

Feminism is actually hedonism

November 11, 2015 | 497 upvotes | by [NightwingTRP](#)

I was thinking the other day about the various hypocrisies of feminism and how they want feminine supremacy, but also want to be dominated in the bedroom and approached first... because no means no except when it means yes and yes can mean no in circumstances where yes sorta means yes but hindsight makes it mean no in that no means yes but it really means no when we've finally made our mind up but it still could have meant yes if it hadn't meant no. Am I acting like a feminist yet? This hedging your bets and never making a decision thing is easy. Does your head hurt?

The reason the feminist narrative on things like this confuses the living fuck out of anyone with either a basic understanding of logic, or simply anyone with their head screwed on correctly, is that it takes diametrically opposite views, statements, thoughts and policies without any shame in trotting them out like they actually make sense. "Yes" and "no" are diametrically opposed statements. Yes can't mean no, and no can't mean yes. (We are talking straight talk in here, not womanese for the smartarse who's about to point out how women can mean yes when they say no in social situations.) In terms of raw statement, they mean the total opposite. This is the basis of the doublethink fallacy that feminists are so fond of. It's how they can say that their rights should not be infringed upon, while simultaneously campaigning to infringe on the rights of others.

However I think there is a more instructive term that will better predict this behaviour, their doublethink and hypocrisy.

Hedonism.

They're not interested in feminine supremacy in and of itself as such, that will just be a side effect of their limitless hedonism-fuelled rationalisations and doublethink. I recently posited in a thread that feminism happily praises liberal philosophy when it suits them and provides pleasure (having casual sex, getting drunk, obesity/fat-positivity) but then on the exact same topics, it will adopt the diametrically opposite authoritarian philosophy to try and reduce the accompanying displeasure or pain (slut shaming, rape apologists, fat shaming are their cries.) I posit from this that the behaviour of feminism will act according to hedonistic principles on any particular topic.

Let's look at where they want quotas and where they aren't interested in adding quotas. They want quotas for women in:

- CEO positions
- Major company board rooms
- Political roles
- Science and Technology
- Engineering

All of these positions are either extremely well paid or very well paid and the top three include strong elements of power, respect and control over others. Now let's look at a few areas they don't want quotas to balance out either a lack of women or a lack of men:

- Refuse collection
- Sewer and drainage maintenance
- Secretarial work
- Teaching

- Nursing

The first two are male dominated. They generally have poor pay because they are mostly unskilled positions. There's no respect factor and the work could be considered unpleasant by many. Making women work in these fields would hurt them. So no quotas because we don't want pain.

Secretarial work is reasonably paid considering how low skill it is. This area is dominated by women. Putting in quotas disadvantages women in a field where the remuneration to skill level ratio is rather favourable. It would hurt women to do this. So no quotas because it would cause pain.

Teaching and nursing are reasonably paid to well paid professions, depending on where you fall on the scale. Both are dominated by women. Again, adding quotas for men to get jobs in these areas to achieve an arbitrary gender balance would cause pain to women. A woman could miss out on a well paid job, that is not maximising pleasure, but by continuing their dominance and continuing this idea that women are better empathisers (and thus have superior softer skills for these jobs) it minimises the pain for women. - i.e. not only do they dominate the fields, but they're more likely to get hired into these jobs too because of the false narrative of being better at it just because they're female.

Whilst we're on the topic of arbitrary quotas for gender, let's logically destroy it as an idea/concept. It's pissed me off for a long time, ever since I had the misfortune of being brought into a discussion with a feminist who couldn't justify to me the need for this arbitrary 50/50 split of gender. It's always dismissed as "women make up half the work force so they need to be represented in higher positions." They could not appreciate the concept that if a company has 75 men and 25 women, and then has 10 positions of power, it is very reasonable to have 8 men and 2 women in these positions of power. This is the likely ratio that a meritocracy would lead to and the ratio for everyone is 1 in 10. When you introduce a discriminatory quota and demand a 50/50 split, you have 75 men looking at 5 positions of power, a 1 in 15 representation for men, while women have a 1 in 5 representation. From this, you are now representing women three times as much as men.

But let's get away from the numbers for a moment, because we know feminists don't like numbers unless they've been made up like 1 in 5 statistics are. (And for the brainless feminist who reads this and thinks that is equivalent to my ratios from before... you're so much of an idiot that you're genuinely beyond helping.) Let's talk about the representation aspect. The idea that since women make up half the population of the country, they should be represented in the running of the country has a veneer of credibility to any fair minded person at first glance. However it rests upon the assumption that a man can't represent a woman's interests. Only a woman can do that.

They don't bother to point out that the entire democratic system would require an overhaul in order to address this factor. All current states in the US and constituencies in the UK would need to have separate male and female candidate lists and elect one male and one female in order to ensure that all women are represented fairly. (Under the current system, your local Senator or MP could be a man... which means he can't represent women based on the fact he has a penis.) No, instead we will force all-female quotas for top positions, because this makes the progression for these women easier, maximising the pleasure for women with no extra effort.

However, they conveniently gloss over things like the "He for She" campaign, which by definition demonstrates that **men can represent women**. The acceptance and endorsement of male feminists within their community shows clearly that genitals don't actually matter to feminists either when it comes to representation. It's about following their narrative. Enforcing this doublethink means they don't lose out on mangina puppets spreading their propaganda, the reduction in pain and increase in pleasure/things that benefit them all rolled into one. So the very basis of their argument for increased representation doesn't

even stand to begin with.

Everything feminism does is selfish. It is not an ideology and has nothing to do with equality. It is defined by the actions of a group attempting to legislate and manipulate culture for the sole purpose of enabling optimal female hedonism.

Mic drop.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 31 points • 11 November, 2015 03:30 PM

Solid analysis, especially where you show women want equality in the boardroom but not in anyplace where work is difficult for lower pay.

I do want to highlight that women dont generally KNOW they want to be dominated in the bedroom. Yea, they love to be choked, spanked and thrown around like rag dolls. They like when a strong man blows a load on their belly and collapses as they feel happy he is pleased.

