

# **CH maxim: The feminist goal is removing all constraints on female sexuality while maximally restricting male sexuality - UofM Enforcing Positive Consent, restricting male sexuality to guilty until proven innocent.**

July 6, 2015 | 309 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

---

For those of you following along at home, this should come as no surprise, but in the news recently is University of Minnesota declaring "positive consent" requirement for students.

The U's new rule, which is poised to take effect this month after a 30-day comment period, says that sex is OK only if both parties express consent through "clear and unambiguous words or actions." Absent that, it would fit the U's definition of sexual assault.

So far, the plan has prompted little dissent at the U. But nationally, critics have derided such policies as absurd and dangerous, particularly when it comes to protecting the rights of the accused.

"Once that accusation has been made, it's somehow up to the accused person to prove they did have consent," said Robert Shibley, executive director of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), a civil liberties group in Philadelphia. "What that means is that they're guilty until proven innocent."

<http://www.startribune.com/university-of-minnesota-to-adopt-affirmative-consent-rule/311650821/>

Anybody who has been here a while is aware of Chateau Heartiste's maxim:

**"The feminist goal is removing all constraints on female sexuality while maximally restricting male sexuality"**

This is just puts the ball that much further down the field.

Each and every feminist goal, plan, action, or legislation is a means to this end: to limit male sexuality and open the maximum amount of opportunity and option for female sexuality.

How much are women going to suffer for this new policy opposed to men?

The question you need to wonder is: was campus rape really an issue? The fact is, it really isn't that big of an issue. But here we have institutionalized rule that limits male sexuality in favor of female.

Combine that with the violence against women act, the dulith model, no fault divorce laws, family courts that award women custody, and laws that make it easier for women in any given field but not men..

And you've got yourself a sexual strategy optimized for women.

Edit: Heartiste Link:

<https://heartiste.wordpress.com/2014/02/05/study-finds-the-foul-source-of-feminism/>

---

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

---

## Comments

---

F\_Dingo • 108 points • 6 July, 2015 05:53 PM

When in the god damn hell is someone going to throw a few lawsuits at these universities for having their bullshit kangaroo courts?

WAFC • 59 points • 6 July, 2015 06:34 PM

Already happening at various schools. I think Amherst is the highest profile one.

RPthrowaway123 • 109 points • 6 July, 2015 06:36 PM

And Columbia now. I hope they get sued into oblivion for letting that Mattress Girl shitshow go on.

krakosia • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 05:39 PM\*

Well kind of doubt the issue is going away. It got positive coverage in mainstream news, last week tonight with Jon Oliver, vice on hbo. Facts are not gonna get in the way of narrative on this one

Edit: John Oliver didn't cover the mattress girl rape story. It was covered on vice  
<http://www.vice.com/read/how-campus-rape-became-a-national-scandal-513>

RPthrowaway123 • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 07:58 PM

Wait...John Oliver made a report supporting mattress girl?

krakosia • 2 points • 8 July, 2015 06:33 AM

Sorry my bad, he had covered gamer gate. I misremembered he talked about the campus rape story

RPthrowaway123 • 3 points • 8 July, 2015 08:28 PM

He had a bunch of SJW bullshit on his show, and didn't challenge any of it. He literally said "the problem in gaming is white people who have penises". Lost a lot of respect for him.

krakosia • 2 points • 9 July, 2015 03:58 PM

Yep, starting to lose interest in the show massively now

[deleted] • -1 points • 8 July, 2015 03:07 AM\*

This comment has been overwritten by an open source script to protect this user's privacy.

If you would like to do the same, add the browser extension GreaseMonkey to Firefox and add this open source script.

Then simply click on your username on Reddit, go to the comments tab, and hit the new OVERWRITE button at the top.

Zerael • 37 points • 6 July, 2015 08:40 PM

The dirty secret is that this is already happening, sir ;)

<http://www.cotwa.info/2014/06/colleges-dirty-little-secret-their.html>

United Educators is an insurance company owned by more than 1,000 colleges and universities. 54 percent of the claims it receives come from students who say they were falsely accused of sexual assault. **A full 72 percent of the insurer's payouts** -- almost three quarters -- go to students who were falsely accused.

(The link's resource/source is no longer available in the page, I've tracked it down for yours truly, you can find it below):

[http://contentz.mkt5031.com/lp/37886/394531/Student%20Sexual%20Assault\\_Weathering%20the%20Perfect%20Storm.pdf](http://contentz.mkt5031.com/lp/37886/394531/Student%20Sexual%20Assault_Weathering%20the%20Perfect%20Storm.pdf)

leftajar • 4 points • 7 July, 2015 06:40 PM

I hope to god that company is publicly traded. I'm gonna go grab a few shares.

Kyfhomyoba • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 07:53 PM

The sad part is that it appears that the 54% and 72% numbers are only for the category of sexual assault claims, i.e., *within the category of sexual assault claims*, 54% come from accused students (and 46% come from accusers) and 72% goes to accused students (and 28% to accusing students). All other categories, e.g., slip and fall, wrongful termination, etc., have no bearing or impact on these numbers. These numbers are *only for the category of sexual assault*.

Not so much justice boner now, eh?

Hoodwink • 31 points • 6 July, 2015 06:36 PM [recovered]

I'm very surprised they don't have their lawyers or some law professors screaming their heads off at them...

Oh wait, maybe they're silent because because it means fees.

TheInkerman • 18 points • 7 July, 2015 12:52 AM [recovered]

IIRC Harvard's law department freaked out when they introduced similar policies, but they can't do much, especially given law schools are usually segregated from the wider university admin anyway.

[deleted] • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 09:17 AM

They did and now they're currently hiding they heads in shame waiting for the shitstorm of cases to arrive at their doorstep.

Squeezymypenisy • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 01:17 AM

Oh they do. But they also realize that they are about to have a lot more work. Public universities keep forgetting that they are property of the state.

grubek • 15 points • 6 July, 2015 07:13 PM

They already have. But if colleges don't comply with the feminist bullshit they lose government funding, so they prefer to risk a demand. Feminists are doing "great work" with your taxes.

