

Do you know where I found this? You guessed right, r/feminism.

March 26, 2019 | 143 upvotes | by [The_king_of_fu](#)



Archived from [theredarchive.com](https://www.theredarchive.com)

Comments

lazarljubenovic • 25 points • 26 March, 2019 04:44 PM

How are they managing to shut down subreddits for moronic reasons but that one survives despite its clearly toxic narrative?

The_king_of_fu[S] • 6 points • 26 March, 2019 05:43 PM

Ikr, they just aren't able to think properly most of the time

DarkNights292 • 2 points • 29 March, 2019 08:38 PM

Because Reddit would receive so much backlash.

[deleted] • 1 point • 30 March, 2019 11:56 AM

Because Reddit caters to women.

SophistMonk • 13 points • 26 March, 2019 08:23 PM

Feminist IDIOT

Oops, I said the same thing twice!

ActuallyDoesntExist • 4 points • 28 March, 2019 08:15 AM

One of these is worse and it's not IDIOT.

53withtrollhair • 10 points • 26 March, 2019 08:46 PM

Feminists by the very meaning of the name are sexist.

LennartGimm • 2 points • 26 March, 2019 10:23 PM

Well, by the same reasoning MRAs are sexist.

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 March, 2019 11:59 AM

The difference is:

Feminism is about supporting the supremacy of women and putting down men.

MRAs, in theory - are simply men demanding equal legal protection.

It's hard for a feminist to whine that women have no rights when they have the right to work, the right to own property, can open their own checking accounts and get loans, are more likely to get into university, and get better jobs.

Men on the other hand, can and do argue about things like a lack of due process, discrimination in family courts (which is, you know, a rights issue), and that it's perfectly legal to take an apple peeler to a child's penis within hours of it being born without any legal action against anyone for assault.

LennartGimm • 1 point • 30 March, 2019 12:37 PM*

I was going off of the proposed idea that feminism is sexist because the name implies it by concentrating on one group: Women. MRAs would be, according to that particular idea, sexist as well. If they are sexist (meaning the members individually or the groups direction as a whole) was not what I was trying to argue.

But to the argument you made: You say feminism is complaining about having no rights, then you name a lot of rights that men and women both have. By this standards, men and women both have enough rights. I am fairly certain that you just worded your argument in an easy to pick at way, so let me rephrase it: The rights feminism has fought for are now no longer denied to women. As such, feminism has lost its reason to exist, seeing that all goals have been achieved. (Please let me know if that is not what you'd say because otherwise I'm strawmaning here). That would be an argument that I can't flat out refuse, but wouldn't agree with 100%. Yes, a lot of women's issues have been solved, a lot has been achieved. This arguably took the momentum away from the movement as a whole because finding new goals has split the movement up. Some want to change society's views on women, some want better political representation, some want more rights, some want better pay, and much more. Many choose what they believe in and go for those goals, while almost everyone going for at least one of those goals calls themselves a feminist, which then gives the group a very weird dynamic of moving in different directions at once while not being united on anything.

I think you are (hopefully unintentionally) strawmaning the feminist cause (which is easy to do with all these crazy tumblr-warriors and such out there). Many feminists don't „whine that women have no rights“, many want to change actual problems women face, like less pay, *social pressure to conform to a certain stereotype**, or underrepresentation in politics and business leaderships.

*Please not that I intentionally didn't mention the wage-gap, because that is, as we all should know by now, a falsely used statistic. What I mean is the overall trend that women simply earn less, very plausibly coming from women taking time off for their family, which could be considered unfair because men are generally not expected to take time off when they become fathers, nor might there be a medical need for it. Women on the other hand are expected to take time off and might need to take time off, should something go wrong. A pregnancy is also very stressful both mentally and physically, so taking some time to heal should be as normal as not going into work the day after a kidney transplant. If that is fair and in what way women are responsible for their choice to become pregnant with many men also wanting to become father having a role in that too is a debate for another time, unless you'd like to debate it now.

