • 6 points • 9 December, 2014 12:23 AM

Well, if you tho't that, you'd be wrong by 40x. At least 40% of all rape claims are false. US Air Force did an extensive, crawl-up-your-ass-with-a-microscope study. Ask any large city detective.

And it's getting worse.

justskatedude • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 12:54 AM

Where's the source? I've never heard that many

[deleted] • 10 points • 9 December, 2014 04:07 AM

http://www.mediadarad.org/research_on_false_rape_allegations.php

In a nine-year study of 109 rapes reported to the police in a Midwestern city, Purdue sociologist Eugene J. Kanin reported that in 41% of the cases the complainants eventually admitted that no rape had occurred.³

In a follow-up study of rape claims filed over a three-year period at two large Midwestern universities, Kanin found that of 64 rape cases, 50% turned out to be false.⁴ Among the false charges, 53% of the women admitted they filed the false claim as an alibi.⁵

[deleted] • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 01:24 AM

I thought the /s was implied.

WhiteTrashInTrouble • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 02:50 PM

It should have been. Good sarcasm shouldn't need /s.

[deleted] • 6 points • 8 December, 2014 10:14 PM

That number only applies to female false claims. Men obviously would lie every single time, as that woman stated.

Newdist2 • 8 points • 8 December, 2014 07:41 PM

A man would never lie about being raped.

Venicedreaming • 5 points • 9 December, 2014 01:15 AM

Never is a big word my friend

[deleted] • 4 points • 9 December, 2014 06:45 AM

[permanently deleted]

Venicedreaming • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 03:13 PM

Well, with the homophobic trend, instead of admitting to homosexuality, I can see one spinning it

to assault. Never is a big word

perogies • -5 points • 8 December, 2014 08:54 PM

Unless that man is a douche bag Hollywood actor..

[deleted] • 9 points • 8 December, 2014 09:35 PM

There's no proof he's lying

MyNewAccount9 • 7 points • 8 December, 2014 07:25 PM

Wow, from a critic of the law:

“The bill will cause women to stop complaining...” she warned. “The law treats men and women as being equal when it is obvious that in these matters, the men are the stronger ones.”

4_YRT • 6 points • 8 December, 2014 10:57 PM

I have a question. Won't the "yes means yes" bill necessarily mean that women will be charged with rape also, assuming that the law is applied equally? I mean, in most rape cases the male, who is probably drunk also, doesn't provide affirmative consent. So if she makes accusations against him, can't he just turn around and make the same accusations against her?

TRPtruth • 6 points • 9 December, 2014 01:02 AM

Mentioning Orthodox Judaism with general Tel Aviv culture and society shows you have no idea what you are talking about. Also, would definitely recommend a trip Tel Aviv, secular Israeli ass is epic.

Vrnn • 3 points • 8 December, 2014 11:05 PM

Few years ago I started talking to this Israeli girl in the mall who was selling crap. I was happy to practice my Hebrew, before I knew it I was her boyfriend. God I miss that place!

There is something to be said about Israeli women, after moving here in Canada 10 years ago I'd have to say Canadian girls are much more tame.

Transmigratory • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 08:22 PM

I didn't see anything about the law makers deciding to ditch the bill... it is postponed.

R4F1 • 7 points • 8 December, 2014 05:38 PM

Here I thought one of the reasons Orthodox Judaism has persisted for so long as a relatively unchanging culture and tradition was due to strictly proscribed gender roles. Guess we can cross Tel Aviv off the travel list.

Seriously? Non-Haredi Judaism is probably the single biggest force promoting cultural-marxism and feminism in the Western world. Everything from Marx himself to Saul Alinsky to the Southern Poverty Law Center to the ADL is under their thumb. The only one's outside their clutch are non-Zionist Haredi Jews (i.e. the Ultra-Orthodox) and a few libertarian Jews like Rothbard and Mises.

through_a_ways • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 05:04 AM

There's a difference between orthodox Jews and secular Jews.

