

Most feminists are radical feminists by the literal dictionary definition of radical feminism: "the belief that society functions as a patriarchy in which men oppress women"

May 5, 2021 | 1985 upvotes | by [Oncefa2](#)

This is the full definition of **radical feminism** given by Wikipedia:

Radical feminists assert that global society functions as a patriarchy in which the class of men are the oppressors of the class of women. They propose that the oppression of women is the most fundamental form of oppression, one that has existed since the inception of humanity.

Does any of that sound familiar?

Radical feminism has its roots in the 1960s during the **civil rights movement** where it compared the position of women in society to the position of African Americans. Something that many African Americans, including African American women, objected to at the time.

The word **patriarchy** started being used in that context during the early 1970s where it quickly became associated with the movement. Radical feminism is the only type of feminism with its own distinct ideology and vocabulary. **Other forms of feminism** largely borrow from existing political theories. They just focus on women (or gender equality) within those frameworks more heavily.

For example, the definition of **liberal feminism**, also sometimes called "mainstream feminism", is,

Gender equality through political and legal reform within the framework of liberal democracy.

This is the definition that feminists like to cite when they fall back on their "dictionary argument". The only problem is that patriarchy theory is not a part of this definition, or of liberal feminism more broadly. In fact radical feminists often criticize liberal feminism for rejecting their views about the patriarchy.

Patriarchy theory benefits radical feminism by abstracting away the explicit comparison to racial oppression that it is based on. During the 1980s, after the civil rights movement, this interpretation helped give it wider acceptance. This was especially true in academia where it became the basis for **gender studies**.

Radical feminism doesn't just attempt to appropriate the struggles of African Americans onto women. It also tries to adopt the rhetoric and beliefs of **black supremacy** and frame the narrative in an "us vs them" mentality. Something that was rejected by black civil rights activists. And makes radical feminism more of a women's supremacy movement than a movement for true equality.

A further development in radical feminism was **intersectional feminism**, which tried to give room for other forms of oppression besides oppression against women.

Many intersectionalists try to say that intersectionalism is a response to radical feminism, as if that somehow makes it "different" or "better" than radical feminism. But the reality is that intersectional feminism is still founded on the idea that women are oppressed through a patriarchal system enforced primarily by men.

This type of feminism has become popular in **BLM**, **LGBT**, and **SJW** spaces, but has recently started facing backlash from inside some of those groups as well. The intersectionalist approach emphasizes oppression and an "us vs them" mentality inside of these communities. And it is often viewed as a radical, unhelpful approach in this context as well.

So have you ever met someone trying to distance themselves from radical feminism, but then also claim that there is a patriarchy, or that women are an oppressed group of people?
Just because this belief is more common today does not make it any less radical than it was in the 1960s. Men do not oppress women. And women's issues do not come anywhere close to the struggles of African Americans. Including, and especially, in history.

Sources:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radical_feminism

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liberal_feminism

<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-political/>

<https://www.humanrightscareers.com/issues/types-of-feminism-the-four-waves/>

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

Nice_cock_6900 • 84 points • 5 May, 2021 04:36 PM

I hate radical feminism

justatouch589 • 9 points • 6 May, 2021 02:33 PM

I hate even more how radical feminism is now socially accepted in the mainstream.

Nice_cock_6900 • 1 point • 11 May, 2021 02:56 PM

me too

it's so annoying

justatouch589 • 2 points • 11 May, 2021 03:24 PM

And if we speak out against the overcorrection, they label us sexists.

Nice_cock_6900 • 1 point • 11 May, 2021 05:37 PM

that happens all the time

if someone disagrees with a "radical feminist"

then everyone will say:

"tHaT's SeXiSt"

Oncefa2[S] • 106 points • 5 May, 2021 02:05 PM

Something interesting I noticed when doing research for this is just how common radical feminism is online on places like Reddit and Twitter. Presumably in comparison to the real world.

I honestly was not expecting Wikipedia to be a good source because I assumed radical feminism had all but entrenched itself into mainstream feminist discourse. There are still some biases in those articles of course. Radical feminism is portrayed in a generally positive light in the article. And there's a lot of apologetics around the comparison of women to black people. But it paints a much different picture than what you typically find online.

For example, the word patriarchy only shows up twice in the liberal feminism article. Once in the history of feminism section (with a [citation needed] tag), and once in the criticism section. Where it's noted that radical feminists criticize liberal feminism by saying women will never be free until we tear down the patriarchy. Liberal feminism is also described as the "mainstream" form of feminism, which you would not guess if you looked at feminism on Reddit or Twitter.

Maybe that should be obvious. But you do see radical feminism in real life quite a bit. The word patriarchy, and the idea that women are oppressed, aren't exactly foreign to most people. So maybe radical feminism has gained inroads within the last few decades. And is more prominent online because of how common it is among younger people and among progressives.