Saiserit • 8 points • 6 July, 2015 08:41 PM

I can't even escape this shit from distance ed 2000km away. Every class has some unrelated assignment which demands I explain, "How does X( article/book/event) amplify/negate/relate to the patriarchal oppression."

Squeezymypenisy • 5 points • 7 July, 2015 01:19 AM

I'll be honest. I just graduated last year. I never had to do any courses or assignments like that. I go to a state school I did have to do a diversity dinner because my fraternity chapter got in trouble for having a white trash bash at a house. It was busted by police.

cover20 • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 01:54 AM

What are you majoring in? Yuck.

Radagascar1 • 1 point • 8 July, 2015 12:03 PM

That sentence makes me cringe.

jdgalt • 1 point • 12 July, 2015 10:26 PM

I take it I'd get in trouble if I did a paper about how the so-called "patriarchal oppression" is a lie, a myth, and a scam? It would make me investigate what remedies exist for bias on the part of the school itself or its instructors.

Saiserit • 1 point • 12 July, 2015 10:42 PM

You wouldn't get in trouble. In my experience, they always like to cash the cheques. You'd just mysteriously get nothing but Cs for the rest of your career at the school and every professor would go silent if you asked for any help.

TheJessee • 3 points • 6 July, 2015 07:44 PM [recovered]

There's already quite a few people who got falsely accused and thrown out of college (basically ruining their future career because of these females) who are being backed by institutions like FIRE to sue the universities

jdgalt • 1 point • 12 July, 2015 10:27 PM [recovered]

The universities may very well be safe because DOE mandates those codes. I would want to sue DOE. (Constitutional rights having to do with due process probably don't apply directly to a university's rules, but they certainly do apply to a federal regulation that mandates those rules.)

niczar • 1 point • 6 July, 2015 08:25 PM

thefire.org

rpscrote • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 03:33 PM

The group mentioned above, FIRE, does really good work suing schools for their bullshit anti-free speech laws and they've started taking on these guilty-until-proven-innocent laws too

RedBigMan • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 08:41 PM

It's happening... what you should ask yourself is when are those kangaroo courts going to be given legal immunity from lawsuits because the agenda they're pushing is the one the government wants to happen so they can get the next generation ready for the next level of totalitarian regime masked as a two party system.

CQC3 • 71 points • 6 July, 2015 06:09 PM

It really is insane. It's like none of these people have ever had a natural sexual encounter. The whole thing damn near rides on tension, ambiguity and levels of uncertainty.

This isn't going to make women happier either. All men under these types of rules will get punished eventually.

Eventually most guys--if it got bad enough, and laws like this became the norm and not just a few Universities, would cease to be the aggressors and cease to initiate contact. Women don't want to be the aggressors in public (to maintain plausible deniability) so they'll be put in an awkward situation.

The very characteristics and actions that turn women on are being banned, and the men that will take the risk anyways to act that way (which they will be hyper successful at since even LESS men will be that way) will be punished because all it would take was one girl to retroactively decide consent never happened or she just plain doesn't like you anymore.

The irony in all this is that women are just going to be increasingly unhappy and discontent the more they get the "equality" they want. I'd say most women are uninvolved with all this BS, just swept along for the ride.

No matter which way you look at it, if we do live in a male dominated society, then it is the failings of men that allowed it to get to this point. That and business controlled interests. Women being the primary spenders on useless bullshit and easily manipulated at that, makes them prime candidates to be catered to.

RPthrowaway123 • 20 points • 6 July, 2015 06:41 PM

I'd say most women are uninvolved with all this BS, just swept along for the ride.

Doesn't mean they aren't just fine with taking advantage of the bullshit they are getting. A guilt-free and reputation-saving card, for the low price of ruining one guy's life? They'd be idiots not to use it.

MattyAnon • 13 points • 6 July, 2015 10:14 PM

I'd say most women are uninvolved with all this BS, just swept along for the ride.

Twice now I've been assaulted by women and on both occasions they've immediately followed this with threats to call the police against *me*.

That's not swept along for the ride, that's actively participating in the lies.

The sooner you accept AWALT, the better your life is.

CQC3 • 4 points • 7 July, 2015 03:19 AM\*

I think there's a bit of confusion as to what I meant. I'm not saying women aren't complicit in this behavior, I'm saying that in any type of movement there is a core and then there is the outer edge, which is usually a very large amount of people who have been swept up by the storm--so to speak. It isn't that they aren't responsible, but rather these are the same people that could get scooped up by anything.

Basically, in the world there is always going to be a certain amount of weak and easily manipulated people that will succumb to some other groups influence. It is no different with Feminism, and I am saying that most women don't agree with any Feminist ideals because they came to the conclusions on their own, it is simply an ideology to attach themselves to and fight invisible wars to foster a sense of self importance and identity.

In my eyes it is no different than organized religion in the sense that it is just another loose group with multiple branches that essentially tells people what to believe, what is right and wrong and what is ideal.

Do people who commit wrongdoings in the name of religion get a free pass? No. Same goes for "feminists". So when I say uninvolved I mean to say there is a difference between arming yourself with someone elses belief system vs being an originator in that system. The difference between being influenced and corrupted by beliefs vs being the originator and source of the corrupting beliefs.

To explicitly state it is: the bigger something becomes, it will gradually pull in more people who care less and less about the original idea (fucked up or maligned as it may be). These people care more about belonging than the thing itself. You see this all the time with viral trends. The mid to late adopters usually care the least in that order about the thing itself, but more about it's popularity. Same thing with religion, same thing with things like social media, and the same thing with Feminism. It has become big enough to where people are expected to be Feminists and like religion it doesn't excuse any atrocities they commit in my eyes.

They don't *actually* believe in this shit, they just think they do because it is accepted and popular to do so and sounds great on paper--and as you say, advantageous to do so, and yet the practice of it has yielded a very discontent generation filled with divorces and unstable relationships. Understand?

MattyAnon • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 11:41 AM

I get what you're saying - that there are crazy feminists leading the charge, and the bulk of women are just going along with things.

That's clearly true.

But "going along with things" also involves a staggering amount of sexism (against men), lies, self talk, abuse (of men), abuse of the system for their own benefit (marriage, regretrape, turning on the waterworks, the list goes on).

