

All Women Lie About Rape - PART ONE

329 upvotes | 19 December, 2016 | by redpillschool

I originally started typing this up about a week ago, and found myself a dozen pages in, so I've decided to release this in parts as I go. Here is part one:

I have an interesting thought experiment for you.

RAINN states that 1 in 6 women are a victim of attempted rape, a super majority of which were successful rapes, and a very small portion of it, the rapist manages to fail at his intended goal.

According to the [NSVRC](#), 46.4% lesbians, 74.9% bisexual women and 43.3% heterosexual women reported sexual violence other than rape during their lifetimes. That's almost half of the women you've met in your life.

That's a lot of assault and rape that's going around. It's virtually impossible to walk down the street, go to the mall, or visit a bar without running into a large number of rape and sexual assault survivors.

Based on these numbers, one might start to wonder if a quarantine of men might start making sense. Or possibly segregation should be necessary to protect women. Perhaps increasing our police presence in our public places, or adding cameras to residential homes might make sense.

Maybe you think my solutions are a little extreme, but I'm not convinced that they are over-kill if these numbers are true and we're in the midst of an epidemic affecting half of the female population. If 1 in 6 women contracted a strange new disease, the CDC might shut down flights into and out of the country.

Reality

My thought experiment today is about addressing how you decide what makes sense, and what doesn't in the world around you. It's likely that none of us have a deep enough understanding of how the world works that any of us could rightly say "I know how everything works, and why everything happens." In fact, it's very unlikely that any of us are anywhere close to understanding even a fraction of reality.

But I don't think that makes us special (or particularly dumb). Nobody really has the capacity to know everything. And not everything can really be known. We're seeing this in spades with the recent epidemic of "fake news," but don't mistake the new term for a new problem.

When the red pill sub was in its infancy, and the manosphere was still working out the individual details of the theories we now know by heart on our sidebar, there were men who realized that certain details of their lives didn't pass the smell test. It gave them a feeling in their guts but there wasn't an obvious answer as to what or why it was.

That very feeling is likely what brought most of you here to The Red Pill. You knew something was amiss and you weren't quite sure what it was.

The Red Pill is one of many counter-cultures by virtue of the fact that we stand in the face of commonly accepted understandings and worldviews. We've observed the happenings around us, and decided that the socially accepted reasons *why* didn't line up quite right.

We, as a group, think we've got a better handle on reality than most... at least, when it comes to sexual strategy. But there's a chance we're very, very wrong. And that's okay in my mind. We may not ever know the true causes of why women like certain traits. We assume it's evolution, though nobody can really pinpoint what mechanism in evolution really caused these behaviors, we take an educated guess that evolution somehow did it, since evolution is largely to blame for all of our behavior.

We like to hypothesize about why certain traits were evolutionarily advantageous. Big muscles on men was important, to fight bears and lions! Long hair on women showed consistency in health over a long period of time. Aggressiveness was selected for in men because those men had all the food. Women shit test and are hypergamous because our species' survival relied upon always finding the best conditions to create a child.

If you asked me whether I believe these hypotheses to be true, I'd say they're the best explanations I've seen to fit my observations. But it's impossible for me to really know. Even with the rigors of scientific study into human evolution, we're probably never going to know for sure the *whys* of our history. We'll see the *whats* and do our best to fit a narrative to match the observations.

And that's what we all do for everything in our lives. Nobody's worldview narrative matches reality precisely. All that matters is that it works.

In *The Red Pill* we've exchanged a worldview that did not work very well for us, which we call the *blue pill state of mind*, and replaced it with a much better approximation: *The Red Pill state of mind*. But *The Red Pill* isn't a perfect worldview, and is likely lined with inconsistencies and faulty logic that keeps it a good distance from aptly describing reality around us. The only real difference between the red pill narrative and the blue pill narrative is that it works better for men to find success, happiness, and sex.

The question that I've asked myself every day since I discovered the dark world of the red pill is this: By which mechanism were we allowed to discover a more functional world view, and by which mechanism do others fail to discover or adopt a more functional world view?

If the Red Pill truly brings success to men who adopt it, then why would any man remain in a blue pill stupor? "Surely," he must think, "if there were men who had the keys to success and were able to demonstrate it, I should listen to what they say."

This isn't a settled topic for me by any stretch. I think it's going to be a topic I'll devote some time to in the next year, because the war of ideas is fascinating to me. But I think a good place to start is first figuring out what the mechanism is that allows us to peer deeper into the rabbit hole, and – while not truly discovering real reality – discover a better worldview that gets results that our mainstream culture doesn't want us to achieve.

For those familiar with Scott Adam's writing, this is a topic he spends a lot of time trying to describe. You'll see a lot of similarities in my approach, I agree with him on a lot.

So Women Lie About Rape?

I'm sure you were wondering what this has to do with rape, or the women who lie about it. I *am* going to get to that, soon.

One of the core mechanisms I've recognized that helped lead me to the red pill was my ability to sniff out inconsistencies in world views. And, like I mentioned, I could be completely wrong on all my ideas, but the one thing I could ensure was that it could at least be internally consistent and match my observations.

If I suggest to you that gravity is fake, and that nothing holds us to the ground, you'll likely be skeptical at such a claim. You know from your experiences that gravity keeps you grounded, that baseballs hit into the sky come back to earth, and that the earth presumably revolves around the sun. Everything you've observed in life and understand about gravity from school has been neatly placed into your worldview, and what I've just said does not match.

When we were told as children that being a nice guy who treats women right and fairly would result in us finding a nice woman to settle down with and live happily ever after, we were told this version of the world before we had enough observational data to confirm or disprove it. By what mechanism would we have been able to determine the extent to which it was not true?

We learned from an early age that knowledge would be attainable from multiple sources. For much, we could learn from our experiences and experimentation. We didn't need to learn Newton's calculations to figure out how to toss a ball. Our muscles and our brains slowly determined the rules of the world around us, and no additional information was necessary.

But gravity isn't entirely explained by our experience, as Einstein found out. There are rules to gravity that fall outside of our perception. This information, we each discovered, can be learned by listening to experts who used acceptable methods to determine more about reality than we can observe. Very few people disagree with relativity, even though none of us have traveled at the speeds that would make these laws perceptible, let alone relevant in our lives.

Einstein, our parents, and the greater culture of media, peers, and experts, became a surrogate for experiences we had not yet, or may never have. For most of us, we will never travel to outer space. But we believe the pictures that show us what the earth looks like from the moon. There is little reason to disbelieve it.

Unfortunately, along with the tidbits of science and history, we were also given information about our possible future experiences. We were to enter into the sexual market at some point, and they intended to prepare us. We grew up acting; In lieu of experience, we acted on their advice.

This means that The Red Pill here about sexual strategy really isn't unique. There must be **Many red pills**.

I'm going to continue this tomorrow, but feel free to discuss and see if you can guess my point in what any of this has to do with *women lying about rape*.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Archwinger • 191 points • 19 December, 2016 07:15 PM

Rape statistics don't line up simply because the real world doesn't mesh with them.

Example: If 20% of college women are raped, why are women still going to college? It's a HUGE risk. Or at least, why aren't women going to all girls' colleges? Why hasn't all-girl college enrollment skyrocketed, while co-ed party schools become nothing but grunting cesspools of toxic hyper-masculine sausage-fests? Or at the very least, why aren't the girls who go to co-ed schools refraining from attending frat parties or drinking or going out places with groups of guys?

If 50% of women on Earth are the survivors or some kind of sexual assault or violence, why has nothing been done? Why isn't the huge majority of women buying guns and learning martial arts? Why do women still go out to bars and clubs without guns or bodyguards and drink to semi-incapacitate themselves? The risk is ENORMOUS! If the world is that unsafe, why aren't women, or anybody, doing anything about it?

Because here's the real deal:

Men are stronger than women. On the average, any one of you could beat, rape, rob, or kill any particular woman you came across today, if you really wanted to. Beating up women or raping them is pretty easy. The one thing that stops men from doing this isn't women fighting back. It's other men. If you beat, kill, rape, and rob, other men are going to beat the hell out of you, capture you, put you in prison, give you a record so you won't get hired or housed anywhere desirable, and ultimately ruin your life.

The only reason women can walk from point A to point B without being beaten up, raped, robbed, or killed by a man is because men have all agreed to play along. Any one of us could hurt any woman we want. At any time. But we're playing along.

Any one man, at any given time, might just say fuck it. He might stop playing along.

This petrifies women. Women live in a constant state of fear and powerlessness. Everywhere they go, they have to worry about things that we don't. They have to worry that any given man might say fuck it and quit playing along.

And the only reason they ever get to point B safely is because men let them. The only reason men let them is because other men are protecting them. The only reason they have any power, any safety, or any control over their lives is because men give it to them.

Think about this seriously for a minute. If you had to live like that, always afraid, and always aware of your own powerlessness, forever at the behest of men granting you any semblance of power and control that you have, you would go insane.

That's what this female hysteria is. Women, desperate to convince themselves that they're not powerless, shrieking at the top of their lungs to no avail. The best -- the very best -- that women can do...the entire epitome of maximum female power and the greatest females can ever accomplish -- is to get men to agree to social systems and programs to keep other men in check. The full extent of female power is manipulating men into protecting them from other men.

[deleted] • 38 points • 19 December, 2016 08:07 PM

you'd think more women would be pro gun, the great equalizer

[deleted] • 21 points • 19 December, 2016 08:22 PM

[permanently deleted]

adam-1 • 22 points • 19 December, 2016 09:27 PM

This is an astute observation. She wouldn't need a gun, either. A pepper spray, or a blade, or a bat, or even a good stone, would do. Since the invention of weapons, hundreds of thousands of years ago, women are not defenseless.

It is true that men have a greater strength, that allows them to hurt women. My personal opinion is that exactly this, the need to be able to physically overwhelm women, is what made men stronger in the first place, evolutionary speaking - and not fighting bears.

Nevertheless, it is not men's *strength*, that women are afraid of, per se. It is their propensity to "say fuck it" and snap. For women it is a completely incomprehensible behavior. Women would never do it - because they never needed to. No woman was ever desperate for *sex* ("sex" in general, since sex with a particular high-value man is another issue). They are totally oblivious to the state of mind that a continuous social scorn, along with a chronic sex deprivation, creates in a man.

[deleted] • 10 points • 19 December, 2016 09:33 PM

[permanently deleted]

Forcetobereckonedwit • 9 points • 20 December, 2016 07:38 AM

Heh heh. You ever see a woman throw a rock? Wouldn't stop me.

interestedplayer • 3 points • 20 December, 2016 09:35 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Blakrov • 11 points • 21 December, 2016 10:55 AM

My experience in the security industry would lead me to disagree with you. Women are quite efficient at doing damage, its simply their physical strength and their tenacity in adrenaline fueled, physically and socially compromising situations.

My instructor with 25+ years experience in security provides anecdotal evidence. Where there is a brawl, usually with alcohol involved, what do men do? They take the hardest part of their body (fist) and slam it into the hardest part of their opponent (torso, head). It may hurt, but attacking this areas won't do serious, life compromising damage. Women however, (usually to the security agent who is breaking up a brawl involving her boyfriend) will use her claws to attack the eyes, ears, throat, remove her high heels and proceed to stab the back of the neck, and more I'm sure.

killxorxbexkilled • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 02:57 PM

I've seen numerous videos of someone getting stabbed in a fight and them not even realizing it until after it was over.

[deleted] • 1 points • 20 December, 2016 10:10 PM

[permanently deleted]

APSTNDPhy • 1 point • 29 December, 2016 02:17 PM

Women have had ample opportunity to form together and create a female centric force,

but they haven't. Ever. Why?

[deleted] • 13 points • 19 December, 2016 11:12 PM

Women would never do it -

what the fuck are you talking about? Have you never seen women behaving badly because society gives them great license to do so? You are aware that women commit more unilateral abuse than men, and when the abuse is bilateral the women strike first approx 3/4 times?

adam-1 • 14 points • 20 December, 2016 01:34 PM

Relax. I am not saying that women are less aggressive.

I am saying that men's aggressiveness is more associated with despair, while women's, (which, if you account for passive-aggressiveness, is hugely bigger than men's), is society-endorsed, as you point out.

interestedplayer • 5 points • 20 December, 2016 09:34 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

gjs628 • 3 points • 29 December, 2016 09:27 AM

I knew a woman in her 20s who was a self defence instructor, but not the whole "girl power, hyaaaah!" crap, this was elite Military beat-him-senseless stuff. She had been at this for over 10 years and could kick most people's ass in a flash. Yet one evening she was followed home by a guy shouting sexually obscene things at her. Despite all her training she ran home terrified. The terror was because he was stronger than her and all it would take is one stray punch and she would be on the floor helpless. The fear was irrational - she knew she could easily beat him - yet rational at the same time because she was aware of her own fragility.