That would also explain why so many people buy into this idea that "feminism used to be better" (including some feminists like Christina Hoff Sommers, and of course Warren Farrell who used to be a feminist himself). That would make the "backlash against feminism" that people talk about really more of a backlash against *radical* feminism. Since that seems to be what everyone is upset about.

Radical feminists, and radicals in the wider women's movement that came before it, have always been around. But I don't think they have ever dominated the movement to the degree that they do today.

Which is a problem since radical feminism negatively affects men and actively stands in the way of gender equality.

But on the flip side, I guess it's technically true that feminists can be allies as well. I'll leave that up to feminists to decide for themselves though. It shouldn't just be on MRAs to call out radical feminists: it would be nice to see this from other feminists too. And to be clear, that means calling out the belief that there is a patriarchy and that men oppress women.

If they want us to go along with their dictionary definition of feminism, then they also need to go along with the true dictionary definition of radical feminism when they claim to be opposed to it.

tenchineuro • 50 points • 5 May, 2021 03:54 PM

But on the flip side, I guess it's technically true that feminists can be allies as well.

Theoretically, perhaps. But if you say IRL, show me.

triplenipple99 • 15 points • 5 May, 2021 08:01 PM

In my experience older feminists seem alright which would support OP's notion. Camille Paglia is a good example.

tenchineuro • 13 points • 5 May, 2021 09:23 PM

My only issue that the handful of women who usually get brought up in these situations are called *anti-feminist, anti-woman and traitors to women* by the feminist movement and a great many women and feminists. So their feminist credentials are at least questionable.

And others like Cassie Jaye, who have stopped calling themselves feminists still find the idea of being called an MRA reprehensible. Cassie Jaye literally shudders at the idea of being called an MRA in one interview. So while superficially these women may be fellow travelers, they really are not on the side of the MRM. What Cassie Jaye would rather be doing is helping girls in some foreign country (interviews are great), she'd rather be doing that than helping boys and men in her own country. And I suspect, despite all the good she's inadvertently done for the MRM, as soon as she is able, she'll be off without so much as a goodbye.

Don't get me wrong, I bear these women no ill will. Cassie Jaye is a pretty and soft spoken women and people listen to her like they'd never listen to a man. But they are on their on side, whatever exactly that might amount to.

Angryasfk • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 12:55 PM

Cassie Jaye is a documentary maker, not an activist. She previously made a film looking a SSM, but she's not a gay activist either. There is a difference between being supportive of something in general and an actual activist. Most people are not activists of any kind.

ISuperSucc1 • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 10:21 PM

Well to be fair women in other countries like the entire Middle East have it far worse than men in America or England.

Oncefa2[S] • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 10:30 PM

They have higher life expectancies.

It's just that men in those same countries are that much worse off.

You're better off comparing men and women from the same country than men from a wealthy country and women from a poor country. Where they still tie by certain measures of happiness and quality of life.

Ilikevats19737o • 4 points • 6 May, 2021 04:52 AM

I live in Lebanon (a country in the middle east) women there are treated like a queen but ya I agree about other countries

tenchineuro • 11 points • 5 May, 2021 10:39 PM

Well to be fair women in other countries like the entire Middle East have it far worse than men in America or England.

To be even fairer men in other countries in the Middle East have it far worse than both men and women in America or England.

What does this have to do with feminists being allies?

EDIT: The Middle East is not a country. Neither is Middle Earth.

No-Perspective5346 • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 05:56 PM

To be even fairer men in other countries in the Middle East have it far worse than both men and women in America or England.

Explain pls. Not a hate comment I promise. Just genuinely curious.

steawesome2013 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 08:43 PM

Men are the ones who are constantly working and dying for the corrupt governments.

SeeBeyond1983 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:24 PM

Lol im public im not gonna pay em any attention, noones gonna watch some angry person rant. Its hard enough for people not to lose their sh1t in traffic over a slow driver or some other lame infraction. Noone stops to hear musicians play, consumer drones and worker bees.

I see it cos im quiet, il sit and hear someone playing their instrument, then watch the world walk by like they have more important things, like shopping, or getting the bosses lunch.

Its all weird and funny but sad.

SeeBeyond1983 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:26 PM

In public, apologies, ive got a touch screen and thumbs

CommunicationDue9315 • 1 point • 10 May, 2021 05:27 PM

What's interesting is how different lived experiences produce different perceptions.

For example I have spent most of my adult life as a student and employee of universities. On top of this a spend quite a bit of time online. This has resulted in me being forced into close contact with feminists for decades and as such my hatred of them has grown, as well as my concern for the evils they create.

Whereupon if I had never gone to university or gone online, I might just never think of feminism at all.

I think this is the problem for the majority of reasonable men and women. They just have no idea how insane

and pervasive feminism has become in certain spheres because they don't inhabit them.

