

The Nuke created feminism.

January 28, 2013 | 13 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

I've been reading Jack Donovan's book *The way of men*, and it's got some seriously good insight into defining masculinity. It also gave me some interesting insight into gender roles, which not only are men failing to live up to in this culture, but women as well.

After considering gender roles such as men being hunters and protectors, and women, children and elders being the protected, it occurred to me why women were so feminine, and why relationships worked.

Granted, not all tribes had monogamy, at least not long-term, but the men and women still maintained gender roles, and the respect garnered by activity in those roles.

Fast forward to modern western civilization, where the threat of violence is far removed. What good is having men if the gender role of hunting or protecting is far removed from a woman's reality? A woman can go to the grocery store and pick up food. She can do so with little risk of being harmed. She can drive there in her warm car. She can do this with a child.

There is no direct threat she perceives, even if every modern convenience she experiences is made possible by men.

Our society has an abundance of men. We have too many men, in fact! During the days of world wars, conscription ensured that the supply of men would be at an all time low. With the very real threat of attacks on US soil, the lack of men and risk of violence combined to drive the value of men through the roof.

Enter the nuclear bomb. Enter mutually assured destruction.

War has become far and removed. Attack on US soil has faded to such a low risk, nobody considers it a reality. Wars themselves are fought with machines to minimize human casualty. Even the Vietnam war kept the risk of violence far and removed.

War as we knew it has changed permanently. The era of fighting world wars as they were has come to a close.

Which has now given women a societal equal footing with men. When men as protectors and providers do too good of a job, women no longer need them. The results are obvious. The second wave of feminism (which I consider one of the most corrosive) and the rise of single mothers, and the end of marriage.

The red pill is understanding, even when it's not convenient. Marriage is dead, and we killed it.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 7 points • 28 January, 2013 06:12 PM

Human beings *require* struggle, without it we become what we are today: Obese, lazy, depressed, chemically dependent, egotistical maniacs, etc.

WorkThrow99 • 2 points • 28 January, 2013 07:25 PM

Remember always that you are just a visitor here, a traveler passing through. your stay is but short and the moment of your departure unknown. **None can live without toil** and a craft that provides your needs is a blessing indeed. But if you toil without rest, fatigue and weariness will overtake you, and you will denied the joy that comes from labor's end. Speak quietly and kindly and be not forward with either opinions or advice. If you talk much, this will make you deaf to what others say, and you should know that there are few so wise that they cannot learn from others. Be near when help is needed, but far when praise and thanks are being offered. Take small account of might, wealth and fame, for they soon pass and are forgotten. Instead, nurture love within you and and strive to be a friend to all. Truly, compassion is a balm for many wounds. Treasure silence when you find it, and while being mindful of your duties, set time aside, to be alone with yourself. Cast off pretense and self-deception and see yourself as you really are. Despite all appearances, no one is really evil. **They are led astray by ignorance. If you ponder this truth always you will offer more light, rather than blame and condemnation.** You, no less than all beings have Buddha Nature within. Your essential Mind is pure. Therefore, when defilements cause you to stumble and fall, let not remorse nor dark foreboding cast you down. Be of good cheer and with this understanding, summon strength and walk on. Faith is like a lamp and wisdom makes the flame burn bright. Carry this lamp always and in good time the darkness will yield and you will abide in the Light.

Buddhist knew that long ago. Do you even Buddhism? (Kept the rest of the quote because, seriously, how is it not applicable to this sub.)

SageInTheSuburbs • 1 point • 30 January, 2013 08:19 PM

I rather like what Jiddu Krishnamurti had to say:

I maintain that Truth is a pathless land, and you cannot approach it by any path whatsoever, by any religion, by any sect. That is my point of view, and I adhere to that absolutely and unconditionally. Truth, being limitless, unconditioned, unapproachable by any path whatsoever, cannot be organized; nor should any organization be formed to lead or to coerce people along any particular path. If you first understand that, then you will see how impossible it is to organize a belief. A belief is purely an individual matter, and you cannot and must not organize it. If you do, it becomes dead, crystallized; it becomes a creed, a sect, a religion, to be imposed on others. This is what everyone throughout the world is attempting to do. Truth is narrowed down and made a plaything for those who are weak, for those who are only momentarily discontented. Truth cannot be brought down, rather the individual must make the effort to ascend to it. You cannot bring the mountain-top to the valley. If you would attain to the mountain-top you must pass through the valley, climb the steeps, unafraid of the dangerous precipices.

So i can read the beautiful words of Buddha, Mahavira, Krishna, Mohammed, Jesus, Lao Tzu, et al—yet i do not need to embody these people—i only need follow my own heart. Many spiritual teachers had

great red-pill knowledge, one must have awakened the spark in order to see it.

WorkThrow99 • 1 point • 30 January, 2013 09:00 PM

Personally I don't try to be just one thing or follow one specific thing, I mash things up and use everything as input knowledge. I admit I still do hold to some blue-pill ways from time to time, but I use them as knowledge, not as the only way to think. Even in the matrix they often go back into the matrix itself in order to attain their goals. If you live within absolutes (never do X, always do Y) then, I think, you are limiting yourself.

SageInTheSuburbs • 1 point • 30 January, 2013 09:10 PM

Always holding to moderation is its own form of absolutism. The best position is not always between two extremes—though i see some wisdom in what you are saying.