Most women don't have the slightest idea what a fight is like. You can ask any woman on the street why she hasn't taken up self defence and I can virtually guarantee 997 out of 1000 would give the same answers: I never really thought about it; it's too rough for me; I'm clever, rape will never happen to me; the police are here to protect me, right?

They are innately aware of their fragility yet instead of facing it head on, they bury it under a mountain of excuses and stick their heads in the sand. Part of me wonders if this is because they almost want something bad to happen so that they can ride the emotional rollercoaster and claim huge amounts of sympathy for their newfound victimhood. It's also widely known that rape fantasy is at the top of the fantasy list. I'm not saying all women *are* trying to actively be raped but I have yet to find a logical reason why none of them seem interested in their own safety, and walking home from a club drunk at 3am wearing next to nothing is no different than walking through a Lion's den with a rump steak tied to your neck.

FwapTrap • 7 points • 25 April, 2017 06:58 PM

Despite all her training she ran home terrified.

You can ask any woman on the street why she hasn't taken up self defence [...] They are innately aware of their fragility yet instead of facing it head on, they bury it under a mountain of excuses and stick their heads in the sand.

You are a special kind of stupid if you don't realize the contradiction of your comment. You give the example of a woman who was trained and whose training was useless and you wonder why women don't take up self-defense? You probably think you're intelligent too. Hilarious.

Marcus1138 • 12 points • 19 December, 2016 10:14 PM

My thoughts exactly. I like being in Canada where guns are very rare - I can handle myself in a brawl. A woman, generally, can't. Guns overwhelmingly favour women, yet women seem to be the most opposed to them.

torodinson • 6 points • 20 December, 2016 01:42 PM

I know of a small town Canadian Tire that sold 200 sks rifles in a couple months, lots of guns here not so much in the cities.

TyrannyVengeance • 4 points • 20 December, 2016 08:35 AM

That's because violence isn't about loss of control that's a myth. Just as governments use militaries men use violence; only now we've been trained not to.

RedSyringe • 2 points • 30 December, 2016 12:53 AM

It's because it requires user responsibility.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 08:34 PM

The full extent of female power is manipulating men into protecting them from other men.

If this is true (which i think it is) they'd get a lot more pleasure manipulating men to do do it for them instead of being responsible for it themselves.

Rhythmic • 24 points • 20 December, 2016 03:22 PM

The one thing that stops men from doing this isn't women fighting back. It's other men.

The only thing?

You remind me of an evening from an old time ago. I was fresh out of college, visiting another town, and I got into a conversation with some school kids.

What struck me was their inability to conceive of the possibility that somebody could actually enjoy learning.

To them, having good grades was an 'obvious' sign that the student was trying to kiss the teacher's ass.

They had never experienced the fascination of an interested subject, it was so sad.

I find it interesting how so many people can't conceive of any other reason to stay away from violence other than the fear of retaliation.

Maybe even sadder.

Archwinger • 21 points • 20 December, 2016 03:32 PM

You give a lot of credit to humanity.

Yes, it is fully possible for a select few men to have some kind of innate sense of morality, honor, pride, etc., and to do or refrain from doing certain behaviors because they derive meaning from being

upstanding people.

However the huge majority of people behave in the way that they are incentivized to behave. If rape were not illegal, there was no punishment, no social consequences, or guys had this magic power where it was 100% impossible for to ever get caught -- but rape was still regarded as bad behavior and a wrong, terrible thing to do -- the majority of men would be rapists. When there is no consequence or risk associated with an action, people do the action.

Really, people adhering to a standard of behavior because it is right is just fear of social punishment (or seeking social commendation). If there was no social reward or punishment involved, just a vague notion that rape was wrong, the huge majority of men would rape.

interestedplayer • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 09:38 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Rhythmic • 6 points • 20 December, 2016 10:06 PM

Your inborn instinct to be nice/nonviolent to others out of "kindness" is just because of the calculated inprinted fact that many times the men protecting other women would be stronger than you so you shouldn't try

This may very well be so. But no invention was ever held back to its original purpose.

Kindness evolved for whatever reason it did. Once it does exist, it acquires a life of its own.

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 10:10 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

chikenvanhook • 1 point • 21 December, 2016 05:56 AM

The toilet paper holder is held to its original purpose...

Rhythmic • 1 point • 21 December, 2016 11:16 AM

Challenge: tempting. Trying to resist ...

adam-1 • 44 points • 19 December, 2016 09:52 PM

There is the case of *men*, generally, protecting women. But this is not the whole picture - and I believe it is not the main picture, either. It is *the elite* protecting women. (Btw, I hate the term "the elite", because it has positive, kind of wondrous connotations, while they are essentially a distillation of the world's greatest scum).

So if *one* man decides to stop playing along, that's no problem. He'd probably run into one chivalrous white knight, maybe two, or three, brave protectors of woman, before the police comes. But if, say, as few as 10 men decide to stop playing along collectively, there is nothing to stop them, even in a big city center, other than the organized use of force by the state.

Allow me to use two paragraphs from my book.

The degree of protection provided by the ruling class to women is highlighted in the following historical example, cited by feminist Silvia Federici, where this protection is negated. Around the 14th-15th century,

the constant uprisings and the militancy of the lower classes had come to threaten the power of the ruling class. It was the “golden age of the European proletariat” which led to the abolition of serfdom. Naturally, the first thing demanded by the poor men when they were to leave poverty behind, was sex. They were no longer willing to remain celibate while the ruling class enjoyed all the women, either as wives or as “maids”. A sexual outlet was initially afforded them through the “institutionalization of prostitution, implemented through the opening of municipal brothels soon proliferating throughout Europe”. But this was not enough. In France and in Venice, under the obsessive fear of the rich against popular uprisings, and due to their belief that “if the poor gained the upper hand they would take their wives and hold them in common”, “the municipal authorities practically decriminalized rape, provided the victims were women of the lower class”. As a result,

“the gang-rape of proletarian women became a common practice which the perpetrators would carry out openly and loudly at night, in groups of two to fifteen, breaking into their victims' homes, or dragging their victims through the streets, without any attempt to hide or disguise themselves. Those who engaged in these “sports” were young journeymen or domestic servants, and the penniless sons of well-to-do families, while the women targeted were poor girls, working as maids or washerwomen, of whom it was rumored that they were “kept” by their masters... On average half of the town male youth, at some point, engaged in these assaults, which Rossiaud describes as a form of class protest, a means for proletarian men – who were forced to postpone marriage for many years because of their economic conditions – to get back 'their own,' and take revenge against the rich.”

Now, a point that is beginning to emerge in evolutionary psychology, is that *resources* was probably *not* the most important thing that individual men provided to women. It probably was *protection*. So, the overturning of the pre-historic balance of the sexes started to happen by the time the "elite" could organize such state structures that would provide women with *free* protection - using the taxes on men's labor to sustain the forces responsible for it.

This is a very critical point in the gender dynamics. As an example, take war: it is a higher level of conflict between countries, and its results (e.g. land occupation) cannot be resolved by economic means alone, since the economic means correspond to a lower level of conflict. Similarly, there is a centralization of the use of legalized violence, in the hands of the "elite", and they use it to provide protection to women. This unbalances the gender dynamics, and there can be no balancing it with other means - other than abolishing the "elite" 's power.

1Mn • 1 point • 29 December, 2016 09:51 PM

The review of your book used adroitly like 10 times.

maxrp • points • 1 January, 2017 01:10 AM [recovered]

Allow me to use two paragraphs from my book.

interesting what is the source for the two paragraphs thanks

adam-1 • 1 point • 1 January, 2017 06:24 AM

<https://TheEmpressIsNaked.wordpress.com>

[deleted] • -2 points • 20 December, 2016 04:41 AM*

[deleted]

What is this?

adam-l • 7 points • 20 December, 2016 01:31 PM

The ruling class is corrupt, almost by definition.

Now, about the system of protection... It is really a very big discussion, with several issues. The main idea is that for society to regain its balance (and I take the prehistoric, hunter-gatherer human past, which lasted for hundreds of thousands, or millions of years, as a base-line for "balance"), women need to pay back for the protection they enjoy.

The conservative expression of this idea, met in here quite often, is "Marriage 1.0", i.e. traditional monogamy, with the wife being de facto obligated to provide sex to her husband. I strongly disagree with this view. At best, Marriage 1.0 only served the men of upper-middle class, and that is not because of the *wife*, but because of the *mistress*, which was a necessary accessory of any good marriage. 100 years ago, poor men could never marry - period.

Now, if you take society at large, i.e. the majority of men, then you can propose two ideas for the payback: On a practical level, wide-spread, legal, safe, affordable prostitution. The state often endorsed this specific solution, in past times. It is a no-brainer.

On a visionary level, and if you tend to lean a bit to the Left, you have to note that prostitution requires either women-slaves, or women willing to do it for some reason - that is, poor women needing money. This is unacceptable, from an egalitarian perspective. *All women* should share the burden, just like all men share the burden of fighting for their country, should a war break-out. For example, in the Ancient Greek world, the institution of whore-priestesses corresponded to this solution: young women would do their time serving the temple and the worshipers, and would just go on an marry, with no shame attached, when they ended their term.

So, a consistent progressive analysis of the gender dynamics would reach the exact opposite conclusions of today's "progressives": instead of focusing on how to further entrench women's right to a sexual veto, it would focus on how to make sex more available to those that pay for its protection, and need it, i.e. men.

"From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs". Isn't that what Marx said?

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 02:20 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 04:25 PM

He may not be referring to natural risks as much as to societal ones. I.e faulty divorce, random child support, less appeal to law enforcement. YMMV, but that's fact.

[deleted] • 7 points • 19 December, 2016 08:21 PM

[permanently deleted]

keyboardWorrier • 11 points • 19 December, 2016 10:48 PM **[recovered]**

I wish feminists would get this into their heads, instead of talking nonsense about "rape culture" and re-writing the rules of sexual consent. They have successfully alienated the 95% (or more) of men who are never going to rape anybody, and who would otherwise be on their side.

Then again, once you start viewing feminism as a massive society-wide shit test it all clicks into place. Having men as allies was never part of the plan.

Troll_Name • 3 points • 20 December, 2016 04:33 PM

Alienation is feminism's favorite hobby.

This is not a liberation movement; it never was and it never will be. It is a *control* movement, and one of the requirements for stable control is disunity in the people *being controlled*.

If you run a slave plantation, you pit the young against the old and the house against the field. If you run a "modern and diverse" company, you do remarkably similar things. Peons are not allowed to organize or cooperate; it's one of the defining traits of their subhuman status.

Take this knowledge and hold up to today's imposed disunity every single place you go.

disposable_pants • 1 point • 31 December, 2016 06:56 PM

This is not a liberation movement; it never was and it never will be.

It started as a liberation movement, back when women had legitimate gripes like rampant workplace discrimination and not being able to vote. But then they won, got greedy, and kept pushing for more.

Troll_Name • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 04:30 PM

"One in three women say they've been raped or sexually harassed." -The official story.

What TV addicts think this means: 33.3% of women have been raped.

What actually happened: 33.3% answering an internet survey remembered mansplaining or manspreading incidents in their past, which constitutes sexual harassment.

keyboardWorrier • 7 points • 19 December, 2016 10:26 PM **[recovered]**

You're right, of course, especially the first 2 paragraphs.

As for the rest of your comment, doesn't it apply to all of us? Sure it applies to women more, but I'm only able to get up in the morning and go to work because other men decide to *play along*. Plenty of men are stronger than me, or have weapons, but they mostly choose not to rob me or kill me.

We're all mostly playing along because the rewards of playing along are greater than the rewards of not playing along. I do sometimes wonder how close we are to the point where this equation stops working out for many people.

BeholdTheHair • 4 points • 20 December, 2016 12:17 AM

Yeah, he kinda' lost me at the end there. Not playing along will naturally result in retribution, which does act as a deterrent, but I don't think it's accurate to imply fear of retribution is the only or even the primary reason most men agree to play along in the first place. As you noted, most of the time it's simply more productive to play along.

london042 • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 11:30 PM

the bad thing is it doesn't even have to be real like you said it's men protecting the women from men,

tons of post about this have happened, clara claims chad raped her after the tinder date and "randomly" 4 of her friends orbiters show up at the frat house to beat him up,

the sad thing is what are the orbiters doing it for? sex

a chance for pussy after she has been raped?

the world is fucked up no wonder women are disgusted with betas

blue_dover • 4 points • 19 December, 2016 08:26 PM [recovered]

Please write a book! You are doing god's work!

adam-l • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 09:07 PM

My thought exactly, these days. Maybe get someone to do a good job curating and editing your posts?