Gold_Balance_9856 • 1 point • 18 May, 2021 04:31 PM*

Yes true. This is how I was exposed to radical feminism. They hijacked a trauma subreddit. Go figure

□□♀□

I was unaware of how vile these people are and how they really feel about and treat men. It's shocking. Not a fan.

I am also apparently oppressing them since I do not share their specific belief that being abusive to men is entirely acceptable. It's not only that, they are completely entitled to behave in that manner. The fact that we do not share any sense of solidarity because I won't support that is interesting. None of this has anything to do with equality whatsoever.

FlatspinZA • 14 points • 5 May, 2021 05:20 PM

I feel bloody oppressed every single time my wife wants to elevate our station in life by spending money we don't have.

Granted, I couldn't ask for a better wife, she does lots of 'wifey' things, but heck, when does it stop?

On a side note, she told me she was buying a broom along with some lipstick she wanted (we have a joint account), and I was like, "Why do need a broom, we have a bloody expensive Dyson, and a dustpan & brush?"

Five minutes later she was telling me off for her having to justify why we need a broom. We have a broom, one of those industrial brooms you use in the garden. I told her to fill out her request in triplicate.

Obv. I got the finger.

[deleted] • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 08:11 PM

I am not an expert on this topic but I feel this is a trend with everything about society these days - It divides society more but masks it with "equality".

vwatchrepair • 11 points • 5 May, 2021 06:12 PM

Laughs in men only being drafted since forever. And other crap similar to it.

[deleted] 6 May, 2021 01:01 AM

[permanently deleted]

vwatchrepair • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 01:02 AM

I served 6 years. Came back. Sorry to disappoint. Wow. □□♂□

auMatech • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 08:30 AM

Thank you for your service.

Seeing the lack of support services available for veterans with severe PTSD in many countries leads me to believe that the intention of sending youth off into war is so they don't return alive. any other outcome appears to be an undesired inconvenience that is often swept under the rug.

On the ironic flip side, many of these institutions actually love to preach about the heroics of people who died on the battlefield.

It's an absolute travesty that people who have served their country are left to fend for themselves. My brother in law lost all of his comrades fighting in a meaningless war, struggles to live anything resembling a meaningful life now due to PTSD, and then to see the government support services for

veterans refuse to provide assistance or treatment for PTSD is an absolute slap in the face. Going further, they even insinuated that his mental state was not caused by sending him to die in a war, but was rather how he was since he was a little child, and demanded certification from teachers all the way back from primary school to verify that this was not the case...

[deleted] • 6 May, 2021 01:05 AM

[permanently deleted]

vwatchrepair • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 01:06 AM

Wow. And you're the noble one here right?? ☐☐♂☐☐☐

redgarnetamaranth1 points 6 May, 2021 01:37 AM* [recovered]

They're a troll account. found out about them because they're shitting up our sub too

vwatchrepair • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 01:38 AM

I knew that. But, geeze, they didn't even try. Sad.

[deleted] • 4 points • 6 May, 2021 01:56 AM

Wow you made an account just to wish death on someone

XHF2 • 33 points • 5 May, 2021 05:52 PM

Warning, it found this sub on r/againsthatesubreddits

They will likely try to find ways ban this subreddit, call it bigoted, misogynistic, etc.

OccultRitualCooking • 22 points • 5 May, 2021 08:41 PM

A story as old as time. We know.

west52 • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 08:52 PM

Lol. Show me the hate in the post. I'll wait.

Oncefa2[S] • 14 points • 5 May, 2021 08:58 PM

We're not opposed to feminism.

We're opposed to radical feminism.

The fact that most feminists are radicals is not our fault. They need to be better if they get offended by that.

EmirikolWoker • 28 points • 5 May, 2021 09:43 PM

We're not opposed to feminism.

Speak for yourself. The foundational principals of all flavours of feminism are inherently anti-male when you examine what needs to be true for them to accurately describe reality. Feminists can claim that it's "just about equality", but it's equality based on bigotted assumptions, presuming psychopathy on the part of men as a class.

Egalitarian values, and mens rights advocacy in particular, is innately antifeminist.

ellipticcurve5 • 2 points • 5 May, 2021 11:38 PM

I disagree, depending on your definition of feminism. I think you are getting too caught up in the

labels and definitions to assess feminism accurately. Lets say someone says that feminism is about equality. Then you can call yourself a men's rights feminist. Someone who fights for equality on the basis of men's rights. Now, most feminists aren't like that. Those that believe in the so called 'patriarchy' are the ones we are really combating. By definition, these are the 'radical' feminists. Many would not call themselves radical feminists, but, based on their beliefs, they are. Hence most 'liberal' and 'intersectional' feminists are actually radical feminists that focus on different aspects of radical feminism. Now, if we want to call feminism egalitarianism, I am totally on board. But I think that we should move away from these labels and focus on beliefs.

Nobleone11 • 10 points • 6 May, 2021 01:19 AM

I disagree, depending on your definition of feminism. I think you are getting too caught up in the labels and definitions to assess feminism accurately.