How many women have the integrity to think "hang on a second, this just isn't right, I'm not going to behave like that?". I don't know any. This involves a degree of complicitness that I can't forgive nor absolve as "going along with things".

[deleted] • 12 points • 6 July, 2015 07:49 PM

I've seen women rebrand themselves as serial rape victims to get into grad school. Shit is fucked up.

DrScientist812 • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 10:07 AM

Tough, empowered serial rape victims who need safe rooms the second someone mentions "due process."

Hoodwink • 20 points • 6 July, 2015 06:40 PM **[recovered]**

It really is insane. It's like none of these people have ever had a natural sexual encounter.

Most of the baby boomers didn't/don't - very few actually participated (very few went to college back then, you didn't have time to slut it up if you wanted family/kids). They had strong family units, a shortage of men in their father's generation (from WW2 - so women didn't want to slut it up because there was no men waiting for them).

Their generation had strong families and men with great jobs (because of WW2 bombing the fuck out of every other Western country). This is why Feminism is completely rampant and gets away with their narrative of everything-is-handed-to-men. For Baby-boomers the narrative is true - but it's not because of Patriarchy; it's because of WW2.

MattyAnon • 11 points • 6 July, 2015 10:12 PM **[recovered]**

For Baby-boomers the narrative is true

No, it's not. For baby-boomers, there were not female jobs for women, times were very different. But if "stay at home and raise a few kids while the man goes out and works and supports her" is oppressing

women, then I'm a red-headed patriarchal shitlord.

Hoodwink • 5 points • 7 July, 2015 03:09 AM [recovered]

there were not female jobs for women

There were jobs. They were mostly clerical, teaching, nursing, waitresses, and all those familiar female dominated jobs. It's not like women never worked in the 1950's or before then. This is especially true in the lower and middle-classes - they worked. Women weren't sitting on their ass. They couldn't afford not to.

There is a common 'example' where women were fired after they got married while working at major corporations, but that's not exactly oppression because the women of the day was going to get pregnant over and over (6+ kids). It's almost a courtesy - pretend if it was a regular thing today - could we reasonably allow a woman to so many days off while pregnant and birthing? Jobs were much harder/demanding then.

The fact of the matter is that you have to take into account the regular time period - and the fact that for the most part, the expectations and policies were actually pretty damn good for families. It also encouraged workers rights and unions because men were expected to take care of much more than themselves - they expected to build families rather than just barely surviving (and not even being able to afford a single apartment like today).

There was no oppression for women except women's expectations to birth and raise a family - 'patriarch' is exactly refers to a man with family and women's vital role/expectations. But, the original feminists were all about strengthening patriarchal family by various means (such as going after alcohol and sex workers) - not dissolve the expectations.

Also, by the time blacks and women got to vote, the party structure in the U.S. was already entrenched so the elites didn't need to worry that voting would shake things up. Voting had already been reduced to the show it is now (i.e. vote for the preapproved candidates by the party which is dictated by money). Feminism 'won' a battle that was handed to them after the gun had been unloaded. Also, Feminism after WW2 didn't belong to a 'bottom-up' social politics, but came from the upper-classes as a planned prescription for society. Probably to dissolve worker power (and men's ambitions to take care of their families as an expectation in their wages) and to control the population growth.

[deleted] • 1 point • 8 July, 2015 06:23 AM [recovered]

Half of jobs today could, and probably should, be automated.

[deleted] • 10 points • 7 July, 2015 01:09 AM

The whole point is to ensure women get their AF and then get to lock them down.

"If you don't make me your girlfriend/wife/whatever, I'll accuse you of rape" is going to be a thing in the near future.

jdgalt • 1 point • 12 July, 2015 10:31 PM

A good reason to start secretly filming/recording your encounters (even non-sexual) with women, to use if they try it.

[deleted] • 8 points • 6 July, 2015 08:24 PM



It's like none of these people have ever had a natural sexual encounter. The whole thing damn near rides on tension, ambiguity and levels of uncertainty.

It's almost like all interactions with strangers, be it sales, sexual, or all out war contain an element of *danger*. But oh, no, we can't have that in our bubble-wrap society. Apart from when danger brings *tingles*. Then give us *all* the danger.

The femtards want to artificially remove danger from the masculine pockets of society that thrive on it, and then wonder where all the good-tingle-men have gone. Good luck fuckers.

Saiserit • 9 points • 6 July, 2015 08:54 PM

This must be why amateur bdsm is so prevalent. It's the other side of the pendulum. The culture has neutered everyone's capacity to enjoy primal sex, so roleplayed danger makes up the deficit.

dannymason • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 02:04 AM

The general logic underlying your hypothesis has been an open secret at least since the '70s.

AFPJ • 5 points • 6 July, 2015 10:44 PM

It really is insane. It's like none of these people have ever had a natural sexual encounter.

It is, they know it, and that's precisely the point: absurdity has a very clear purpose.

Cyralea • 5 points • 7 July, 2015 02:38 PM

It's not going to affect desirable men. Women aren't going to lay charges on men they want to fuck. They will use this as leverage against men they later discover were betas, or alphas that refused to commit.

RPS is dead on, this is a way of restricting male sexual freedom in order to expand female sexual freedom.

MattyAnon • 5 points • 6 July, 2015 10:10 PM

Eventually most guys--if it got bad enough, and laws like this became the norm and not just a few Universities, would cease to be the aggressors and cease to initiate contact.

Even where women are the aggressors, how are you going to prove you didn't rape her?

"Can you prove affirmative consent sir?" / "Well no, see she jumped on me and ripped all my clothes off before holding me down and..." / "Ahhhh.... so you say you can't prove she consented?" / "She screamed yes and forced me to..." / "Which you can't prove can you, Mr Rapist?"

Squeezymypenisy • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 01:21 AM

Run bro. Or try out of country universities.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 July, 2015 06:17 AM

These laws are getting pushed by the fat uglies that aren't getting ass anyway.

Saiserit • 2 points • 6 July, 2015 08:44 PM

No means no except when it means, "lie better."