But when its over she just knows how she felt during sex. She cant articulate WHY she liked it, she wont admit that to anyone let alone herself

Dis_mah_mobile_one • 14 points • 11 November, 2015 07:32 PM

That's kind of the heart of "just get it". I've had girls gladly admit that they love to be dominated and even "abused" (one girl's exact wording), and they do this shamelessly. The important thing is that I was Alpha Fux for them at the time.

I've had one of those same girls vehemently deny deny deny everything - *before* I'd proven my "Alpha" bonafides in her eyes and she happily submitted to anything I wanted. Girls are silly once you understand them.

rp_valiant • 7 points • 12 November, 2015 02:51 PM

That's the gist of RSD Tyler's famous "secret society" monologue:

<https://archive.is/WFy3Q>

To a bluepilller, a woman will deny everything and refuse everything. To a redpilller, she will open up how she really is because the interaction is only there to provide pleasure for both people and thus no secrets need to be kept to maintain some kind of fair maiden illusion. Women don't marry/date betas because they want to, they do it because they need his resources. Anything that could shatter her visage in his eyes must be kept secret.

fingerthemoon • 1 point • 15 November, 2015 09:53 AM*

I've heard it said that women are more in tune with their body and emotions. This is laughable because they don't even know what they want until they get it. They don't even understand themselves.

Feminism fucks up men and women both but I think it fucks women more. It's easier for a man to see through the bullshit. Women don't understand themselves and know what they really need to be content and feminism sends them off on a fruitless journey for power/independence while they squander their youth and rapidly diminishing SMV. And when they hit the wall they will always rationalize the problem as men. Whereas a man has much more time to figure shit out and get it together. He also has logic to help him see through the matrix and accurately asses himself, his faults, needs and priorities, therefore it's more likely he will find contentment eventually.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 November, 2015 12:47 PM

I agree with everything but that it's easier for a man to see through the bullshit. Today's men (myself included til two years ago) are mostly indoctrinated to the point of ignorance

fingerthemoon • 1 point • 15 November, 2015 05:14 PM

Well, you made it here right? You saw through it. I didn't say it was easy, just easier. For women it's damn near impossible with all the group-think, herd mentality, emotion over logic, etc.

Another reason why it would be easier for a man to 'wake up' is because we can sink lower and no one cares. If a woman is down on her luck there are many people who will help her, so she just won't go as low. When you've tasted the pain of being fucked over by the woman you love, you lose everything and your life falls apart, you're at the end of your rope, and no one cares. This will cause the strong to seek understanding and pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. Through difficulty we become men.

[deleted] • 1 point • 15 November, 2015 05:43 PM

Love your optimism but I disagree.

Most men will go to their graves not knowing what we know. They will die willing slaves

fingerthemoon • 1 point • 16 November, 2015 11:54 AM*

That's true. And also the fact that men are easily manipulated by women. Most men will go to their graves having been a slave to women their whole lives and women will go to their graves being a slave to their subconscious hypergamy and constant dissatisfaction/hunger.

But when a man does stumble across the truth of his own existence, he can enjoy a freedom and contentment that is practically impossible for a woman to behold. However rare it is, it's possible for us, but not for them.

We can become truly independent and do whatever we want. Walk out into the wilderness and survive with only a knife. We can learn to be alone and focus on our work, dreams and aspirations. Most women can't be alone and they need more physical comforts (emotional as well).

I guess what I'm saying is that the grass is greener on our side. I could be wrong but I don't care, I choose to look at it this way. I like being a man.

[deleted] • 1 point • 16 November, 2015 12:23 PM

I've never been happier and why wouldn't I be?

I and I alone determined my happiness.

always-be-closing • 187 points • 11 November, 2015 03:27 PM*

The basic condition of any weak person is that they avoid all pain and seek only pleasure. The truth is that by pursuing beyond immediate reward, we can find things of great pleasure, build things of greater pleasure, and ensure less painful conditions in the future for ourselves and those we care about just by enduring a little pain.

This is why the beta man jerks it to porn and plays Xbox instead of feeling the sting of a few date rejections and unreturned cover letters.

This is why the slut tells herself she's just not ready for commitment and yet resents the men who will leave her without so much as a word.

The *mindless* short term pursuit of pleasure and the avoidance of pain is fundamentally borne from a weak person's lack of self respect, agency, validation, and belief.

Only by living deliberately, learning to deal with pain, and learning to prioritize ourselves can we move past the childish scream for comfort from others, deal with failure, and pursue success.

[deleted] • 43 points • 11 November, 2015 05:42 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 12 points • 12 November, 2015 12:01 AM

We had a similar saying in the army that would roughly translate "Daddy beats you because daddy loves you".

RedHeimdall • 11 points • 12 November, 2015 09:18 AM

That's what I always tell my GFs

SgtBrutalisk • 36 points • 11 November, 2015 07:36 PM

Every living organism wants to avoid pain and follow pleasure. But, only great men can submit themselves to painful conditions willingly, over and over again. The end result is an unbreakable body, soul and mind.

[deleted] • 17 points • 11 November, 2015 08:29 PM

Great men are people who seek long-term pleasure (even at the cost of short-term pain) rather than short-term pleasure. They're not men who endure pain purely for the sake of enduring pain.

For instance, a great man wouldn't chop off his hand, or randomly throw his own mother off a cliff, just to build willpower. After all, chopping off your own hand doesn't bring you long-term pleasure.

BlueFreedom420 • 25 points • 11 November, 2015 09:37 PM

Long term pleasure is a myth. You will always suffer because you seek pleasure -long term pleasure brings long term suffering. A great man knows that great pain brings a wisdom; he learns that pleasure and suffering are illusions.

iSnORtcHuNkz69 • 4 points • 12 November, 2015 01:05 AM

This right here is TOP comment. Well said. Wisdom comes from pain and pleasure. If youve been through both you can definitely see through the mirage of pain and pleasure. Speaking of pain and pleasure, theyre pretty much equal in terms of wisdom

Fafner2 • 8 points • 11 November, 2015 09:51 PM

Great men are people who seek long-term pleasure (even at the cost of short-term pain) rather than short-term pleasure. They're not men who endure pain purely for the sake of enduring pain.

