

Anti-Rape Program Teaching Women how to say "no" Halves Number of Campus Assaults

June 17, 2015 | 761 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

Coming straight to you from nonsense land where you can't make this stuff up, a program was put into action that taught women how to say no to bad sexual experiences, and- guess what, the number of assaults went down. Kinda goes against the "teach men not to rape" mantra we keep hearing.

A program aimed at teaching women how to recognize dangerous situations and resist sexual coercion almost halved the risk of rape on three college campuses, a new study shows.

"We expected that providing women with knowledge and tools could increase their ability to defend themselves and reduce the severity of the sexual violence they experience," said study author Charlene Senn, a professor of psychology at the University of Windsor in Ontario, Canada. "We didn't expect the reductions to be as dramatic as they were. Only 22 young women need to receive the program for one completed rape to be averted."

So did men just give up on rape, or what changed?

The 12-hour resistance program, conducted in four sessions, taught women how to effectively assess the risk of sexual assault by men they knew, recognize the danger in coercive situations, get past emotional roadblocks to resist unwanted sexual behaviors and practice verbally resisting the behavior or actions. The program also spent two hours teaching self-defense strategies and included several hours bringing all the instruction together in a session on safe sex practices and effective communication about sex.

In other words, teaching women to avoid a bad situation and actually vocalize the word "no," when they don't want sex cleared up the rape cases. Is it possible that these guys were having sex with women because they thought the lack of no meant yes? Or maybe, just maybe, when you give women the tools to function as a fucking adult for once, they actually feel some semblance of responsibility for their actions. My take on it? Women who were taught that avoiding rape was their responsibility took ownership over their own decisions, accepting that unfortunate or awkward sex wasn't rape because they could've said "no" at any time.

It was the leftist culture of nonsense that crippled women's decision making capabilities by telling them that they are responsible for zero percent of their actions, and that any resulting consequences must be the fault of the man in the situation. Of course everything's rape, when you're an object with no agency, just having life happen around you and to you. When you can't say no, even wanted sex is rape.

Fucking retards.

<http://health.usnews.com/health-news/articles/2015/06/10/anti-rape-program-halved-number-of-campus-assaults-study>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

CopperFox3c • 284 points • 17 June, 2015 06:22 PM

Whoa, whoa, whoa, RedPillSchool ... are you suggesting that teaching people about personal responsibility - that there are consequences for the choices they make in life - leads to better outcomes??? That's just crazy talk ...

All kidding aside, **it's amazing what common sense can accomplish when put to good use.** For some reason, we don't seem to value common sense as much as we used to. People are way too caught up in worrying about "how things should be", rather than dealing with "how things actually are".

Ibex3D • 128 points • 17 June, 2015 10:59 PM

Oh my god, I had that argument with a feminist.

Her: I should be able to walk down a dark alley or bad neighborhood when I want. I shouldn't have to worry about whether or not someone will rape me.

Me: No, you shouldn't but that doesn't matter because there are bad people in the world.

She just couldn't grab the concept that women need to take precautions for their safety. Oh and the enormous sense of victim-hood. She said I don't understand it as a man. I tried to explain that men are constantly on the defense too when alone or traveling some where sketchy. Just cause dudes don't want to rape us doesn't mean they don't want to shoot us and take our money. She honestly thought men just walk through the world unconcerned for their safety because male privilege I guess. I was flabbergasted.

lucidsleeper[] • 57 points • 18 June, 2015 01:17 AM

If I left the front door of my house open, some crackhead junkie is going to break in and steal anything valuable. Just because there are laws against stealing, trespassing, burglary, doesn't mean it won't happen.

It's incredible how so many people fail to understand this.

[deleted] • 9 points • 18 June, 2015 05:30 PM

Word. I had this exact same argument with a BP guy and as soon as he pulled the bullshit of "women shouldnt need to take precaution, men should learn to keep to themselves" and I used the exact same analogy of "just because you shouldnt steal doesnt mean I wont lock up my house. There are bad people in the world who will do bad things. Why not protect myself as much as I can?". and do you know his answer to this? "thats victim blaming"

[deleted] • 10 points • 18 June, 2015 08:43 AM

This,

We are so ready to teach young people that bad things can happen in our society: At my school I was taught that if I didn't take precautions such as locking my house I would be robbed, If Im not being careful in bad surroundings I could be attacked or that if I don't properly dispose of documentation I could be vulnerable to fraud.

If however you teach young girls just simple tactics regarding an awareness for their surroundings and the avoidance of rape then feminists start to lose their shit.

wile_E_coyote_genius • 13 points • 18 June, 2015 01:35 PM

I'm not sure they don't understand, I think it's more of the fact that victimhood is now a status symbol

among a certain section of society.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 June, 2015 04:44 PM

That's where the feminist movement stems from (3rd wave) along with things like 'privelege'

It's now all about who is the bigger victim, and all it is is a personal excuse for not bettering yourself. I find people that believe they are victims in a country like America to be truly pathetic individuals

[deleted] • 16 points • 18 June, 2015 12:41 AM

They want reality to bend to them.

Hint : it wont.

laughkisskill • 29 points • 18 June, 2015 12:36 AM*

Yeah, this is a perfect example. Every guy believes he's a secret agent under fire, every girl believes she's untouchable.

Stupid, but at least the former learns to take precautions, sometimes too much to the point where it's damaging, but still, they have agency.

I had a conversion much like yours a few weeks ago. Though this was about something so stupid I don't want to post it here. Same mentality though.

kalstate • 6 points • 18 June, 2015 01:35 PM

Every guy believes [he's] a secret agent under fire, every girl believes she's untouchable.

Man, that's so friggin' true. Eloquently put.

SoUrLovin • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 02:16 AM

guys you have to bring up the "don't play dumb with your smartphone" posters that are on the subways here in nyc. then say "don't tell me not to have my phone out, tell people not to steal"

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 June, 2015 04:45 PM

Why is "teach men not to rape" acceptable when "teach blacks not steal" isn't?

At its core the feminist movement is very prejudiced

buddboy • 12 points • 18 June, 2015 01:13 AM

feminists don't want women to become strong and powerful, they want the rest of the world to become soft and fuzzy so they can feel secure in their timid unrealistic worldview

Brave_Horatius • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 08:09 AM

Especially considering men in the 15-35 age group are at the highest risk of being victims of violent assault. We report the last fear of it though so reality is being suborned feels.

thefisherman1961 • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 03:57 PM

A lot of feminists will mistakenly believe that you're engaging in powertalk by telling someone to take precautions to protect their safety because they will say you're victim blaming.

Ibex3D • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 04:49 PM

Could you explain what you mean. I kinda skipped over the articles on powertalk. They didnt sound too necessary to me at this stage.

[deleted] • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 11:40 PM

They claim saying a woman can and should avoid risky situations to avoid sexual assault is victim blaming.

In the example above, the woman wants to walk through dark alley ways in a risky neighborhood all alone and yet somehow feel invincible. Would you feel safe in that situation? Would you avoid the dark alley in order to take a safer route home?

Guy gets knocked out by some thug at a bar. The first question people ask is "What did you say/do to piss him off?" followed by "Well, I guess you learned that lesson, idiot!" and probably laugh it off from there. This type of talk assumes the man is an agent responsible for his own outcomes. When women are the victim, they are coddled instead of educated.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 June, 2015 04:41 PM

What women don't understand is as men we are far more likely to be victims of assault, violence, and murder. Having lived in poor areas while in school WHENEVER I went shopping in khakis and a button down, or something similarly nice, I was approached by people with bad intentions. What did I do?