No, they're getting caught up in actual evidence illustrating that feminism doesn't practice what it preaches and hasn't done so for decades.

StarZax • 5 points • 6 May, 2021 02:07 AM

Those that believe in the so called 'patriarchy' are the ones we are really combating

And that's exactly the point, the patriarchy stuff is soooo engrained in the minds. We are at a point where feminists obviously think that patriarchy exists even if they are just not militants, not really into the movement, they are still way too sympathetic to the patriarchy narrative.

So yeah I don't really give too much attention to the labels, to me a feminist is a feminist, they already believe in the patriarchy so there's already something wrong. It could be worse if they are really into radical stuff, but it's still wrong

EmirikolWoker • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 05:46 AM

I disagree, depending on your definition of feminism.

All forms of feminism believe in class warfare between men and women with men winning.

Lets say someone says that feminism is about equality. Then you can call yourself a men's rights feminist. Someone who fights for equality on the basis of men's rights.

You call yourself what you like. I won't call myself a feminist, because I don't believe in class warfare between men and women with men winning.

Those that believe in the so called 'patriarchy' are the ones we are really combating.

So feminists then.

if we want to call feminism egalitarianism, I am totally on board.

Feminism's first big act was one of female supremacy, the creation of a two-tier citizenship where one class of citizen had the right to vote without the obligation of civil and military conscription, and the other paid for their vote with that conscription. It was never about egalitarianism. Have you read the Declaration of Sentiments? It's rotten all the way down.

But I think that we should move away from these labels and focus on beliefs.

That's exactly what I did by examining the foundational principle of feminism (class warfare

between men and women with men winning) and unpacking it.

Oncefa2[S] • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 11:52 AM*

All forms of feminism believe in class warfare between men and women with men winning.

I really appreciate your analysis of feminism. I've linked to it a thousand times before. I'd say it's more like 99% though, not all. Especially today where radical ("patriarchal") feminism has basically taken over. Most non radicals jump ship so it kind of escalates the problem.

But I don't think that's always been true for all feminists throughout all history here. Some literally just wanted a few laws changed. Kind of like the MRAs of today. In fact after we changed those laws, the non radicals disbanded because they didn't have anything to complain about anymore. Roe v wade in 1973 was the last major thing in the US. After that it's basically been radicals complaining about non problems (or at least very small *social* problems) and attacking men for no reason.

This is normally a moot point but I think it's relevant here.

EmirikolWoker • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 05:17 PM

But I don't think that's always been true for all feminists throughout all history here.

Check out the Declaration of Sentiments. It's been based on class warfare between men and women with men winning from the start.

SweatyButtcheek • -14 points • 5 May, 2021 10:06 PM

And ya'll are surprised this sub is on r/againsthatesubreddits

EmirikolWoker • 22 points • 5 May, 2021 10:08 PM

Can you point out what is hateful about that comment? In case you're going there, "feminism" is not synonymous with "women".

If a statement is descriptive of reality, it's not hateful.

SweatyButtcheek • -16 points • 5 May, 2021 10:22 PM

Feminists can claim that it's "just about equality", but it's equality based on bigoted assumptions, presuming psychopathy on the part of the men as a class.

He's simultaneously bunching up all feminists into one and that feminism isn't about equality, while also saying all feminists think that all men are psychopathic? This whole post is blurring the line between "radical feminism" and regular "feminism". I'm a man who grew up with a mom and a sister, chances are, most people are automatically feminists. The thing is that you can't go throwing misogyny and misandry around and claim that it's correct, because everybody has a different way of thinking.

Oncefa2[S] • 20 points • 5 May, 2021 10:32 PM

Most people are not feminists.

And even fewer are of the "non-radical" variety.

SweatyButtcheek • -8 points • 5 May, 2021 10:40 PM

But, see, you're generalizing too much. You can't just state something and label it a fact.

SharedRegime • 11 points • 5 May, 2021 11:17 PM

Then maybe women should stop doing the same to men yes? See how easy your logic is used against you? Get better logic.

SweatyButtcheek • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 11:28 PM

Did you read my whole thread? I was literally saying that people think differently from each other and how you can't say that all women think all men are "dogs" or "pigs" or whatever.

maxlvb • 17 points • 5 May, 2021 10:44 PM

FYI: [All] feminists like to claim that their movement is about "equality" and often use the dictionary definition as proof.

But what the dictionary says and what feminism and feminists do are two completely different things. Actions speak louder than words, therefore feminism and feminists should be judged by what it and they do instead of what the dictionary definition says.

And through its actions the feminist movement has constantly shows that it isn't about equality, but is actually about female privilege and misandry - a skewed system in women's favour, seeking superior rights & privileges for women, demonising men & boys. It is very obvious that "equality" is nothing more than a mask that the feminist movement uses to conceal its female privilege and anti-male agendas.

