

Discussion Thread: The Red Pill and other "unacceptable ideas" ... Voting.

10 upvotes | 9 May, 2013 | by Whisper

I think something ZionController said deserves its own thread.

I realize a lot of my posts piss people off. No one was madder about me saying women shouldn't vote than my own woman when I told her I would support taking her voting privilege away. She says I'm a jerk. She's right. I ask her if she still loves me. She says unfortunately. I say then it doesn't really matter that I'm a jerk then, does it?

Now, of course, this idea is going to piss off a lot of people. But the thing about taking the Red Pill is that it is defined by the act of looking at reality the way it is, and reacting to what is really there, not dismissing ideas just because they give us, or anybody else, bad feels.

Obviously, when you look at reality, you only get IS, not OUGHT. Ought you have to make up for yourself.

But that doesn't mean all "oughts" are equal. Some sets of principles lead to wealth, health, and happiness, others lead to disaster. And this is true both for people and societies. So what "ought" to happen is something we can argue about, starting from the idea that there is no universal right and wrong (that's a blue pill idea), there are sets of morals that help us personally, or civilization as a whole, thrive, and others that have crappy outcomes.

So, that being established, "should" women vote? What's your individual take on this? What arguments do you have to support your position?

Coming soon: other "unacceptable ideas" threads covering topics such as racism.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 7 points • 10 May, 2013 05:06 AM

The red pill and authors associated with it has led me to explore ideas that I wouldn't have before. Notably ideas of the New or Alternative right, traditionalism, anti-modernity, human bio diversity, ethno-national thought etc. It's good to explore different points of view and to not dismiss them out of hand - too many people today lack that ability and we see it in the trolls and blue pillers.

So should women vote? No, but then I'm a committed non-voter, I don't want to engage with the beast or give my legitimacy to it. The real question worth asking : is the form of democracy in the west worth defending? Should anyone be voting away their power?

redpillschool[M] • 15 points • 10 May, 2013 01:29 AM

I just want to address the racism question before I begin. Racism is addressed in our posting rules and discussion that isn't strictly sexual strategy based is prohibited.

Although being honest and open to reality, no matter how grim or wrong it may seem, is one of our goals, we found that discussion of race devolved into what amounts to racism.

Though there are genetic differences between the races, the divergence in genetics over different segregated cultures (which gave rise to races) is a much smaller amount of time than the divergence developed in the expression of genes in genders.

It's an interesting conversation, and I'm not about to say it shouldn't happen, or that there aren't differences. But I am saying that theredpill isn't the place to have them.

From our standpoint, I'd appreciate it if we limited our scope to physical differences in our races and differences in our cultures. There are plenty of black people that don't participate in thug culture, and plenty of white people who do. Let's remember these differences. That doesn't mean the color of one's skin defines sexual strategy, but rather the culture.

Thanks.

zionController • 10 points • 10 May, 2013 04:10 AM

Agreed. There are various factions of 'red pill' but our niche is the realm of sexual strategy, and I don't want to see us getting involved in any charged racial discussions. All bros welcome here

soapjackal • 1 point • 10 May, 2013 07:10 PM

I would definitely leave if this sub were to go there.

Whisper • 3 points • 10 May, 2013 04:45 AM

I don't happen to subscribe to racist ideologies myself, but I feel like, having taken the red pill, I can no longer dismiss such ideas out of hand as evil, but have to use evidence to refute them as wrong.

redpillschool • 2 points • 10 May, 2013 01:12 PM

I can no longer dismiss such ideas out of hand as evil, but have to use evidence to refute them as wrong.

Agreed.

ribbite • 13 points • 9 May, 2013 11:05 PM

"should" women vote?

Why shouldn't they? Isn't that the question you're supposed to be asking?

I'll say that I don't believe in universal suffrage, but I'll also say I don't believe in restricting it entirely on the circumstances of one's birth. Why should anyone's opinions and input matter less solely because of the way they were born? What's the argument here? Women are too selfish? What about the ones that aren't? Is it assumed that the ones who aren't are just going to agree with all the men who "know what's best" anyway?

Quote from an anti-suffragette:

Emma Goldman opposed suffragism on the grounds that women were more inclined toward legal enforcement of morality (as in the Women's Christian Temperance Union); that women were the equals of men; and that suffrage would not make a difference. She also said that activists ought to advocate revolution rather than seek greater privileges within an inherently unjust system.

The first part makes some sense, but the rest of it is more abstract and isn't very convincing.

Really all this seems to stem from is some instinct to not make women directly responsible for anything.

threads covering topics such as racism.

Define racism.

theubercuber • 5 points • 9 May, 2013 11:22 PM

I agree with you.

I think today if anyone can vote and be influenced by corporations or what have you without being fully informed or even fully invested in a system (full time job, not relying on welfare, etc.), voting means very little and can be very emotional and irrational.

I also think this is unrelated to gender so much as individual's role in society. If you want someone to have political power, maybe have them earn it a la starship troopers?