RedBigMan • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 08:59 PM

Yeah don't forget they'll pass these laws and when men refuse to hit on them they'll bitch that noone is trying to have sex with them.



Sorta like the senators and corporate bosses and stuff who won't allow themselves to be left alone with female interns or whatever... Well they wanted laws that would prevent sexual harassment and when dudes start taking steps to protect themselves from false accusations they're suddenly evil misogynist pigs for acting in their own best self interest.

RPthrowaway123 • 39 points • 6 July, 2015 06:04 PM

Everybody talks about college as the best time to fuck around, but boy am I glad I graduated when I did.

fuckin\_retard • 30 points • 6 July, 2015 10:01 PM **[recovered]**

College has always been the best time to fuck around. Demographically, logistically, socially - college is THE place to get laid. That being said, I feel fucking horrible for the up-and-comers because shit is changing for the worse.

As a man - I was "sexually assaulted" 2 times in college. Girl 1 forcibly attacked my face with her tongue on the dance floor. Girl 2 had sex with me when I was black-out drunk and she was sober - AFTER giving me a lecture about how being drunk removes the ability to consent. The hypocrisy is real.

Girl 3 didn't assault me, but she wanted to fuck me and physically threatened my girl at the time.

If the genders were reversed in any of these scenarios, the perpetrators could have been ostracized socially, kicked out of school, or worse...

Fucking PussyPass™ man. Its a powerful thing

MHOOD01 • 4 points • 7 July, 2015 02:20 AM **[recovered]**

How did that happen with girl 3, did she go all out like the fat bitch in 'Lets Be Cops' and said, "I'm gettin' fucked tonight!"?

cover20 • -5 points • 7 July, 2015 01:56 AM

But you didn't go after them.

I won't call you a white knight because you were just doing what most men do. But the only way to use these new rules is to keep checking with yourself "do I choose to be bothered by this? should i make a shitshow out of this?"

In other words like a litigious female. We got no choice, we have to win by their rules.

grubek • 40 points • 6 July, 2015 07:15 PM

You have to admire feminists. Official government statistics show that rape rate is lower in campus than off campus. Yet, they have managed to convince everybody that campus rape is an epidemic and used the hysteria to pass laws giving themselves more power. It's impressive.

MHOOD01 • 6 points • 7 July, 2015 02:27 AM

Those mutt-faced bitches are the bottom of the barrel.

There's more rapes in prison than on campuses. I guarantee it.

redpillschool[S] • 46 points • 6 July, 2015 05:19 PM

“Really, there’s been a lack of due process for victims forever,” she said. “We’re now shifting and rebalancing, where both parties need to be able to demonstrate there was consent.”

Stupid victims, having to prove a crime took place. They need due process (1) right away!

(1) Due process now defined as whateverthefuck.

Jaques\_Fury • 23 points • 6 July, 2015 06:26 PM\*

I would love to see some of these policies go after the children of some of the more powerful families out there. These policies have been adopted at all levels, both public universities and elite colleges alike. Surely someone in power must have noticed this by now.

From what I've gathered, all Ivy League schools (excluding Harvard) have some form of "affirmative consent" policy. For instance, Princeton University defines consent as follows:

1. Consent to one act does not constitute consent to another act.
2. Consent on a prior occasion does not constitute consent on a subsequent occasion.
3. **The existence of a prior or current relationship does not, in itself, constitute consent.**
4. **Consent can be withdrawn or modified at any time.**
5. Consent is not implicit in a person's manner of dress.
6. Accepting a meal, a gift, or an invitation for a date does not imply or constitute consent.
7. **Silence, passivity, or lack of resistance does not necessarily constitute consent.**
8. Initiation by someone who a reasonable person knows or should have known to be deemed incapacitated is not consent.

Notice that item #7 is their way of voiding the previous "No Means No" standard in place of this newer "Yes Means Yes" standard. Then there's the magical ability to withdraw consent present in item #4.

Item #3 is particularly crazy. According to this one, if you've had a girlfriend for *years*, you are still required to obtain verbal consent each time before you have sex.

To top it all off, these cases are run through a kangaroo court where only a preponderance of evidence is necessary to indicate guilt. And, since Princeton defines guilt of sexual misconduct as *anything* where the accused failed to obtain consent, the accuser only needs at least 51% of the total evidence to indicate that consent was in some way violated.

---

tl;dr - Crazy consent policies have been the staple of campus life for some time now. It's not just California and public universities. Ultimately, they have defined consent to be 100% within the control of the women; making it entirely impossible for a man to acquire and maintain it.

RPthrowaway123 • 11 points • 6 July, 2015 06:43 PM

Holy shit. So basically, unless she signs a form (not just one, she would probably need to sign a new one every time the couple changed positions) then it is impossible to prove that you didn't rape somebody.

ferengiprophet • 18 points • 6 July, 2015 07:03 PM

Even if you do get her to sign the forms, she can always claim that she was suffering from emotional duress at the time of the signing.

RPthrowaway123 • 21 points • 6 July, 2015 07:10 PM

"Where have all the good men gone?!"

"They're running from you in terror, lest they run afoul of any of the billion laws that govern any interaction they might have with your bitchy ass."

[deleted] • 14 points • 6 July, 2015 07:21 PM\*

Does nobody stop and think....there is no way to disprove a false accuser in this situation? It's literally the means to put anyone you had sex out of college, permanently. It's a fucking superpower.

edit: prison to out of college

RunawayBear • 8 points • 6 July, 2015 08:06 PM [recovered]

To correct your point, you would not be jailed based on the Universities' policies. The standard of criminal conviction of rape is still beyond a reasonable doubt, meaning that the accuser still has to prove beyond such doubt that a rape did in fact occur (which is determined by individual state statute). However, being publicly shamed/slandered, kicked out of university, loss of scholarship, financial aid, etc. are all distinct possibilities.

[deleted] • 8 points • 6 July, 2015 08:15 PM [recovered]

Also when you're kicked out of a university, you are not eligible to return to any other ones. They ask you on the application if you are eligible to return to your previous school.