This is more accurate than what /u/SgtBrutalisk said. Pain for the sake of pain is idiotic, and not helpful. Suffering short-term pain for long-term pleasure is a hallmark of people who are successful in life.

Stanford did some research on this exact subject of delayed gratification (see <http://jamesclear.com/delayed-gratification>)

refusewool • 8 points • 11 November, 2015 04:56 PM*

The metaphor also extends to the pain of initially swallowing the pill compared to living in what is perceived to be ignorant bliss.

[deleted] • 18 points • 11 November, 2015 10:45 PM

"Why do my eyes hurt?" -Neo

"Because you've never used them before." - Morpheus

ben0wn4g3 • 4 points • 11 November, 2015 11:00 PM

nietzsche said this in different words.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 06:11 AM

can you elaborate on the "living deliberately" part?

Archwinger • 48 points • 11 November, 2015 03:55 PM

The pendulum swings back and forth. Once society gets in danger of actually failing or there's a war or something, feminism won't matter.

My personal prediction is that they're going to ride this rape culture/consent thing for awhile longer, keep inflating false statistics (96% of all college girls are rape victims!) and start pushing for change. "We're not safe in universities. We should push for all-girl universities and ban men from them so women can get degrees and jobs safely!" Politicians bend over backward to do it, men stop going to college in record numbers and go to trade schools instead, while universities become female-dominated.

The men at these trade schools work together and figure out all kinds of smart ways to make the world a better place, they excel in math and engineering and physics and move on to get careers doing and fixing things and making good money doing so. It soon becomes desirable to attend these male trade schools rather than the female universities, and women start pitching a fit about how they're criminally underrepresented in these trade schools and how they're as good as any man and should be equally represented. Then they start fighting to be able to attend these prominent schools with the men.

About 50 years later, there's a supposed rape epidemic at schools, and the women demand action.

CopperFox3c • 27 points • 11 November, 2015 06:17 PM

Ironically, as women as a group weaken the men in their group, undermine their stature, diminish the respect for them, pussify/domesticate them ... they make it *more likely* that some other group will attack, i.e. "a war or something." Cause when shit hits the fan, who will have to defend the group? The men.

Feminism really is like a snake eating its own tail. A luxury afforded by the power accumulated by past generations. I do wonder sometimes if it is some sort of natural cycle ... some sort of destabilizing force that encourages humans to migrate, spread, mix new genes, create new groups, etc.

[deleted] • 10 points • 11 November, 2015 06:37 PM

Spot on. I am now seeing Feminism as a natural cleanser, forcing out beta genes and multiplying alpha ones. World wars I and II (ED:and other events/causes) killed off all your bravery and honour, the ones most likely to go over the top and run head first into battle? Then we need to make sure we breed enough of them again. Of course this isn't conspiratorial; merely human group genetics has got it covered.

Dips into all this European race stuff as well. War brides; women don't see theed, but only alpha. They would rather be raped by masculine invaders than have whiny betas around, if it means their offspring will be more alpha, and they'll be able to tag along with the stronger tribe.

Feminism is the result of society being emasculated. Which is why for true apex alphas, they might not even notice the changes going on.

Praecipuus • 3 points • 12 November, 2015 03:55 AM

Sure, nothing new here, though. This is how inter-gender dynamics have always worked.

Men do stuff to get things -> Men get things -> Women bitch and moan about wanting those things -> Men give Women those things because pussy. Repeat.

mr_nate_ • 17 points • 11 November, 2015 03:31 PM

Thank god someone finally said it! One thing that really bugs me about this proposed "quota of women" in the workplace is that it's not about gender — **it's about SKILL**. We see time and time again that although more women are graduating with degrees now, these degrees are often useless things like "English" or "Gender Studies" (no offense but what can you actually DO with that shit).

Incorporating a 50/50 balance would diminish the skill of the workplace. The men are in these positions of power primarily because they have the skill set to manage and maintain the position. Likewise, the women already in the workplace have the same skill set. But forcing a NEW influx of women to be put into top workplaces pushes away higher skilled men. They need to recognize that this isn't about gender, it's about skill. Employers don't want gender equality, they want **maximized skill**.

SgtBrutalisk • 3 points • 11 November, 2015 07:44 PM

I finished only high school but got involved with the freelance writing market. I was advised by several people to certify my knowledge of English and get more lucrative jobs. Cost of Cambridge certification test? 130 €. It's not that English degree is useless; it's overpriced. People who master underwater puppetry usually spend truckloads of cash to do so, while I get to take my chances by risking an amount of money I earn without a problem.

mr_nate_ • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 02:04 PM

Awesome, the English degree gave you increased credibility and value. The main point I'll bring up to you is that it's who you knew, not what gender you were. How the world works

Edit: Off topic, but people need to know that you should only be investing money in college degrees if you think you will benefit by making more money afterwards with the degree. For instance, if you're majoring in business, why the fuck are you paying money to go to college. You don't need it. On the other hand, if you're majoring in Biomedical Sciences, you best damn well learn.

[deleted] • 44 points • 11 November, 2015 02:39 PM

Great post.

People do as little as they need to in order to survive. If you can survive just fine on X amount of effort then there's no reason to do X+1. By moving away from meritocracy towards equality of outcome, feminists make damn sure that X is just fine and that there's no reason for women to do X+1. With the amount of work they've gotta do set firmly, women have no reason to ever do any more.

The problem shows up when women realize that X-1 will work too, if they all do it together. What are we gonna do, hire the *best* workers instead? The reason that the MRM is considered a hate group is because it challenges feminist hedonism. Women know that there isn't enough free value to go around for men and women and if men were afforded the rights that women have then women would have the burdens that men do, and they would consider that to be oppression.

newls • 34 points • 11 November, 2015 05:56 PM

In *Outliers* Malcolm Gladwell points out the interesting fact that children of employees usually learn that X+1 effort does not yield a proportionate increase in reward.