Archwinger • 5 points • 20 December, 2016 02:55 PM

I say a lot of crap about a lot of different things that don't really go together. Nobody wants to get a copy of "Random Musings from an Internet Guy Named Archwinger" for Christmas. And if they really want to read whatever I piss out of the keyboard in my spare time, they just need an internet connection.

angryguy4444 • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 09:10 AM

Fuck man, you need to write a book.

I mean, seriously.

Please.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 05:14 PM

[permanently deleted]

Archwinger • 1 point • 21 December, 2016 06:36 PM

Because those activities don't have a 20% (that's a lot!) death rate.

[deleted] • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 06:50 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 21 December, 2016 08:07 PM

TO most women, rape is a fate worse than death.

most women say, or at least imply, that they'd rather be murdered than raped. To hear most women talk about rape, it's even worse than death.

AvatarStinky • 1 point • 22 December, 2016 03:16 PM

Most car accidents are minor fender-benders where the consequences are minimal and won't affect the people involved on a day-to-day basis. If you're at fault your insurance premiums will go up and if you're not at fault then you're inconvenienced by having to drive a rental for a few days. All in all not life-changing.

When someone is raped it's a life-altering experience. It can take years of counseling to get over and even then, the person is not always the same. By equating driving to rape you're doing exactly what the feminists do.

redzorp • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 01:11 AM

Excellent observation and well articulated!

Forcetobereckonedwit • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 07:36 AM

Slow clap.....(so beautifully true and well said. It also explains why they have developed manipulation skills

bar none)

goldnhorde • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 01:58 PM

This is always my throw at this argument. because it has two big holes.

because there is a further stat that keeps getting thrown in which is that over 75% of these incidents on college campuses happen at fraternity events. I mean, I get it. they are an easy target. So many drunken douches in one place that more than likely could not defend themselves properly and have a public image that starts at "guilty". plus, juts like the Duke Lacrosse team incident ... the public WANTS to believe the story.

but if you take all THEIR information it ends up that you could stop like 50% of sexual abuse cases if you didn't go to fraternity events.

I recently had some troll type come on this forum and was waving some rape cards around and I posed this to her that this made it seem like "free drinks" was much to important to her, her ilk, and the rest of the girls on campus and that since this was the only answer, that their claims and "victimhood" could not be taken seriously since they had exercised absolutely no accountability or responsibility.

I can't yell "Free Drinks", run into a cave of lions, read a sign at the cave that says that there is a 85% chance I will get mauled by lions if I go in for free drinks, yell "FREE DRINKS!!!", run into the cave, get mauled for three days, crawl out and cry that the lions attacked me.

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 09:27 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

trptwerp • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 10:14 PM

You deserve a level above senior endorsed.

TyrannyVengeance • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 08:32 AM

This is one of the most brilliant explanations I've ever read.

Wanna know the sad thing? Half of our neck beard readers won't ever know the extent of their own innate power.

Archwinger • 7 points • 20 December, 2016 11:45 AM

All that feminism really is, at its core, is a series of attempts to equalize the fact that you're stronger than women.

That's why there's so much focus on socializing and indoctrinating children, anti-masculinity, and male demonization. It's all attempts to destroy male identity and masculinity, preferably from a young age. Get rid of male aggression, competitiveness, sports and gym culture, even gamer culture. Marginalize everywhere men gather without women. Regulate everything men talk about and how they say it.

It's all a huge attempt to neuter men, to equalize the fact that you can kick any woman's ass right now, rape her, kill her, rob her, hurt her any way you want. They want everyone to forget that you're stronger than girls.

[deleted] • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 03:33 PM

which is funny, becuae the few times guys snap from this, it tends to be unrestrained male

aggression.

instead of where it used to be, we kept each other in check, because we liked having women around us. Or, how courtship parts of chivalry existed to prove that we wouldn't beat a woman, as a DHV. Hence gentle-men

MattyAnon • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 04:25 PM

Beating up women or raping them is pretty easy. The one thing that stops men from doing this isn't women fighting back. It's other men

The main thing that stops men raping women is that the vast majority of men are not rapists.

Archwinger • 7 points • 20 December, 2016 04:36 PM

You're giving too much credit to humanity.

Right now, there's a huge risk involved in being a criminal, and a limited reward for the crime of rape. And even if we ignore criminal punishment, there are huge social consequences.

While yes, some men do have an innate sense of morality and honor, and they derive meaning from being good people, imagine a world where rape wasn't illegal, there were no social consequences, and/or the act of rape was 100% risk-free. Do you seriously think that the vast majority of men would still refrain from rape simply due to their conscience? When there was absolutely no risk or consequence?

Of course not. People behave in the way they're incentivized to behave. Right now, there are incentives to not be a rapist, and huge risks if you are one.

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 09:40 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Archwinger • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 10:18 PM

Right. First world ideals like honor and feminism are all fine and good when times are easy.

But the very second shit gets hard, and people have to worry about real problems like having enough to eat, having clean water, not freezing to death during the winter, and not getting shot going from place to place, prioritizing crap like female sexual liberation goes out the window. It's all about who can beat the hell out of who, and who has the balls to actually shoot someone else dead.

angryguy4444 • 0 points • 20 December, 2016 09:06 AM

If 50% of women on Earth are the survivors or some kind of sexual assault or violence, why has nothing been done?

Because patriarchy, meh

eixan • -1 points • 20 December, 2016 01:46 PM

If 50% of women on Earth are the survivors or some kind of sexual assault or violence, why has nothing been done?

Yeah I believe it. I dont think the rate is different for mem either. In fact rape is probably one the least

horrible experience of what most people experience in their lives. I honestly don't think rape is that much worse than being in a bar fight or something. Women over value rape because it threatens the pussy economy.

le_king_falcon • 87 points • 19 December, 2016 04:41 PM

Everything is about sex, apart from sex, which is about power.

The easy argument is that crying rape gives women power. It may be the power to harm men, it may be the power to change laws, it may be the power to change societal perceptions. Or simply the power to overwrite their own memories and perception of the truth with something preferred over the truth and the consequences that come with it.

The difference between perception and reality is tenuous at best, but even more so in the average female with a hamster. Rape is abhorrent enough that it allows for the wholesale rewriting of history and obfuscation of any link between reality and what is perceived.

That's my two pence anyways, I could be totally off base though which I'm sure I'd enjoy as a learning experience.

redpillschool[S] • 38 points • 19 December, 2016 04:46 PM

crying rape gives women power

I will definitely address this as we move forward. But I encourage everybody here to consider what the direct benefit is to being a victim.

throw17453 • 21 points • 19 December, 2016 09:42 PM

A lot of it comes down to attention.

By claiming to have been raped - they also covertly claim "I am sexually desirable - someone couldn't control themselves and risked so much just to fuck me"

There's the sympathetic side - I've been raped... victimised... hurt unjustly..... there is an outflow of support from people white knights, other women, sometimes news outlets etc. so much focus all on this one innocent little girl and her plight. It's enough to make any narcissists head spin.

There's the excuse perspective. Suddenly this one event can be used as a reason behind any failing - bad day, negative attitude, trouble, psychological or physical ill health, bad habits... a catch all excuse for absolving of responsibility.

Society has also twisted things so that now to claim victimhood does - in some circles - imbue you with power and entitlement, and a community (often "fake" social media communities).

Not to mention all the other reasons behind claiming rape - buyers remorse for consensual sex that she regrets.

A way to get back at someone who she feels has hurt or wronged her.

The hamster spinning is also quite strong in this, I think many girls who false claim rape come to believe they are being honest - or even if they recognise they are lying, that they are still in the right.

voomer53 • 7 points • 20 December, 2016 03:59 AM

Abuse is in fashion...try to find any female celebrity who has not already claimed abuse or rape in her past.

Toolman890 • 27 points • 19 December, 2016 07:29 PM

You gain male sympathy, and a woman's survival depends on it. She meets a man, confides to him her lie, she gains sympathy, and she feels a rush of comfort from his protective reaction (or the expectation of this reaction, even imagined, if telling the lie to a survey). A woman has to manipulate a man sexually and emotionally. Otherwise he's just going to walk away after he cums. A woman has to play victim and appear weak to manipulate a man emotionally. Just how our brains work.. child, puppy, woman.. we are wired to protect the weak to maintain the life cycle.

The caught in the act lie is obviously about her survival. Otherwise she's a social outcast and dies.

le_king_falcon • 12 points • 19 December, 2016 05:04 PM

Ahh yes I could be boiling it down too much as the benefits that can ensue are their own forms of power IMO.

Whether it's attention, virtue signalling, camouflage for their own mistakes, even the removal of agency and a pulpit to speak from.

I'm looking forward to seeing what you are driving towards and hopefully some good discussion too.

conquerlifegroup • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 07:12 AM

Beyond excited to see where this goes...

nodoxsavefreespeech • 12 points • 19 December, 2016 06:19 PM **[recovered]**

what the direct benefit is to being a victim

it allows people to completely absolve themselves of any agency.

nothing is EVER my fault

vengefully_yours • 35 points • 19 December, 2016 06:48 PM

If you're a victim, then anything you do to your attacker is acceptable. If you can make yourself into a victim without actually being one, then you have carte blanche to do as you please. That allows the weak to use the masses to overcome the strong.

coffee_34 • 11 points • 19 December, 2016 08:17 PM

It's like a false flag attack.

The best way to attack someone is to make yourself look like a victim while doing so.

[deleted] • 13 points • 19 December, 2016 10:04 PM

Funny enough, I see the victim mentality almost daily on TRP. Men blaming society and women for their misfortune.

ShrimShrim • 7 points • 20 December, 2016 05:48 AM

This is literally the foundation of TRP. These men are victims to stronger men, and women who don't desire them. TRP is *founded* on victimization.

theoctopuss • 0 points • 20 December, 2016 02:17 PM

Unless you're a man. Regardless of what society thinks, others (women included) will think you're a puss if you act like a victim. You'll get nothing more than pity acting as a victim.

supremelummoX • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 10:02 PM

It ain't my fault! Sums it up nicely

vandaalen • 4 points • 19 December, 2016 10:37 PM

As always when this comes up, I heavily recommend reading about "Where microaggressions really come from: A sociological account":

Campbell and Manning describe how this culture of dignity is now giving way to a new culture of victimhood in which people are encouraged to respond to even the slightest unintentional offense, as in an honor culture. But they must not obtain redress on their own; they must appeal for help to powerful others or administrative bodies, to whom they must make the case that they have been victimized. It is the very presence of such administrative bodies, within a culture that is highly egalitarian and diverse (i.e., many college campuses) that gives rise to intense efforts to identify oneself as a fragile and aggrieved victim.

FerociousOreos • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 07:30 PM

People validate victims through attention and support.

I look forward to part 2.

TheRedPillRipper • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 09:03 PM

Being a victim is easier. Being a perpetrator is harder simply because perpetrating anything involves a conscious action. Humans over time have evolved to make things easier for ourselves. Crying rape is just a natural progression. It's easier to be a victim than reflect and analyse your own actions.

If the Red Pill truly brings success to men who adopt it, then why would any man remain in a blue pill stupor?

They remain because it's easier. It's easier to consciously believe The Blue Pill Fairy Tale than gaze into the abyss and have it gaze back in to you.

goldnhorde • 6 points • 19 December, 2016 05:09 PM

it isn't just that easy.

it is also about socialization and lowering the bar / moving the window.

1. socialization - "wow ... over half women you know are raped ... why wasn't I raped? or was I raped and didn't know it?". now let me go ahead and say, we've already seen enough women just plain not give a crap about destroying someone else's life as long as they meet their goal. and this goal would be: "to be interesting", "to be a valued victim", "(really sounds bad but) show attractiveness".
2. lowering the bar / moving the window - organizations redefining rape in terms that when you see some of them explain it is horrifying, because it means most men have been raped by women.

and for all that "being part of the group" just look at the lengths of which women went through in the 90s to be all lesbian you know ... for a year or two and suddenly weren't again ... but somehow can't stop talking about it ... you know, to make it off their bucket list of lifetime movie achievements.

if you are bi, then be bi, but I am talking about the women who have no intentions of ever being with a women again in bed or a relationship.