[deleted] • 3 points • 6 July, 2015 07:50 PM

Recordings would fall under the revenge porn laws....

jdgalt • 1 point • 12 July, 2015 10:43 PM

Not the laws I've seen, unless you make the recording public.

Of course, they do open the door to graymail. ("If you pursue that rape charge, I'll have to introduce this video as evidence, which will mean it becomes a public record that anyone can see, forever.")

[deleted] • 1 point • 13 July, 2015 02:15 AM

Dude, that could get real fucked up. :s

NakedAndBehindYou • 8 points • 6 July, 2015 08:50 PM

If you combine #4 and #7 you get the ludicrous result that a woman can withdraw consent during sex without actually making the man aware of the fact that she has done so.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 02:03 PM

That is EXACTLY what they want. "well, we started doing it, and I realized it was wrong, but I couldn't say no because I felt x, y, or x emotion" = rape.

And look at No. 8. Drunk girl who initiates and rips your clothes off can still claim she was raped because "you should have known better."

crotchetyMfer • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 07:24 AM

Sexual Consent Youtube video

This was meant to be a joke, but it's closer to reality now. A few RP gems in the lawyer banter to boot.

faded\_jester • 18 points • 6 July, 2015 08:43 PM

The Chappelle Show "Love Contract" is actually becoming necessary. Way to show how empowered you are feminists....by making sure you have no agency or accountability.....like children.

You have to be a complete fucking moron to even accept the principle of "retroactive consent" let alone think it would be anything but a disaster.

Miheegz • 15 points • 6 July, 2015 09:23 PM

That's why I love Chappelle. It was just a random skit. He practically predicted the future. He wrote that sketch around the time of Kobe, R kelly and other stars rape accusations! He was saying pretty soon this is the only way to protect yourself!

dr\_warlock • 16 points • 6 July, 2015 06:40 PM\*

1) Rollo has an article The Political is Personal

Women are using the law to enforce and optimize the female imperative.

2)

**Regions With Affirmative Consent** (5, not including single schools) :

Demonstration of Affirmative Consent (video; length = 1min 52 sec )

Your word vs. her word, unless you have electronic evidence

California Has Adopted "Yes Means Yes" (News Report)

Hawaii Has Adopted "Yes Means Yes" (ROK Article) [Archived]

New York Has Adopted "Yes Means Yes" (ROK Article) [Archived]

"Yes Means Yes" Comes To London (ROK Article) [Archived]

Canada Adopts "Yes Means Yes" + New Sex-ed Curriculum (ROK Article) [Archived]

Withholding sex is 'Sexual Violence' at University of Michigan

[deleted] • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 02:07 PM

Check out the last one:

ignoring the partner's feelings; withholding approval as a form of punishment; yelling at the partner; labeling the partner with terms like 'crazy,' 'stupid

"being as asshole" is now "sexual abuse" punishable by expulsion.

Why anyone would ever get into a relationship with a co-ed is beyond me....but wait....Could refusing a relationship be a form of abuse because it involves "withholding affection" and "ignoring feelings"?

denart4 • 15 points • 6 July, 2015 09:46 PM

MGTOW MGTOW MGTOW

How many times does this need to be said? Playing the game is losing the game.

[deleted] • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 03:06 AM

Too bad that subreddit is ass

[deleted] • 8 points • 7 July, 2015 03:27 AM

Men who have actually gone their own way tend to not congregate in concentrated locations on the internet.

tallwheel • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 07:12 AM

There is a better MGTOW community on youtube, and on forums like mgtowhq and goingyourrownway. In my honest opinion, the subreddit really is ass. Probably due to a combination of shitty moderators and a lack of momentum at the right time.

GayLubeOil • 13 points • 6 July, 2015 09:26 PM

I really don't think the feminist movement is sustainable at this point. Ten years ago they could make the claim that feminism is about equality and back then it was still somewhat believable. Today the claim that feminism is about equality is much harder to substantiate precisely because of policies like these which have different outcomes for men and women. The further they go the more they are going to alienate the manginas and moderates that enable feminism. At that point their going to be isolated with only their cats for company. Mr. Wiskers always understands even if you are a deluded cunt.

Limekill • 5 points • 7 July, 2015 03:10 AM

Its interesting how they are always cats, never dogs.

Perhaps it's because cats are mercenary bastards whom only look out for their self indulgent own interests.... Also dogs show loyalty and affection and these girls are strong independent women... much better to go with the aloof, 'give no fucks' cat (or alpha male).

GayLubeOil • 11 points • 7 July, 2015 03:17 AM

Dogs need to be trained, housebroken and taught the leash. They don't have the leadership skills to handle being a dog owner.

tallwheel • 5 points • 7 July, 2015 07:09 AM

policies like these which have different outcomes for men and women.

But.. b... but, the law is worded in gender neutral language, and therefore applies equally to both men and women.

....pfftbwhaha! Sorry. Couldn't type the above without laughing aloud.

RedBigMan • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 09:18 PM

Yep... it's gender neutral language... but as we all know the first one to file a complaint has first mover advantage and will basically be believed without question... Who's usually the first one to complain? Women.

If some dude porked a 3/10 chick he wouldn't file a complaint that he retroactively retracted consent or that he was drunk and unable to consent... Fucker would make the walk of shame and get razzed by his buddies for a good while about it.

Women think if they fucked a guy who's a 3/10 that omg I was raped, someone drugged my drink, I was drunk and would have never had sex with this guy evar so it must be rape. Let me go complain and ruin this dudes life. brb lol.

[deleted] • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 06:54 AM

Oh Mr Whiskers knows shes a crazy bitch. He just doesnt care cause he's got his.

hamsterbator • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 07:54 PM

unfortunately the vocal minority bullshitters still manage to change policy.

jdgal • 1 point • 12 July, 2015 10:46 PM

The manginas are already alienated -- but they are whipped, so they will toe the line as long as they think they will get any.