Start dressing like shit when going out to rough areas of town. The world caters to no one and sadly it will never be perfect. It's not victim blaming it's fucking common sense

[deleted] • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 05:26 PM

yeah she should come and visit Pakistan. If you are a female and walking alone at night you are more protected than a guy walking alone under same conditions. Reason? Because rape is not a big problem in our country (that's India) and mugging (money, bike, mobile phone, personal valuables etc) is common place. Men usually carry around this and or ride bikes (female bikers are rare) and also there is a sense of "respect" (dont even ask) when looters deal with females.

cariboo_j • 1 point • 20 June, 2015 12:58 AM

Men are by far more likely to be victims of violence.

IronBallsOfKnowledge • 1 point • 20 June, 2015 01:53 PM

I had to try and explain that to one as well. She said something along the lines of she shouldn't have to worry about walking home from a bar at 2am...

I told her everything that was wrong with her statement from being by herself, at night, in a neighborhood with drunk people around. I also told her how men would be a target as well in that situation. And we're always looking for safe ways to travel.

She didn't want to hear it. I was victim blaming or something like that. Oh well. Reason doesn't work with emotion.

redpillbanana • 23 points • 18 June, 2015 12:15 AM

My comment from when this story was first posted:

I can see the feminist reaction now: "Forget learning to avoid rape, how about teaching the rapists not to rape??" and "This will lead to victim-blaming!"

When it comes to sexual assault, feminism provides an endless supply of clueless victims.

xwm • 7 points • 18 June, 2015 12:48 PM

Never mind that it reduced rape by half. Throw it out because it wounds their sensibilities. They'd rather have the higher rape rate. (More press/attention too I guess)

kalstate • 13 points • 18 June, 2015 01:37 PM*

Not sure where to put this comment, but this study redefines rape entirely--without speculation.

Edit: To elaborate, if training to utter 'no' actually cuts rape accusations in half, then half of the accusations aren't rape.

[deleted] • 11 points • 17 June, 2015 11:11 PM

A big part of hamstering is avoidance of responsibility for one's actions. At its core much of female hypergamy depends on it, which is why I'm not at all surprised that the anti-rape programs created by our feminized society encourage women to be victims who have zero responsibility for their personal outcomes

jb_trp • 15 points • 17 June, 2015 10:15 PM

But expecting a woman to say "no" when they *don't* want to have sex with someone... Isn't that victim blaming? /s

RedPill4LYF • 13 points • 18 June, 2015 06:34 AM

Whoa, whoa, whoa, RedPillSchool ... are you suggesting that teaching people about personal responsibility - that there are consequences for the choices they make in life - leads to better outcomes???

That is some major league shitlording right there.

Mikesapien • 14 points • 18 June, 2015 07:26 AM

That is the dumbest, and best thing I have seen in weeks. 10/10.

NikoMyshkin • 6 points • 18 June, 2015 11:06 AM

thank you fine sir. that was beautifully done.

i am actually surprised that SJW didn't burst out in to tears or accuse the guy of using violence and intimidation against her. you know - because he used actual logic and facts.

she needs to go to SJW school where they'll teach her how to respond to facts: by bleating about discrimination so loudly that the facts are forgotten and the fact-user is shamed into silence.

wile_E_coyote_genius • 4 points • 18 June, 2015 01:34 PM

People are way too caught up in worrying about "how things should be", rather than dealing with "how things actually are".

This is RP in a nutshell really. Don't worry about how things ought to be and deal with how they are.

[deleted] • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 12:02 AM

As they say, common sense is not that common anymore.... ;)

NakedAndBehindYou • 162 points • 17 June, 2015 06:56 PM **[recovered]**

If a woman can say "no" and end a sexual assault, do you know what that says about these so-called "sexual assaults"? They never existed to begin with. They were just examples of women having consensual sex but

regretting it afterwards, or having consensual sex that they didn't "really" want to have but they were too afraid to say no, but then blamed the guy for anyways.

[deleted] • 85 points • 17 June, 2015 07:11 PM*

Here's my theory:

Your average woman is not unique. Hell, even your above average woman is not that unique. The uniqueness bar for women has been set so damn low that being a gamergirl is a way to be unique. For comparison, gamer men are considered trash. Man trash is the bar set to be a unique woman. Women still want to be unique and accepted though. They look around at how to do it and they see rape victims getting worshipped. Those "victims" are also not even questioned so the alibi is flawless. Why not pretend to have been raped?

Women usually do stupid shit by solipsism, impulse, and hamster though and not by outright fabrication. So what they do when they hear about rape is that they think back to their history for anything which might have resembled what they're told and then, boom! She's now a rape victim who just never happened to report her crime. It's just a story to tell. The trail's probably cold anyways, right? Besides, some of them can tell their hamster that it's activism. I mean, they are breaking the silence right? That helps women, right? So what if they were never actually raped; their story helps other rape victims, right? They're just so damn noble. For the rest of them, there's always rampant denial.

[deleted] • 15 points • 18 June, 2015 12:07 AM

I'll ad to what you say - "just the fact that she accused him of rape, means he must have done something horribly wrong".

With that type of thinking.....

[deleted] • 8 points • 18 June, 2015 12:08 AM

Yeah, that's a very dangerous line of thinking. I've adapted the much safer "just because she accused him of rape means she's a lying cunt."

[deleted] • 7 points • 18 June, 2015 12:27 AM

It is a very dangerous line of thinking which entirely disregards the concept of innocent until proven guilty, the concept of conviction through thorough research of facts and evidence beyond a reasonable doubt.

This line of thinking is not only dangerous, it's absurd. But they still say it over and over and over.

[deleted] • 13 points • 18 June, 2015 01:07 PM

I literally heard a feminist say rapists don't deserve a free trial. I mentioned that you can't know he's a rapist without a fair trial. Appatently an accusation is enough.

Just... How do these people even get into high level universities? They literally can not think straight sometimes

Oh, and this feminust was a man BTW

[deleted] • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 01:38 PM

You can't expect someone to understand something, when their salary depends on them not understanding it.

Right there, is a big part of the problem with universities.

Bwhitty23 • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 02:01 PM

I go to a tech school and there is only ~20% female. We also have some humanities and the others around that. This takes up 10%-15% of the females here and instead of doing what our school is known for they go to the humanities. Since my school got gobbled by a Liberal arts university and some degree programs will move to my campus so there will probably be a lot more females at our "tech" school. I would say since most women don't like Stem and almost all university's offer the humanities I think that is why so many women end up in university and this is not to say that the humanities are "easy" because I'm sure some of those degrees have rigor to them.

[deleted] • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 02:12 PM

I do a humanities degree. It's a lot fucking easier than a STEM subject. I have looked at the stuff people studying maths and engineering have to read and have come to the conclusion that I am stupid.

I do modern languages, so I suppose it's a different sort of skillset I'm being taught, but seriously, it's such a doss. I have 12 hours of lectures a week, in my first year I pretty much did nothing the whole time and got 3% shy of a first. Second year I did even less and just got a 2:1, but I shouldn't have, as I literally pissed the year away. I have changed now and realise I need to put in lots of work, but the fact I could get away with doing essentially nothing, and even turning up to an exam 20 minutes late because my alarm didn't go off, and still get an upper second, is a piss take.