**This social pressure is also set on men, they are expected to conform a certain way as well. This can be best seen in the shaming of male masturbation toys vs the celebration of female toys. But it's easiest to see the pressure set on them while ignoring the other side. Which is why some feminists argue that women have such pressure and ignore men, and some MRAs argue and ignore women. Who has the larger pressure put on them also depends on the individual and how well their view of self conforms with a socially accepted view of self, so I think arguing who is pressured more is very hard and kind of pointless. Instead of fighting to equal the pressure out, how about we just try to get rid of the pressure on both sexes, so we can all be who we want to be.

I think it's important to hear both sides. Some parts of society are still very chauvinistic. (warning for anecdotal evidence here, take with a grain of salt): I grew up with a boy in my class who was set on becoming the head of the firm his father was leading at the time. He wasn't too bright and had anger issues as early as 6yo. He had a big sister though, she was smart and polite, but could be stern too. An ideal head of the company. Now why wasn't she set to inherit? Because she was a girl. The men doing business with that company were a lot of builders and workers, who at the time (though not so long ago) wouldn't have taken her seriously. Had she been a guy, no problem. Of course this is anecdotal, but a good example of where sexism might still apply while no laws were technically broken. Yes, all the issues you mentioned in your last paragraph are very important and too often overlooked. Just look at Johnny Depp or now even more recently Cardi B. Did that start a industrywide campaign of men coming forward? #shetoo or something like that (in the sense that

„she too is a perpetrator“)? No! People coming to the defense of Cardi and people ignoring Depp's issue after harshly condemning him before. This is disgusting and needs to change. But as long as we keep fighting for who gets to decide what's an issue: Men's or women's rights, we will get less done.

Also one last point to think about: When we dismiss the „wage gap“ because it's just women choosing less lucrative fields, then shouldn't we ignore women going into college more often because it's men choosing to not go or to apply for fields with smaller capacities? If we say that the men are denied despite wanting to study a certain field, what about the women being denied despite wanting to work a certain field? Both are issues, or both aren't. I know that different factors lead to the two problems, but ignoring one of the issues on any of those grounds also opens up the way to ignore the other issue, if you want to be consistent in your logic.

Edit: I was curious and looked at your post history (not to find anything on you, but to see what kind of things you post to better know who I'm talking to, feel free to go through my history too), and I was intrigued by your post about going into a feminist subreddit that rebranded itself to signal caring about men's issues, although you were pretty quickly banned. This is a trend I've seen on many feminist subs and other platforms, and even non-feminist subs (I'm banned from the confessions sub for commenting on another sub, but whatever). I like that you tried to step out of your bubble and confront yourself with people who think differently. What I can say that worked for me (especially right now): The comment I made that you replied to got another reply that quickly turned into a debate. I'm a pretty defensive person and will defend my views. I'm here because I mainly agree with this sub, but that debate pushed me to for once debate against someone whom I'd normally agree with. Not that I was arguing him on something I secretly believed, but we started arguing about small things that we viewed differently and it developed from there (at least that's how I perceived it, you can read it yourself and he probably also felt differently). The way this debate pushed me to argue the other side and see some validity in it really helped me get out of my bubble by informing myself on some of the issues that I personally don't face. Maybe that will help you, if you so want, to challenge your own views: Go to subs that agree with you (as I could see mgtow and antifeminism, but maybe also something like mensrights or antisjw) and try and find a view expressed that you disagree with. Doesn't have to be a huge disagreement, could just be on a one-line comment, like the one we are at now. Then debate, if the other person is up for it. But what I'm doing here is helping myself do exactly that while also driving yourself deeper into your bubble, so I guess that makes me something, but I don't know what. Not that there's anything inherently wrong with bubbles by the way, everyone has one, just don't let it become an echochamber by only looking for your own views validated. But I have to agree that in general, the feminist subs are exactly as much echochambers filled with insufferable treatment of differing views.

[deleted] • 1 point • 30 March, 2019 12:49 PM

I think you are (hopefully unintentionally) strawmaning the feminist cause (which is easy to do with all these crazy tumblr-warriors and such out there). Many feminists don't „whine that women have no rights“, many want to change actual problems women face, **like less pay**

NOTE: goes for "muh wage gap" then two sentences later, says he isn't.

(warning for anecdotal evidence here, take with a grain of salt)

The plural of anecdote is not data.

You're complaining about a girl making life choices which cause her to earn less money and some

specific dude in an anecdote.

I'm talking about it being completely legal to ignore due process for men, and sexual assault against men being totally acceptable under our law.

