

Sokal 2.0 - The open secret of feminist philosophy

October 3, 2018 | 103 upvotes | by [NightwingTRP](#)

You'll already be aware of the "Academic Grievance studies scandal" which, to anybody who has been paying attention to mainstream culture in the past few years, is basically the social justice academia being embarrassed yet again. This scandal is providing some good evidence of what we already knew, that people working in the social justice arena are not intelligent, their work is a sham and their PhDs are false awards. They are not called professor for being intelligent, knowledgeable or capable of providing anything useful to modern research. They are given it to meet diversity quotas. They are given these titles to shut them up. They are awarded these PhDs to quiet their shouts of *misogyny*.

Respected independent magazine Quillette has published a [set of responses](#) to this Sokal affair 2.0 from academics in various fields. It is a worthwhile read for the entire article. However for this post I want to look at one response in particular which is very relevant to the recent quarantining of TRP. For context, our quarantine is due to a claim of "misogyny" which is thrown quite calmly around without any specifics. Backed by the academic idea of positive masculinity endorsed by what is acceptable to feminist academics. We have not adhered to that, so we must be punished. Except... there's a very interesting statement regarding the school of thought we refuse to adhere to in this response piece.

Neven Sesardic is a Croatian philosopher who has taught philosophy at universities in Croatia, the United States, Japan, England, and Hong Kong.

One cannot properly judge this new (multiple) version of the Sokal affair before studying the fake articles that were part of the project conducted by Lindsay, Boghossian, and Pluckrose.

Among all these submitted papers mixing “absurdities and morally fashionable political ideas” the project collaborators single out the article that was accepted by the journal *Hypatia* (A Journal of Feminist Philosophy) as their most important success. Indeed, kudos to them. **Yet the reader should know that it is a carefully guarded secret in philosophy that feminist philosophy is often not characterized by intellectual rigor and high academic standards.**

(The secret is so well-guarded, though, that many philosophers do not dare to admit even to themselves to know it, let alone express it publicly.) So *Hypatia* was a logical and easy choice for the attempt to place a fake paper in one of the well-known philosophy journals.

Emphasis mine. It is an open secret that the feminists have been given a seat at the table despite the fact everybody knows their ramblings are unworthy of giving even slight consideration. I wonder why they did that? And I wonder why they keep it a secret that they all know these feminists are spouting illogical nonsense? Might it be a cry of misogyny that they are trying to stay away from? That perhaps holds weight as an accusation even when it is being applied incorrectly? Are we living in a society where terms like sexist and racist are flung about with great abandon, applied incorrectly on a regular basis, simply as a manner of smearing political or ideological opponents who won't fall in line with your [religious doctrine](#)? I do not answer these questions but leave them for you to consider. Let us continue to the example evidence that Neven provides:

Occasionally, however, unintentional absurdities of feminist thinking have crept into much better philosophical journals than *Hypatia*. A good example is an article from the Australasian Journal of Philosophy in which a feminist describes a “phallic drama” involving two statements, p and $\sim p$ (the negation of p):

There is really only one actor, p , and $\sim p$ is merely its receptacle. In the representation of the

Venn diagram, p penetrates a passive, undifferentiated universal other which is specified as a lack, which offers no resistance, and whose behavior it controls completely.

Note that this is no longer a Sokal-type hoax but an instance of authentic feminist philosophy. Sometimes it is impossible to tell the difference. For more information about how caving in to feminism damages philosophy as a discipline see [the 2014 article](#) co-authored by Rafael De Clercq and me.

(Emphasis for Sesardic's quote from another paper.) Most interesting. It appears that feminist nonsense (and I use the term advisedly because that example is most certainly what Sokal would have referred to as nonsense) is seeping outside of their own little echo chamber despite failing to reach basic academic evidence and theoretical standards.

This is the measurement by which we are judged by reddit to be misogynists. They have openly stated such by linking to show "this is what positive masculinity is" and linking to feminist academia. Academia itself considers it to be nonsense, so I'm relatively confident that the reddit admins are also spouting nonsense in an attempt to appear smart... not unlike these feminism PhD holders.