Humanities degrees tend to be so much easier, as you can bullshit about stuff you don't know the answer to. In stem, you either know it or you don't. Also, the marking is very subjective, so it's pretty wishy washy.

I think if I'd done engineering I couldn't cut it. I'm simply not a fucking genius. Bear in mind, I got to the second best uni in the country for my course.

So yeah, stem subjects are a lot harder. And I don't even do one.

Bwhitty23 • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 02:48 PM

Yeah pretty much how it is here in the states. I bullshit my English class cause it was a lot more fluid. Once I learned this I spent like 40% or less in the class. Basically from February to April when I got out I went to English once maybe twice a week. My speech class was worse as she canceled like 60% of our classes and only 20% of the remaining 40 was relevant material and giving speeches. Pretty easy shit. But I know I have to buckle down cause my degree classes are coming. Calculus based physics is coming.

Also I'm sure you could cut it. Most of it is just applying yourself and getting focused when you need to be.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 September, 2015 09:12 PM

If it makes you feel any better, my sophomore year, I got a C in Art History and an A in Chemical Thermodynamics.

Kid_Crimson • 14 points • 17 June, 2015 08:41 PM

Spot on! This and so many other bad behaviors can be explained as a toxic mix of victimology. mass

hyteria, and women's group-based social identity being enabled by the dominant feminist gynocentric culture. It's like rocket fuel for consequence-free attention-seeking behavior.

NikoMyshkin • 14 points • 18 June, 2015 11:15 AM

essentially, a rapist, by definition, is a person that refuses to take no for an answer. therefore, logically it cannot be said that saying no halves rapes.

but of course i must be a misogynist for using logic

H_to_Tha_OV • 0 points • 18 June, 2015 02:41 PM

Let me play devil's advocate here. Women that were previously abused as children or traumatically raped often shut down (dissociate) when they get triggered. That's a proven fact, the same thing can happen to shellshocked vets. In those cases, you gotta give the lady some benefit of the doubt and call it something other than consensual sex. But still, I agree that rape or any charge against the male would likely be an injustice.

Independentmale • 12 points • 18 June, 2015 03:40 PM

you gotta give the lady some benefit of the doubt and call it something other than consensual sex

No, we sure as fuck do not. Look, I'm sympathetic to their plight. Really, I am. But if a girl goes along with what's happening without resistance, never says no and appears to be into it, that shit is consensual. Period.

I can't read her fucking mind. It's her job to say no. If she's been brutally traumatized to the point where she can't do that, she has no business going out in public on her own. She needs heavy therapy and someone she trusts to look after her 24/7. Maybe we can put a bracelet or something on her so everyone will know she's unstable and leave her alone.

We can't let these broken, fragile girls continue to victimize innocent men. When she appears interested because she's too scared to do otherwise and later cries rape, that man's life is overturned. He is made out to be a monster, his name is dragged through the news and depending on the extent of the publicity he may never be able to live a normal life again. This is completely unacceptable.

NakedAndBehindYou • 8 points • 18 June, 2015 03:53 PM

I understand what you're saying. But if a woman goes along with a man's advances without resistance, by definition that is consent. The man certainly cannot be held accountable as a rapist if the woman never provided any notion of non-consent.

Basically, even taking into account real PTSD and trauma, we are still treating women like children if we say they didn't "consent" when they clearly did.

knitro • 75 points • 17 June, 2015 11:01 PM **[recovered]**

Here's how avoid getting robbed

Oh that's helpful advice

Here's how to avoid gang violence

So useful

Here's how to avoid a scam

Awesome, you're a lifesaver

RAPE APOLOGIST SCUM

SMEGMA_CHEESE • 11 points • 18 June, 2015 11:51 AM

I once suggested a rape prevention campaign at my university at this conference thing that almost no one else showed up to. It was basically the Feminist League there and I was naive to all the illogical bullshit at the time and I just figured that no one could possibly think that they can make a rapist stop raping. They stopped letting me make suggestions after that and they seemed upset, so I just figured they wanted me to stop eating so much pizza (Pizza for 100 people, 5 people showed up lel).,

About two years later when I learned that people are capable of being so damn irrational as to think the criminal will change their minds and self-defense is unnecessary, I realize that I must have really offended them with my perfectly sound logic! Haha! Wow! I just think it's so funny that it took me two years to realize that because I could never have possibly believed that people could be so stupid.

thefisherman1961 • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 04:03 PM

I could never have possibly believed that people could be so stupid.

That happens to me a lot in this world. I am so oblivious to the amount of stupidity that surrounds me because my brain has learned to tune it out.

SMEGMA_CHEESE • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 06:27 PM

I just inherently believe in people and naturally don't judge. In fact, I didn't really even notice other races until I was in High School. I just saw them as people and didn't go beyond that. On top of that, I would always support people's movements like Women's Rights and such just because "Why not? They seem to think it's a problem, so I trust them." I wouldn't judge people for being fat, I could barely tell the classes of people apart (Like rich, poor, middle class, etc.) and I always, always blamed myself whenever I had trouble with someone else and felt really bad about it. Although, in my defence, when I *did* realize it wasn't fair, I would go out of my way to get revenge. But I digress.

And then it all changed, pretty much. Innocence lifted.

Now, while I'm not an asshole, I have a fine-tuned bullshit detector and I trust no one due to some serious, awful, life-changing issues I had with a certain someone. It's a much safer and happier way of life. You should never put everyone else's issues on your shoulders.

[deleted] • 2 points • 19 June, 2015 04:51 PM

Teach poor people not to steal: that's class warfare you elitist filth!

Teach blacks not to assault people: racist! Racist!!!

Teach Muslims not to kill: how dare you!!!

Teach men not to rape: yep, this is ok

LetMeSideBarThatForU • 49 points • 17 June, 2015 07:42 PM

Anti rape program = Teach girls how to say no.

Rape = Violent sexual assault.

Sexual Assault = Any form of sexual molestation that occurs without consent from the victim.

Anti false-rape report program = Teach girls they are responsible to say no.

Results = False rape reports drop by over 50% assuming some of the reports are legitimate.

Lessons learned?

BRING BACK SOCIAL SHAMING.

MattyAnon • 54 points • 17 June, 2015 08:20 PM

BRING BACK SOCIAL SHAMING.

Bring forward legal consequences to lying and fabricating.

BruhBrehBro • 6 points • 18 June, 2015 12:02 AM

this, shaming is a female game we are above that. Let the law be enforced for both genders equally and they will quit their bullshit right away.

trpMilo • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 04:59 PM

Shaming isn't a female game. Shaming is simply applying dishonor. Cowards in battle are shamed, those unable to provide for their families were historically shamed. You can't have honor and approbation without dishonor and shame

BruhBrehBro • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 09:45 PM

dishonor sounds way more manly. Let's stick with that.

Cyralea • 61 points • 17 June, 2015 08:21 PM

Let's be honest about one thing, rape hysteria has little to do with rape or the prevention of rape. It's a Feminist power play. The rape card is one of the most powerful tools in the victim-complex toolkit that feminists use. Not a man alive can attack a rape "victim" and come out ahead socially.