What if voting was restricted to people that meet some basic requirements such as paying a certain amount in taxes (including sales tax and registration fees, not just income tax), passing a quick reading comprehension test of a bill before voting on it (no more ambiguously worded bills and blanket corporate ads 'yes on 8 for family values'), stuff like that?

ribbite • 5 points • 9 May, 2013 11:24 PM

What if voting was restricted to people that meet some basic requirements such as paying a certain amount in taxes (including sales tax and registration fees, not just income tax), passing a quick reading comprehension test of a bill before voting on it (no more ambiguously worded bills and blanket corporate ads 'yes on 8 for family values'), stuff like that?

I've had these EXACT same thoughts. Feels good to finally see someone that shares them.

racontemoui • 4 points • 10 May, 2013 12:21 AM

The point is, voting is not a right. It's a responsibility. You shouldn't be given responsibility if you haven't demonstrated the ability to handle it. And if you're not taking your responsibilities seriously, and bad things are happening, they should be taken away from you.

How to implement this is tricky of course, but this should be society's aim.

30303030303030 • 1 point • 10 May, 2013 07:39 AM

I'd vote for that.

[deleted] • 1 point • 10 May, 2013 12:56 PM

I've always liked the idea of a 2 or so year service in the military during young adulthood. While not mandatory per se, only people who finish it get the vote.

RedHonest • 10 points • 10 May, 2013 04:25 AM

I'll say it this way: If you start talking about politics then you're retarded. Politics is retarded. The more a person speaks about politics, the more retarded they sound. Sorry...this is true when Heartiste does it. Rollo doesn't blog about politics because he *knows* how it sounds. Heartiste also believes in stupid shit like somatypes.

I like The Red Pill is because the politics is personal. It's all about what *you* personally do with your life. I trust people a hell of a lot more to make decent, careful decisions about their personal lives than their political decisions.

You can live your whole life believing the earth is flat, and no harm will come to you. You can start an asinine am radio station, and broadcast to world about the truth of flat earth, and not only will you not be harmed by your beliefs, but you can even make a killing in advertising if you can get people's rage machines churning.

Voting is idiotic, everyone with wisdom knows this. Vote with your cock instead. Game is the only politics you need. Game requires everything that voting does not require: Actual skill, actual experience, courage, and to be relatively free of delusions. It is delusion that brings you to the ballot box; it is delusion that starts multithreaded, heated, and pointless discussions on online discussion boards; and it is delusion that will make you positively *suck* at game.

Feminists can rant about patriarchy all they want, and we know *exactly* what this is. It's an easy scapegoat, it's someone else to blame their problems on, it's a dodging of responsibility.

This is what politics *always* is, gentlemen. Speak two words of politics before me, and I'm going to assume you're deluded. Speak three words and I'll know you're an idiot. After the fourth word I won't hear the rest.

Men, judge yourself on your actions, not on your words. Attain a sense of reality, and only by testing boundaries, experimenting, and finding your own answers. Just...stop...talking...

A_Study_in_Orange • 3 points • 10 May, 2013 05:50 PM

You, sir, speak with wisdom. Politics IS retarded. Speaking about politics... so retarded.

What I like best about this rant is how everything you talk about is so vaguely identified and ill defined that it's almost impossible to debate. That sir, is TRUE WISDOM.

RedHonest • 1 point • 12 May, 2013 11:38 PM

Rhetoric trumps logic every time. Debate is mostly useless. You disagree with my opinion, but the strongest logic is weaker than most people's fancies.

A_Study_in_Orange • 1 point • 13 May, 2013 01:13 AM

LOl whut?

soapjackal • 2 points • 10 May, 2013 07:12 PM

Politics and women. Awful combination to be discussing.

Read no treason by Lysander spooner if you want an honest opinion on voting.

thetikutaku • 2 points • 14 May, 2013 01:12 PM

How are you even real? How is this subreddit even real? I've been reading for half an hour and I still can't believe that people like you exist. How can you think of your mothers, sisters, wives and daughters - of women in general - like they are inferior animals only valued by their looks and how easily you can get them to sleep with you? Absolutely disgusting. I'd shoot a bullet through every single man's brain who has ever posted here. SHOULD women vote? Maybe we should make everyone go through psychological and moral evaluation before we let sexist racist scum have a say in politics and human rights.

Whisper • 1 point • 15 May, 2013 04:17 AM

I love the smell of death threats in the morning. Smells like... fear and desperation.

[deleted] • 1 point • 18 July, 2013 09:45 AM*

There is a huge gap between full equality and being treated as sex robots. That huge gap is generally called being a mother, wife, housewife, plus generally the caregiver professions. I absolutely respect my mother *as a mother* but it does not enable her to be wise in politics.

Your huge mistake is that by your standards every man in 1900 would be scum - when in reality, and yes, despite the racism etc. of that era, they were better men than we are. They were willing to die for things they believed in, they did not run away from a fight, they had principles, they had character etc.

This is I think where a huge Left - Right barrier lies. My starting point, on the Right, is that I don't hate great-grandpa. This is not negotiable. Any ideology that says there were dumb and evil automatically fails. Thus, if great-grandpa was for example sexist, I don't necessarily have to be, but I have to think that sexism does not necessarily make a man scum. I have to think that it is no big deal. While you on the Left defined your ideology so that basically you have to hate everybody born a few generations ago and you have to think, if you want to be logical, that today's videogaming hipster is somehow better than a Wyatt Earp or Bismarck.