The Red Pill is the idea that there is forbidden truth. Something going on behind the curtain. When the reddit admin make up a spurious reason to reject any appeal and ban us for this nebulous "misogyny" as defined by their feminism academics, we have yet further proof of our own position. This is a persecution. A witch hunt against those who will not fall in line with the feminist religion and dare to have the heretical thought that men, men's thoughts and men's interests actually matter too.

Register over on [TRP.red](#) today unless you wish to have the blue pill forced upon you.

Archived from [theredarchive.com](#)

Comments

redpillschool[M] [score hidden] 3 October, 2018 03:17 PM* stickied comment

Postmodernists pretend to be experts in what they call "theory." They claim that, although their scholarship may seem incomprehensible, this is because they are like mathematicians or physicists: they express profound truths in a way that cannot be understood without training. Lindsay, Boghossian, and Pluckrose expose this for the lie that it is. "Theory" is not real. Postmodernists have no expertise and no profound understanding.

When I was young, I was taught that science and scientific theory must have falsifiability. In today's culture, there's a sham being presented as science. Feminism, gender studies, and general Marxism are being passed as facts and cogent theories. But there's a problem- none of them are falsifiable. This is how we know they are wrong. Not because we disagree, but because they are not falsifiable. This is postmodernism at its core.

Have you noticed you can't falsify institutional racism. Or patriarchy theory? Or sexism?

As an aside, I am absolutely loving the unfolding of all of this around us. The new topics on here are also refreshing. I think we neglected the significance of the anti-male world around us, while we were busy talking about self improvement.

UnleashYourLife • 4 points • 3 October, 2018 04:40 PM

Plenty of people did not?

It's just that they got drowned out by "be attractive, don't be unattractive", "how will this help me get laid?", "don't think about it, outalpha it bro" crowd.

But then again, most of those wouldn't have imagined that TRP would get hit by the absurdeism.

[deleted] • 0 points • 4 October, 2018 06:53 AM

I think we neglected the significance of the anti-male world around us, while we were busy talking about self improvement.

I don't intend to be deliberately bitchy, but wasn't the mod team decidedly against the "improve society" faction and all about the "enjoy the decline" faction?

There was a schism, and not the first time it's happened regarding what essentially boiled down to the Gaylubeoil route or the Jordan Peterson route.

NightwingTRP[S] • 7 points • 4 October, 2018 01:41 PM

The mod team has always been behind a morally ambivalent position. It's the only way to avoid moralising from hijacking the discussion. The price of this is that we must allow those who want to "enjoy the decline" to do so as they see fit. It is not my place to decide upon every man's lifestyle choice. I, and a number of others, have been openly opposed to the enjoy the decline attitude because we find it too nihilistic. The nihilistic element I find to be deeply non-masculine. Even if there is nothing, we are men, we invent and we build, so even if there was no meaning, we would then create that meaning instead.

Note that I am also strongly opposed to JBP philosophy because he encourages creation of more

followers rather than leaders.

[deleted] • 2 points • 5 October, 2018 12:41 AM

I, and a number of others, have been openly opposed to the enjoy the decline attitude because we find it too nihilistic.

This is how I feel. But on the flip side, if I care too much I start to realize that there's nothing I can do and the decline is probably inevitable, and it's just too depressing so why am I wasting time thinking about something I can't control? So I end up swinging wildly back and forth between detached nihilism and anger/disgust. Yes I know this is probably not healthy.

[deleted] • 2 points • 4 October, 2018 03:08 PM

The nihilistic element I find to be deeply non-masculine. Even if there is nothing, we are men, we invent and we build, so even if there was no meaning, we would then create that meaning instead.

This is my essence, man. Well said.

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 October, 2018 02:46 AM

Note that I am also strongly opposed to JBP philosophy because he encourages creation of more followers rather than leaders.

I have barely scratched the surface of his works but what makes you have that view from him?