KriegerAleks • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 07:43 PM

I've said this to many many female friends "if you have to ask". If you have to ask and wonder if you should do something, chances are you shouldn't. If you have to ask if you were right, chances are you weren't. If you have to ask if you were raped, you very very likely weren't

MattyAnon • 118 points • 19 December, 2016 06:46 PM

Rape is one of a peculiar subset of crimes: it is *gender specific* (male rape victims are denied, ignored and shunned by society to maintain this).

Anything that is gender specific cannot be compared to other crimes. It affects one gender only.

Women have a large in-group bias (women will always favour their own point of view over men). [Scientific fact]. Men have a small *out-group* bias (men will slightly favour women over their own gender). [Scientific fact].

Women leverage this constant bias-in-their-favour in concert with the "men and women are equal except when women are to be favoured".

Being a rape victim makes her (and other women) desirable, they get to be the prize, and they go to be *the victim* all at the same time. There is no downside *to women* of rape being labelled the most heinous crime imaginable (so we're told).

Rape happens, let's not forget that. But it's rare. But pretending it's extremely common lets women play the constant victim card, provides leverage against men (threats to call the police), AND absolves her of responsibility for sex. She gets to claim it wasn't consensual any time she likes, and the world is all too ready to believe her. Especially if she can muster up a few false tears.

For this absolution of sexual responsibility to work, men must be portrayed as rapists. All women collude with this lie, and men (biased towards women don't forget) will join in with this in order to out-compete other men. "Those sexist rapist bastards, I'm not like they are".

Quick aside on gender-specific crimes:

Gold digging. Almost universally female on male crime. Defined to be "not a crime". Pretending to love a man to steal his resources through sham marriage. Society deems this "not a crime" and blames the man for his poor choice.

Fake-rape prosecutions. Female on male crime. Defined to be "not a crime" in order to protect other women who may wish to come forward. The male victims are thrown under a bus. Men are blamed for this because either "other men actually do rape" or "we bet you did it really". There is never any social forgiveness for a crime that never happened.

Sperm Jacking. Female on male crime. Defined as "not a crime" and child support is mandatory regardless of circumstances.

Abortion of a man's child. Female on male crime. Defined as "not a crime". (The converse: keeping a child against a man's will is of course "not a crime". Forced abortion of a woman's child is defined as murder, but abortion chosen by the mother is "it's my body" and therefore "not a crime" in most states and countries. The woman is always prioritised over both the father and the child.)

Paternity fraud. Female on male crime. Defined as "not a crime". Men are made responsible for their children even if they're not actually their children.

Rape. Male on female crime. Defined as "the worst and most heinous crime imaginable" and men are imprisoned and murdered for it.

TL;DR Male on female crimes are the worst crimes imaginable, female on male crimes are totally fine and the man is held responsible for these too.

[deleted] • 13 points • 19 December, 2016 10:04 PM

Being a rape victim makes her (and other women) desirable,

Not sexually. I'd say that it counts as a big red flag for even a non-redpilled man. That's a lot of luggage, and also the possibility of it being a lie.

london042 • 8 points • 19 December, 2016 11:25 PM

Bingo, there was a post stating all of the problems a "rape victim"

Now to be clear, it was stating all the mental baggage and problems of a REAL rape victim, there were so many things that would go wrong with the relationship and no upsides, basically a ruined woman from the details of how the girl would be broken and horrible to be with in so many ways.

Now we have the fake bs rape victim, your feminazi hr ~~independant woman~~! little girl that was in the room with mr ceo and called rape for that big ass lawsuit or sally that got plowed by chad but sarah saw her and told her beta bob bf about it.

Any woman that claims to have been raped/sexually assaulted, STAY FAR AWAY or be VERY cautious with plate status at MOST.

you are right with it is a very huge red flag. and everyone should read this

Overkillengine • 8 points • 20 December, 2016 09:32 AM*

Indeed, men should treat any women whom claim to be a rape victim, regardless if true or not, the same way they would treat hazmat.

- 1) Stay at a safe isolation distance and avoid interaction when possible.
- 2) When avoidance is impossible, wear protective gear at all times and act with supreme caution.

Anything good a man could get out of either situation (true claim or false claim) could instead be obtained with far less risk elsewhere. Some will see this as selfish on the part of men without realizing or caring that the fiat power a rape claim gives a woman is potentially lethal.

Trying to survive and not be a victim is **not** selfish.

RedPillWriter • 39 points • 19 December, 2016 09:39 PM

Women have a large in-group bias (women will always favour their own point of view over men). [Scientific fact]. Men have a small out-group bias (men will slightly favour women over their own gender). [Scientific fact].

So my work involves citation and referencing standards and this really bothers me. Square brackets "[]" are usually reserved for citation numbers, when you put the reference list at the bottom of the text. Putting "Scientific fact" within square brackets (presumably for stressing the point?) is like giving the finger to the scientific method and all science. It's a joke.

Seriously, if you are going to quote something as a "scientific fact", you may as well shoot up Google Scholar and get that citation there. Or at least don't use square brackets - we have **bolding** and *italics* and all kinds of shit.

kevin32 • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 02:51 AM

I was thinking something similar, like he meant to link to the facts using Reddit syntax, but either forgot, it got auto-removed, or maybe there never was a reference. I'm somewhat of a source-nazi at times.

lifeisnotverygood • 0 points • 19 December, 2016 11:56 PM

is like giving the finger to the scientific method and all science. It's a joke.

Maybe that was his point.

nkfarwell • 10 points • 19 December, 2016 11:43 PM

Men have a small out-group bias (men will slightly favour women over their own gender). [Scientific fact].

you are aware that outgroup bias is another naming convention for the outgroup homogeneity effect, not upside-down ingroup bias, yes? no?

that and citing your claims with the scholarly source "[scientific fact]" lead me to believe you're a moron

tk421awol • 1 points • 20 December, 2016 10:22 PM [recovered]

(A) Do you dispute that the things he stated were fact are actually factual?

(B) You are correct that he used "out-group bias" incorrectly. However, can you cite a source stating that out-group bias is "outgroup homogeneity effect"? My understanding is that out-group bias is out-group bias is the tendency towards negative feelings for those not like ourselves, or simply bias against those in the out-group. It is very different from outgroup homogeneity effect, which is the tendency to assume everyone in the out-group is the same, aka stereotyping.

(C) You failed to cite any sources to substantiate your claim.

Should I insult you with your own word because I don't like your lack of citation and choice of words? Or can we keep this a civilized discussion? If I wanted to debate and argue (rather than discuss) with excessive ad hominem attacks, there are many other subreddits I would visit instead of TRP.

nkfarwell • 0 points • 21 December, 2016 02:22 PM

hahahahaha holy fucking shit dude you can't even google. i'm sure you're very popular with the ladies anyhow

We_Are_Legion • 2 points • 23 December, 2016 09:54 AM

Abortion of a man's child. Female on male crime. Defined as "not a crime". (The converse: keeping a child against a man's will is of course "not a crime". Forced abortion of a woman's child is defined as murder, but abortion chosen by the mother is "it's my body" and therefore "not a crime" in most states and countries. The woman is always prioritised over both the father and the child.)

The amount of hamstering on abortion rattles my brain. I am certain history would consider it as one of the more barbaric and heinous practices if it weren't for women's ability to gain sympathy over a faceless child.

MattyAnon • 1 point • 23 December, 2016 04:21 PM

I'm not decided on the abortion issue, except I'm fed up of the female double standards ("killing my baby is murder! unless I do it!").

ETRossier • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 03:38 AM [recovered]

Yeah man, you're going to want to cite that "scientific fact" stuff. That is, if you don't want to make a complete fool of yourself.

tk421awol • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 10:09 PM [recovered]

Yeah, because referencing things that any man on this board should have read for himself and been familiar with is totally making a fool of yourself, especially when it is just SOOOOOO difficult to locate online.

throw17453 • 20 points • 19 December, 2016 07:18 PM

Your attitude in this post, intellectual attitude, is refreshing.

We, as a group, think we've got a better handle on reality than most... at least, when it comes to sexual strategy. But there's a chance we're very, very wrong. And that's okay in my mind.

It stands in stark contrast to a more common attitude I see here, where people are pushing ideas with 100% certainty. There is no nuance, no doubt... we understand how women work, how men work, society, politics etc.

I'm aware that from some perspectives, unwavering assuredness and confidence in whatever view you hold can have benefits. Rhetorically it makes your views more persuasive and impactful, from a frame perspective it is also stronger, and it could be argued that it is more "masculine" to take that kind of attitude.

However in terms of seeking truth, reality, intellectual integrity... you lose something by taking such an attitude - and shut yourself off to growth. Your post emphasises one of the tenets of scientific knowledge and advancement. Doubt everything.

The relativity point is an interesting one to me - I think in time it, like Newtons laws of classical physics, will be shown to be an incomplete // incorrect account. Yet one that at the time best explained observable phenomena and current scientific understanding.

[deleted] • 4 points • 19 December, 2016 08:07 PM

a lot of it is pushing for men to have irrational confidence. What kind of answer do you expect to see in a man starting out?

the nuance comes with time

throw17453 • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 09:06 PM

Having irrational self confidence is - to me - something completely different.

It ties closer with developing a DGAF attitude, developing a strong and independent sense of self, and simply going out in the world and achieving whatever you set your mind to.

What kind of answer do you expect to see in a man starting out?

I'm starting out, and in many ways far behind most people here, but what I mean is this.

The recognition that some doubt in your beliefs, values, theories and world view is actually reflective of strength of character, and mind.

I do not - however - mean doubt in yourself. You should have complete belief in yourself not because it is accurate, true or anything else, but because it builds a strong sense of self, and creates a mindset that will propel you to succeed.

Rhythmic • 3 points • 20 December, 2016 01:51 PM

Our minds give us hacks rather than truth. Hacks is all we've got. Or we could call them

'appearances.'

Don't worship your appearances.

I do not - however - mean doubt in yourself. You should have complete belief in yourself not because it is accurate, true or anything else, but because it builds a strong sense of self, and creates a mindset that will propel you to succeed.

No human was ever *'wrong'*. Opinions always are. We are biologically hardwired to confuse the two. Classical physics was never 'true,' just hugely useful. In reality, there are no 'zeros' and 'ones,' yet they rule our lives.

There is no 'spoon.' The map is never the territory. The true Tao cannot be explained.

This is a bitter red pill to swallow.

The intellect is best used for contemplating its own inherent limitations. We use it for hamstering instead: sewing fig leaves together to cover our 'nakedness.'

Our status-consumed monkey brains crave being 'right.' And we'll fight to the death to deny this.

I'm curious where this thread series will go.

There's certainly some good intention behind the highly controversial title. Unfortunately, it lends itself to evil interpretations. I hope nobody gets hurt.

Back to your point:

because it builds a strong sense of self

You are onto something very important here.

You call it a 'sense of self.' I'd rather call it '**internal validation.**'

This is something we all have to learn - very much like standing upright, talking, reading or doing math - but most people never do. I don't claim to have it all the time either.

People who lack internal validation resort to what I call '**worthiness crutches:**' external things I believe my worth should depend on:

Maybe I have swag.

Maybe I have a cool car/job/degree.

Maybe I am smart.

Maybe I am talented.

Maybe I am rich/ Maybe I am not an evil capitalist.

Maybe I am righteous.

Maybe I am RP/ the whitest knights of all.

Maybe I am above these things.

If I missed your particular crutch, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to.

(BTW, these things can be quite awesome - as long as we don't abuse them as crutches.)

Worthiness crutches are based on comparison with others, which makes relying on them a losing game: because somebody always *has to* lose. Somebody else *has to* be less awesome than me - or I'm gonna feel like shit.

Choosing to play this game is a strategic error that we are hardwired to make. It's '*natural*' so to

speak.

Staying enslaved by this drive keeps us locked within the cycle of eternal suffering.

Awareness of what's going on is the first step toward freedom. Rather than trying to hamster this away, we should stay vigilant to our natural tendencies.

What worthiness crutch am I clinging to right now?

Remember, you can't base your sense of worth on not having a worthiness crutch (or rather - on successful denial).

Keep your friends close. Keep your 'enemies' closer.

The moment you make yourself believe that you've killed the hamster, it has you by the balls once again.

And I saw a hamster come out of the sea. And I tried to hamster it away - so it looked like it was dead, but it wasn't really.

You wanna **get rid of me, Jake?** Me Me Me? BOOM!