"Womanism is feminism's vulgate. It asserts that women are the oppressed or the victims and never the collaborators in the 'bad' things that men do. It entails a double standard around sexuality where women's sexual self-expression is seen as necessary and even desirable, but men's is seen as dangerous or even disgusting. Womanism is by no means confined to a tiny, politically motivated bunch of man-hating feminists, but is a regular feature of mainstream culture."

"One of the reasons for the failure of [all] feminism to dislodge deeply held perceptions of male and female behaviour was its insistence that women were victims, and men powerful patriarchs, which made a travesty of ordinary people's experience of the mutual interdependence of men and women."

Rosalind Coward

SweatyButtcheek • -9 points • 5 May, 2021 10:55 PM

Dude, you're living in a different world. Stop feeding yourself propaganda and look at how *real* people act in the *real* world.

Ilikevats19737o • 4 points • 6 May, 2021 05:08 AM

Ur feeding urself feminist propeganda it's not about equalitty and they act shitter in real life

maxlvb • 4 points • 5 May, 2021 11:01 PM

Unfortunately, although your comment was indeed clear, simple, and straightforward, there is some difficulty in justifiably assigning to it the fourth of

the epithets you applied to the statement, inasmuch as the precise correlation between the information you communicated and the facts, insofar as they can be determined and demonstrated, is such as to cause epistemological problems of sufficient magnitude as to lay upon the logical and semantic resources of the English language a heavier burden than they can reasonably be expected to bear.

[deleted] • 6 points • 6 May, 2021 01:51 AM

Not at all surprised. That sub is full of shit.

JestyerAverageJoe • 114 points • 5 May, 2021 03:40 PM

People mistakenly think that "radical" means "extreme." Radical means root. Radical feminists are feminists who see men as being the "root" of the problem. And radical feminism is mainstream.

neos7m • 38 points • 5 May, 2021 05:18 PM

I'd say your etymology could be improved - yes, radical is an adjective pertaining to roots, but the interpretation IMHO is "the purest, truest form of feminism; where feminism has its roots; feminism focusing on its roots, i.e. its core". Which if you think about it makes it sound even more mainstream.

commentsarenothing • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 09:42 PM

Wouldn't it just be a different type of feminism? I always thought radical meant different, very different. In this instance it seems to mean extreme. Please explain to me. Genuinely interested. Not a troll post.

maxlvb • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 04:36 AM

There are hundreds of different species of ducks. But ALL ducks walk like a duck, and quack like a duck. That makes them all ducks...

If (for some reason) you dont understand that analogy...

There are hundreds of different kinds of feminism (according to feminists.) But ALL feminists talk about feminism, and and believe in feminism. That makes them all feminists...

commentsarenothing • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:03 PM

I was talking about the etymology of radical.... That was the subject I was referring to

maxlvb • 0 points • 6 May, 2021 10:57 PM

etymology

The history of a linguistic form (such as a word) shown by tracing its development since its earliest recorded occurrence in the language where it is found, by tracing its transmission from one language to another, by analyzing it into its component parts, by identifying its cognates in other languages, or by tracing it and its cognates to a common ancestral form in an ancestral language

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/etymology>

Feminism is still feminism no matter how much you want to analyse it to the 'nth degree'...

IOW A duck is still a duck.... ☐

Feminism: Equality, when convenient.

commentsarenothing • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 11:07 PM

I am talking about the etymology of the word radical. I had an interest in it. I don't know who you are talking to. I'm not talking about feminism AT ALL. omg just stop already.

deusdeorum • 19 points • 5 May, 2021 07:07 PM

They don't mistakenly think radical means extreme.

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/radical>

You've described (root) one sense of it's meaning and use. It also is synonymous with extreme.

SharedRegime • 4 points • 5 May, 2021 11:15 PM

rad·i·cal/'radək(ə)l/ Learn to pronounceSee definitions

in:AllMedicalLinguisticsMusicMathematicsBotanyPoliticsChemistry*adjective*adjective: **radical**

1. (especially of change or action) relating to or affecting the fundamental nature of something; far-reaching or thorough. "a radical overhaul of the existing regulatory framework" Similar: thoroughgoing thorough complete total entire absolute utter comprehensive exhaustive root-and-branches sweeping far-reaching wide-ranging extensive profound drastic severe serious major desperate stringent violent forceful rigorous draconian Opposite: superficial

forming an inherent or fundamental part of the nature of someone or something. "the assumption of radical differences between the mental attributes of literate and nonliterate

peoples" Similar: fundamental basic essential quintessential inherent innate structural deep-seated intrinsic organic constitutive root Opposite: minor

(of surgery or medical treatment) thorough and intended to be completely curative.