NightwingTRP[S] • 2 points • 5 October, 2018 10:26 AM

Because my academic background is psychology and he is a jungian. Also his christian faith permeates much of his thinking which is like building a house on sand. Finally, I think it was Whisper who wrote it, but there's an entire article on JBP and why he's putting you back onto the plantation, just now as a happier and more effective worker... but you're still a slave to women. Pretty much all of that applies. A piece was stickied for a while about how Peterson and co just push some tradcon values without any further thought. You can't wish away how women really are just to fit into your traditional conservative dream. There's a reason all those conservative girls read those erotic novels then get caught in sex scandals with conservative men of power. AWALT still applies.

[deleted] • 1 point • 7 October, 2018 01:51 PM

Because my academic background is psychology and he is a jungian.

I have to confess a lack of knowledge about Jung and psychology as a whole. Did he upend psychology or is his views of archetypes hostile to the field?

Finally, I think it was Whisper who wrote it, but there's an entire article on JBP and why he's putting you back onto the plantation, just now as a happier and more effective worker... but you're still a slave to women. Pretty much all of that applies. A piece was stickied for a while about how Peterson and co just push some tradcon values without any further thought. You can't wish away how women really are just to fit into your traditional conservative dream.

I remember those and I disagreed. My disagreement boils down to I think a trad con society is just better than today's society. Both personally and on a societal level.

Today the circles of beta and alpha have no overlap. You literally cannot be natural with women lest you accidentally do or say something that triggers her to see you as beta. It's crazy. And if you're actually a nice honest and honourable provider you're basically a sheep to wolves. And to normies, this is still the expectation of society. Which gives nothing to people who follow.

Back in the "good ole days" however being a beta provider was a societal expectation. Which meant you got respect from other Men and social status from it, which made you attractive. There was some overlap between alpha and beta. So normies who followed the rules received some benefits for essentially perpetuating society.

I would rather live as myself in a time where a Hoe has an n count of 5 rather than today when a Hoe has an n count of 50.

redpillschool • 6 points • 4 October, 2018 01:23 PM

I don't intend to be deliberately bitchy, but wasn't the mod team decidedly against the "improve society" faction and all about the "enjoy the decline" faction?

We've had a men's rights flair since the beginning of the sub.

I think a lot of people say enjoy the decline and live your life. But that doesn't mean we haven't talked about these issues. If you ever read my posts, it's almost always about the culture wars.

And I post a lot. So...

foxhound525 • -2 points • 4 October, 2018 06:23 AM

If you try and apply science to any social science, you're gonna have a bad time. That does not prove that these things do not exist though. That's a very nonsensical perspective to take.

redpillschool • 4 points • 4 October, 2018 01:25 PM

That does not prove that these things do not exist though. That's a very nonsensical perspective to take.

That's the difference between the postmodern take and mine. If you showed me proof of something existing I would accept it and change my world view.

And that proof starts with a falsifiable claim. Go for it, we'll be waiting.

foxhound525 • -2 points • 4 October, 2018 01:29 PM

I'm a biochemist, and a lack of proof does not confirm non-existence. You need to be able to prove it doesn't exist. Hence why some scientists still hold religion. Until something is proven either way it is simply unknown. That's science

redpillschool • 5 points • 4 October, 2018 02:13 PM

I'm a biochemist, and a lack of proof does not confirm non-existence.

And I've never made that claim.

As a biochemist I'm sure you're familiar with Russell's teapot. The burden of proof lies upon those making extraordinary claims.

As of now I have no reason to believe in a teapot floating in space.

That's reason. (You know, the thing that science requires.)

foxhound525 • -1 points • 4 October, 2018 02:55 PM

I'm just saying that you not believing in it doesn't mean it doesn't exist. Believe what you want of course

redpillschool • 6 points • 4 October, 2018 03:29 PM

My not believing it isn't why I don't think it exists.

It's because there is zero falsifiable proof.

Bring the proof and I'll believe it exists.

CainPrice • 58 points • 3 October, 2018 02:25 PM

The idea that "real men" are feminists is just more social engineering.

Women are afraid of men. Because at the end of the day, men are just plain stronger than women. Any man who really wants to can overpower a woman, rape her, rob her, beat her up, or murder her. Most men would never do such a thing, but any one man could if he was deranged enough.

The only reason women make it to work safely every day, without being raped or killed, is because men let them. Men choose to behave themselves.