Cis\_Masogynist • 10 points • 6 July, 2015 07:06 PM

The reason yes means yes it's getting pushed so hard is that women now outnumber men at university. With more women having a smaller pool of men to choose from they have to legislate the men into beta-hood. I'm a firm believer that the hookup culture that permeates all university life currently is a result of less men enrolling and graduating. Women go to school to meet men who are going to become their future beta-bux. But because of the unequal ratios women's hypergamy is being compromised.

slutnip • 8 points • 6 July, 2015 08:23 PM\*

This is true, I graduated in 2008 and my freshman class was 39% guys 61% girls. There were 18k total students. I was a total idiot (beta) and I was swimming in vag. I didn't have to learn game until after college when all the shit I was doing wasn't working anymore 2+ years afterwards. Even my relationships afterwards were total nightmares and I couldn't figure it out.

It's only getting worse too. Looking around at the world, guys are becoming total vaginas so what they are doing is working

The big picture end for this entire situation is that ALL WOMEN are going to lose. None of these women are happy with the world around them. What women want to marry a complete mindless beta retard. If you look at them, sure they are cheating but they are miserable as fuck

skoobled • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 07:00 AM

Understanding that would require forethought, which is not a female strong suit. In the meantime, BB is the promise of a free lunch

Of course it makes little sense also if they've herded men out of colleges - how is he supposed to get that job to pay her bills? That will be his fault also, if course

RedBigMan • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 09:21 PM

No the dude will just not get a girl and will end up as MGTOW and stop giving a fuck about women entirely.

Self-fulfilling prophecy... The opposite of love isn't hate... It's apathy. Men will become apathetic to women which is far worse of an outcome than 'patriarchal misogyny' that all these women are afraid of.

newls • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 07:34 AM

From the sounds of this thread and general off-internet conversation I must have missed out big time on this kind of stuff at university. Even though an athlete I was awkward and probably creepy to a few girls. God fucking damnit!

With TRP and going after my life mission in a big way things seem to be going alright on the female front now though.

cocaine\_face • 1 point • 8 July, 2015 01:42 AM

You can still fuck them after.

BrunoOh • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 02:20 PM

Women have a poor understanding of cause and effect.

[deleted] • 9 points • 6 July, 2015 07:11 PM

Eh fuck Blackstone right? Fuck the main precedent that guides our judicial system. We have an epidemic of regret sex! We must trample over men's rights!

operationzeem • 8 points • 6 July, 2015 08:42 PM **[recovered]**

It'll only take a few high profile law suits before this whole clownish debacle is forced to fall flat. After a few universities get shafted (after verbal consent, of course) these ridiculous rules will be repealed. In the meantime, good luck to all the college kids out there man...

epixs • 2 points • 8 July, 2015 06:24 AM **[recovered]**

I totally agree. All we need is some legacy donor's kid who's in the top white frat getting accused and boom his rich dads lawyer sue's the shit out of the whole university.

Honestly, this needs to be done. The reason most of these university get away with their kangaroo courts is because the families that are accused aren't the most wealthy that can afford to bring the legal matters to top law firms and/or use their internal connections with the university provost/dean/internal staff...

StarDestinyGuy • 8 points • 6 July, 2015 11:23 PM

Sigh...I'm a Minnesotan. Just graduated from the U of M this year actually. I remember reading about "Yes means Yes" in California awhile ago and thinking, "Thank goodness it hasn't infested us yet."

Looks like I graduated just in time.

vandaalen • 4 points • 6 July, 2015 09:54 PM

"Once that accusation has been made, it's somehow up to the accused person to prove they did have consent," said Robert Shibley, executive director of the Foundation for Individual Rights in Education (FIRE), a civil liberties group in Philadelphia. "What that means is that they're guilty until proven innocent."

What would happen in the case that the accused would answer with a counter-claim, that it was the accuser who acted without proper consent?

Did they specify that anywhere?

cover20 • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 01:48 AM

Yes this is probably the way to go. The best defense is a good offense.

They may be biased in favor of the female, but at least you give them some trouble rather than throwing yourself on their nonexistent (they are women and white knights after all) mercy.

Starcruiser28 • 6 points • 7 July, 2015 12:16 AM **[recovered]**

The answer is simple, do not provide them any attention or validation or any sexual contact at all, don't even hug them. Is your education worth it? Treat them like lepers. Avoid talking to them or being alone with one of them otherwise you will be a target.

They might get the message, eventually.

Look for your fun out of school, do not date or "hang out / hook up" with any chick from your school. When you date one outside do not tell them you are in school and do not do something stupid.



My boy will get the message, he is already being told of how dangerous things are getting, and not to trust a female and he is seeing it right now in HS. He has 2 more years and he sees how they play the guys.

epixs • 1 point • 8 July, 2015 06:26 AM [recovered]

He's a lucky kid, wish my dad told me this shit early on. You're doing your son a great favor by informing him about all this.

[deleted] • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 12:26 AM

this idea will quietly slip away once the womens start realizing theyre not getting laid

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 01:10 PM

I think the reason feminism has been so successful for women is the fact that they can always get laid, no matter how terrible they make it for men.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 04:09 PM

fuck a feminist? not even once

its playing russian roulette with a hole

RedBigMan • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 09:49 PM

Well they wont be getting laid by the dudes at their school. I doubt if this became even more commonplace that you'd see guys not willing to jeopardize their future graduation by banging sluts... at least on-campus sluts.

wont\_tell\_i\_refuse • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 04:37 PM

Here's what's really happening... instead of men approaching, women just select a good-looking FWB off the Internet.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 04:38 PM

old mate chad thundercock will have an even bigger waiting list

2012Aceman • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 11:54 AM

My problem with the "informed verbal consent" reaction to sexual assault rates is that it doesn't do anything. Consent can be withdrawn at any time right? So even if you do get verbal consent beforehand it is meaningless because if you go over a limit with your partner and they decide to shut it down their prior consent is meaningless, and anything you do after is criminal. This is why rape convictions are such a touchy subject: When was consent given? When was consent withdrawn? Under what circumstances was the consent withdrawn?

The same goes with consent under the effects of alcohol. Chances are if a woman is drunk and going to have sex, the man she's having sex with has been drinking as well. In that circumstance, can either of them consent? Current debate says no: with alcohol in your bloodstream you not only cannot consent, but you do not have the ability to give your own consent AKA anybody who is drunk has no rights to themselves. But... isn't that ridiculous? If that were true, how do we charge anyone with drunk driving? They were drunk, they couldn't consent to drive, so how are they culpable for the crime? In the same sense, how can a man rape a woman who gave consent but was drunk, if he himself is drunk and therefore could not given consent, meaning she is raping him as well?