Hahahaha! Still here, Jake!

To me, the RP is about realizing that we all are slaves to appearances. It's easier to observe it in others first, but the ultimate challenge is to realize that I'm no '*better*' - and I don't have to.

Trying to be '*better*' is based on comparison. It's external, it's a crutch.

By virtue of being human, people will judge me based on appearances, in particular, on the appearance of '*status*' - which was never '*true*,' only useful for outprocreating one's peers.

I can play the game of manipulating appearances - without believing them - and get better treatment from others.

I can also become aware how I myself have been a slave to appearances - and start taking them with a grain of salt.

Shit, this got too long. I'd better stop now.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 09:10 PM

irrational self confidence.

mummersfarce_is_done • 3 points • 20 December, 2016 08:06 AM*

I think it is because their aim is different. Unless someone is a true master at a concept, the self-assuredness is mostly a result of trying to **win an argument** rather than finding truth. It is an ego stroke. Its aim is to obtain emotional satisfaction through superiority. I even suspect this is not a case of irrational self confidence, but **concealed insecurity**. Because who else needs to feel superior? People with low insecurity have that need.

Truth seeking in a debate is just about that, truth seeking. Such people don't find it hard to concede points when they are convinced to be on the wrong via demonstration. Of course when these two distinct types come into a debate, the first one usually draws the latter into his own game rather than the other way around. Because it is hard to concede points when your opponent is looking for that sadistic satisfaction of your shortcomings. It is a healthy attitude to deny that opportunity to a sadist. Maybe that's why truthseeking is

not as common as the other one. The other is much easier to spread.

However if a truthseeker is very adept at calming other emotionally upset people, then it is possible to cure the other person into a proper debate. But for a proper debate to occur, the emotions need to be addressed first. But only and only then. Unfortunately, this happens much rarer on a broad scale.

Note: I also think my response is a good example of being self-assured (as well as yours), while not trying to "win" a debate. If you propose counter points, then I would be glad to listen. I think **this** is the correct masculine attitude. Self-assured, masterful (hopefully I'm not deluded on this one) but always ready to learn more.

Everyone has some knowledge in light of their experiences, and they need them to apply into their life to prosper. They can not be in *constant doubt* about their knowledge *all the time*, otherwise life would be impossible. "Do I need food to stay alive? Hmm I'm not sure, lets try. (when going to acquire food) Wait a second! How could I know this feeling in my stomach means I need food?" Can not live life like that. But at the same time, one needs to be open to change in light of new information. So both being solid and flexible, is the way to go if you ask me.

throw17453 • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 07:01 PM

I agree with you.

I like to view TheRedPill as very much focused on truth, and not so concerned with ego, winning arguments, status, validation etc.

Now many people here do fall into that category, it is one of few places you can actually talk openly about aspects to human nature that some would deny, or find distasteful.

However there are also a lot of ego seekers, people who love the validation of an upvote, or people incapable of having their mind or views changed on a topic, because they cling to their views emotionally - and to be challenged on them would be taken as a personal affront more than a discussion of ideas.

Now that is just because this place is made up of human beings, who are largely emotional, irrational and egotistical - all things I've been guilty of to greater or lesser extents in the past.

Your point is interesting though, some of the best discussions or experiences I have had with someone person to person, are when they have made me look at the world differently, reassess my own views or just cause me to see something in a different way than I did before. I've also had quite a few times where I've had that effect on others.

Being able and eager to the possibility of having your views challenged or changed without taking it personally or emotionally is something fundamentally good - but as you put it having the strength of your convictions and confidence in the views you hold at the same time.

[deleted] • 40 points • 19 December, 2016 04:55 PM

All models are wrong but some are useful

This is why I advocate ignoring the 'why' of these things. Our current system (masculinity, sexual marketplace) is still, and may always be, an Orrery... And we may never get it 100% right, but it's close enough to work in the imperfect world of interpersonal relationships.

It eventually gets more complex, taking more information into account, getting more accurate, but harder and longer to build. Eventually, a new Orrery is created that simplifies it. PUA became TRP by this system, and the next thing down the line will do that.

All models are wrong but some are useful

This is why arguments from purple pillers, blue pillers, white knights are always laughable, and worthy of shitposting at best. The entire argument tends to be it being wrong, and defending women by male standards of virtue... It completely misses the point

That's why TRP is simply guys swapping notes. The current Orrery, with thousands of men putting new gears together, aligning the planets closer to what we see. AWALT isn't predictive, it's descriptive of the large grey area female behaviour resides in. So it's always off the mark, but it's close enough to have a good guess where Uranus will be in 3 weeks, so we use it.

Focus less on why things are the way they are, focus on 'how' you work around them.

Olga_Schmutzer • 12 points • 19 December, 2016 07:31 PM

AWALT isn't predictive, it's descriptive of the large grey area female behaviour resides in. So it's always off the mark, but it's close enough

What a gem. You rose above yourself with this, I bookmarked it.

Always like your posts on marriedRedPill as well. I can really recommend everyone who's married or lives together with an LTR to take a look at the MRP-sub; you will find quality stuff from experienced guys who lift... lift heavy.

blue_dover • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 05:52 PM [recovered]

That's why TRP is simply guys swapping notes

Absolutely! Now that I have been on here for a few months or so - I see that this shit is quite common sense. Yes it was a good rush at the start because of the goldmine of information I had stumbled upon - But a lot of guys already know this shit. They might not know the terminologies such as AF/BB or hypergamy - but they already know the concepts and understand it.

Some of us were just the unfortunate ones who had to stumble upon TRP to understand these things.

vengefully_yours • 11 points • 19 December, 2016 06:54 PM

unfortunate ones who had to stumble upon TRP to understand these things.

Imagine having to figure it out before the internet, before cell phones, before any quality books were written about it, but in a world where you were told the blue lie. Many men my age are fucked, because they'll never learn how to do this. I know incel 50 year olds, and others of us are fucking college girls.

You're fortunate that it's here, equally so that you read it and it clicked rather than your mind running home to the blue nightmare.

[deleted] • 9 points • 19 December, 2016 08:50 PM*

Men used to pass this knowledge down. It came from fathers, brothers, elders in your tribe (neighborhood)

There are too few men with knowledge today. Too many pajama boys raised by pot bellied fathers afraid of being hit with a frying pan.

Getting our message out today is only possible via Internet

BluepillProfessor • 7 points • 19 December, 2016 10:18 PM

Nobody needed to figure it out. Men were allowed to have male spaces and male clubs not that long ago. Further masculinity was valued not long ago. Not long ago older men and fathers told younger

men the truth at a young age. This is much harder to do when you only see your kid on Wednesday and every other weekend and when it is virtually impossible to speak anything without a female overlord watching and weighing your words.

angryguy4444 • 0 points • 20 December, 2016 09:27 AM

70 years ago feminism wasn't a thing.

[deleted] • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 10:32 AM

That is not true at all. <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Feminism> read

RedEyesBlueShades • 1 point • 24 December, 2016 01:58 PM

I had an entire post on 'why' vs 'how' basically making the same point as you. Check it out, I'd be interested in your opinion. Alas, it was not well received even by senior contributors...

Needless to say, agree 100% with you.

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 December, 2016 06:48 PM

Well, with the assumption I know what I'm doing, and the disclaimer that *no one has ever paid one shiny nickle for anything I've ever written*

There is a difference. I'd say the big reason you were getting more pushback than me (and I got plenty when I posted mine, people love autism) was; You start off by painting a much different picture. kids bickering, and you find it fun, but serious talk guise. a few jabs for the reader being poor at arguments etc. and then use it to show why bickering on the internet isn't worthwhile. A few examples of people blindly walking into scenarios, and I think that some better anecdotes could be used.

TBH, I'll bet if you go back to this, flesh out the main point I took from it (Starting your argument with WHY exposes your HOW conclusions to attack) may end up with a much better post. It's still too much thinking, not enough doing for my liking, but that is preference. I take TRP with the approach that action influences thought. either way, if I look at your summary, the post doesn't really solidify those points in my mind.

I agree with your premise, but it's not the same thing.

I didn't know I was doing it, until someone else pointed it out. For me, the why vs how is really a landing point. It's simplifying what TRP is for, for the reader. When you start reading, it's reiterating that most OG red pillers talked about it like an engineering problem. try X, receive result Y. Eventually call it something if it's consistent.

It's calling out analysis paralysis, with a roadmap for RP. Lift, be attractive, don't be unattractive, you are the prize, and use your anger to better yourself. Swap notes with other guys, and try things until you find stuff that works

RedEyesBlueShades • 1 point • 25 December, 2016 06:29 PM

That nobody paid you for writing has nothing but a positive ring to me. Else I'd start suspecting you're good at writing, but not necessarily at thinking... since you'd be paid for writing.

Anyway, appreciate the feedback. Will clean it up, rephrase and repost. Cheers!!

Cyralea • 8 points • 19 December, 2016 07:37 PM

If the Red Pill truly brings success to men who adopt it, then why would any man remain in a blue pill

stupor? "Surely," he must think, "if there were men who had the keys to success and were able to demonstrate it, I should listen to what they say."

The answer is fairly simple, but requires you to go back far enough. Children absorb information uncritically during their adolescence. There's a strong evolutionary pressure there -- kids that were critical of their parents ideas simply died, because that lion looked really friendly to them.

Society is easily shaped in adolescence. Aristotle knew this: "Give me a child until he is seven and I will show you the man". It takes a *lot* of deprogramming to override this. We all know too well how often people spit up the red pill. People hold onto their childhood ideas really strongly.

Regarding rape, that's one of the toughest red pills for people to swallow. I recall a bit I wrote 2 years ago, and it's still one of the most controversial pieces in TRP history.

Looking forward to your next post.

interestedplayer • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 09:57 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Cantloginhere • 4 points • 19 December, 2016 05:36 PM

In my town (UK, 100k) the local rag has featured at least 3 rape trials in the last month or so. Two were one night stands where they even admitted giving consent before hand, yet still put these guys on trial because they regretted it. The other a 14 year old stalker angry at getting told no.

Luckily all the guys were exonerated in full because they had witnesses.

What if anything happened to the women as a result of false allegations was not reported.

Not that long ago there was also town wide manhunt for a black guy that attacked a student coming home from a club. Days later she admitted making it all up.

Seems like a fairly new and frequent trend of either women being misled about what rape is, or even worse the courts wising up. Worse because that means it could have been going on undetected for a while.

[deleted] • 6 points • 20 December, 2016 03:58 AM

Since these always devolve into people arguing with OP over trivial shit I might as well have a go.

Why lie outright when statistics can do it for you?

If I was writing a survey to gauge how many Women had been sexually assaulted, and my funding was based on this, it's in my interest to inflate this number.

So what I would do is ask a question like "Has you or **anyone you know** been groped or touched inappropriately in a sexual manner? (This allows for a much wider range of things to be included as I get to determine it all as sexual assault as opposed to what she thinks was sexual assault, I don't want her making her own mind up on whether or not she's a victim do I?)

What it also does is allow for 1 incident to be included multiple times.

Example.

10 Girls are out on a night out and Rebecca gets groped and tells the dude to fuck off. She doesn't consider it

sexual assault, she laughs it off and moves on.

Now the next day a sociology grad gives a survey to those 10 Women and asks the questions

Have you, or anyone you know, ever been grabbed inappropriately, or had someone make unrequested physical contact etc etc

Now 9 of these Women saw Rebecca get grabbed so seeing the "or anyone you know" part of the question answer "yes" As does Rebecca.

Now when you tally it up, you have Rebecca getting some titty grabbing and hey presto, now it's 10 sexual assaults.

Now you take your "100%" rate of sexual assault and apply for emergency funding.

I sense many tendies will be dropped over this, and the upcoming threads. Hell I might even check out the blue pill just for the lulz.

ReddittFeist • 32 points • 19 December, 2016 05:33 PM*

What part of "*When a woman does get raped for real and talks about it, she's not lying*" do you not understand?

I agree with Mike Cernovich and certain politically incorrect LEOs that it's likely that the majority of rape claims are FRAs.

But women, and men, do get raped, and it's really nasty. And it's real.

Sophistry will get you nowhere.

Overhyped claims like "*all women*" are nonsense. I know counterexamples.

A more accurate title like "*Lying about assault (sexual or otherwise) is a hardwired female strategy*" would have been a lot more credible.