The only reason women get to choose who talks to them at a bar or who they go home with is because men let them. Men choose to play along and grant women rights. This is why a loser at a bar who won't leave a woman alone is so upsetting to her. He's not hurting her. He's harmless. But his presence is a very in-your-face reminder to her that if a man really doesn't want to, he doesn't have to respect her comfort at all. He reminds her that she's powerless.

The only reason women have any rights or safety or power at all is because men are all playing along and letting women feel powerful.

And women know this. They know that every minute of the day that they're not raped or beaten or robbed or murdered is men choosing to let them be safe. They know, deep down, that they are utterly dependent on men choosing to behave well and that where it counts, they are completely powerless.

Women are angry, and feminism is women lashing out at this sense of powerlessness. Women think that with enough social engineering and conditioning, they can compensate for the biological fact that men are stronger and could rape and kill them if they wanted.

The pseudo-philosophy that men are inherently evil, powerful, take advantage of women through tiny ingrained societal aggressions, and so on is just feminism's attempt to put the biological fact that men are stronger and have inherent power into words, and to try to guilt the world for men daring to be naturally strong enough to hurt women if they wanted to.

redpill77 • 29 points • 3 October, 2018 03:06 PM

They do have power. They developed advanced social perception and rhetorical skills which allow them to manipulate the reality of men who are not powerful enough to perceive power talk. Frame.

Men with abundance and superior ability are able to be in touch with reality.

Men with lower status are lured into a women's frame with the promise that another type of truth exists- forget your low stature in the male hierarchy- just listen to women's stated needs and they'll love you!

CainPrice • 36 points • 3 October, 2018 03:30 PM

That's their master plan. If every boy from a young age is taught their way of thinking, their way of behaving, and their sense of values, they believe we can finally reach a utopian age of skinny, androgynous, feminized, respectful men who are weaker than women and shun conventional masculinity, and women no longer have to fear men.

They genuinely believe that enough social engineering can beat biology.

tanlkula • 8 points • 4 October, 2018 10:11 AM

Thats when wars start to happen. Women can not rule. If men become women-like, disease, hunger and the collapse of the economy is inevitable.

Its like that old quote. Good times create weak men, weak men create bad times, bad times create strong men and strong men create good times.

JamesSkepp • 31 points • 3 October, 2018 03:42 PM

The pseudo-philosophy that men are inherently evil, powerful, take advantage of women through tiny ingrained societal aggressions, and so on is just feminism's attempt to put the biological fact that men are stronger and have inherent power into words, and to try to guilt the world for men daring to be naturally strong enough to hurt women if they wanted to.

Don't forget the other side of the medal. We, men, pedestalyzed women as can-do-no-harm-wonderful-innocent-creatures for centuries. People tend to default to black-white thinking. So, if women are wonderful and innocent, men must be hideous and evil. The current situation is as much about unwinding feminism as it is about unwinding BP beliefs average man holds.

[deleted] • 3 points • 4 October, 2018 06:56 AM

We, men, pedestalyzed women as can-do-no-harm-wonderful-innocent-creatures for centuries.

It's almost like AWALT has a flip side and that is All Men instinctively protect and cherish Women.

I dare say getting Men in general to not pedestalise Women is like trying to get Women to ignore hypergamy.

JamesSkepp • 7 points • 4 October, 2018 08:18 AM

All Men instinctively protect and cherish Women.

I'm a bit on the fence on this, whether it's instinctual (genetics) or learned behaviour (every man learns this since he was a little boy b/c EVERY other man does this).

exit_sandman • 11 points • 4 October, 2018 10:13 AM

Seeing women as protection-worthy is instinctual, but seeing them as infallible and wonderful by default definitely is learned.

If men were evolved to always #believewomen, they would be completely helpless against any act of paternity fraud. I dare to say that the protective infantilization of women is basically a compromise between the two - you have to make sure nothing bad happens to women, but you also can't rely on them behaving "properly" out of their own accord.

[deleted] • 4 points • 5 October, 2018 12:52 AM

seeing them as infallible and wonderful by default definitely is learned.

Definitely, and this is proven by historical texts like the Old Testament which gives us insight as a primary document into what men who lived in this time thought of women. Women are dangerous. Women are destabilizing. Women are devious.