WorkThrow99 • 1 point • 30 January, 2013 09:23 PM

Never said I always hold to moderation, and far from it. I often go from one extreme to the other to test both sides of the spectrum, and find out where on that spectrum I want to be, sometimes it's in the middle, sometimes it's closer to one extreme, and sometimes I find out that it's beyond one of the extreme and I'll need to push more to get there.

There's about nothing that's certain except that I live and breathe, there are just a bunch of things which seem to help get some specific outcomes, which are good way to go about things. There are rarely any one way to get to a certain objective anyways. Look at nutrition and training, all the diets, all the routines. Just that facet has about an infinity of ways to get the same results. There's about three things I hold as almost absolutes, I live, I breathe and if you want to lose fat, the laws of thermodynamics applies, eat less than you use in a day. :-d (Also, cookies are fucking delicious.)

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 January, 2013 07:28 PM

I do not Buddhism. I Son-of-Man. However, that is quite relevant and I will incorporate it into my lifestyle. Thank you.

WorkThrow99 • 1 point • 28 January, 2013 07:52 PM

I recommend you read some of the Buddhist stuff, not that I find everything good, but there are some good insights in there. Lot's of "detach yourself and evaluate the fuck's happening".

VZPurp • 1 point • 28 January, 2013 11:21 PM

Mindfulness meditation works. It is good for annihilating attachments. Even if you don't go for the Buddhist reasoning behind it, it still applies to ceasing bothersome attachments.

GaiusScaevolus • 1 point • 28 January, 2013 05:13 PM

There is a tragic comedic aspect to a race or class who have done their job so well that the rest fancy them obsolete. By ending war, our forefathers have in a way doomed their descendants to an arguably worse fate, gendercide by proxy.

[deleted] • 2 points • 28 January, 2013 05:14 PM

I have a theory that the elite will maintain their gender roles.

legendofpasta • 3 points • 28 January, 2013 09:18 PM

The elite always do run things the way they are meant to be run. They want money, they make it; they want to achieve something, they do; gender roles? Naturally! Why have it any other way, it's the best way to pass on your genes. Look at the pathetic losers 'occupying wallstreet' and compare them to the winners making big bucks on wall street. Anyone can be the 1% if they want to be. That's the route I took. I could have become an art student or a maker of home made jewelry, but I follow the money, worked my ass off and now people tell me I'm privelliged. Lmfao. Anyway, I won't live any other way than clearly defined gender roles. I'm not doing the damn dishes and I'm affluent enough to demand it of any woman who steps foot in my abode.

VZPurp • 2 points • 28 January, 2013 11:35 PM

Good on ya, mate. Intelligent, hard work pays off. I'm currently making a substantial transition in careers and it's quite rough at times but that's just how it goes =]

[deleted] • 0 points • 28 January, 2013 09:22 PM

Pretty much.

nicethingyoucanthave • 2 points • 28 January, 2013 10:48 PM

We have too many men

I see two problems with your theory:

1) you assume that the natural state for humans is more men than women. I disagree. While you're correct in stating that men were typically killed fighting other tribes or wild animals, you are ignoring the fact that women so often died in childbirth.

In truth, you've got it backwards, I think. The natural state for humans is to have slightly more men than women.

2) you claim that the abundance of men is what caused the decline of gender roles. Here again I disagree. There have been historical contexts in which there were definitely many more men than women, yet gender roles persisted. Consider almost any frontier setting. It has always been the case that more men then women ventured to the frontier.

In fact, I remember a study about marriage in the US West in the 1800. I'll see if I can find it. It reinforced the idea that women are very selective - marrying up in socioeconomic status. But the point is, they did marry.

No, I think your theory just doesn't hold up. I think you'll find that the biggest contributor to the rise of feminism has been hormonal birth control. Without the pill, many more women would get pregnant and would have to put their lives on hold to care for a child.

And just to be clear, I think that the pill and the rise of feminism has been a net positive for society. The reason I'm here is not because I'm frustrated or pine for the good old days. I just think that my behavior has to change to fit the times.

...and I think those times are cause by birth control, not by nuclear weapons.

SageInTheSuburbs • 1 point • 30 January, 2013 08:51 PM

If feminism did not exist, i would never have swallowed the red pill. Feminism is the negative, and it pushed me to the positive.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 28 January, 2013 10:53 PM

The abundance of men in combination with relative safety. Not one, and not the other. Both.

Edit: Also- I will add, I don't think there's been a direct positive effect yet, but the pendulum will swing back eventually. Currently feminism and the demise of the family unit is taking a toll on our economy.

roe_ • 1 point • 29 January, 2013 04:11 PM

Marriage is, I believe, the optimal arrangement in which to raise children. The rise of single motherhood hasn't eclipsed this. So it's a bit early to declare the institute of marriage dead.

IMO, we're approaching the end of a re-negotiating of the sexual "social contract" between the sexes, brought about a result of birth control and other innovations which have been game changers in the how men & women relate to each other.

There have been similar upheavals - I wager a serious one happen around the early development of agriculture, which may be how we ended up with monogamous marriage in the first place.

redpillschool[S] • 1 point • 29 January, 2013 04:15 PM

You're more likely to end in divorce than not. It's dead alright.

roe_ • 2 points • 29 January, 2013 09:37 PM

Not quite true, and the divorce rate is dropping:

<http://www.hookingupsmart.com/2012/06/13/relationshipstrategies/your-chances-of-divorce-may-be-much-lower-than-you-think/>

WorkThrow99 • 0 points • 28 January, 2013 07:21 PM

The results are obvious.

Women will control the nukes, but not knowing the consequences of war, from not being in them, will kill us all? :-D