On the other hand, children of small business owners often learn that X+1 effort does yield a proportionate

increase. An increase in the amount of concentrated effort almost always accompanies an increase in revenue.

This makes obvious sense, since the salaryman earns no overtime pay, except for a pat on the head, a biscuit here and there, and an obligatory bonus at Christmas time. The small business owner sees a direct correlation in revenue output to the amount of concentrated effort he applies to the enterprise.

sperbz • 3 points • 11 November, 2015 07:19 PM

For anyone interested in new reading material, this book was actually quite interesting.

flyercomet • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 03:35 AM

It is. I have criticism though. I think too much Gladwell attributes too much to luck and circumstance and dismisses personal effort too easily. It is a worthy read, but only with a healthy skepticism to the hypothesis.

[deleted] • 9 points • 11 November, 2015 07:35 PM

Women know that there isn't enough free value to go around

I agree with the rest of what you wrote but I think you're giving them entirely too much credit here.

It's not likely they are consciously holding double standards. I'd say most of these women truly believe things are one-sided and that men aren't struggling. So they view MRM as a joke because the idea of male privilege been beaten into their head so vigorously that the notion of that not being true is akin to a devout Muslim contemplating the possibility that Allah doesn't exist. This latter point being why I compare prog/lib/fem beliefs to a quasi-religion.

[deleted] • 4 points • 11 November, 2015 08:41 PM

I don't think women are that stupid. The shit they do is consciously done.

aguy01 • 11 points • 12 November, 2015 12:26 AM

We are talking about women. The things they do are emotionally done.

fingerthemoon • 1 point • 15 November, 2015 10:28 AM

Not that conscious because they're fucking themselves over in the long run.

WillWorkForLTC • 2 points • 12 November, 2015 12:12 AM

Couldn't have said it better myself. Equality = discrimination to the hamster.

[deleted] • 12 points • 11 November, 2015 05:11 PM

Solid Post Bro.

When Wealth rises, People get complacent. To get mask the pain of complacency, People turn to hedonism

Looking back at the history, Feminism always existed only in wealthy countries. Because feminism is a hedonism to complacent women.

sundaybrunch11 • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 10:40 AM

this should be upvoted more. I live in a poor country and always wondered why feminism does not have a strong grip here.

[deleted] • 28 points • 11 November, 2015 03:26 PM

[permanently deleted]

skoobled • 14 points • 11 November, 2015 10:14 PM

It'll never be mainstream news. Doesn't fit the agenda

MattyAnon • 12 points • 11 November, 2015 08:04 PM

Not much call for increasing the quota of women in prisons either.

And god damnit, we could fix this so easily! Just add paternity fraud as a crime (how is it not?), and we could get that quota up. It wouldn't even need any positive discrimination, *and* we could make it a crime regardless of gender.

Think about it... approx 5-10% of children are raised by their non-biological father (usually unknown to him). I make that around 3 million women guilty of this crime, vs 2 million (mostly men) in prison at the moment.

You can do this! You can be the equal of those men in prison! Go girl!

More realistically... great observation about feminism as hedonism. Feminism is certainly mindlessly pro-female in all sorts of self-contradicting ways, and by being designed by and for females of course it is selfish and solipsistic. How could it be anything else? It sounds a lot like a child saying "I want a pony! But I don't want to clean up after the pony! And ponies should be free to do what they want! But I don't want my pony to run away! Free the ponies! Where did my pony go?"

Or like someone who says "The government should pay for everything! And I shouldn't pay taxes!"

Or... "The corporations should support the people! And not make any money!"

It's all just childish one-sided thinking designed to enslave someone else into working and pandering to their current emotional state and needs. Like children getting their needs met from their parents.

In fact a big part of feminism is an attempt to continue the support they got from their parents and putting this responsibility onto their boyfriend/husband/the state. Freedom without responsibility. Positive quotas on the basis of manufactured injustice rather than merit. Women beyond question or criticism in the workplace.

Classic feminism is "women should be free to fuck and then marry who they want and when they want and then have freedom (*with alimony*) when they want it ... and and and ... why aren't men marrying us anymore? they owe us marriage, why are they not holding up their half of the deal?? they must be immature... men shouldn't be free to do as they please! those shitlords!"

You can tell entitlement at a glance by how it responds when it doesn't get its way. If there is vitriol and hate and abuse, you know you're dealing with entitlement. If there is "ok, fair enough, you go your way and I'll go mine", there isn't entitlement. How do women respond when they don't get what they want?

The key to feminism's success is purely the *women are wonderful* effect. Bias from women *and* from men. (Fuck the white knights. Seriously... fuck the white knights). Whatever they do (and the little pink-haired trampstamp-tattooed pierced darlings sure do and say some crazy shit)... whatever they do it would work. People simply nod and listen and stop thinking when faced with someone of higher social status to them (ie women and victims and especially women-victims who are beyond any sort of moral question, due to years of being paid for by ... err I mean abused by the patriarchy). These are ungrateful dependents, unwilling to be independent and responsible for themselves and instead screaming and crying about it.

The Women Are Wonderful Effect is backed up by an onslaught of female criticism for any man who says.... well, anything as far as I can tell. We've all seen this happen enough times whenever women are present. This is enough to stop most men thinking clearly, and they generally just give in. Their need for social approval is so great, they cannot even dare to think outside the box they've been put into. It's pathetic and tragic to see. Men

need to be given the weapons to fight back, starting with "men and women are different" and ending with "I'm right because my penis is bigger than yours".

TL;DR: Feminism = childlike dependency without responsibility and beyond criticism due to victim mentality

hebola4lyfe • 2 points • 12 November, 2015 01:26 AM*

In fact a big part of feminism is an attempt to continue the support they got from their parents and putting this responsibility onto their boyfriend/husband/the state. Freedom without responsibility. Positive quotas on the basis of manufactured injustice rather than merit. Women beyond question or criticism in the workplace.