Men's desire to protect women also has an element of ownership to it. If a woman is fucking you, you own her (pre 1960 of course). Naturally we want to protect what we own. I don't care much if a guy across town's TV is stolen, but I'd be pretty pissed if mine was. I think the desire to protect your women (and by extension, the women of your male allies) is instinctual. But the desire to pedestalize women as a concept and protect all woman-kind is completely culturally driven.

[deleted] • 2 points • 5 October, 2018 02:43 AM

I'm a bit on the fence on this, whether it's instinctual (genetics) or learned behaviour

I've never felt the urge to go into academia or research but this is the thing that would make me want to.

I'd really want to test this out, put a bunch of people in an MRI/fMRI machine and cause pain/distress to various people and things and see if there's a different reaction in the brain.

chadwickofwv • 2 points • 5 October, 2018 02:48 PM

That would be a very interesting study.

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 October, 2018 12:46 AM

The desire to protect women you know and care for is instinctual. The desire to protect "woman-kind" as is entirely culturally driven.

dogkindrepresent • -1 points • 4 October, 2018 04:59 AM

If your goldfish had the capability it would leap out of its bowl and rip off your face.

exit_sandman • 13 points • 4 October, 2018 10:10 AM

I concur. This is also the lens through which you have to interpret feminist statements like "rape is about power, not sex" - it's female projection.

Because for a woman, her most fundamental power is to grant (or, more often, deny) men access to her sexuality. A woman who can reject men has the power to make or break their day (or rather: night), she can make them jump through hoops or otherwise engineer situations where she benefits from it. She can translate her power into provisioning, into security, into indirect *actual* power (by latching onto a man who is suggestible but high-status).

So yeah, while there are indeed men for whom taking a woman against her will might be the actual incentive, lots of men plain and simply want someone to fuck and don't really go through mental gymnastics of how awesome it is to overrule a woman's sexual autonomy by use of force - there's only gender that feels a power shift 100% of the time when a rape takes place, and it's not men.

[deleted] • 4 points • 5 October, 2018 12:55 AM

I concur. This is also the lens through which you have to interpret feminist statements like "rape is about power, not sex" - it's female projection.

I always thought that this claim was extremely dubious, even when I was still a virgin and had literally no

opinion on any of this shit. It just made no sense to me. Very good explanation. Solopsism 101. The only reality is the reality in her brain.

[deleted] • 5 points • 3 October, 2018 10:15 PM

The problem will stretch into future offspring who grow up and are subjected to today's toxic culture, unless current societal "advances" are reversed. Last night, I talked to a friend who said verbatim: "I don't know how to speak to women". I told him about the time I went on a date with a so called feminist and forced her to pay half the tab, which she happily obliged. He was dumbfounded. I told him that equal rights = equal responsibility, and she respected my boldness to even act like that. Then I told him to view it as a screening, why the fuck would I want to date a woman who didn't stick to her words?

Back to the issue at hand: as an early member of Generation Z I was lucky enough to not have this crap shoved down my throat at a young age. Things will go to shit when they're given this "doctrine" at an age they cannot question it. As the only "valid" opinion out there, these kids won't even know they had a choice to differentiate.

BlueFreedom420 • 3 points • 5 October, 2018 11:25 PM

while I agree this is the case. it also the case that women are mothers, sisters, and wives, that women are rational beings. There are weak men too. Society protects the weak because the weak still offer much to society.

Feminist is not about power in the brute sense. It's power over other men. Society is controlled by a small amount of people. They don't care about feminist or the red pill. They care about power. And feminist allows them to weaken men and delude women.

Feminist is a symptom not a cause.

FinancierGuru • 5 points • 3 October, 2018 09:26 PM

In the workplace of today, many women hold the power.
They fire and dispose at will.

CainPrice • 8 points • 3 October, 2018 09:29 PM

Then they go to a bar and Creepy McCreeperson won't leave them alone and they feel oppressed.

All the professional success in the world doesn't change the fact that being caught alone in the bar parking lot with Creepy petrifies them. In fact, when a woman is professionally accomplished, it grates on her even more that she is supposed to be strong and independent, but is powerless and depends on guys like Creepy behaving themselves.