The leftism-pushing parties are the latter, but both are tied by common ancestry and religion.

R4F1 • 0 points • 9 December, 2014 09:45 AM

The orthodox, conservative and reformist branches of Rabbinic Judaism differ in their personal stances, but politically they're effectively the same. In Israel, the orthodox are often the ones in power, but most of Israel's supporters in the US are reformist. It's usually the reformists, and atheists, that promote "Progressivism" in the West. It's like comparing Neoconservatism with Progressivism, Neocons act like they're traditionalist/conservative but they're hand-in-glove together with Progressivism (actually an offshoot of it).

WindowToAlaska • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 11:00 PM

Haredi is a form of orthodox Judaism. There's many types of orthodox Judaism. You are wrong. In the orthodox (read: religious) Jewish world the families are patriarchal. In the modern and non religious and reform Jews are liberal and Marxist types.

JazzerciseMaster • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 01:18 AM

Why is that? I'm a Jew - I come from a secular, close-to-atheist family that is firmly left of center. I find that I (and many Jews of my generation) have shifted to the right (the original catalyst was ultra anti-Israel sentiment on the left, which drove me into the arms of the right, which I previously dismissed as 'selfish' and 'irrational.') Since then, I've become much less emotional about issues, and more rational. Though I'm still interested as to why Jewish secular culture tends to veer to the left. PS: I'm not here for Protocols and conspiracy answers, duh.

WindowToAlaska • -1 points • 9 December, 2014 03:54 AM

I honestly have no idea. Probably because of the holocaust. They think being a pacifist will protect them and be above violence (when in reality it's the opposite)

R4F1 • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 09:49 AM*

There is a huge difference between orthodox Judaism and Haredim (Ultra-orthodox). The vast majority of Haredim are non-Zionist, while most Orthodox are Zionist. Haredim are often apolitical, and politically they never ally with the reformists. Orthodox, Conservative and Reformist often ally with each other for political purposes. The founders of Zionism were very anti-religious, and the Haredi have always opposed them for those reasons, meanwhile the Orthodox and Conservative have supported them. Furthermore, Judaism is at least to some degree matriarchal. That is one of the key features of Rabbinic Judaism, compared to pre-Rabbinic Judaism where lineage clearly came from the father (Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, etc). In modern Rabbinic Judaism, lineage and race is inherited through the mother. The exception being Reform Judaism, which ironically is the most Progressive/leftist version of Judaism, facilitating gay partnerships, anti-gender segregation, etc.

[deleted] • 4 points • 8 December, 2014 04:58 PM

[permanently deleted]

brotherjustincrowe[S, □] • 6 points • 8 December, 2014 05:02 PM

It's interesting that Israel trains relatively effective female soldiers - along with Russia's 1st Women's Battalion of Death, the *soldaderas* of Revolutionary Mexico, and the "Dahomey Amazons" of what's now Benin, all of these cultures had in common their explicitly patriarchal nature.

cocaine_face • 6 points • 8 December, 2014 06:24 PM

Women are still humans and humans in general are pretty malleable. While virtually no woman will approach the strength of most any men, with the right environment they can still be taught discipline. It may not come as naturally to them, much as emotional manipulation, reading subtext or childcare doesn't come as naturally to us, but if you sink enough hours into anything, man or woman, you'll typically get better at it.

The problem in this context is that women get no sexual value from this practice (or marginally little), it isn't emphasized for them, and the incentives typically aren't enough for them to deal with their boredom (why program computers or join the military when you can lie on your back and have a man who believes it is his duty to take care of you - take care of you?)

[deleted] • 10 points • 8 December, 2014 05:25 PM

Its all just a PR stunt, don't get too excited.

Newdist2 • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 07:40 PM

Yeah; is there any evidence that they are effective soldiers?

(also, not to get too political here, but pushing unarmed Arab children around at checkpoints isn't exactly difficult. Let me know when the Israelis have an all-female rifle company ready to go house-to-house in Fallujah.)