Using this knowledge, feminists have found a way to ensure that there are zero consequences for acting out on their hypergamy, and all of it falls on the shoulders of men. Dude you randomly fucked last night ended up being a huge beta? Use the rape card to get out of that faux-pas. Alpha player refusing to commit? Play the rape card, his image is ruined forever.

Teach Men Not to Rape has nothing to do with actually reducing rape, but with keeping the focus on men being aggressors to poor, innocent women. This narrative is useful, and not something feminists want to do away with. If they did, they'd do something radical like teach women how to say no to unwanted sexual advances.

jb_trp • 28 points • 17 June, 2015 10:28 PM

I'm convinced that Third Wave feminism has set back the women's liberation movement at least a century. These women are basically children who need safe spaces when they are confronted with ideas that "invalidate their experiences."

Healthy women don't put on an extra 80 lbs, cover themselves with tattoos like a 1920s sailor, and dye their hair purple/pink/red. They lack any level of personal responsibility. The very suggestion that they should have said "no" when they didn't want to have sex with somebody likely will give them a panic attack:

"But... But... he was raping me. I just froze. I didn't even think to say no. He had spent the last 45 minutes trying to kiss my neck and touch my boobs while we were watching 'The Notebook.' Honestly... What could I do??"

NotAnAutomaton • -10 points • 18 June, 2015 05:10 AM

Excluding the irrelevant bit about tattoos and hair style choices, yea 3rd wave feminism has been a

horrible setback for the whole feminist movement. I still call myself a feminist but always under the condition that I'm talking about 2nd wave only. All this PC Police "social activism" speech and behavior authoritarianism is a god damn travesty for the rest of us well-adjusted adults.

Mikesapien • 13 points • 18 June, 2015 07:39 AM*

Why is it when feminism is criticized, the general TBP public invariably reverts back to the inflexible, outdated dictionary definition of feminism, "equal rights for men and women?" That's not "feminism," that's egalitarianism, or humanism. Maybe that was feminism once, but not any more. Not for decades.

EDIT: Oh, and that bit about weight gain, tattoos, and hairstyles is not irrelevant, that's the face of modern feminism. It's a stereotype, sure, but stereotypes exist for a reason.

Zekohl • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 12:25 PM

Are there no laws against insulting people where this "lady" lives? calling people fuckface on camera would result in a sweet 800-1000€ settlement here in germany. But then, we don't have a lot of that militant BS feminists running around, instead we got all our universities infested with gender BS...

fortifiedoranges • 0 points • 18 June, 2015 08:04 PM

Your country used to be so great.

NotAnAutomaton • 0 points • 18 June, 2015 05:34 PM

Weight gain, yeah, I think nearly all men would agree its gross. Tattoos? I still disagree. A lot of feminists might be inked these days but thats because a lot of my whole generation is inked and doesnt look down on that.

Mikesapien • 6 points • 18 June, 2015 08:03 PM

There *is* such a thing as too many tattoos. I and a lot of guys don't have any problem with tats (it's even fetishized), but the stereotype to which /u/jb_trp was speaking was some feminists' seeming inability to find a happy medium, or, like with vibrant, obnoxious, ugly hairstyles, the way in which they resort to ink as a means of abrasive self-expression.

Have the confidence to get a tat because it looks good, or you like it, or it means something, not as a way of saying how edgy and hip and unique you are. You know exactly what I mean; dudes with low self-esteem and poor self-image don't go get a bunch of tats; yet chicks do it all the time.

NotAnAutomaton • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 09:28 PM

Were discussing a matter of aesthetic preference at this point, there is no right or wrong to be had. For you, some people cross a limit. Thats totally fine, but dont try to establish your own preferences as some sort of standard.

NotAnAutomaton • -9 points • 18 June, 2015 07:45 AM

Thats 2nd wave feminism, what I said, genius.

Ailer • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 12:37 PM

If you're still curious why you're getting your downvotes for claiming 2nd wave feminism is fantastic, I'll help clue you in with a question: Which wave of feminism got us no-fault

divorce?

NotAnAutomaton • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 05:20 PM

Basically I want women to work and receive equal pay, vote, and be able to participate in society alongside men (they may never make the team but id like them to be able to try out fairly). Is that not all 1st/2nd wave feminism? Im talkin up to like the 70s or so.

When did nofault divorce come into play? I always thought that was relatively newer...

Mikesapien • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 08:12 PM

The Second Wave ended in the 80s. At this point, why even call that view "feminist?" It's like calling yourself a Whig because you support economic and industrial growth in the United States. It's anachronism and pedantry *at best*.

NotAnAutomaton • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 09:44 PM

Maybe youre right. Really what im after anyways is just egalitarianism. Its just sad how bad feminism (the original stuff) turned in on itself.

sweetleef • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 08:32 AM

Excluding the irrelevant bit about tattoos and hair style choices

It is relevant to the argument that feminism is deluding these women, convincing them that longstanding behaviour expectations and customs are, suddenly, no longer important, and that they can do whatever they want without consequence.

A woman who covers herself with visible tattoos is almost always condemning herself to a life of mediocrity and mockery. The media and the radical hambeasts tell them that the rules don't apply, that they are different, but they're not.

NotAnAutomaton • 0 points • 18 June, 2015 05:05 PM

I disagree. How old are you? (Not being dismissive). Tattoo acceptance I dont see as having anything to do with gender/sex and much more to do with generation.

sweetleef • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 07:51 PM

No matter which generation you are, you won't see many major corporate executives or supreme court justices with neck tattoos. Tattoos are a sign of, at best, a desperate desire for acceptance, and in the case of always-visible tattoos, of very poor judgement.

In some cases it could work, in fields that depend on trendiness like artists or pop singers, but in most cases, covering yourself in drawings is voluntarily limiting your opportunities for the reward of following the current fashion trend.

That is true for men, but even more for women. When this trend dies out there'll be a whole lot of regretful 45 year-old women covered in vapid facebook-philosophy quotes and drawings of flowers. My recommendation would be to invest in tattoo removal businesses.

RedPillDad • 8 points • 17 June, 2015 10:37 PM

Great explanation of the unexplainable.

One has to admire the sheer audacity of it... "Have you ever stood and stared at it? Marveled at its beauty...

its genius? Billions of people just living out their lives...oblivious."

RedBigMan • 6 points • 18 June, 2015 11:28 AM

Except that overusing a card immunizes society against it. It's almost as if society has it's own defense mechanism for abusing privilege and power.

10+ years ago if you heard someone was raped you probably didn't question shit... Today? You probably assume the cunt is lying until proven to be telling the truth.

kalstate • 6 points • 18 June, 2015 01:54 PM

You know, this is an interesting thought. Take it one step further, in another decade, it's possible that nobody will listen to anybody who cries rape. That would be bad for actual victims.

RedBigMan • 4 points • 19 June, 2015 04:35 AM

When every girl you see has a story that she's been raped or 'almost raped'... Yeah it will be ignored and real victims will suffer because of false accusers trying to cash in on sympathy of the general public.

Sympathy like Willpower is finite. You can only go to the well so many times before it runs dry.

Cyralea • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 04:05 PM

Women aren't exactly renown for their long-term thinking capacity.