[deleted] • 1 point • 3 October, 2018 03:24 PM

Don't you think this is changing with them being pushed gradually deeper in the workplace, receiving greater social benefits, etc? Proffessionally, a woman can now outrank a man. Financially, she can outprovide him.

CainPrice • 22 points • 3 October, 2018 03:28 PM

No. At the end of the day, a homeless druggie can rape and kill a woman. A CEO can rape and kill a woman. Nearly any man out there can hurt a woman if he wants.

The fact that a woman can spend years in school and get a job and pay her own rent and become self-sufficient just makes the fact that she's completely powerless grate on her even more. She's supposed to be a strong, independent woman who can take care of herself, and she's just as easy to beat, rob, rape, or

murder as any other woman, for any man who decides to quit playing along.

The fact that more and more women are becoming educated and self-sufficient is making women angrier about their powerlessness, not helping them deal with it.

[deleted] • 6 points • 3 October, 2018 04:01 PM

I don't think they care, really, as do most men. Most kids have never been in a real fight in their lives, they've never felt what it feels like getting close to death. I started jiu jitsu this month, and it shocked me how intense fights are. Sure, I've been in some pushing/kicking contests when I was young - but man, having someone trying to choke you really triggers the instincts.

Regardless, the world is getting increasingly non-violent, and while the evolutionary drives aren't going away, the guardian state is getting ever stronger, and men are getting a lot more cowardly.

Whether you know how to fight or not, most people will never be in a real one.

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 October, 2018 04:59 AM

To me, I'm a bit of two minds on this. Ultimately, the reason probably goes back to the ideals of liberalism/nuclear peace that help underpin our current order. No major war is going to happen anytime soon that spares humanity, because nukes are instant war-winners against anyone that doesn't have them. Any civil war will be swiftly crushed because the elite will never, ever risk the almighty launch codes falling into the hands of average men.

And yet that's probably just as fine, because from all that I've heard about it, *war is Hell*. True violent conflict includes almost every manner of human savagery and from all the research I've seen it's a deeply damaging experience that one often spends the rest of their lives trying to forget.

JamesSkepp • 14 points • 3 October, 2018 03:10 PM

p and $\sim p$ (the negation of p):

There is really only one actor, p , and $\sim p$ is merely its receptacle. In the representation of the Venn diagram, p penetrates a passive, undifferentiated universal other which is specified as a lack, which offers no resistance, and whose behavior it controls completely.

Hmmm....are you sure this is written by a feminist philosopher and not Neoreaction?

The Red Pill is the idea that there is forbidden truth. Something going on behind the curtain.

It WAS not. TRP was in the open, you might have not liked it or ignored it. Now that TRP is quarantined it LITERALLY is forbidden knowledge. Funny that the entire paragraph makes more sense after we've been quarantined than before.

exit_sandman • 2 points • 4 October, 2018 10:16 AM

Now that TRP is quarantined it LITERALLY is forbidden knowledge.

Which makes me think of

dogenes09 • 13 points • 3 October, 2018 04:13 PM

Majored in philosophy. As he said- not so-guarded secret except amongst the blue pills. I had two pretty red-pill philosophy teachers who both voted against making feminist studies a real major at the uni.

dogkindrepresent • 3 points • 4 October, 2018 04:56 AM

The forbidden truth is that feminist academics incensed at this will all rally releasing dozens of biased dodgy papers as rebuttles which will gain acceptance automatically.

BlueFreedom420 • 2 points • 5 October, 2018 11:21 PM

"Critical theory" is the biggest Bullshit of intellectualism for the past 50 years.

Read "The Owner and his property" by Max Stirner and read his scathing and prophetic diatribe of "pure theory"

trollslapper • 2 points • 6 October, 2018 11:08 AM

Yet the reader should know that it is a carefully guarded secret in philosophy that feminist philosophy is often not characterized by intellectual rigor and high academic standards.

if the reader is a total moron then yes they may be unaware that Feminist theory is not well researched.

anyone who has done psychology or sociology know this already, as does anyone who pays attention to the world.

giant case of "no shit sherlock"!