FarOrAMess • 4 points • 8 December, 2014 08:36 PM

As a former officer of the IDF, I can confirm that the Karakal battalion (male & female infantry battalion) is pretty effective. I wouldn't compare it to the main infantry brigades such as Golani and the Paratroopers, but they take full responsibility for the Egyptian border and have already dealt with incidents before, some of those operations were led by women.

If you'd ask the girls from the battalion, I believe they would all be willing to go house-to-house in wherever.

It's just one of those things that make Israel so different and difficult to grasp from a TRP perspective, very versatile and distinct culturally.

cocaine_face • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 05:42 AM

TRP is, as far as I can tell, MOST applicable to white upper-middle class American women between the ages of 18-25 (and for the wall stuff, their aftermath) in elite colleges, primarily near the coasts.

The more deviation you get from that, the less applicable it'll be. Don't get me wrong - a lot of the TRP stuff is timeless, universal truth, but the specifics are, as far as I can tell, for that demographic.

My suspicion is that this is because a good portion of the men here are in a similar demographic.

bakbakgoeshertroat • 3 points • 8 December, 2014 09:32 PM*

No surprise. A fair amount of feminists are Jewish. As an outside observer, it seems like they have a vindictive need to emasculate Jewish men. Jenji Kohan, the writer-creator behind *Weeds* and *Orange Is the New Black*, is especially good at it. The male Jewish characters she writes are submissive in nearly all aspects.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 10:26 PM

[permanently deleted]

Kyfhomyoba • 3 points • 9 December, 2014 12:21 AM

It is important to distinguish between a Jew [religion], an Israeli [nationality, 30+% of Israelis are Arab], a Hebrew [ethnicity, i.e., seed of Abraham], and Zionist [proponent of Jewish/Hebrew state in Palestine - most Zionists live in USA and are fundamentalist Christians]

Bazooko • 4 points • 8 December, 2014 07:36 PM

ITT: Israel experts who have never been to Israel

Idontlikekarmawhores • 2 points • 9 December, 2014 12:55 PM

So far Muslims are the only ones keeping their women at bay

bkmnalpha • 1 point • 18 January, 2015 08:36 AM

Dear ,Islamic culture is truly a rape culture...not the feminist definition..but actually a rape culture If you are in a place where Sharia law is present...you can enslave a woman,rape her,have a child,rape your own daughter because technically any slave's offspring belongs to you by law (Koran 23:1 if I remember correctly...and I read it in Arabic the original language of the book)

WhiteTrashInTrouble • 0 points • 9 December, 2014 02:48 PM

That's the opposite extreme. I'd take pause anytime I found myself agreeing with Islamic culture.

FTFY_account • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 12:16 AM

Here I thought one of the reasons Orthodox Judaism has persisted for so long as a relatively unchanging culture and tradition was due to strictly proscribed gender roles.

These progressive feminist groups are generally secular and antagonistic to Orthodox Judaism. A small minority of these feminists claim to be Orthodox, but they radically reinvent Orthodox Judaism in their own image, and the resulting syncretic religion is largely ignored or rejected by mainstream Orthodoxy.

In any case, Orthodox Jews comprise only about 20-30 percent of Jews in Israel, and rarely control the legislative agenda.

bobbatosakosanose • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 07:29 AM

Israel, unlike the the rest of the feminized countries still needs to be masculine or otherwise they will get steamrolled by their enemies. So I doubt they will end up completely emasculated.

rebuildingMyself • 1 point • 9 December, 2014 03:54 PM

Feminists know their own bullshit and will guard against the other side doing it. The same came up whenever you talk about the male birth control pill (what if he lies about taking it????).

KubrickBrHue • 1 point • 30 December, 2014 04:10 PM

Pretty interesting, considering that it is in Israel.

[deleted] • -5 points • 8 December, 2014 04:17 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 5 points • 8 December, 2014 04:26 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -4 points • 8 December, 2014 04:29 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 December, 2014 04:35 PM

Enjoy getting a woman you hate pregnant? If you force yourself off she could just claim domestic violence too. People like you are the reason why shit like this exists.