Classic feminism is "women should be free to fuck and then marry who they want and when they want and then have freedom (with alimony) when they want it ... and and and ... why aren't men marrying us anymore? they owe us marriage, why are they not holding up their half of the deal?? they must be immature... men shouldn't be free to do as they please! those shitlords!"

Exactly, well said ! Women are constantly searching for the female oriented support they were used to when they were girls: catered by the gynocentric society and parents . They dont want to let that support go under any circumstances so they will go as far as to tricking men into impregnating them even if those women dont want children . They will use their womb(having children) and vagina(giving sex) to their advantage to keep this privilege/support they refuse to let go .

NeoreactionSafe • 30 points • 11 November, 2015 02:33 PM*

On Red Pill we seem to be always dancing on the tip of the iceberg.

The trend in Western civilization has for a long time been towards a Newtonian view of reality. This "Newtonian Materialism" rips the older spiritual view of reality out from within the people. So after absorbing this materialism people start thinking in shorter time horizons.

Why even start a family?

If I'm just this Newtonian bag of material "stuff" that dies and has no meaning (existentialism) why not just indulge in hedonistic distraction?

...generally **everything** we've seen is a drift towards a materialistic world view.

Femimism is just the logical endpoint of this "decomposition" of the soul. (post-modernism)

And we aren't done yet either...

There are plans to continue to dissolve national borders and we already see the attempts to make everyone a **Queer Fluid** sexually so materialism is getting into every aspect of our lives.

The cure?

Red Pill gives us the option:

One can remain Blue Pill and be the beta bucks who seeks romance.

One can be Red Pill and refuse to imitate the romantics and hedonists with a stoic frame.

One can be Red Pill and continue the hedonistic concept to a whole new level of power.

vengefully_yours • 48 points • 11 November, 2015 06:37 PM

Yes I'm nothing more than the sum of chemical compounds formed from elements that were made in the

crucibles of supermassive stars billions of years ago. We are the universe come to life with the ability to study itself.

You could look at it like you're insignificant, which yes you are, and just throw up your arms, give up, and let your life fare back into the void from whence it came. I'm not doing that.

My life has meaning to *me* and it's the only one I get, I'm cam sure going to enjoy as much of it as I can.

Does that mean I'm going to be a hedonist seeking only happy thoughts wrapped in cotton candy flavored unicorn shit? No, it means I'm going to build my life, put in the work to get as much out as I possibly can. Like said elsewhere in here, the things you must work for bring far more rewards than the things that come easy.

Do you want your life to be easy or quality? Most people choose easy over quality, then they can't figure out why more stuff doesn't make them happy. I own several cars, I derive pleasure from them because I built them. Anyone can buy an old car, not just anyone can rebuild it into something awe inspiring or terrifyingly fast. What's missing when you buy it is that sense of satisfaction that only comes from doing the work yourself.

That satisfaction is what drives me, it's the meaning of my life. My meaning and purpose is defined by me, what I want, what I do, and what I achieve. It's not too impress anyone else, it's purely for my enjoyment. Once I'm gone I really don't care what happens to everything I "own" because like girls it's just my turn to have it around.

People have lost sight of that, and it had little if anything to do with souls or spirits, it has everything to do with focus. Focus on what matters, not on the bullshit you're told to focus on. The best part is *you decide what matters* and where to focus. Most people simply focus on bullshit.

NightwingTRP[S] • 7 points • 11 November, 2015 07:03 PM

I require an extra 10 upvotes to give to this comment.

LateralThinkerer • 0 points • 11 November, 2015 09:09 PM

The reason you haven't felt it (love) is because it doesn't exist. What you call love was invented by guys like me, to sell nylons. You're born alone and you die alone and this world just drops a bunch of rules on top of you to make you forget those facts. But I never forget. I'm living like there's no tomorrow, because there isn't one.

(Don Draper, *Mad Men*)

aguy01 • 3 points • 12 November, 2015 12:29 AM

This is the whole reason for religion. America was made great on its religious discipline, and it's dieing with its atheistic hedonism.

RP-on-AF1 • 1 point • 13 November, 2015 11:08 PM

And the enemy of the west is highly religious. It drives them to fight and reproduce. They aren't shy about their plans to take over Europe by outbreeding the natives.

Mindcrime2015 • 3 points • 12 November, 2015 04:42 PM

minor quibble regarding the term "Newtonian materialism. " Newton was incredibly spiritual. The bulk of his writings and research was involved in pursuing an understanding of G-d. The calculus and scientific experiments were a sideshow for him.

NeoreactionSafe • 2 points • 12 November, 2015 06:39 PM

True.

He was very reserved about his private beliefs and he acknowledged that he knew he was scratching the surface of reality with his basic math rules relating to nature.

My general point was that materialism is a philosophy trapped in the 18th and 19th century.

[deleted] • 6 points • 11 November, 2015 06:53 PM

There's this book, proofs of a conspiracy. Supposed to be texts from the original bavarian illuminati from the 1700s. They explicitly talk about creating and using feminism to help reach their goal of a world without religion. A Nobel goal at the time but ya know... those who fight monsters become monsters... Yada yada.

NeoreactionSafe • 3 points • 11 November, 2015 09:00 PM

May 1, 1776 is when it all started in Bavaria.

Yeah, who would have guessed they would have pulled this off?

KissTheBridesmaid • 7 points • 11 November, 2015 05:39 PM

Great post. This baffled me for a long time. Why has the world gone completely nonsensical? Why are women continuing to get all these privileges, many of which are actually pointless and they don't actually really want, they just think they want?

In a political system in which elected officials and agendas require the support, or at least 'perceived' support of the general population (popularity), pandering to the wants of women makes sense.

Women like to be given things. They like privileges. They don't care about merit or achievement. All you have to do is offer them a privilege and they will ALL support you. Sheep mentality.

Whether or not it is actually good for them in the long run is irrelevant. As we know, women have a notoriously terrible awareness of what their real wants and needs actually are.