Hokuto199x • 51 points • 17 June, 2015 06:45 PM

You know, it's like any other crime. I know where the bad parts of town are. Should I walk around there alone and unarmed with a wad of \$100 bills and a gold watch? If I get mugged the mugger is still wrong, but I'll be damned if it wasn't stupid to be putting myself in that situation.

[deleted] • 41 points • 17 June, 2015 06:54 PM

There was some stupid youtube duo that were trying a parody skit where they troll people with "yo I got the money, you got the stuff?" to gauge the reactions. So they went by the bank, then went to the streets with 10 grand they pulled out of their bank account. They tried it on some random kid, he saw the 10 grand, sucker punched him, grabbed the cash and ran off with it. The rest of the video is them doing an interview with a cop about the police report lol.

Hokuto199x • 29 points • 17 June, 2015 07:00 PM

It's almost like they were asking for it.

[deleted] • 24 points • 17 June, 2015 09:22 PM

Stop victim blaming its obvious that we need to teach men not to steal so that any type of robbery never happens ever again in the history of mankind.

PMMeYourBootyPics • 21 points • 17 June, 2015 10:20 PM

Stop victim blaming. Just because I leave my car unlocked and with the doors wide open in the bad part of town in the middle of the night, while it was containing my keys, cell phone, and life savings in cash, doesn't mean I was asking for all my property to be stolen!!! Instead of teaching people like me to make smart choices and use common sense, we should teach people not to steal cars and money. Also, only teach black people that, since only blacks can steal things. End the Negro Theft Culture!!!

Ibex3D • 2 points • 17 June, 2015 11:03 PM

I'm gonna use this on the social justice warriors next semester haha!

Mikesapien • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 07:34 AM

"So you're saying women's sexuality is just money for the taking, is that it? OBJECTIFICATION! PATRIARCHY! MISOGINYYY!"

Invalidity • 28 points • 17 June, 2015 06:29 PM

I would posit that the worst thing to come out of law is the notion that people cannot give consent when they are intoxicated. When two people are intoxicated, by that law, neither party is able to give consent. If sex happens then, who is responsible? By illogical and irrational decision, the male will always be held responsible.

Does this make sense? No, it doesn't. And it likely will never have to make sense. This law strips women of all accountability because it doesn't attempt to help women avoid bad situations, but rather says, if anything happens, it's not your fault. It is never a woman's fault.

On top of that, the idea of creating safe spaces for women goes hand in hand with this. Let's strip all accountability from women, and yet, lets designate all matters of places wherein drinking is involved as a safe space.

It is not the environment that is unsafe, it is the substance being consumed. Yet for all it is worth, feminists will NEVER argue against alcohol. Why? Because most of them know that it helps them pursue men at higher SMVs.

The solution: Pin all the blame on low SMV males, and incriminate them before any action has even occurred.

Tell me that is absolutely not fucking stupid.

[deleted] • 13 points • 17 June, 2015 09:25 PM

feminists will NEVER argue against alcohol. Why? Because most of them know that it helps them pursue men at higher SMVs.

That is incredibly insightful. I always wondered they don't just TEACH WOMEN NOT TO DRINK. Its a whole lot easier than cuntsplaining to men about "how not to rape"

(Cuntsplaining is exactly like "mansplaining" except its a more accurate word)

Invalidity • 8 points • 17 June, 2015 09:38 PM

Women enjoy drinking. They simply don't want all the negative stuff that might result, ie. a low SMV male making advances on them.

Women aren't dense; they know that they might end up in bed with a guy who is less than what they expected. You know why? Because that's what alcohol does to people, it lowers their inhibitions!

Neither side, male or female, is stupid. Feminists simply know that they can make a small case, that can be resolved by common sense, and exaggerate the hell out of it.

They want to lower the inhibitions of attractive men so that they can bed them easier, but they want to keep unattractive men away from them.

[deleted] • -3 points • 18 June, 2015 12:56 AM

le or female, is stupid. Feminists simply know that they can make a small case, that can be resolved by common sense, and exaggerate the hell out of it.

They want to lower the inhibitions of attra

You know why? Because that's what alcohol does to people, it lowers their inhibitions!

You are taking away the woman's responsibility here : it was not her fault, alcohol made her do it.

Alcohol puts a woman in a state where she has less self control over her desires. That's why if you take home a drunken girl, it means she really desires you : she acts on her feelings without exercising any logic to calibrate her behavior (maybe I should wait that he buys me something? I don't want to be labelled a slut).

I think that when a woman fucks a beta, alcohol just multiplied her horniness and her desire for dicks. Sometimes she just wants to fuck a random guy. Sometimes the guy is lucky and gave off a good image of himself which was not representative and because the girl was DTF she didn't screen a lot.

But I don't believe alcohol alters women's preferences. I don't believe that drunk women will find beta attractive. It's the set of conditions that led them to drink in a nightclub that put a agenda (hadn't done something crazy in weeks, girls night out lolz). She literally came to the evening with the expectation to fuck and because alcohol unleashed her emotions/horniness or the very reasons she came to find a mate, she hadn't been able to assess this guy's value correctly.

But she thought he was alpha enough. Alcohol helped her being wrong on this point but at no point will alcohol make a woman love betas.

NikoMyshkin • 7 points • 18 June, 2015 11:23 AM

alcohol can only ever potentiate a feeling. it cannot ever produce feelings (eg desire for a given person) de novo.

vandaalen • 25 points • 17 June, 2015 07:12 PM

Wat?

Are you trying to tell me that I have got control over how people perceive me and are acting towards myself and that I actually have the power to change the image I represent by adjusting my behaviour and appearance?

Are you really attempting to sell to me, that in the end it is actually myself who could make a difference and not the thousands of strawmen I put up to blame?

That's too damned complicated for me. You better tell other people to not do those bad things they do and you better don't tell me to change. I don't like change. Especially if it involves me having to put effort in doing so.

[deleted] • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 12:46 AM

Saying a word is too much effort because, you know, feels>

NeoreactionSafe • 11 points • 17 June, 2015 09:47 PM*

Let's assume:

0 is "absolute objective reality".

100 is "bat shit crazy fantasy land".

The **Overton Window** represents the attitudes that a culture will accept as valid at any point in time. Anything outside this window is dismissed as "weird and unacceptable".

So let's say the Overton Window spans the region 86 through 93.

Within the window the idea that "**Men are all Rapists**" makes perfect sense.

Now add this experiment (above) where actual reality gets introduced... what happens?

You go from somewhere in the 86-93 range **directly to zero**.

When Feminism finally collapses it does so suddenly, almost like a light bulb goes on and people are suddenly able to see how things are. (basically a Red Pill moment)

This is why our ability to present actual raw Truth is so brutal, it doesn't just back the Overton Window down a few points, but instead sends it all the way back to reality... back to zero. This knowledge should give inspiration because while it took literally a hundred years of pushing and pushing from the left to create these delusions, it can disappear in an instant.

RedBigMan • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 11:34 AM

I'd say the reality most people live in is probably somewhere in the 40-60 range on that scale. Feminazis and Tumblrinas live in the 85-110 range (Yes this crazy goes to all the way to 11!)

NeoreactionSafe • 4 points • 18 June, 2015 01:39 PM

The Overton Window means views outside the window are harshly rejected.

Red Pill is outside the Overton Window.