At the end of the day the way our legal system is formed it can be hard to get convictions against rapists, true.

But that's due to the intimate nature of sex (there usually aren't a lot of witnesses to the event) and the high legal requirement for criminal convictions (beyond a reasonable doubt). And in a case of he said she said there will always be room for reasonable doubt. This "informed verbal consent" thing sounds a lot more like a "gotcha!" law than an effective law. After all, it's not like we're going to start recording our pre-coitus conversations.

[deleted] • 4 points • 6 July, 2015 09:10 PM

[permanently deleted]

StarDestinyGuy • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 12:10 AM

Heartiste? Any specific recommendations for what to read? I'm assuming that's an author's name.

[deleted] • -3 points • 7 July, 2015 03:29 AM

Use Google, retard.

<https://heartiste.wordpress.com/>

CattlesbyQFeline • 0 points • 7 July, 2015 02:52 PM

Man, get the fuck outta' here with that bullshit.

This is the type of shit that is going to kill whatever MRM exists. You white motherfuckers need to stop acting like YOU'RE the ones that these cunts are coming after. Every time I browse one of these PUA/MRM bastards' websites, there's always some shit about how White men are being fucking targeted specifically by feminists, or about how Black Women are "masculine" and/or "unattractive" or generally bad people.

Racism at its finest. And don't, for any amount of time, act like you cats ain't fuckin' seen it. I know you have.

If this type of hubris is what constitutes the MRM, then maybe it should be destroyed. Because your separatist, "white males are under attack" bullshit flies in the face of reality. Faggots and dykes and their SWJ allies didn't attack white men when they corrupted the Civil Rights Movement and hijacked it, and that was in the late fucking '80s-early '90s.

You cats better stomp that closet pseudo-racism out before it burns the MRM to the fucking ground.

[deleted] • 1 points • 7 July, 2015 04:00 PM

[permanently deleted]

CattlesbyQFeline • 0 points • 7 July, 2015 05:16 PM

I live in the United States of America. Just had a birthday. You might have heard. And it wasn't started by white people, for the record. If you wanna dance with me on that shit then I dare you to try.

And as far as the destruction of western civilization, you're trying to distinguish it from the "third world", which, again for the record, is the origin (according to you) of the people who are "invading" "white countries". That these people come from the very same countries whites looted (yep), raped, and pillaged is of no consequence to you and cats of your persuasion. It's the fault of your ancestors that they didn't have the fuckin' foresight to see this happening. Chickens always come home to roost, and though I like beef better, chicken is always good to me as a Black guy.

But okaaayyy. It's cool as a fuckin' fan. Go ahead and blame us non-whites (don't y'all calls the "mud people"?) and cultural marxism (Marx was a white guy, btw) for the ills of "The West". Some of us were actually fuckin' born here and have ancestors who fought here against the same shit you cats think you're railing against. But yeah. Do you. "Freedom of speech" and shit.

[deleted] • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 09:34 PM

[permanently deleted]

CattlesbyQFeline • 0 points • 8 July, 2015 03:56 AM

The Declaration of Independence is based off of the Articles of Confederation which was given to your ancestors by John Hansen, who was a Moor. That doesn't mean Arab. And I never said revenge was the issue. That's what YOU all are saying by blaming "immigration". The fuck are you talking about?

I don't give a fuck about cultural marxism. My concern is the obviously manufactured gender war. Other people's cultural "heroes" don't concern me. Again, I'm American, Freedom of Speech by default. So don't step to me claiming I'm "butthurt". Things aren't going your way and wanna blame everyone else, as if y'all could get your shit together on your own. Your European Union is crumbling as is the US yet everyone else is blamed. As if we started two World Wars.

[deleted] • 2 points • 8 July, 2015 04:09 AM

[permanently deleted]

CattlesbyQFeline • 1 point • 8 July, 2015 01:25 PM

This is going as expected! -^

Yeah, the MRM is going to fold faster than Superman on laundry day. I'll be saving this post for safe keeping. There was no "President of the Articles", for the record. LOL. Go learn your history, white boy.

[deleted] • 1 points • 8 July, 2015 09:48 PM

[permanently deleted]

CattlesbyQFeline • 0 points • 8 July, 2015 10:02 PM

*snicker*

But maybe you should go defend Bill Cosby being a rapist some more. I hear he's a good guy, who didn't do nothing.<

Rather him than Adolf Hitler, Mr. "multiculturalism is White Genocide"! LOL.

As far as the "white inventors" argument, what have YOU invented, sir? Because if you aren't Jewish, don't claim Einstein. If you ain't German, don't claim Wenher Von Braun. If you ain't Greek don't bring up Aristotle or Archimedes or none of that shit. Because, you know, you all don't like each other. At all. Even with the whole world in your hands. Fuckin' clown.

Not only that, but you were too busy murdering and subjugated the rest of the world. No competition. Hell, when the Japanese got their hands on the transistor, they took over the technology game. And all your Greeks studied in Egypt. And they were Black too. Niggers, you call us. Even in your bible. All your inventions and advancements get asterisks.

Toldja you didn't wanna mix it up with me foo'. Gather your "crime statistics". I'll wait.

poptart\_fiend • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 04:24 AM\*

We live in a sad and decaying society.

Universities used to be places for high class young men to go and study. And I mean actually study, for the sake of learning. Theodore Roosevelt got drunk once in college.

Now administrators sit around and worry about who said what before two 18 year olds touched each other's private parts. They judge academic success by US News & World Report rankings. They assert there is a patriarchy at female dominated (US undergrads = 56% female) universities. This behavior suggests extreme insecurity and confusion.

chadchadington • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 05:49 AM\*

"...absolute power corrupts absolutely." -John Dalberg

I am beginning to connect the dots of the FI. I'm not happy but I understand why. Women are no different than men if left to their own devices and given enough power. What feminism has taught me is women are motivated differently but the thirst of power is insatiable. What ideology claiming "equality" begins with the prefix fem (female) and ends with -ism (ideology).