Joseph_the_Carpenter • 35 points • 19 December, 2016 07:01 PM

"When a woman does get raped for real and talks about it, she's not lying"

I am involved in studying and treating individuals with PTSD, rape victims included among them. The real rape victims do not talk about their experiences on social media or brag about their victimhood. They feel shame and paranoia and suffer silently. You can bet if someone is screaming to the world on twitter or to a news site that they were raped it's a safe bet they are making it up.

london042 • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 11:42 PM

like comments below this is very accurate,

triggered ppl are screeching "all women aren't lying about rape!"

but as you say, the real victims are quiet, no doubt any woman that randomly states it or shouts it out is lying

max_peenor • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 05:36 PM

Overhyped claims like "*all women*" are nonsense. I know counterexamples.

So, having grown up deep in a catholic community, there was a saying I think is relevant--one only spoken

and laughed at when the adults were drinking way too much.

Every catholic is a christian except those that don't believe in god.

Our identities are convoluted amalgamations of our names, our associations, our conditions and, frankly, what others assume about us. When we say "all women," we mean it. However, an individual woman's identity might be more complex.

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 09:46 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

nrafield • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 07:32 PM

It is a complicated matter. From your example, supposedly, it would not be that hard to determine if a rape actually took place as the differences in the consequences and evidence between rape and voluntary sexual intercourse would not be hard to notice. On the other hand as I don't live in the USA, and such a thing as frequent rape (in particular) and false rape accusations aren't so prevalent in my country. And this leaves one the question: How can you ever hope to judge something at all unless you've had a lot of personal experience with it? But, well, that's what many people do.

But, as there's been a ton more stuff involving lots of people being told one thing when in truth it was something else, I get your point. However, no matter what pieces of puzzle you discover and glue together, there's always the answer which seems to be elusive: Why?

Yes, we can trace these things to a certain point. Why do unreasonably rich people exist? Because someone at some point had worked for all that wealth. Why are women attracted to these kinds of men? Because of the wealth, and because of the positive trait that wealth implies.

But why did it all have to end up like this? If reproduction was the ultimate goal, why did not everyone just evolve into plants and survive through photosynthesis and be free to reproduce as much as you wish without shafting anyone? How about remaining microorganisms? There is much more of them than humans, and yet most of them hardly influence the human life at all.

Because of this missing piece of puzzle, everything feels like in doubt to me. How can we be sure women act like they do because of evolutionary reasons? How can we be sure that there isn't another approach to women that works better than being an alpha male? Generalizations are good to a certain point, but ultimately, if you wish to actually understand stuff, I feel it would only limit you. Especially when there are exceptions.

BluepillProfessor • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 08:00 PM

If the Red Pill truly brings success to men who adopt it, then why would any man remain in a blue pill stupor?

You underestimate the power of social conditioning. Social forces can make a man do many things that are against his interest. They can make a man jump up a ditch and charge a machine gun while his compatriots are falling all around him like wheat being harvested. Surely it can make a man defer to women- especially when that is how we all started our lives!

By what mechanism would we have been able to determine the extent to which it was not true?

By having male spaces and strong fathers and other masculine role images. This is why feminists have largely destroyed male spaces, fatherhood and masculinity. Now we have no way of knowing until we read The Red Pill or we look back on a lifetime of failures and open our eyes for the first time. You know why we use the whole

Red Pill analogy. It is often a very painful welcome to the real world moment.

There must be Many red pills.

This would seem to contradict your "boundaries" post. If there are many Red Pills, exactly what borders are we defending?

Of course there are many versions of truth and Red Pill is "truth" but as Pilate said:

Quid est veritas?

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 08:02 PM

This would seem to contradict your "boundaries" post. If there are many Red Pills, exactly what borders are we defending?

I'll expand on this in the future, but I don't mean to say there are multiple sexual strategies that are equally effective- rather there are other places in life where we are conditioned to have biases that prevent us from having working world views.

[deleted] • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 08:34 PM

Without giving up identifying details, I was accused of *attempted rape* in university.

The real story is a girl who was long term *crashing* in a fraternity house (summer session) flirted during a drinking game, invited me to her room, then got afraid when she couldn't unlock her own fucking door, and threw out the assault charges after *escaping*

I'll be watching this thread for an explanation of her behavior because to this day I have no real idea why she did what she did. We never spoke again (advice from attorney) so your guess is as good as mine

london042 • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 11:51 PM

you should make a post, because this sounds interesting and fucking mentally retarded.

this is what I imagine.

Her: hey chad want to come to my room? :) you: ight

her: *gets in room and locks door*

you: lets watch a movie or some shit

her: *makes sure door unlocks incase he's a beta that doesn't pass my shit*

gets nervous because door won't open, and I might be stuck with this guy that obviously wants to fuck me, oh no please help I'm trapped and he's literally plowing me, theres no way a guy can come in to protect me if this guy turns out to be beta and thinks I want his dick i'm defenseless someone call the police.

door opens because her dumb ass turned it wrong

her: you raped meeeee!!!

sailorJery • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 11:35 PM

I don't know. I'm a good looking guy and during my nightclub days I was sexually assaulted pretty regularly, I just didn't think it was a big deal because I was never in fear for my life from fat women or gay bears.

Forcetobereckonedwit • 3 points • 20 December, 2016 07:27 AM

Personally, what I find much more fascinating is not *why* or *that* women lie about rape, it is the societal *importance* of rape.

The act in and of itself could be equated with someone physically overcoming or coercing a male into accepting said aggressor's finger shoved up their ass. Granted, I'm sure that that would be uncomfortable, annoying, demeaning, embarrassing, and angering. I'm sure it would create feelings of impotence, subjugation, weakness and the like. BUT, the hue and cry about the rape of a female, the social outrage at anything even approaching non-consensual penetration of a vagina, anus, or mouth by a penis, or other object, in a sexual manner, is completely out of proportion to the actual crime. The public shaming, the media circus, the disgust, the aggression by other males and females towards the *rapist*...there's something very strange going on here.

I have been trying to unpack it (as *they* say lately) and what sticks out to me is very red pill. The level of social outrage and consequences attached to what is called rape is purely a function of the RP truth that dominion over the vagina is sacred and forms the entirety of the female's value. She is the all powerful vaginator and thou shalt not access it without Her permission.

Males automatically build bridges, create cities, provide methods of transportation, create metal, plastic, farms, all manner of food production (the list is almost endless)...women gestate and nurture babies. Of course females *can* do those typically male endeavors, and many do, but males just do it, have always done it, and will always do it. It is a given. It goes un-noticed, un appreciated, unremarked. The female is the womb and that is her job. The male is the womb support system, and that is his job. You can complain about it all you want. You can try and change it all you want, but there it is.

Back to rape: The vagina and it's caretaker the woman, are sacrosanct and not to be violated. Rape denies the woman's decision in a possible procreation. The woman is to only accept the best sperm into her vagina for the betterment of the species and rape changes that completely.

Of course there are "rapes" where horrible violence occurs. There are brutal attacks that involve sexual invasion. There are also "rapes" where age or alcohol related non-consent are involved, but the outrage remains the same. "Oh my god, so-and-so got RAPED!". "That guy's a RAPIST". It is wholly different than a solely physical attack. Why?

Am I making any sense here? I'm having a hard time putting my thoughts into a coherent theme and I think I've gone far enough anyway.

Thoughts?

DoesNotMatterAnymore • 3 points • 20 December, 2016 09:06 AM*

Just to give you a NON-US perspective on this. I said this before, but the US is not treating rape as a crime. Why do i say that? Because in my country if someone cries rape, the situation is investigated by the POLICE and not SCHOOL BOARDS.

All these false rape accusations happens, because US bitches doesn't have to sit down and tell they story to a police officer.

If someone would ever accuse me for rape in my county, she has to prove it, - i know it's crazy - with facts.

Reading your stories, and the amount of rape happens in the US, sometimes i feel that you are posting from Somalia, or from some other fucked up African country.

Betterthanuatlife • 22 points • 19 December, 2016 07:04 PM

All women

You sure bout that buddy?

kevin32 • 10 points • 19 December, 2016 09:18 PM*

Given the deceptive, manipulative, gold-digging, attention-whoring nature of women, yes. But why would

women *lie* about rape, you ask? Well,

Women lie about rape if they regret having sex when it was consensual.

Women lie about rape to cover up their infidelity.

Women lie about rape if a man won't commit to a relationship after sex.

Women lie about rape to prevent being perceived as sluts when their sexual behavior is brought to light.

Women lie about rape to blackmail men for money or position.

Women lie about rape to get rid of men at their school or workplace.

Women lie about rape for leverage in family court.

Women lie about rape to publicly ruin the reputations of men.

Women lie about rape to indirectly brag about how desirable they are, the same reason they post Creepy PMs.

Women lie about rape if they regret having sex when it was consensual.

Women lie about rape for attention.

Women lie about rape for revenge.

Women lie about rape if caught in a sexual act that would cause shame or damage their reputation.

Women lie about rape because doubting their claim is socially reprehensible and anti-feminist.

Women lie about rape because they don't want to be held accountable for their actions.

Women lie about rape for public validation and praise for being a "rape survivor".

Women lie about rape because they'd likely get a slap on the wrist if they confessed or were caught lying about it.

Women lie about rape if they regret having sex when it was consensual.

Women lie about rape because the justice system tends to rule in their favor because they're women and by proxy, "victims".

If you consider the benefits of just a *handful* of these, you'd understand why false-rape accusations are so prevalent.

lurkingtacopiller • 6 points • 20 December, 2016 12:33 AM [recovered]

Blows my mind that someone can read this post, and then come to the comments have nothing to say except for nitpicking at the title. Looks like concern trolling season is back in full swing.

Rhythmic • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 03:39 PM

I found the post body very interesting. The title - meh.

To me, it's a given that rape claims are not always true. Let's not preach to the choir.

The problem I see with the title is that it can be interpreted as if *all* rape claims were false. Which would be a ridiculous claim. In an effort to appear confident, OP shot on his credibility. Which is sad, because the post itself is quite awesome.

I am all for fair investigations - which are lacking. But the title goes to an extreme. Many trolls will feast on it.

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 09:51 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Betterthanuatlife • 1 point • 21 December, 2016 02:29 PM

I'm not a newbie, I just consider generalizations to be dumb. A lot of women are evil, due to the

unlimited power that the system gives them, but to say everyone of them will accuse you of rape is just not true, and it's also a sign of paranoid schizophrenia. Clearly I don't know you as a person, maybe you have had a false rape accusation slapped on to you by some vindictive cunt, and if that's the case then you have my deepest sympathy and I can understand why you'd be a bit cautious. However not everyone share those experiences with you. And I refuse to believe that half of the world's population is evil just for having vaginas.

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 09:49 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Betterthanuatlife • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 02:23 PM

Why are you so sex obsessed? Why do you think that everything any man do they do for the sake of sex? Talk about putting pussy on a pedestal. Also refuting sweeping generalizations isn't being a "nice guy". If you think otherwise then you're basically the same as those feminists who claim that all men are rapists.

justinsayin • 7 points • 19 December, 2016 06:56 PM

So Women Lie About Rape?

Probably some women. But I think the problem is that the people who assemble these statistics are purposefully using flawed and leading survey questions in order to get the answers they want to report.

Pierre-Marouille • 9 points • 19 December, 2016 04:59 PM

Is it biologically possible for a man to maintain an erection while trying to overpower a woman ? I've personally lost my erection a few times while fighting against the packaging of a condom...

ryno55 • 19 points • 19 December, 2016 06:01 PM

Try not fucking fat chicks

ArkAngeEV • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 06:55 PM

crying rape gives women ~~power~~-attention. Fixed.

PowerVitamin • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 07:15 PM

Imagining a rape case (or exaggeration) validates their beauty that it can provoke a guy to the point of extreme action dominated by lust.

NihilistMonkey • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 11:10 PM

Very well said. I think too many people get caught up in the idea that there's just one TRP, or that it's a hard science. X is alpha, Y is beta, all women like/hate Z.

There's plenty that I've taken from here and utilized to great effect, and plenty that sounded like it was written by an angry manchild. There's plenty that sounded good but when I put it into practice decided it wasn't for me.

Very interested to hear where the rest of this is going.

favours_of_the_moon • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 12:24 AM

GayLubeOil (I think it was him) once told me, you know how all this shit goes around about how college

football players are all rapists? Why do women flock to those fraternity houses? Isn't that rapey?

Makes you wonder.

enfier • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 08:21 AM

It's not that complicated. There's a big gap between what women report as rape and what qualifies as rape in a questionnaire.

If her otherwise worthwhile husband and father of her kids gets drunk one night and forces her to have sex, she's not going to run down to the police station the next day and ruin her own life. But she might check the yes box on an anonymous survey.