Think of it as:

"What a politician can say without getting jumped on for their comment."

exit_sandman • 15 points • 17 June, 2015 08:00 PM*

What, you mean men are less likely to push for sex when you actually say "no"? Woah, what a novel concept, let's not get carried away here guys!

[deleted] • 25 points • 17 June, 2015 07:04 PM*

I don't believe for one moment that women or feminists actually fear rape. If you think that something as scary as rape might actually occur then you would be doing everything in your power to prevent it. You would latch on to every little thing you can find that'd help you solve the problem because in a rape culture, nobody's coming to do it for you. We see that principle demonstrated first hand at TheRedPill. We learn that the world's against us and immediately start lifting and learning.

The only thing that can explain women refusing to take responsibility for stopping rape is that they've assessed the risk and find it to be so atrociously low that it's just not even worth considering when choosing how to act. They've figured out that political leverage is valuable and that opening themselves up to rape is a negligible cost because almost nobody actually gets raped in 2015 and those who do, tend to be piss poor---not feminists.

kalstate • 7 points • 18 June, 2015 01:58 PM

I don't believe for one moment that women or feminists actually fear rape.

I tend to agree. Also, since women are having sex at will, and they sleep with alphas anyway, who's going to rape them? A beta? (Obviously predatory rapists exist, but they are far and few between.)

neonoir • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 01:18 PM [recovered]

And, if they were really afraid of college rape culture, than why has the percentage of women enrolled in college steadily increased for the past several decades? And why has the percentage of men enrolled been dropping, to the point where colleges are making special efforts to try to reverse the "missing man problem"? Wouldn't a rape culture have the opposite effect?

cariboo_j • 2 points • 20 June, 2015 01:11 AM

I'd be more afraid of rape accusation culture

RedPillAnonymous • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 01:07 PM

Rapes were not halved, if simply saying no stopped it then feminists are genuinely calling consensual yet unwanted sex rape. This is women making up definitions of rape. There was no sexual "violence", if a "no" is all it takes to stop a man from having sex with you, he is not nor was he about to be a rapist.

nuesuh • 6 points • 18 June, 2015 01:14 PM

If you aren't mature enough to say "no" or "stop doing that, i'm not like those girls :3", you're not old enough to make out with men.

jimjackjoe • 13 points • 18 June, 2015 12:04 AM [recovered]

Direct quote from a friend on facebook: "Rather than teach women how to negotiate for the pay they deserve, how about we teach employers not to discriminate against women." Translation: "How about instead of me learning a useful skill, everyone else just changes so I don't have to do anything." Basically the same as the "teach men not to rape" argument. I love it.

RedBigMan • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 11:36 AM

Teach employers to pay more because pussy.

mikesteane • 6 points • 17 June, 2015 11:47 PM

Only 22 young women need to receive the program for one completed rape to be averted.

Thus one in 11 women are raped. If you start of with a cooked figure like that to start with, then the final results are as worthless as the first number you made up.

[deleted] • 6 points • 18 June, 2015 12:44 AM

Wait until the feminists backlash at this idea because it's victim blaming. It got good results? Don't care, it's victim blaming.

[deleted] • 5 points • 18 June, 2015 05:18 AM

Women don't want to defend themselves, they want someone else to defend them.

RedPillAnonymous • 4 points • 18 June, 2015 01:16 PM

"It was the leftist culture of nonsense that crippled women's decision making capabilities by telling them that they are responsible for zero percent of their actions, and that any resulting consequences must be the fault of the man in the situation."

Couldn't keep it in could you? Sorry but "leftism" whatever that means, isn't at fault, traditional cultures ("rightists"?) and especially traditional men are far worse when it comes to holding women accountable. They are the first to go full white knight for a "good girl" when she loses her discretion and indulges in some drunken cock. She cries rape and all the good little traditionalists come running to lynch the guy.

Don't put this off on those of us who choose not to believe in god, or in sociopathic corporations, or in endless wars for no reason, or in education ect.

redpillschool[S] • 0 points • 18 June, 2015 01:17 PM

The left has been hijacked by the neomarxist movement (feminism).

I don't think it's that far fetched to say there's a strong link there.

RedPillAnonymous • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 02:27 PM

There is no neomarxist movement. There is only corporate greed, a mercenary government, and a handful of obscenely wealthy oligarchs to preside over it all.

Right wing christian views and ideals are as absurd as feminists.

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 02:38 PM

Women's liberation can only be achieved through a radical restructuring of the current capitalist economy, in which much of women's labor is uncompensated.

Engels (1884) argues that a woman's subordination is not a result of her biological disposition but of social relations, and that men's efforts to achieve their demands for control of women's labor and sexual faculties have gradually become institutionalized in the nuclear family. Through a Marxist historical perspective, Engels (1884) analyzes the widespread social phenomena associated with female sexual morality, such as fixation on virginity and sexual purity, incrimination and violent punishment of women who commit adultery, and demands that women be submissive to their husbands. Ultimately, Engels traces these phenomena to the recent development of exclusive control of private property by the patriarchs of the rising slaveowner class in the ancient mode of production, and the attendant desire to ensure that their inheritance is passed only to their own offspring: chastity and fidelity are rewarded, says Engels (1884), because they guarantee exclusive access to the sexual and reproductive faculty of women possessed by men from the property-owning class.

As such, gender oppression is closely related to class oppression and the relationship between men and women in society is similar to the relations between proletariat and bourgeoisie.[1] On this account women's subordination is a function of class oppression, maintained (like racism) because it serves the interests of capital and the ruling class; it divides men against women, privileges working class men relatively within the capitalist system in order to secure their support; and legitimates the capitalist class's refusal to pay for the domestic labor assigned, unpaid, to women.

If you read that and said "sounds like feminism," you'd be right.

If you read that and said "sounds like marxism," you'd also be right.

One in the same buddy, and they've hijacked the left and the social consciousness in general.

RedPillAnonymous • 2 points • 19 June, 2015 12:57 PM*

I never argued that feminism wasn't a mad libbed marxism for women. I stated that there is no neomarxist movement. Feminism is a sock puppet. The womens studies leaders certainly believe the feminist nonsense, but they are nothing but clowns given power to create more clowns, the real power lies far beyond them.

Feminism is entirely sustained by corporate and government funding. Feminism wasn't created to end the current power structures, it was created by the current power structure to sustain it.

Further feminism is a weapon aimed at the common man, because it is a lot easier to get away

with openly stomping the average man into the dirt if you do it with the pretense of a white knight saving damsels in distress, than if you do it as an out right bully.

But my point remains, feminism is just neo-chivalry.

Edit: I could also mad lib Mein Kampf by switching jews with men, marxism with patriarchy, aryans with women, ect. and get instant feminist literature. But that wouldn't mean that feminism was a neo fascism movement, it just means that feminists couldn't think up their own theory so they stole other ideologies and pieced them together.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 19 June, 2015 01:10 PM

I see no reason why the powers that be would want to destroy the economic unit of the family and upend the only thing that kept the average guy in line.

When men have nothing to lose, that's when you see revolutions.

If this were a master plan, it went horribly wrong.

RedPillAnonymous • 1 point • 19 June, 2015 01:32 PM

Basically the powerful wealthy white men got tired of sustaining all the other white men and cut them off as dead weight. Now the rest of the white men get to be poor minority trash as well. I imagine they are confident that they will bring about a new middle age style nobility, with a small wealthy elite, and vast masses of impoverished filth.