I'm not whining about Johnny Depp vs. Cardi B, though it is amusing that feminists everywhere are celebrating her hurting and robbing and raping men because "turnabout is fair play". Between that and auditoriums full of women giving Loreena Bobbitt (who hacked her husband's cock off in his sleep because ~~according to the arresting officers she did it because he wasn't satisfying her~~ after consulting with a lawyer, vague accusations of abuse) a standing ovation, yeah, wouldn't touch any of them with a ten foot barge pole.

They've had every legal right they've asked for, every unfair advantage, every "push men aside to promote women at all costs" and still complain we live in A Handmaid's Tale.

At the same time, we're arresting a six year old who hugged and kissed a classmate for "sexual assault".

Feminists hate men, they've always hated men, it was always about female supremacy and putting men down, 1000% full stop. So equating a hate group with a group trying to redress problems in law is rich and your "I have an anecdote here" bullshit is irrelevant.

LennartGimm • 1 point • 30 March, 2019 01:19 PM

That's why I explained why I didn't mention the wage gap explicitly: It is bullshit, just like the pink tax. But the data doesn't lie: Women are paid less, just not for the same work. Maybe let's look at the reasons why women don't work the same, and I think family can really mess up a career. And a family always starts with two people, not just one, so why is only one of them suffering for it?

I also explicitly say that this was anecdotal. I know that it proves nothing, but I liked throwing it in there. If I wanted to use that as real evidence, I wouldn't have put my disclaimer in front, surely?

I'm not complaining. I'm saying that there's still issues that both sexes face and I think it's wrong to address only one of those groups. Like I said above, it's always „women chose to become pregnant, they have to deal with the consequences“ which baffles me to hear from many men who are fathers themselves. Pregnancy can be, but is seldom the choice of the woman alone. In almost all marriages with children, the couple decided TOGETHER (I have no idea how to put things bold on mobile, so this will have to do) to try for a pregnancy. Now there's two possibilities: Either the woman suffers a stepback in her career while the man doesn't, or we try to even it out by not punishing women for pregnancy. As it stands now, with the whole „her choice her consequences“, the woman suffers a damp in her career. Now why should one suffer for the decision of both? In that case, wouldn't it be fair for the man to have to financially support her, because she is now less able to? Just to even out this damp, nothing more. And then if the marriage ends, should the man still be responsible for the money his ex doesn't earn because of her pregnancy? If you are against alimony but also want women to bear the consequences of a pregnancy on their own, you are giving them an unfair disadvantage over men who want to become fathers. Both have the same wish, but only one has to suffer for it.

Not sure what you mean by „under our law“ regarding sexual assault against men. I'm German and thus don't know the ins and outs of American (I'm assuming) laws, could you elaborate? Also how is it completely legal to ignore due process for men? Where does the law

make that distinction? Because it feels to me that you're taking some anecdotes of men being treated badly by admittedly scummy policemen while you don't really care about the cases where everything goes right. And then you inflate that to say that it's somehow legal, and not that it's the seriously bad judgment of some policemen.

Saying that feminists always hated men is just wrong. In the beginning, when it was just about women being able to vote, would you call that „pushing men aside to promote women“?

Technically you could, but it's simply equal rights. Now of course, the issues nowadays are not that clear cut anymore. More grey areas than black and white, which is why you seem to dismiss all women's issues because they aren't as serious as they were in the beginning of the movement. But are men's issues as serious as women's issues in the beginning of the feminist movement? I wouldn't say so.

I also like how you seem to really dislike my anecdote I shared, even though I hinged no arguments on it, but at the same time bring the anecdote of the boy being arrested for kissing a girl. We can both that it's a infuriating story that is pretty ridiculous, but it's still anecdotal. Even if it was published in the news and is more widely known, it's still an anecdote.

You can look at the edit of my last comment if you like, it's right at the bottom. Maybe you have something to say to that as well, maybe you don't. But I'm pretty sure I misjudged you and you will not be interested in what I wrote, even though I had hope.

[deleted] • 0 points • 30 March, 2019 09:45 PM

But the data doesn't lie: Women are paid less, just not for the same work. Maybe let's look at the reasons why women don't work the same, and I think family can really mess up a career.