If a college girl gets drunk and ends up waking up next to a hot guy the next morning, her brain will fill in the gaps for her. If he's below her standards she's going to have bad feels and that's going to show up on the survey, even if she rightly concludes that her hazy memory makes for poor evidence and it's not worth reporting.

There's also a whole host of situations where behavior that could be considered rape is considered acceptable by the woman. As an example, if a woman consents to her partner having sex with her if she becomes unconscious, how does that get reported on a survey?

What those statistics should state is that a certain percentage of women report behavior that could be considered rape. The women filling out the surveys often don't consider themselves victims of rape.

Woujo • 2 points • 20 December, 2016 05:03 PM

All Women Lie About Rape

That cannot possibly be true because there are some verified rapes. So those women aren't lying. And there are a lot of women who are never raped and never claimed to have been raped. So they're not lying either.

And I read all that text and didn't see anything about how all women lie about rape. I see that this is supposed to be part of some series but why don't you just come out and make your main point?

MikePatton-yakyakyak • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 10:21 AM

Fun fact: woman-on-woman rape is much more common than man-on-woman rape. Feminists conveniently gloss over this fact.

Hillarysdilddo_2016 • 2 points • 21 December, 2016 10:45 PM

If 1 in 6 women contracted a strange new disease, the CDC might shut down flights into and out of the country.

I get why you'd say that, but not really.

Remember CDC said some dude with Ebola riding the NYC subway was no big deal. Also CDC is very interested in "gun deaths" as a "public health issue" even when 2/3rds of their stats (30k/yr) are from suicides. Furthermore, the same number of deaths occur annually from vehicles yet there is not such an outcry for this "public health issue." Even more interesting is the fact that since pizzagate I have learned that up to 800,000 kids a year go missing (including runaways), and 260,000 go missing (abduction), and 60,000 per year are random pedos abducting kids.

60k kids getting raped (as in for real) / year is less of an issue for the CDC than 10K gun homicides / year.

Interesting? Not really.

CDC is a political organization that prioritizes leftist politics rather than public health concerns.

HP_civ • 4 points • 19 December, 2016 07:29 PM*

Hey, the basic premise here is in bad faith. We are all about bringing seriousness into the rape discussion and weeding out false accusations. This

Based on these numbers, one might start to wonder if a quarantine of men might start making sense. Or possibly segregation should be necessary to protect women.

However is just plain wrong. No one of the serious people actually said this. No one really wants this. This is making the other side look like something that it isn't, and it is in bad faith. Do not do that. You discredit TRP to everyone else with that and just feed the anti-TRP narrative.

According to the NSVRC, 46.4% lesbians, 74.9% bisexual women and 43.3% heterosexual women reported sexual violence other than rape during their lifetimes. That's almost half of the women you've met in your life.

Remember that it is "in your lifetime". You would need to divide one event through all the hours of a whole life. Then that number becomes very very low. Making the conclusion that "all" women lie is wrong and ignores the fact that they can heal from that event.

This text can be seen by opponents as downright malicious because it does not counter them at an argumentative level, but it only drowns them out, and what you drown them out with is very wrong or plain old bullshit. Once again, you are feeding the anti-TRP narrative. I am having a hard time publicly standing up for TRP as it is; do not make it harder.

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 09:59 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

JamesSkepp • 4 points • 19 December, 2016 05:21 PM*

All Women Lie About Rape

Even the ones that got raped and assaulted in Europe by the muslims?

see if you can guess my point in what any of this has to do with women lying about rape.

Narrative changes depending on circumstances/target audience.

This or it's a troll title to get the thinking going.

Edit:

Second (and a half) possibility:

Create a fake (fake - b/c it's irrelevant if they do or don't, it's not the point) narrative ("All women lie about rape"), then wait for readers to rally themselves after one of the possible groups representing major viewpoints. Basically a showcase how "fake news" can be created.

[deleted] • 19 points • 19 December, 2016 05:47 PM

You've been around long enough to know this already

1. title to weed out BP trolls, since they can't help but rage on controversy
2. article fleshing out actual thought

3. ban train cometh

I already see a good dozen of them coming. It's like magic, in slow motion.

though you're a bot, why bother talking to you>?

JamesSkepp • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 05:49 PM

Maybe yes, maybe not. I'm hoping for the "real" thread, not troll one.

[deleted] • 10 points • 19 December, 2016 06:00 PM

If you haven't figured it out, RPS post isn't about rape, or fake rape. GLO and others do the same often. bait with controversy, as a test to see if people are still in a BP mindset. Someone can only read the actual message if they can stow their outrage porn for long enough to make it to the second paragraph.

He's describing inconsistencies, and how to spot them. Rape is merely the example, there's hundreds of other examples to use, unfortunately, none of them get the ban train going

jimjackjoe • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 08:53 PM

Yeah the "all" in the title is a very deliberate choice of words. Remember Illimitableman's post titled something like "Single-Mothers are Disgusting Sub-Human Scum who Do Not Deserve to Exist?" That was a classic weeder-outer title. People were seriously posting comments like, "Yo illimitableman, you're still stuck in the anger phase bro. I thought you'd advanced beyond that and now I've lost respect for you." haha.

RadChadswell • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 07:25 PM **[recovered]**

Title - "All women lie about rape"

Content - "We should test theories against lots of observations and experience. Now I'm gonna say all women lie about rape, without stating ANY observations or experience to support that"

Maybe you should have waited to finish writing PART TWO before posting...

Nice clickbait, though.

redpillschool[S] • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 07:41 PM

I've got far more finished that I haven't posted yet. I think the smart fellas here can make a connection between the text saying "test theories" and then making an extraordinary claim such as "all women lie about rape." Can you guess what it is?

RadChadswell • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 07:49 PM **[recovered]**

Yes, of course, but that's irrelevant to the irony.

The irony is that you rambled for pages about the importance of having a claim backed up by personal evidence and observations, then made a claim supported (so far) by only speculative theories and implications. That's pretty fucking hilarious.

You could have just posted this first half with a different title, what this post is actually about, instead of starting with "All Women Lie About Rape" and not even writing about that part yet.

I called you on clickbait. Don't deflect.

redpillschool[S] • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 07:51 PM

It's there for a reason, those with working brains will put it together. Are you one of them?

[deleted] • 1 points • 19 December, 2016 07:54 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 07:57 PM

If you want people to put things together from implications and suggestions, you shouldn't spend multiple paragraphs arguing that conclusions need solid evidence and not just speculation. If you are capable of even basic logic, you should realize this.

Why? Are you lazy?

[deleted] • 0 points • 19 December, 2016 08:05 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 08:16 PM

Let's follow your logic for just a minute.

You're arguing "above me" but can't get figure out what it is I'm doing. I think you and I have different definitions of "above." Perhaps you mean on an autism spectrum.

I wrote something hinting what is to come. Correct.

You have a feeling where the argument is going. Okay.

3) In spite of that, you did not finish your post or even bother to spend 5 minutes summarizing where you intend to go. Would have been easy. You intentionally left a teaser, getting the audience to guess and speculate. You didn't need to do this. It was a conscious choice in how you presented your piece.

I didn't draw the conclusions for the reader. Agreed.

4) I'm criticizing you for that choice, for probing people to speculate after devoting so many paragraphs to the importance of evidence over just believing other people and speculation. i.e. your own argument discredits the approach you chose to take in presenting your post

My argument has an apparent contradiction, but doesn't discredit anything if my approach has a goal that you can't see. It's a little daft to think that *your* interpretation is the only possible one.

Why do that, in spite of the hypocrisy in choice of presentation?

If my goal had more to do with learning to draw conclusions or leave ego investment out while drawing conclusions, then the lesson is well taught with a subject that creates a visceral reaction and posting that gives long-time spans in between where people have the opportunity to do thinking and hypothesize between posts.

Or, like you, skip the thinking and go straight for calling it click-bait. Either way, your interpretation is lacking and assumes me a troll rather than somebody who puts energy into helping men.

[deleted] • 1 points • 19 December, 2016 09:09 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 09:12 PM

You're critiquing how people don't test gravity anymore, for example.

I genuinely don't think you read or comprehend anything that happens here.
Maybe you should try somewhere else.

RadChadswell • 0 points • 19 December, 2016 09:33 PM [recovered]

I'll dumb it down even further.

then the lesson is well taught with a subject that creates a visceral reaction and posting that gives long-time spans in between where people have the opportunity to do thinking and hypothesize between posts.

This is a noble goal. I support it. I think you failed to do it though. To hypothesize, they need to start with some observations about rape accusations. You can't assume all men have seen the same shit you've seen, and it's not practical for them to go out and provoke rape accusations. So you should give them some case studies to mull over. A springboard for hypotheses.

redpillschool[S] • 3 points • 19 December, 2016 09:53 PM

Checks post history, okay you're gone.

ktchong • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 11:51 PM*

"All women lie about rape."

All women? Every single one of them? Really?

If you make that sort of statement, then most likely you have actually raped a woman or women. You were just making up an excuse to disqualify all rapes - *for your own benefit*. i.e., if any woman accused you of rape, then she lied - because all women lie about rape. That statement of yours actually reveals a lot about *you*.

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 10:00 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 08:18 PM

Stefan Molyneux does a fucking amazing video about this comparing rape rates to the increased rate of unfounded domestic child abuse during divorce cases.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 08:25 PM

I'm going to continue this tomorrow, but feel free to discuss and see if you can guess my point in what any of this has to do with women lying about rape.

First off, disclaimer that of course all women don't lie about rape. But in TRP that's how we word things("AWALT" for example)

Some combination of:

Studies done on rape/sexual assault use broader definitions of rape or ambiguous questions("Have you ever had a sex when you didn't really want to?", "Have you ever had sex while drunk/on drugs", or "Have you ever regretted a sexual encounter") to determine if rape has occurred

Some sort of hamstering that results in power plays where women get attention and validation for claiming they were raped/assaulted, usually do this on social media (a subtext could be "I am so attractive that men want to rape me", though that is debateable)

Regardless of if it happens, rape often has no witnesses and can be proven by only the word of a person. Thus, you could infer some more trumping up of rape statistics from false accusations that are accepted as true.

MentORPHEUS • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 08:56 PM

In sociology, there is a concept called the Sick Role which posits that in the "sick" state, people have benefits such as being exempt from social and other obligations, and are considered *not responsible* for their condition. The sick role also includes obligations of trying to get well and seeking the help of competent health professionals toward this end.

I think "all" women lie about rape because society's Victim Role offers benefits such a marshaling the attention, protection, and resources of men *and* women. Feminists have made every effort to remove obligations from the "Victim" role, such as seeking the help of competent professionals (police), taking responsibility to avoid further danger (don't get blackout drunk among strangers or go home with a man you don't intend to sleep with), and maintaining their own life obligations (I knew an able bodied woman age 50 who has been ON THE DOLE FOR LIFE because she was allegedly molested by her father at age 13.)

Thus, the collective sisterhood broadening the definition of rape and destigmatizing perpetual victimhood makes *all* forms of **hypoagency** much easier for *all* women to get and maintain. This also serves **hypergamy** by providing an easy out for regret sex; with one word, a burden of guilt and shame can be shifted off the woman onto a man. This shift is a de-facto one-way street. Rape is an easy accusation to make and a difficult one to defend, and when an accusation is proven false beyond all reasonable doubt, there are almost never repercussions for the woman who made it.

IGoYouStayTwoAutumns • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 10:36 PM

There's a great quote from A COURSE IN MIRACLES (never thought I'd be quoting ACIM on the Red Pill but here ya go, paraphrasing slightly):

"To play the victim is to do nothing more than to attack others while professing your own innocence simultaneously."

Rape happens, yes, but it's far more rare than the media would have you believe. Last I checked the DOJ listed the current rape stats at 6 out of 1,000 (maybe someone can offer me updated numbers on this, if things have changed), that's right around one half of 1% of the female population.

The fact is: people who have been raped, ACTUALLY raped, almost never come forward and talk about it. **I know this because I (a man) was raped by my older male cousin when I was quite young, it went on for quite a while (I don't know how many times it happened but it was a lot, my memories are hazy, I was just a young child), my family was in complete denial about it (and still is, to some extent), and NO ONE EVER TALKED ABOUT IT EVER.** Least of all me.

Being a rape victim, it's kind of like being a war vet (or at least I imagine, I've never been to war, thankfully). You don't go around shouting out loud about the horrors that you've seen. You don't really talk about it all, in fact (except maybe with a good therapist). You just suck it up and get on with your life.