Men, for the most part, seek status and power to maximize their influence and progeny. Kings and emperors had harems of women alongside kingdoms where their rule was imposed.

Women, appear to maximize their hypergamy to breed with the best males (alphas) and have more subordinate male rear their offspring (betas) so their genes propagate. Everything we are seeing nowadays reflects this maximizing strategy when the power shifts to women: lack of agency, lack of accountability, control over the judicial system, invasion of male space, viewing men as disposable, etc. The result is not equality but acting in their own interests.

I fear the end game will come when men actual begin to use political force (voting) or passive force (withdrawing from relationships/sexual market) to effect change. This as we know is beginning to happen. The end game being a gender divide affecting both sexes for decades and affecting the birth rate. Men scramble to re-invent their identity without any guidance while women re-invent theirs without impunity and plenty of assistance. Hence, effeminate men, angry men, confused men, withdrawn men, renaissance men (red pill men). Effeminate men appeal to women's narcissism--they mimic women and are not seen as a threat. Notice how many men are led by women through grocery stores, on the street, everywhere. They follow behind with their heads down while their lady struts ahead with a focused look.

I worry that if there is no balance to the gender equation in the coming years and women's power grows without considering the other half of the gender equation, a radical "balance" will ensue.

Everything in nature is balanced. Nature doesn't fuck up. Grass doesn't strain to grow. Some say cancer is nature's way of population control however raw that may sound.

The State already awards women privileges in family court and in the legal system in general. Cohabitation laws in certain states award women similar power to a man's assets if the two live together for too long or "appear" as a couple. If a man dates a single mom and provides gifts or forms of assistance to her kids the court may force him to support these children. There are many cases of female predators getting light sentences. This may get to the level where single men may be encouraged by tax breaks to sire a child with a woman or provide for her current offspring. If enough men drop out of the market I don't think the women will sit by idly. Shame will be the first tactic. Rationalization will come next ("there are no good men anymore!!") and on the extreme side government incentives to provide for these women.

Not to be dramatic but I sometimes wonder if it will every get to the point where women assault and sexually

violate men knowing they face little consequences while men have little options of fighting back. Will the State ever force men to provide infrastructure for the country and support for women if men continue to drop out of the job market and dating market? Importing labor is expensive and opens the door for dependency on foreign investment which may lead to political influence over the country (OPEC, Chinese manufactured goods).

soontobgrad • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 12:53 PM

Why do they have to do this to Minnesota? Why can't they just stick with New York and California?

Minnesota is home to some of the finest women in America (anyone that has been up there can confirm for sure), if tall hot blondes are your thing I cannot recommend a better area. Rather than sticking to San Francisco or New York, the feminists want to spread to the areas where attractive women are and poison those places as well....

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 11:26 PM

I live in California.....send help.

johnnight • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 10:09 AM

How much are women going to suffer for this new policy opposed to men?

Well, the demand for college women by college men has just been criminalized, so as suppliers they will suffer. The rational response is to go sarging outside of college.

BigDiggerNick74 • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 06:40 PM

Fuck I'm glad I got out of college when I did.

It's getting to the point where you need a girl to sign a consent contract in front of a license attorney just to get laid in college.

Soon they're going to require any sex on campus to have at least 2 witnesses present.

cover20 • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 01:58 AM

Men may want to use this rule sometime. Suppose the bitch steals your sperm. She stimulated you, got you hard, induced you to put it in, and now she's pregnant and ready to take 20 years of your income in child support.

Go after her this way. It may not have an effect in the family court, but it could at least get her kicked out of school. Not sure but if you lie enough you could make a case to the school tribunal that would get her kicked out of school.

Limekill • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 02:39 AM

Why the hell would you do this - you want her to take care of the child via a job, not sit on her ass, while you have to make all the \$\$\$.

I mean if she has sperm jacked u, u are fucked already - kicking her out of college aint going to do much....

tallwheel • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 07:28 AM

You're pretty fucked by that point no matter what happens. I think what you said applies better to less serious cases, like the same as what you wrote above without the actual pregnancy happening for instance.

Overall, I agree guys should try turning the tables by using these rules to accuse women when appropriate. I'm not confident, though, that guys will admit to being victims, and whether the university will take them seriously when they do.

BrunoOh • 1 point • 7 July, 2015 02:22 PM

Career sluts don't want to be single mothers, and if so it will be long after the clock starts ticking.

TRP\_Fraternity • -7 points • 7 July, 2015 12:09 AM

Downvote me if you must but I go to the University of Minnesota and I don't think this will be a problem.

If you can't get a girl to show or say that she wants to fuck you before you guys fuck, you probably shouldn't be fucking.

I've seen a lot of creeps on the dance floor. We've had them rush our fraternity. We've kicked them out.

A person should be able to read social cues and have enough social skills to clearly see when a girl wants to fuck. It's not hard.

**Guess what. If you are decent looking and have decent social skills this change won't affect you at all. You will clearly know when she wants it and she will clearly show it. She won't regret it because you are a decent guy with decent skills and she won't be too drunk to realize what's going on**

If you are harassing girls on the dance floor, being creepy and trying to fuck girls that are too drunk, this change will hurt you.

Getting clear consent isn't hard if you're decent at game and take care of yourself.

cover20 • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 01:46 AM

So you were a creep unless she doesn't regret later? You sir are a white knight.

TRP\_Fraternity • -4 points • 7 July, 2015 03:19 AM

You should be good enough to have her not regret it later. It's not hard.

skoobled • 3 points • 7 July, 2015 07:07 AM

And what if you were so good that she wants more, but you don't? OMG he won't boyfriend me?  
RAPE!

tallwheel • 2 points • 7 July, 2015 07:24 AM

Maybe fine and good for redpillers (and let's face it, even then it's a dangerous game hoping she never changes her mind in the future), but spare a thought for the legions of blue pill college men who will be hung out to dry by this policy. They may or may not be a lost cause, but I sure don't want to see them kicked out of school just for doing everything society taught them nice guys are supposed to do.