Master plans for power can and often do become overly ambitious. They very well may end up greeding themselves off the edge of a cliff. It all depends on whether modern technology gives the common man or the elite an edge. Consider the government has never had the ability to spy on the people (prism) that it has today, but the people have never had the ability to spy on the government (wikileaks) to the the extent that we can today either.

We unfortunately live in the midst of their push for power, our youths wasted in an age of feminist filth and economic slag. We will grow old to see our sons given the rights we never had, or to see them wear even heavier chains.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 19 June, 2015 01:33 PM

Basically the powerful wealthy white men got tired of sustaining all the other white men and cut them off as dead weight.

I disagree with your version of history.

RedPillAnonymous • 2 points • 19 June, 2015 01:43 PM

I'm fairly convinced the whole civil rights movement was more about throwing the common white man down with the minorities more than it was about raising minorities up with the common white man.

It's not like the rich backers of the civil rights movement tolerate diversity in their social networks.

I don't think the elite consider common whites to be one of their people now any more than nobility considered white peasants to be their people.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 19 June, 2015 01:47 PM

While that may have been the effect, I believe that even the elite understood the

principles behind keeping the masses placated in order to keep the working class doing what they do and propping up the economy- which the elite, whether or not they like the workers, knew they needed.

Destroying marriage and removing incentives for the worker bees to work is antithetical to the entire idea of reaping the rewards of being on top.

RedPillAnonymous • 1 point • 23 June, 2015 04:36 PM

I guess to illustrate I would ask you to imagine the typical middle class white persons feelings and sympathies towards lower class white trash, and then extrapolate that to get an idea of what the white elite thinks of the common middle class white people.

I really think the elite just decided feudalism with them on top (absolute freedom of rule) was better than nationalism with them on top (responsible stewardship). Also WWI and WWII showed they sucked at responsible stewardship anyway.

this_guy2001 • 10 points • 17 June, 2015 11:08 PM

The other day, on the slutwalk comment section, this one female was upset that people were not listening to the feminists' side and that they cut off one of the feminists before she had a chance to explain. She said people don't realize how many times rape goes unreported, to which she admitted to not reporting her episode.

My question is: why wouldn't you report something like that? This isn't like when your nephew walked out of Walmart with a handful of candy you didn't pay for.

Mildly_Sociopathic • 4 points • 18 June, 2015 01:32 PM

Do they take breathing lessons too? Fucking idiots being needed to be taught how to say no.

PeteMullersKeyboard • 5 points • 17 June, 2015 08:06 PM

How long until some fucking knuckle dragger calls this out as being sexist. I'm sure someone already has, we just haven't seen it yet.

Its almost like...taking responsibility for your own fucking life works out in your favor...who fucking knew...I need to go process this for a bit...

watersign • 3 points • 17 June, 2015 11:29 PM

or just say yes to chad all the time. chad doesnt rape!

RedBigMan • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 12:13 PM

I'm legally changing my name to Chad. /s

[deleted] • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 12:39 AM

get past emotional roadblocks to resist unwanted sexual behaviors

what the fuck?

When someone grabs you and push you against a wall, tears your pants down and pulls his dick off, the girl still has to check if she feels like resisting the assault? But wait, if she doesn't feel like it, that's not rape right? That's a new step in non sense land.

Transmigratory • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 02:04 AM

That explains why the feminazis didn't want this to happen.

[deleted] • 7 points • 17 June, 2015 06:30 PM

[permanently deleted]

GSstreetfighter • 6 points • 17 June, 2015 10:08 PM

Some girls want so badly to have credentials of oppression that they will lie about being assaulted to join the ranks. Kind of like Bug Chasers.

TheQuestion78 • 4 points • 17 June, 2015 09:22 PM

I can accept that guys nowadays need to be fully fucking clear with their intent/being not forceful in sexual situations...

..But COME ON! Women really need hours of training just to learn the simple fucking fact that they can say "No!" and all of the sudden the guy knows not to proceed further!? I know women can be illogical but this is illogical to the third power.

And clearly this reveals how loose the definition of "sexual assault" has become. Sexual relations between men and women never changed. What changed was that a bad sexual experience is simply not a mistake anymore, rather bad sex=sexual assault.

I'm a college student and MGTOW so it doesn't matter, but this kind of shit is what makes me fear for my fellow college friends. One of my friends has joked about getting everyone in our group tape-recorders so that we can always have a tool to record consent. Sadly, his idea would actually go a long way to protecting men. It's really depressing and this is definitely an area where feminism has gone WAYYY too far.

binrobinro • 7 points • 18 June, 2015 01:22 AM

They already have "tape" recorders. They're in their phones. Just gotta remember to use them. Some men have already avoided jail by recording the interactions on a date. Kinda kills the "he said/she said" claims.

cocaine_face • 4 points • 18 June, 2015 11:08 AM

This is why good bedside manner is important with hook-ups.

I was out of college by the time I started getting laid by anything but ugly girls, but for men nowadays, either date or fuck outside your college (tribunals for sexual assault only apply to students at **your** school) or have good bedside manner. Good bedside manner gives a woman good "feels" and makes her unlikely to report a consensual sexual assault as a rape.

TheQuestion78 • 1 point • 19 June, 2015 04:24 AM

I see your point. Definitely agree on the dating outside though. Much more of a safer option.

H_to_Tha_OV • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 12:30 PM

It seems foreign to us as men, but some women freeze up under pressure and also have a hard time saying "No". Encouraging ALL women to clearly set the boundaries under all circumstances is a good thing. It can minimize "accidental rape."

TheQuestion78 • 1 point • 19 June, 2015 04:22 AM

I don't discount the benefit of it. If they can take an active role in communication it would definitely help us men. I don't disagree with that at all.

thelandofdreams • 2 points • 17 June, 2015 11:19 PM

You forgot to put quotes around "assaults"

Xuixien_TheEpic • 2 points • 17 June, 2015 11:58 PM

If feminists really care about the welfare of women, they're going to have to concede this point.

TheLolomancer • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 09:52 AM

Since when have feminists done ANYTHING logical?

There is no biology or psychology discussed in the vast majority of women's studies conferences. It's all about X oppresses Y and 'what feels right'. It's worse than parliament in there.

Sir_Shitlord_focker • 2 points • 19 June, 2015 06:39 AM

Down from what ? the imaginary 1 in 4 ? That's one way to do progress I suppose, make up an imaginary problem and then solve it.

Today I cured foot cancer. Yay me.

collidoscope • 2 points • 19 June, 2015 07:42 PM*

How were these considered rapes in the first place if the girls weren't saying "no"?

[deleted] • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 12:11 AM

Recently, when the whole "scandal" came out about some senators or congressmen who won't be alone with female staffers, the feminists had a hissy fit over it.

I had a whole argument with a few of them about it. I maintained that it's a good policy to have to save yourself from rape accusations. But of course, there's no talking sense with them....

RedBigMan • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 12:12 PM

Of course there is no talking sense with them. Feminism particularly 3rd or 4th wave crap is about female superiority.

They want men to be damned if they do and damned if they don't. That creates a catch-22 where only female power is permitted.

Men will do as men have always done and protect their own self interest. If not being alone with a female staffer is what it takes to protect yourself from false rape and/or sexual harassment accusations then that is what men will do. You can not legislate a law that says the boss has to meet with you alone behind closed doors with no witnesses after all.