This is why it is so easy to get their support and any politician or public figure pushing an agenda or just trying to gain popularity is aware of this and would be an idiot not to use it.

The support of the male population can not be won over this easily, it is more complicated than that.

Taking this approach for men would be guaranteed to alienate ALL women but would not get you the support of all men.

In fact, it would already lose you the support of a significant part of the male population due to their protective instinct towards women (white knighting). At the same time, the majority of remaining men would simply not care about these issues at all and support an agenda based on non-gender related things, more specific to their goals or profession or social class. Men's principle imperative is not to be provided for. It is to provide, to achieve and to create value.

This means that creating a narrative based on offering privileges to women is guaranteed to get you MORE THAN half of the population's support. ALL women and a significant amount of men.

These ridiculous privileges that women are getting these days did not come about because women fought for them and eventually the world gave in and gave them what they wanted. It is actively encouraged by anyone who wants to be any kind of public figure, ESPECIALLY policy makers.

Not much we can do about it other than acquire the tools we need to enjoy the decline. That's why we have TRP.

pillpapa • 6 points • 12 November, 2015 03:49 AM

While we're on the topic of representation, why don't we talk about the real elephant in the room? The ultimate oppressed class. One of the few classes of individuals who have ZERO representatives in congress and the senate combined. That's right, I'm talking about children.

With no representatives, there's not a single person looking out for their well being and nobody to prevent them from being oppressed without mercy. 25% of the population is younger than 15 years old so there's NO reason why 25% of congress shouldn't be children. It's pure, systemic discrimination and it needs to end now./s

GayLubeOil • 15 points • 11 November, 2015 07:34 PM

While we are on the topic of hedonism let me tell you a story. Back in the 1600 there was a sect of Jews called the Sabatteans. According to the Jewish religion the Messiah is going to come when everyone is good or everyone is evil. But how the fuck are you going to make everyone good? That shits impossible.

So the Sabatteans came to the conclusion its impossible to make everyone good so lets make everyone evil. Seems pretty logical right? Then the Messiah will come. Then they started wife swapping and doing all sorts of other hedonistic shit that runs counter to conventional Judaism.

So this philosophy of up is down, spread to a lot of organizations. There are alot of people in places of power who fully belive this shit. Some of them belive it because it's a convenient philosophy to do whatever you want without worrying about morality. Others are theistic and think a dude will come down from the sky.

Feminism is anti marriage, pro hedonistic cock carousel, pro sodomy and very critical of conventional patriarchal JudeoChristian morality. Feminism is bankrolled by the same ritch white dudes who go to the Bohemian Grove and do robed rituals.

AVWA • 11 points • 11 November, 2015 11:08 PM

What you are speaking about, these Sabatteans, is true. Iv'e researched them extensively. And yes, they are still here. But TRP is not the place for this type of information, at least in my opinion. Its way, way, way, deep in the rabbit hole. More information [here](#).

GayLubeOil • 6 points • 11 November, 2015 11:32 PM

I know. I'm just pointing People in the right direction

tekn0_ • 2 points • 12 November, 2015 02:19 PM

Good stuff GLO. Good to know that you know the real stuff behind the mainstream scenes out there.

marlowbanks • 1 point • 11 November, 2015 09:09 PM

Interesting stuff about that sect of Judaism.

I once heard a conspiracy theory about something similar happening in modern times. About a group that teaches its members to raise their kids to be the "bad kids" and to seduce other kids to do bad things. Their daughters are raised to sleep around, their sons are raised to try and seduce virgins. Doing drugs and drinking is encouraged by the parents, etc.

Maybe the Sabatteans or something similar are still out there.

2012Aceman • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 02:33 PM

In "For the Love of Evil" Piers Anthony explains that the true duty of evil isn't to do chaotic things, it is to tempt OTHERS to do chaotic things. For the true purpose of evil is not to corrupt the good, but to bring out the innate bad in people. Feed the bad too much, and you become corrupted. But the evil itself

never makes you bad, it just encourages you to do bad things until you find yourself on their side.

musclebound92 • 6 points • 11 November, 2015 11:08 PM

Its mob mentality narcissism and hedonism. Its psychopaths. Just not the fun kind to read about or watch in movies, but the most annoying kind of person you can be. I work with one of the most feminist women I have ever met. She is utterly insane. A black hole that just sucks in and destroys.

[deleted] • 5 points • 12 November, 2015 06:26 AM

I absolutely agree with *nearl*y everything you've said, however a mistake often made here is the belief that feminists and women in general are working together in the bonds of feminine sisterhood toward putting all women above men.

This is false. They do not care about each other any more than they care about men. Not one bit. They betray and use each other at the earliest convenience. Everything they do is 100% for themselves. Not a single position they take is one that doesn't effect them in some way shape or form. The ones who cry about there not being enough stem women have stem aspirations. The ones who cry about fat shaming want to eat more and not be teased. The ones who cry about slut shaming want to be slutty, and the ones who obsess about rape victims being unquestioningly believed are planning on getting rich crying rape.

They do not care about each other. They never did and never will; they are not capable of forming those sort of bonds. If any feminist woke up tomorrow suddenly transformed into a man, they'd be a sociopathic spouse abuser with no friends or hobbies outside of narcissism and masturbation. So essentially, exactly as they are now only with a penis.

screamingATtrees • 9 points • 11 November, 2015 05:24 PM

Consent...Don't make laugh..nobody gives a fuck if the guy consents.

The way to end feminism is to stop fucking women who are proclaimed feminists. Ignore them, don't ever take them seriously, don't hire them, don't help them and definitely end arguing with them.

hebola4lyfe • 4 points • 12 November, 2015 01:14 AM

The way to end feminism is to stop fucking women who are proclaimed feminists. Ignore them, don't ever take them seriously, don't hire them, don't help them and definitely end arguing with them.