1. 2. advocating or based on thorough or complete political or social change; representing or supporting an extreme or progressive section of a political party. Similar: revolutionary progressive reforming reformist revisionist progressivist leftist left-wing ultra-left socialist anticapitalist extreme extremist fanatical militant diehard red swivel-eyed *derogatory* Bolshevik Opposite: conservative reactionary moderate

characterized by independence of or departure from tradition; innovative or unorthodox. "the daring, avant-garde spirit of the music was too radical for the conservative audience"

1. **3. LINGUISTICS** *denoting or relating to the roots of a word.*

MUSIC belonging to the root of a chord.

1. 4. MATHEMATICS of the root of a number or quantity.
2. 5. BOTANY of, or springing direct from, the root or stem base of a plant.
3. 6. INFORMAL • NORTH AMERICAN very good; excellent. "Okay, then. Seven o'clock. Radical!"

noun noun: **radical**; plural noun: **radicals**

1. 1. a person who advocates thorough or complete political or social reform; a member of a political party or part of a party pursuing such aims. Similar: revolutionary progressive reformer revisionist leftist left-wingers socialist militant zealot extremist fanatic diehard ultra red *derogatory* Bolshevik Bolshevik Opposite: conservative reactionary moderate

2. 2.CHEMISTRYa group of atoms behaving as a unit in a number of compounds.

3. ***3.the root or base form of a word.***

any of the basic set of 214 Chinese characters constituting semantically or functionally significant elements in the composition of other characters and used as a means of classifying characters in dictionaries.

1. 4.MATHEMATICSa quantity forming or expressed as the root of another.

a radical sign.

Every definition of radical.

Copy pasted this directly from google.

I do believe where you get the "root" definition for it is under the noun definition, which just means the root of a word. So you are actually wrong on all accounts. I bolded and italicized the definition I believe you were referencing.

The root word of feminism is Femina which is latin for Woman. Youre argument is reaching hard even if you did somehow come to the correct answer (that being that radical feminsts see men as the inherit root problem to all of society) the way you got there was incorrect.

Nice_cock_6900 • -18 points • 5 May, 2021 04:36 PM

ok

dilfybro • -10 points • 6 May, 2021 01:20 AM

They don't see "men" as the "root" of the problem, they see "patriarchy" as the root of the problem.

Not all men participate in patriarchy; some women participate in patriarchy.

StarZax • 12 points • 6 May, 2021 01:59 AM

No need to try and brush people off. Not only we know men are blamed for a lot of stuff, we also deny the concept of patriarchy as a whole, which is supposedly a system defined and created by men to benefit men to oppress women, but women who also disagree with this concept are said to have « internalized misogyny »

Also tell that to those who claims that men are trash or kill all men, tell them that men aren't the root of the problem, because obviously those kind of people think they are

dilfybro • -2 points • 6 May, 2021 12:22 PM

I'm not arguing what's right and wrong.

I'm pointing out the definition given here is wrong.

If you ask radical feminists if they see "men" as the "root of the problem" - as the post claims - they will say "No, we see patriarchy as the root of the problem. Some men do not support patriarchy; some women do support patriarchy. So it's not men. It's the system."

It's about accuracy. You can go argue with the radical feminists about whether or not patriarchy exists.

StarZax • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 02:55 PM

You could ask some radfems and they still would say that men are the root of the problem. There wouldn't be such things like "men are trash" or "kill all men" if nobody was claiming that.

giustiziasicodere • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 05:34 PM

You don't need to scout much around: just read "The second sex" by Simon de Beauvoir. It's all in there.

Yoguls_monkeys • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 05:21 PM

A good read, not sure I agree that these ideas have their roots in the 1960s though.

“The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpation on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her.” - From the Declaration of Sentiments, 1848.

Oncefa2[S] • 4 points • 5 May, 2021 09:02 PM

Yeah I kind of alluded to this in the comment I left above.

The **term** radical feminism goes back to the 1960s. The term patriarchy (in this context) comes from the very early 1970s. The *dictionary definition* of radical feminism can be found in 1983, at the latest, and hasn't changed much since then. The *concept* definitely goes back further than that though.

Accguy44 • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 07:38 PM

Well if this becomes more widely known, they'll just change the definition of the term. “See, it's not *radical* feminism [anymore]”

DanteLivra • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 09:34 PM*

mumble mumble internalized misogyny.

A confused radical feminist

[deleted] 6 May, 2021 01:03 AM

[permanently deleted]

DanteLivra • 10 points • 6 May, 2021 01:05 AM

Hating women as a group = misogyny.

Hating a group that promotes hate as an ideology, who happens to be a majority of women (but a minority compared to all women) \neq misogyny.

Go back to your main account.

[deleted] 6 May, 2021 01:06 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 7 points • 6 May, 2021 01:58 AM

the superior sex

Lmao it's funny that it's the superior sex that always screams oppression

[deleted] • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 05:27 AM

Imagine making an alt account because you are afraid of your precious internet points on your main account. Truly amazing.

themolestedsliver • 4 points • 5 May, 2021 02:28 PM

Great post that I am going to consider when looking forward. Thanks

Lui_Le_Diamond • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 10:27 PM

The us v them mentality many extreme political groups adopt needs to die out entirely. It forces us into conflict with each other, and only hurts rather than help.