Also because mines are dangerous, math is hard, and whining is easier.

LennartGimm • 1 point • 31 March, 2019 12:07 AM

That's just you making up reasons without really putting yourself in the other sides shoes. But fine, believe that 50% of all humans are lazy, stupid and childish. Oh and of course they all hate you. You as an individual because you have a penis and that just drives all of them mad. Don't for a single second believe that women, like all humans, have reasons for what they do and circumstances that force them to act a certain way at some times. No no no, it's much easier if everyone fits into this exact box you cut out for them, because otherwise you might not feel so superior! It's sad that you just ignore the points I make and instead just say „but it is probably not that [no reason given] but much more likely what I believe! [No reason given]“.

[deleted] • 1 point • 31 March, 2019 12:09 AM

That's just you making up reasons without really putting yourself in the other sides shoes

If I had a vagina and therefore could claim moral authority on the basis of my innate vaginal superiority, and the benevolent sexism of the "boo hoo, boo hoo hoo hoo hoo, I'm just a girl" I sure as hell would rather take a jerkoff course like gender studies and claim my contribution to STEM is just as valuable as any man's, because I bullied some other girl into taking math.

LennartGimm • 1 point • 31 March, 2019 12:15 AM

So because you're lazy and have no drive to do anything with your life, if you weren't forced to, everybody else has to be that way. Got it. Btw, why would men go into something like physics? I mean, your reasoning here would imply that men do it to earn money while women go into other courses to be lazy, but there is so many courses easier than physics or maths to earn a ton of money, why chose a hard one? Or could it be that they're interested in the subject? And couldn't that imply that women can also be interested in the subject and chose it based on that? What a weird concept: People going into fields where their passions are. Well, it seems that for you, the concept of passions alone is more than baffling enough.

Oh and what is your contribution to STEM then? Have you ever done anything for the field or are you more the kind of guy who gets off to other men doing it and you claim moral superiority by proxy?

53withtrollhair • 1 point • 26 March, 2019 10:31 PM

Well, sure they are. That is the purpose of their argument. To display the discrimination of sexist laws.

LennartGimm • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 12:46 AM

I'm not sure I'm following you. Could you rephrase that?

53withtrollhair • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 02:18 AM*

They are discussing their point of view from a man's perspective ergo they are sexist It is like saying a person is proud of their nationality is displaying nationalism. Just because a word has the ist suffix doesn't immediately make it a bad thing. Too many people are too easily offended by nothing.

LennartGimm • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 07:11 AM

But doesn't that go against you initial statement or am I completely lost?

53withtrollhair • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 08:23 AM

Reread the thread and tell me how I am not supporting my first statement

LennartGimm • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 01:29 PM

Okay I think I got your point now. Let me state your point in my own words so you can tell me, if I still have it wrong: Feminism is sexist as per the word, FEMinism. MRAs are not inherently bad just because there is an „ist“ at the end of activist. Both points I agree with. Then in one response you said that MRA are sexist which very much confused me. But they also want to display the discrimination of sexist laws, which kind of goes against that they're sexist. And then you made your point clearer by saying that MRAs are sexist because they are only viewing the discrimination against men (by seeing through the eyes of men).

So in conclusion, feminists and MRAs are sexist because they only concentrate on one side of the argument.

I'd say that sexism nowadays (and maybe forever) has such a negative connotation that

it is viewed as something negative. I think feminism and MRAs are not sexist by definition, just because they concentrate on one side. I feel that sexism is inherently harming, and more than just ignoring the other side of the argument. So I wouldn't describe either feminism or MRAs as blanket sexist. But of course there are people on both sides that are sexist, and some very much so. Saying that feminism is sexist because it only looks at women's issues is a bit like saying that you're discriminating against people who are starving because you're not also including their problems in your activism.

53withtrollhair • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 04:07 PM

You are really over thinking this. I am a proud Canadian, very proud. I am a nationalist. Is that bad. Of course not. In all the instances that I proposed, it is in the essence of neutrality. I would say feminism and MRA are 2 sides of the same coin. I do agree that sexism can be harming in the same way that over doing anything can be harming. Feminism had lofty goals in the past, which were noble. Now, you can witness the evolution of this movement to degeneracy. Abort male babies, all men are evil, etc etc. I do not think I have ever seen or heard a MRA group say such spiteful and harmful things- true hate speech. Yet no response from the speech police, strange. I am only speaking in this instance from a perspective of a proper definition. Nothing more. I do not project my position here at all, except of course, for being a proud Canadian.