So killing the white knights and beta manginas . A lot of beta manginas are in powerful high positions in society : the political sector .

nzgs • 5 points • 11 November, 2015 05:12 PM

It's Marxism, not hedonism. The things you're describing, such as the doublespeak language, thought-policing, and constant demands for power and entitlements are typical of marxist doctrines.

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HZMtlE_0rew

Understanding leftism/marxism/collectivism is absolutely key to understanding trp.

unsafeword • 10 points • 11 November, 2015 06:37 PM [recovered]

Marxism and third-wave feminism are one and the same. For those fortunate enough not to have been immersed in this, the main defining issues for each:

First-wave feminism (pre-60s): Voting and property rights

Second-wave feminism (60s-80s): Abortion, equal workplace *opportunity*, domestic violence, denormalizing

the nuclear family

Third-wave feminism (90s-present): Marxism.

Third-wave feminism marxism includes:

equal workplace *outcome*

redefining or banning terms to change the meaning or perceived appropriateness of old literature

vast expansion of identity politics to bind people to common cause based on sexual orientation, race, obesity.

The resulting majority of minorities then has a common "villain" outsider in the old, straight, white, wealthy male. The universal oppressor is used to legitimize almost any action.

feels-is-reals and general unhinged batshit insanity all over social media and in popular media. This serves an actual purpose. The uncritical parrots joining the cause of the moment are the useful idiots who shout down, isolate, and demonize dissenters.

TRP is about enjoying the decline. This is the source of that decline.

occupythekitchen • 1 point • 11 November, 2015 09:03 PM [recovered]

I dont agree third wave is marxism but anyone who knows communists know the first thing communism does is give equality to male and women as well as employment.

Other than that communism infiltrated the west well unfortunately the only facet of communism we have in our society is alimony and child support, in communism is the government job to care for the citizens in modern capitalism its the husband job to take care of his ex wife and bastard kids

ASAP_Bickle • 6 points • 12 November, 2015 12:03 AM

It's not something that cannot be agreed upon, it's actually historical fact. Feminism as a doctrine was created by the members of the Marxist Frankfurt School when they relocated from Germany to American in the 1940s. They essentially sat around a table and said "how can we bring this country down from within?", and feminism was one of the things they came up with. Go ahead, look it up.

occupythekitchen • 3 points • 12 November, 2015 12:20 AM

Yeah but they envisioned 3rd wave, I mean who could predict this descent into lunacy. I guess I was never a woman's psychologist in the early 1900s to even conceive of it.

ASAP_Bickle • 3 points • 12 November, 2015 05:46 AM

I believe they did predict it, yes.

The two greatest Marxist social inventions of the time were Critical Theory (attacking little bullshit about the country, making a big deal out of nothing, essentially anyone complaining about 'the patriarchy' or 'micro-aggressions' is engaging in Critical Theory) and Political Correctness (also known as Identity Politics, i.e. "your points against feminism are invalid because you're just a misogynist so shut up!").

The tools used by feminists today are directly descended from Marxist philosophers as a means to fuck up the USA from within. It's safe to say they are succeeding.

JohnCh8V32 • 2 points • 12 November, 2015 11:43 AM

Go ahead, look it up

en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frankfurt_School#Cultural_Marxism_conspiracy_theory?

ASAP_Bickle • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 11:16 PM

Can't speak for the reliability of Wikipedia, but that's the one.

Campes • 3 points • 11 November, 2015 04:21 PM

They want the best of the best and none of the worse. Let men take care the garbage. Hedonism indeed.

Kalidane • 3 points • 11 November, 2015 04:34 PM

I have plenty of respect for refuse collectors who perform the job well. It goes the same for any productive work. More so if I don't know how to do it myself.

Take your article to the hypothetical - what would happen if they got the quotas they want? I'm thinking the whole thing would go to shit and they would switch to blaming the implementation of the quotas, prosecuting organisations which failed to adequately comply, and an acceleration in the numbers of men checking out of the system. One can't mandate performance and the more you mess with meritocracy the bigger the snafu.

Keep in mind that they can't consider consequences, so they will forever say "I want..." "You should..." no matter the system state. They can't understand why it would be a bad thing to do what they see as a good thing. Much like a 4 year old.

If you imagine their headspace as resembling a nightclub serving free cocktails and starbucks, with a disco ball made of glitter-covered kittens, you'll better understand the fruitlessness of your reasoned arguments.

skoobled • 3 points • 11 November, 2015 07:15 PM

Feminism is feralism, more like. The irony of freedom is that it's freedom from civilisation, which was supposed to be freedom from the jaws of the (cruel and cold) natural world. Abandon civilisation and expect to die in the wild

favours_of_the_moon • 2 points • 11 November, 2015 05:19 PM

Hedonism is based upon physical pleasure and enjoyment.

FemiNaziism is primarily based upon "power," or "empowerment," which to most gender studies and social work majors, is just ego inflation and compensatory facade.

[deleted] • 2 points • 11 November, 2015 06:27 PM

Excellent work; bordering on visionary. Reminds me of the 'Heads I win, Tails You lose' (HIWTYL) concept from the 'Gervais Theory'. Using deception to engineer 'sociopath' situations that will either pay off big, or defer blame to something/someone else should it fail.

Specified to female activity, Hedonism is the perfect concept for summing up a HIWTYL based on the things deemed good/bad in the feminine mind. I remember talking to my sister once about how much I enjoyed music festivals and travel, because it sort of forced a really exciting and challenging Asceticism on you - to which she remarked she couldn't imagine anything worse. Many women profess to be huge campers/travelers etc, but it's where the concept of 'glamping' comes from. Stations to charge your iPhone, wash your hair etc., because they *can't stand the Asceticism*.

What's more this act of maximising pleasure now (and decreasing pain) regardless of future outcome is very descriptive of *R-strategy* survival and mating, as opposed to masculine *K-strategy*. I think really R could be conflated with Hedonism, and K with Asceticism. Although personally I think any apex leader has a balance of both; a *middle way* so to speak.

Phenomenal observation Nightwing.

sonldow • 2 points • 11 November, 2015 07:54 PM

Making women work in these fields would hurt them. So no quotas because we don't want pain.