Greg_W_Allan • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 11:29 PM

I don't know of a place or time in which the oppressed class had longer life expectencies than the oppressor class.

Oncefa2[S] • 7 points • 6 May, 2021 12:16 AM

Or fewer legal rights.

Or worked more.

Or died more.

It really doesn't make any sense. But that's (radical) feminism for you.

dontpet • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 06:30 PM

I think most people don't put a lot of thought into gender politics but have a firm belief that women need special support and protection. They wouldn't frame it as patriarchy, because they haven't thought about their justification. They just feel more protective of women.

If radical feminism disappeared tomorrow we would still be in a very similar situation is my guess. I think this sub puts way too much time into focusing on that issue than in developing our compassion for men as the leading item of discussion.

I think we do our focus on compassion for men here. Just let's do more of it, and more in our own lives.

Angryasfk • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:45 PM

Not as bad a situation IMHO. The radfems do a lot of lobbying, and above all have created the "women's studies" and "gender studies" departments that pose as the "experts" and influence policy and laws! As well as indoctrinate young girls and women either directly if they enroll in those courses, or indirectly through courses and handouts they provide to schools and workplaces. And don't forget things like the Duluth Model, and the general DV "industry", where they exploit sympathy for women to further their own ideology.

I agree things would not be a level playing field, but the radfems do have a significant impact, particularly on how society responds to the notion of giving women special support and protection!

sPrAze_Beast • 24 points • 5 May, 2021 02:17 PM

I didn't read any of it but here is a reward because it looks very long

Oncefa2[S] • 22 points • 5 May, 2021 02:26 PM

Lol thank you.

The tldr is that radical feminism is the belief that women are / were oppressed much like how black people are / were oppressed. They literally tried to appropriate the idea from the civil rights movement in the 1960s, which was addressing real issues of racial injustice against black people, so they could feel like victims.

Most people who try to distance themselves from "the radicals" are themselves, by definition, one of the radicals. Radical feminists believe that there is a patriarchy. So if feminists are going to throw around the

"dictionary definition" of feminism, meaning "equality of the sexes", then we need to start reminding them of the dictionary definition of radical feminism.

Nice_cock_6900 • 12 points • 5 May, 2021 04:38 PM

Ok makes sense i think they should look at the definition

banwavereality • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 06:02 PM

saved

Noob_master_slayer • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 11:08 PM

"Patriarchy" is a tool that man-haters disguised as "feminists" use to shut down any men's right talk because radical feminists want women to supersede men, and want "the future is female" to become true. This works because if someone believes that "patriarchy" exists, then by definition, male issues are non-existent. And that's exactly what radical feminism espouses.

eupraxia128 • 4 points • 6 May, 2021 12:22 AM

Egalitarianism is what feminism pretends it is. But the funny thing is, if feminism was actually egalitarianism we wouldn't call it feminism.

MetroidJunkie • 4 points • 6 May, 2021 08:54 AM

"You don't understand, though. Us small voices without any actual power or influence call ourselves Feminists, so we're the true definition of it and they don't count"

lestrategie[] • 5 points • 6 May, 2021 10:45 AM

Feminism is wrong in its very premise that men are a class. I mean, did they not read Marx?

Same for women: pretending that duchesses are oppressed by peasants is just a way to justify living like a duchess off the work of peasants.

Angryasfk • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 02:53 PM

Actually it is a debased form of Marxism! What they've done is swap economic class for sex (gender if you must use that word). Identity politics has done that too. Socialism for rich people perhaps?

Throwawayaccount • 3 points • 5 May, 2021 08:27 PM

Honestly, I'm against using that definition.

Words mean what they are commonly and usually meant to be.

It's absurd when racism is redefined as "power plus prejudice", or whatever definition is convenient to make it so that telling someone they don't qualify due to skin color is fine because they're too pale.

It's equally absurd to apply this definition, and use it to rope in people with extreme feminists.

Oncefa2[S] • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 09:10 PM

It's literally how feminists themselves define it. You're entitled to your opinion though ;).

Angryasfk • 0 points • 6 May, 2021 01:57 PM

You realise this "power plus prejudice" is a feminist thing don't you? It means they can never be sexist towards men. It's very much an "intersectionalist" doctrine. And this is the real point: are you really a feminist if you don't believe in "patriarchy" and "patriarchy theory"?

SeeBeyond1983 • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 02:39 AM

Thats why i ignore em to the end. Turned hermit, don't support their talks, business or governance.

SeeBeyond1983 • 5 points • 6 May, 2021 02:42 AM

Give them the entire economy, but dont work for them, make your own money, make them do every last bit of it, food, water, mining, piping, fuel, textiles, machinist jobs, education, just dont lift a finger to help them do it lads, let em be the slaves of the economy, all alone,

TigersLyonsCheetahs • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 07:45 AM

Who funded feminism?