[deleted] • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 01:40 PM

True. That makes sense to you and me. But that's exactly what the feminists want to do.

RedBigMan • 2 points • 19 June, 2015 04:33 AM

Won't happen. The men in power realize just how badly they fucked up and they're not going to legislate something that will effectively increase their own risk. They will legislate things which will increase risks to the general population though like yes means yes type laws.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 June, 2015 01:03 PM

I don't think it should be legislated. I do think that every man and woman should have the right to

not be alone with a member of the opposite gender.

Fake_Credentials • 1 point • 17 June, 2015 11:04 PM

If possessing certain knowledge and tools can prevent other crimes like, like murder, it can also prevent rape. The difference is, the crime of rape is nearly always done towards women, and you can't expect them to function well enough to implement said knowledge and tools in heated situations.

Ever notice how most women handle crisis situations? They scream and/or sob hysterically while a man takes care of it for them.

RedBigMan • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 12:14 PM

No they act out until they realize that wont handle the crisis. If no men come to her rescue then you watch how quickly she handles shit herself.

If you as a man were able to cry crocodile tears and have women come rushing to your defense you'd go to that move every single time too.

Chaohinon • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 04:56 AM

You mean it doesn't make any sense to shout at non-psychopaths about how they need to teach psychopaths how to be less psychopathic? Next you'll try telling me I can't teach a grizzly bear to not do grizzly bear stuff. Fucking shit lords with your mansplainingcislogik.

antariusz • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 09:59 AM

Imagine how many more rapes could have been prevented if they had also decided to teach women not to rape!

KurrKurr • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 11:04 AM

[META] This post doesn't obey the new posting rules.

No summary, no lessons learnd. Why isn't this post deleted, yet?

/s

RedBigMan • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 11:08 AM

Only 22 young women need to receive the program for one completed rape to be averted.

You would think with the epidemic of rape happening on campus and 1 in 4 women getting raped and what not that 22 women getting this program would stop 5-6 rapes or something. /s

It's like securing anything... You just need to make it difficult enough that a criminal will take a pass on it because it's too much of a hassle of taking the risk of committing a crime when the reward is nowhere near worth the effort.

screamingATtrees • 1 point • 19 June, 2015 02:03 AM

"but I shouldn't have to do anything to avoid rape" lol

buddboy • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 01:11 AM

you are only focusing on the part of the article tha supports our redpill view. No

teaching women to avoid a bad situation and actually vocalize the word "no," when they don't want sex cleared up the rape cases.

That is only part of the story, the article says

The program also spent two hours teaching self-defense strategies.

You can't claim that women only needed to be taught the word no to avoid rape when they also spent time learning self defense strategies. Both of these parts of the class must be taken into account but you are completely ignoring half of the story.

redpillschool[S] • 8 points • 18 June, 2015 02:53 AM

If one were to have to deploy a self-defense strategy, I think it's safe to argue that they were assaulted, so this would not have a decrease in assault rate.

So, no, these are not to be factored in.

buddboy • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 09:28 PM

a very good point, making me rethink my original opinion

CowardlyPetrov • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 02:53 AM

/u/Authority8 makes a good point, but it is also not a RP pov that there are NO rapists, only that they are UNCOMMON

Therefore, MEN are not rapists. RAPISTS are rapists. Self-defense would then be useful. Feminists are the ones that trivialize REAL crimes, not RPer.

RedBigMan • 3 points • 18 June, 2015 12:21 PM

/u/Authority8 makes a good point, but it is also not a RP pov that there are NO rapists, only that they are UNCOMMON

No rapists are actually RARE AS FUCK. When the rape rate is 0.5 per 1000 individuals that means 1 in 2000 people have experienced rape. Even if we multiply that number by say a factor of 4 to account for 'unreported' rapes the number is 1 in 500 experienced a rape.

Now we'll assume some of those rapes are by the same serial rapists since common feminist diatribe is that rapists always keep offending and stuff... So like the number of rapists has to be miniscule at best. I'd say like 0.01% of the population are likely rapists... Which is probably better than the number of people who are murderers.

CowardlyPetrov • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 01:19 PM

I won't argue with that. I completely agree with the point of being semantically clear. I made the mistake of not being so because I am not hysterical with false rape mongering, but knowing why I made my mistake doesn't justify it.

buddboy • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 09:30 PM

If I were a feminist I would want to empower women and make them stronger. But it seems all modern feminists want is to make the rest of the world softer and safer so it is better suited for their fragile nature

[deleted] • 2 points • 18 June, 2015 01:49 AM

But wouldn't there still be police reports that a guy tried to rape a girl and she fought him off using self-defense?

Maybe the self-defense strategies did play a role... By removing plausible deniability: "If you were raped,

why didn't you utilize the self-defense strategies you were taught?" Thus the girl can no longer claim false rape accusations.

redpillschool[S] • 4 points • 18 June, 2015 02:54 AM

Like I commented above: "If one were to have to deploy a self-defense strategy, I think it's safe to argue that they were assaulted, so this would not have a decrease in assault rate."

buddboy • 1 point • 18 June, 2015 09:29 PM

yes, you and someone else pointed this out to me and I think it is a very good point

[deleted] • -2 points • 17 June, 2015 11:15 PM

What's sad is that we still harbor the delusion that feminism is for women. That this is some how a movement to make women's lives better, more equal.

But this isn't about equality and anyone who stills believes so is a fool of the highest order. These are college educated women, following college educated women. They already know the cause and effect of social behavior.

We refuse to acknowledge this because doing so would mean finally accepting once and for all that this isn't women being crazy, it's a fight. The educated American woman is making her push for the top of the food chain, simple and plain.

Being a victim allows them to generalize anyone who is against them as wrong and evil. Being a victim is their religion because like religion it gives them armor and protection. You're no longer disagreeing with them, you're agreeing to rape and domestic abuse and victim blaming and slut shaming and whatever other bullshit they put on you.

Being a victim IS their power. Why the fuck would they want to purposely give it away?

Understand you are dealing with women who don't give a fuck about women getting raped. They're always on the lookout for the perfect martyr, the perfect new story. They're like the inventor of the rape whistle, a man whose profits only rise if women are actually getting raped.

If you've ever been in a relationship, hell if you've ever had a mother, then you know there's no ACTUAL problem to fix. If we stopped all rapes in America, they'd push domestic abuse. If we fixed that, they'd push pay wage. If you fixed that, they'd push something else, and something else, and something else.

America is turning into that really cool friend you had who got married and 3 years later became an empty husk because he thought if he just always said yes to his wife that she'd finally stop complaining.

BlueFreedom420 • 0 points • 17 June, 2015 09:25 PM

Too bad laws are changed so that a woman doesn't have to say no and just call the police months, even years later.

Add to the fact that alot of rape claims are just women who want to gain that victim cred that they were taught by liberals as sacred.

[deleted] • 0 points • 17 June, 2015 10:48 PM

That's actually the University where I graduated.

[deleted] • 0 points • 17 June, 2015 11:53 PM

This comes across as LMR shit test 101. This kind of pseudo empowerment is merely to embolden would-be

sluts to fuck WITH men instead of actually fucking us.

A419a • 0 points • 18 June, 2015 12:40 PM

If a 'no' stops it, then it was sexual assault to begin with.