But nobody would make them work there. They'd just get favoured over males. This is a good position for a woman to be in if you want the job, and it's irrelevant if you don't.

mugatucrazypills • 5 points • 11 November, 2015 03:25 PM

A coercive yes means no, is that too hard to understand ?

Just because I got you to say yes to giving me all your money while I was holding a gun, doesn't make it consent.

As for the hedonism=feminism thing, I think that's obvious. Ayn Rand explains it in better detail than I can.

The problem is that these women are prostitutes and selling/trading sex, but then they "pretend" there's a consent issue some time post-transaction. If you're a buyer and you don't demand clarity in the original transaction then you're adding risk in this area so this problem is partly beta faggots fault.

This is basic contract law.

Clarity would be, **"I want you to fuck me now. I want you to fuck me harder. Please stick it in my That feels so good. Thanks for fucking me like that."**

That's why it's betas grovelling for scraps that get into the most trouble with rape allegations.

MattyAnon • 8 points • 11 November, 2015 08:09 PM

A coercive yes means no, is that too hard to understand ? Just because I got you to say yes to giving me all your money while I was holding a gun, doesn't make it consent.

This is irrelevant and not what was being said. Noone is talking about "forced consent". Nice strawman argument there, but we're not falling for it.

What *is* being said is that the "yes" shouldn't have to be verbal, the man shouldn't have to ask, it's the woman's job to be clear, that it is her actions at the time that count and not what she says about it 6 months later, and she cannot say "I said yes at the time, but now that my boyfriend found out about it I am now claiming to be drunk and don't remember a thing".

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 November, 2015 03:11 PM

I like the way you think. I'm not just talking about this post either.

refusewool • 1 point • 11 November, 2015 04:51 PM

This is sidebar quality material.

[deleted] • 1 point • 11 November, 2015 04:52 PM

Levayan satanism is essentially hedonism also, with dark visuals. Are we seeing a trend here? If you are fond of satanism then feminism might be great also. If you aren't then maybe not.

daedius • 1 point • 11 November, 2015 04:56 PM

It's important you distinguish between psychological hedonism and rational hedonism. Red Pill is incredibly selfish, the difference being that we promote strong long term thinking, ideas based in factual reality, and only doing something if it advances the life YOU want.

Hippo_Kankles • 1 point • 11 November, 2015 06:33 PM

Just learned odds of probability in finite math. You know your shit!

BlueFreedom420 • 1 point • 11 November, 2015 09:43 PM

I think all beings move toward pleasure, but its the wisdom of pain that gives us our meaning and strength.

Feminist hedonism is a mark of decadence. Its a mark of a culture/civilization that has too much, too easily.

Feminism flourishes because the state must make sex hard to get so that males must buy into the system and feed the system. It has become too easy to get resources, thus females will naturally create higher and higher barriers to sex. Thus the state takes the feminist logic of making male sexuality criminal as its doctrine.

greatmikeshark • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 03:41 AM

STEM is part of Engineering

Stythe • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 02:33 PM

Personal note: Kids lush boundaries to test the limits. Women give shit tests to make sure their man is a rock. Its subconscious behaviour designed to find where in the pecking order you are.

Feminism is the modern representation of the spoiled child. As men, we are just as bad as feminists in our own way because we've become coddled in this bullshit. At this point the people who caused things to start swinging in this direction are gone or powerless. The baby boomers are generally too blind or dumb to notice it. Only now with people seeing the ramifications firsthand are we starting to wake up to the problems were swimming in. Many of us our pissed. We can't deny that we've been misled. With the anger subsiding were deciding to make the best of our situation and stand up for ourselves.

This is what the world needs. People to act what they preach. To show what integrity really is. Women respect that innately and those that don't are too far gone to worry about. This way, people could actually be upfront

throwaway_holla • 0 points • 11 November, 2015 07:43 PM

they want feminine supremacy, but also want to be dominated in the bedroom and approached first

Not so. Plenty of people identify as feminist and also see nothing wrong with approaching men or even throwing themselves at men, and don't want to be dominated at all, ever.

through_a_ways • -2 points • 12 November, 2015 12:49 AM

Everything everyone does is selfish, feminism is no different.

I actually appreciate "female logic" more than "male logic", at least when it comes to anything practical regarding social/political factors.

Male logic is like a preset algorithm that recognizes contradiction. It remains the same, and takes in a variety of data/inputs and analyzes it in the same way.

Female logic is a more complex algorithm. It could be roughly described as "find what's good". It's a very vague task, and one needs to analyze, both consciously and unconsciously, millions of different stimuli in order to arrive at the truth. Additionally, the importance of different stimuli themselves can change, so the female system needs to be able to analyze one level above that.

In male logic, "what's good" would be whatever has the fewest contradictions with paradigms that were previously deemed valid. This leads to male logic acting against its own self interest. Of course, this is why most males don't actually engage in male logic outside of areas where it is imperative (science math and engineering), and no males engage in male logic 100% of the time.

A good example of this: imagine that you found \$50,000 lying on the street, dropped by the person in front of you. Female logic says "what's good", and that money is good, so you keep it. Male logic searches for contradictions, and applies the same algorithm to the other situations, IE: yourself losing 50k that way. Male logic thinks there is a contradiction because you would want a stranger to return 50k to you. Female logic keeps the money, male logic returns it.

We could analyze this situation further with male logic, and if you analyze it enough, the fundamentals of male logic breakdown. Proper use of male logic should conclude that female logic is superior in almost all applications where there is a personal gain involved.

[deleted] • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 08:37 AM

Arguing that acting without integrity or accountability is a step *forward* for humanity is ridiculous. The system is strained enough as it is from free handouts to females. The last thing it needs is for males to start acting the same way. It'd collapse immediately. That being said, long term a collapse may just be the best thing.

hebola4lyfe • 1 point • 12 November, 2015 01:33 AM

What the hell are you talking about lol ? Your example is borderline retarded .