Roosh's observation (was it Roosh? Think it was) that **all public rape accusations are false**: I totally believe it. Totally true. My own experience (as a young child, raped by an older family member), I think (for men), is actually MUCH more common than society would like you to believe. But we never hear about it (certainly I never talked about it, later on life), because 1) we (the victims) feel guilty, ashamed, like WE did something wrong (though I'd like to think I'm over most of that by now), and 2) even if we did come out and say something, who would care? Society says: you're a man, we don't care if you were raped. Suck it up and deal with it. So we do. And society never hears a peep.

But women: when a woman screams from the ramparts: "I WAS RAPED!!"--what are they REALLY saying? Just like in the quote above, they're attacking other women while professing their own innocence simultaneously. The attack is: sorry ladies, but I AM MORE ATTRACTIVE THAN YOU. I'm more desirable. The alpha wants me more. So much more, in fact, that he's willing to risk imprisonment to have sex with me. That's how desirable I am. That's how intoxicating my body is. The alpha took me, ravished me, impregnated me. I am his. I have his protection. My babies will be safe this winter. I am the number one bitch in this tribe, and don't you dare cross me. ALL of that is inherent in the public "I was raped" cry. And then, at the same time, this: "But no, I am innocent of any wrong-doing. I am not attacking anyone. I am just stating how things are." It's incredibly twisted, but as a form of attack, as of a way jockeying for position, it's actually incredibly effective (those who've studied martial arts will tell you the indirect attack is usually more powerful and effective than the full on frontal assault).

Anyway yeah, we've got a lot of guys on this sub, I wonder how many of you also have examples of sexual abuse in your past (from an older relative, a mentor figure, whatever). And I wonder how many of you spoke up about it. I'm guessing: very few. And those of you who did: I wonder how much society cared. I'm guessing: not very much. And so you just learned to bear it silence. It sucks guys, I know. I hear you. I've been there (I guess you could say, I still AM there). But it is what it is. Like a war vet (or anyone with PTSD) you just learn to live with it and move on as best you can.

It's a pity, though, isn't it, that the women are taking all the headline space with their false rape accusations, all so they can appear more attractive, more desirable, to their peers. All that, for a little attention. All I can think is: wow, what a shame. That we give them all exactly what they want (attention), while completely ignoring the real rape victims all the while (because they don't have the courage to come forward).

cdennwb • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 10:38 PM

You seem to be coming at this topic very logically, so I am looking forward to your next rendition of this topic. As for this "Red Pill Philosophy", I have not adopted it nor do I plan to as it goes against one of my core principles: Do not judge the individual based on the population. I do, however, plan on looking at the argument from all sides.

In conclusion, I like your writing and your focus on facts and reason. Good luck.

joh2141 • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 12:27 AM

Reading To Kill A Mockingbird taught me women will lie about rape. Which sucks and ruins it for actual real victims whom the support should be going towards. Not some new aged girl who drank beer at a guys place and constituted that as date rape.

killcat • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 05:21 AM

To be fair the RAINN statistic, while very very wrong, is more likely constructive deception and statistical trickery on the part of RAINN, than the individuals lying.

ShrimShrim • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 05:50 AM

ITT: Victims of society bitch about victims of society.

stawek • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 08:15 AM

You should look into Darwinism, which stand in opposition to materialism.

In short: there may or may not exist absolute truth. It does not matter. What matters is the question: does the thing you know helps you prosper and multiply? If it does, it is *true enough*, no matter if it is in fact the "real" absolute truth. In this understanding TRP is true, even if some parts of it aren't.

For example, Einstein's relativity may be considered "real truth", but people have been living for millennia without knowing it. They knew that *things fall down and heavy things fall down faster*, which was in fact incorrect. It was good enough. As long as you remember not to step off a cliff, it makes no difference if gravity works as described by Einstein, Newton or Aristotle.

To this extent blue pill *was truth* up until recently. We cannot fathom it nowadays, but as little as 100 years ago women were truly dependant on men. 200 years ago a woman without husband would either turn prostitute or starve (yeah, she could be a maid or a teacher for rich children. In both cases she was also a prostitute, as one can't find another reason for the noblemen of the time to hire dozens of "maids"). Women *were* virgins on their wedding days. Women *were* taking care of their husbands, cause divorce was impossible. Women *were* needed and useful, cause an average man had no time to worry about cooking his meal or doing laundry. Women *were* faithful were it really mattered: the oldest child, who inherits everything can be reliably made by husband - marry a virgin and keep an eye on her at all times till she gets pregnant (that was her mother in law's job in most times). Blue pill *was true enough* for very long time, even if details remained fuzzy and people never really knew about hypergamy and evolutionary psychology.

deathinthesun1991 • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 12:05 PM

I feel like the blanket statement "all" is quite black & white, which the world most certainly is not. I agree that the majority of females I have met have done this at some point or another, but certainly not "all".

TrueFacets • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 02:36 PM*

Hey Reddit

I'm still wasting a lot of my time with useless shit. The one thing I did consistently do during the last two years is reading and saving every article posted on trp and in blogs of rp-vanguards. Carefully saving and sorting everything.

As a consequence, I know the written theory quite well.

Here my thoughts on this Topic

There probably has to be made a correlation with time (like in relativity - lol) and living situation. Imagine life 100-150 years ago. And I mean the life of the common people. Most of the media, photos, paintings and writings from this time come from the "upper" class. Ladies and Lords and Sir's and old big houses with heavy stone walls and big ballroom's come to mind.

90%+ of the population however was piss poor, working in steel or textile factories and living in the "poor" quarters of cities like London. Or they were simple farmers. There are some, but not that many, records of the shit they lived in. And even if someone reminds us of this fact, its comfortable to forget it fast and focus on more pleasant things of the time.

Back then, a young man probably had to elbow his way through life quite differently. And his father (assuming he was not a drinker) probably did everything to teach his son toughness.

With a far higher infant deathrate and...

Actually, i'm not sure what my point exactly is BUT, the Redpill then was probably different. You had to take good care of your Girl and Children for them to have a slight chance at a somewhat better life. You couldn't just work and learn and improve and better yourself, you needed your time to somehow provide some kind of a life for your family.

The luxury of today, where we have so much time to do whatever we want, without the fear of starvation, is quite a new thing for Humans!

Also imagine the situation of a 18-20 year old girl back then. Propably not the easiest position to be in either.

LOST_TALE • 1 point • 30 December, 2016 11:00 PM

The question that I've asked myself every day

Empiricism Reason or, aka evolved consistency structures of experience. You look like you are wondering at the stars on how the hell we discovered X thing in science.

DarkStar-88 • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 03:37 AM

It's pretty disturbing that you would even have to write up a post about this. Anyone with any critical thinking skills can shoot down almost all of your attempted points. If you have any sense of awareness whatsoever, rape should be pretty easy to avoid. Obviously some males have been wrongly accused of rape. The same can be said about any subgroup of people and any crime anywhere. Feel free to ask me some questions if you do not agree with me. I love enlightening those that are a little slow when it comes to comprehending reality.

12isLimited • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 07:24 PM

Go to AskWomen or TwoX and enjoy all the fake rape stories. The best ones are "MY BOYFRIEND RAPED ME" Those are great.

[deleted] • 1 points • 19 December, 2016 07:32 PM

[permanently deleted]

redpillschool[S] • 7 points • 19 December, 2016 07:46 PM

Once again, we are aware this works because we're told. But if I handed you a GPS and told you nothing of it other than it's a magical map device, would you suddenly intuit the theory of relativity?

worker-parasite • 0 points • 19 December, 2016 05:03 PM

So all those women who claimed they were raped by soldiers during raids were lying? cool.

electricqueer • -1 points • 19 December, 2016 08:02 PM [recovered]

The title of your post is ridiculous dude as a survivor of a brutal pedophile rape!! And yes, he did go to jail.

[deleted] • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 08:09 PM

want a cookie?

interestedplayer • 1 point • 20 December, 2016 10:01 PM*

[deleted]

What is this?

Terdmuffin • 0 points • 19 December, 2016 06:05 PM

So instead of AWALT, are you suggesting AWLAR, not as a truth but as a starting point for interpreting what a woman says or does?

We are taught women are delicate flowers, innocent, sweet, incapable of such outright and malicious deceit while men are ravenous, insatiable beasts that lack the intelligence or self awareness to keep themselves out of trouble.

We here can see and have seen that this isn't true. We can see these percentages in the OP do not align with what we see to be reality. So what must be Happening here? Are these studies formed in a way to over report rape and sexual assault? Are women lying about the rapes and assaults? Are they changing the facts in their mind to make things fit their own world view? (men do this too so let's not act like only women have hamsters).

We've seen enough instances of women outright lying that it has the general reputation of women. We see that some women do lie about these things. I'm not saying all women lie about rape but I think all women have the ability to either lie or convince themselves of alternate truths.

Koryphae_ • 1 point • 19 December, 2016 04:48 PM

I tried following your train of thought, but it seems to me that you are just dissatisfied with the fact that during your lifetime there will be questions which will be left unanswered. But that's part of the trip. Don't try to find answers to everything.

The 'mechanism' you refer to, i.e. why aren't everybody red-pill-minded is fairly simple in my opinion - people are stupid and emotionally unevolved.

redpillschool[S] • 6 points • 19 December, 2016 05:04 PM

dissatisfied with the fact that during your lifetime there will be questions which will be left unanswered. But that's part of the trip. Don't try to find answers to everything.

I'm not dissatisfied. For me, the trip is about seeking answers - possible or not.

[deleted] comment score below threshold • -7 points • 19 December, 2016 04:35 PM

ALL women lie about rape, you say. ALL.

After that title, I don't need to read all the tl;dr crap beneath to know you're full of shit.

Auvergnat • 10 points • 19 December, 2016 05:18 PM

I get what you mean. That's a very weird claim that OP made right here. But rather than discarding it, I instead wonder how on Earth he'll be able to back it up. My guess is that it's rethorical. However, I **will** read it and will judge the claim **then**.

redpillschool[S] • 14 points • 19 December, 2016 04:36 PM

Then you'll never know what it said.

CoreJJ • 5 points • 19 December, 2016 04:54 PM

I've got to say your text is humble talking about the possibility that TRP might be wrong and all we think we know is a lie, wich btw I completely agree. The point is, your title is a bit of a contrast with that. I'm eager to know what agrument you have to say to support your claim but that being said, I don't think all women lie about rape.

sqerl • 8 points • 19 December, 2016 05:15 PM

For some perspective, there's an entire radfem thought experiment which says ALL piv sex is rape:
<https://web.archive.org/web/20131221123431/http://witchwind.wordpress.com/2013/12/15/piv-is-always-rape-ok>

I'm willing to hear this one to its conclusion.

empatheticapathetic • 2 points • 19 December, 2016 05:29 PM

Achi mama. I guess all women do lie about rape.

[deleted] • 5 points • 19 December, 2016 04:56 PM

too bad, that's where the entire thrust of his statement came from.

Brickick • 0 points • 20 December, 2016 07:49 PM

Blah blah blah. You basically said nothing here. Yes women have lied about rape before but most survivors don't ever say anything out of fear. If you were a woman or a gay man, you'd understand. Instead of segregating the sexes, why don't men and women teach straight men (the main perps in rape cases but not 100% of the time) to view women as equal counterparts? The abuse of women has been accepted since the beginning of time. Obviously when people start talking about it, people tend to say it's bad, but for a long time and still to this day some people put up with it and a lot of men are ingrained with the idea that they are superior to women simply because of their dick. I am grateful that women have been brave enough to speak up about their experiences, because yes, 1 in 6 women is a lot, but it is an absolute reality for women everywhere. Most every woman I know has been sexually abused, and guess what, most men I know have too. People are sick. Just because you haven't experienced something doesn't make it untrue for someone else. You sound like a straight male, so I know it's hard for you to understand, but could you just try a little? The definition of rape: when someone forces themselves inside you without your consent. You might not realize it, but boyfriends and husbands rape their girlfriends and wives all the time. Just because she's your girlfriend/wife, does not mean you can use her body to get yourself off whenever you want. If she says no, then it is rape. If she says I don't know, and you stick it in, it's technically rape. Do you know how many young girls kill themselves because of sexual abuse? How about the number of girls and women who get attacked with acid in the street or get murdered for rejecting a man's advances? Sounds to me like you really don't know what you're talking about, refuse to learn more about it, and have just come up with some typical mansplaining nonsense that doesn't even have a clear message.