LennartGimm • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 06:22 PM

Alright, good to know I was overthinking it. I'm German so English is not my first language, which might explain my slightly different sense of the meaning of words like sexism and nationalism. For me, they are linked with bad intentions in a way, although one can be sexist without knowing it, that's why I mentioned harm before. You say you don't project your position here, but you're clearly condemning the modern feminist movement. I agree that there are some very radical feminists, but they are a tiny minority. Just like MRAs are somewhat linked to MGTOW which are again linked to Incels, which have their own abhorrent views, just like radfems have. Linked here just means that the intersection of the two groups are bigger than for two other groups, not that all or even many members share the beliefs of the other group. I think we need to listen to actual people, not to the most degenerate post that will get 5k upvotes because of its stupidity. I think that MRAs count incels to their movement just like feminists will count these crazy tumblr-warriors to theirs: Not at all. Women do sometimes have it harder in the workplace, so do men. If we want to tell women that the wage gap is due to their decisions, then we also have to acknowledge that the higher rate of men working in „lower class jobs“ (nothing against those jobs, they are necessary and I am glad that we have people who do them) like garbage men, janitors and the likes.

throwaway46819 • 1 point • 30 March, 2019 01:54 PM

Yes, but it's because they claim to help "gender equality" and "both men and women", under the name "feminism".

And their actions absolutely reflect it. If they only claimed to try to help women's rights, without trying to deliberately hurt men throughout the entire process, that wouldn't be sexist.

That's why MRA isn't a sexist term. MRAs aren't anti-women at all, they just focus on fighting for men's rights, without trying to hurt women's rights.

subhchatu • 10 points • 26 March, 2019 04:29 PM

@ReggaeRege you are right, just imagine it

zzvu • 6 points • 26 March, 2019 10:28 PM

u/Cunt_Bag is a good name for her

UltimateCurryCel • 3 points • 26 March, 2019 05:10 PM

BANNED FROM R/FEMINISM

The_king_of_fu[S] • 3 points • 26 March, 2019 05:44 PM

Not yet, my friend

DarkNights292 • 1 point • 29 March, 2019 08:39 PM

Haven't we all been? Lol

[deleted] 28 March, 2019 06:41 PM

[deleted]

DarkNights292 • 2 points • 29 March, 2019 08:39 PM

It's like r/feminism x3

The_king_of_fu[S] • 1 point • 28 March, 2019 07:17 PM

I checked it the day after this post, and it can be pretty disgusting

AToastThatBurned • 2 points • 27 March, 2019 06:29 AM

Oh the irony, this just infuriates me. I dont know if they are retarded or something

[deleted] • 2 points • 30 March, 2019 11:56 AM

And how long until that comment of yours was removed with an immediate 1-2 ban/mute combo?

One thing I've learned is, feminism CANNOT tolerate things like dissent, and facts.

The_king_of_fu[S] • 1 point • 30 March, 2019 08:09 PM

The comment have lasted at least for 3 days, and maybe (just maybe) it hasn't been removed.

It wasn't my comment, though

Homosapain • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 02:11 AM

u/google-the-cat

google-the-cat • 2 points • 27 March, 2019 02:46 AM

Hello there!

Homosapain • 3 points • 27 March, 2019 02:46 AM

now look at the name of the sub i summoned you to

google-the-cat • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 02:56 AM

I believe that everyone should be able to have their own opinions, and as long as you are not attacking the person, and the idea, with the ability to respectfully disagree, then we can have a civil conversation.

Homosapain • 1 point • 27 March, 2019 02:46 PM

no

[deleted] 29 March, 2019 12:45 AM

[deleted]

google-the-cat • 1 point • 29 March, 2019 10:50 PM

What am I guilty of? Believing what I want to?

google-the-cat • 0 points • 27 March, 2019 02:48 AM

Yes, and?

[deleted] 27 March, 2019 02:48 AM

[removed]

google-the-cat • -1 points • 27 March, 2019 02:48 AM

Ok. And?