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 December, 2014 04:33 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • -2 points • 8 December, 2014 04:34 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 December, 2014 04:41 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 04:56 PM

Everybody cut the petty bullshit. Stop making messes for me to clean up.

brotherjustincrowe[S,□] • 3 points • 8 December, 2014 04:21 PM

Let's see...if you're too drunk to move and she shoves something up your asshole?

[deleted] • -3 points • 8 December, 2014 04:24 PM

[permanently deleted]

tone_ • 3 points • 8 December, 2014 04:36 PM

That's not female specific though.

Well you've just answered your own question. Expand that to everything else.

Your ever increasingly loose definitions of rape, such as non verbal permission, talking someone into it, not getting a notarized document etc are one way. These rules have to work both ways.

And there's the obvious point that someone could simply not want to. By now you should have figured out that sexual arousal isn't exactly something that everyone can control 100% of the time. It's a reaction that can come at inconvenient or unwanted times (and even not happen for some if they're unlucky). It's like saying if a women has a physical reaction to being forced into sex, she must have wanted it. Biological reactions don't demonstrate consent.

Same for a guy. But maybe the guy is super weak, get's pressured into it because he doesn't want to be labelled as gay / not up for it, or he's being threatened / blackmailed etc etc.

It's not really stuff that I'd imagine applies to many guys in here, but I don't see how you can't understand it.

[deleted] • 0 points • 8 December, 2014 04:46 PM

Thank you for actually sharing a cogent point of view and not just a bunch of paranoid fantasies.

Well for a start all your even increasingly loose definitions of rape

For me, this is the crux of the issue: there's a world of difference between being beaten unconscious or having a knife put to your throat (or some other violence or threat of violence) or being drugged into unconsciousness then having an object (penis, bottle, whatever) forcefully inserted into your body against your will and merely being seduced, coerced without violence, or otherwise being made to perform a non-penetrative sexual act against your will. They just are not the same, whatsoever, and using the same word to describe both acts cheapens the first one and elevates the second beyond its merits.

Is being tricked or even drugged into sex bad? Yes. Is being tricked into getting a girl pregnant bad? Absolutely. Is waking up to find someone you're not attracted to riding on top of you troubling? Very much so. But are any of these events actual rape? Fuck no.

People need to stop using the word "rape" to cover every possible crime that might revolve around sex. It's lazy and shabby use of language, and it's bullshit like this that got our society to this point in the first damn place. Sexual assault is not rape in the same way that assault is not murder.

tone_ • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 05:10 PM

I pretty much agree with the reasons you're confused about it all. All the bs that's counted as "rape" nowadays really isn't. Someone who was pressured into something and only finds out it was "rape" the next day from a friend's definition is not comparable with someone who is physically assaulted in a dark alley.

I think the only point is that if this BS is applicable to women, it has to be to men. Half of it is the principle and just the whole double standards of it. But yeah being raped is not really a huge concern for most guys, and actually the fear of a false rape accusation actually is more-so. Making the moronic Israeli feminist actions all the more fucked up.

Either way at a base level, 100% regardless of whether the rules are bat-shit insane, or reasonable and correct, rape shouldn't have anything to do with gender at all.

brotherjustincrowe[S, □] • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 04:29 PM

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ikd0ZYQoDko>

BleachedWhale • 3 points • 8 December, 2014 04:31 PM

Some ham-beast gets three of her friends to hold you down, and rubs her cunt on your face until she is squealing and sweating with pleasure...

You cool with that?

[deleted] • -3 points • 8 December, 2014 04:32 PM

[permanently deleted]

anonymouse • 4 points • 8 December, 2014 04:48 PM

Rape = forced sex.

That's like arguing Bill Clinton didn't have sexual relations with that woman Lewinsky.

BleachedWhale • 2 points • 8 December, 2014 04:34 PM

Because the only thing that can penetrate another thing is a penis?

Right?