Angryasfk • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 02:01 PM

Some funding came from wealthy female feminists (that's how the development of the contraceptive pill was funded, and also why it's a female pill and not a male one - they weren't interested in funding a male pill as they wanted women to have the choice). Then later it came from their take over of women's refuges/shelters and the control of the funding that comes from that. And then there's the university departments! And where universities are funded by the state, that means the taxpayer funds feminism!

950Adv • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 05:18 PM

Combine *all* female stereotypes and multiply that by 100 = feminism.

(Also, they need men to *remove* these "oppressions".)

kdidongndj • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 07:51 PM

To try and simplify a complex ideology such as radical feminism with one single line from wikipedia is a bit silly.

Radfem ideology is basically the belief that men are inherently bad as rulers of the world, and that the entire world must be restructured against their rule. They largely do not believe in trans people. They believe women and men are intrinsically different and a man cannot 'become' a woman and vice versa.

Modern feminism generally just doesn't like gender as a concept. They want to make it into something fluid and changeable. Radfem believes strongly in the concept that men and women are completely different, and that in our world men are on top and women are at the bottom. Whereas radical feminism focuses entirely on women, modern feminism is more about the broad spectrum of groups 'oppressed' by the patriarchy, including the LGBT people or feminine men etc.

The term 'radical feminism' is somewhat of a broader meaning in some respects to mean any feminism which is radical. But the actual specific meaning of it in discussions about this stuff is not broad, its a very weirdly specific form of feminism which rejects a lot of stuff in modern feminism. Today, radfems is often synonymous with TERFs.

Oncefa2[S] • 4 points • 5 May, 2021 09:08 PM*

No today we often call them intersectional feminists.

TERFs aren't the only type of radicals out there. And what you're talking about in general is known as cultural feminism, which yes is a type of (older) radical feminism, and is obviously related to (modern) TERFs, but that is not the only form of radical feminism. Especially not today.

I'd argue that TERFs evolved out of cultural feminism and intersectionalists evolved out of radical ("patriarchal") feminism.

SokalDidNothingWrong1 points 6 May, 2021 11:33 AM* [recovered]

Didn't read. Sorry. Whisky. Costco Irish.

Anyway, the other maximum of radfem is that men and women are equal (literally, not in terms of rights) and that any difference is due to le patriarchy.

Men hurt women more in extreme domestic violence cases? It's not because they're stronger, it's because of patriarchy.

Men are more likely to forcibly rape women? Le patriarchy, men aren't just naturally hornier and stronger than women (and culture today certainly doesn't attempt to redress this).

Men are more likely to forcibly rape women? Le patriarchy, men aren't just naturally hornier and stronger than women (and culture today certainly doesn't attempt to redress this).

Men are more likely to ask women out? Le patriarchy, men aren't just naturally hornier than women or even more likely to orgasm in a casual sexual encounter (and culture today certainly doesn't attempt to redress this).

If I mostly cared about men, I wouldn't care. But I'm a feminist, and think women are more important than men, and we need to be sane to see how to help women, so radfem is cancer and makes it harder to reason about the actual problems women face. So I guess they'll call me a radical MRA?

Oncefa2[S] • 4 points • 6 May, 2021 12:06 PM

The non-radical feminists of the 70s would probably be called MRAs today.

I don't agree with your entire analysis though. Biological differences are important but forcible rape is extremely rare. And women rape men about as often as the reverse. Especially date rape, coercive rape, etc.

If men are "hornier" then they also have better self-control. I think this type of logic borders on misandry just as much as misogyny. Men can and do control themselves every single day just like women do.

You're right about them not wanting to have this conversation though. The biggest one is the wage gap. They can't seem to figure out that a 6 foot 300 lb logger working 60 hours a week exposed to the elements and in dangerous conditions will make more money than the 150 lb secretary working 37.5 hours a week in an air conditioned office putting the lumber that the men cut down into a spreadsheet.

Yes there are women loggers and I want to encourage that. And I give them a ton of respect for it. But it doesn't take a rocket scientist to figure out that the earnings gap is largely driven by biology, not misogyny or discrimination.

We need to stop attacking men and acting like everything is their fault when we're just born this way.

ItsKaptainKilljoy • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 10:06 PM

The OP acknowledges the differences in feminist ideology, but there is also broad disagreement about strategy. Sex-positive and sex-negative feminists agree on a lot of ideological grounds, but subscribe to different strategies about how women should react to sex. Do you topple the patriarchy by burning your bra or looking fantastic in it? Does prostitution exemplify sex slavery or female entrepreneurialism? Depends on who you ask.

There are feminists who agree about the patriarchy but disagree strongly about how to address it. Legislative advocacy? Lesbian separatism? Writing obtuse academic papers? Restructuring society?

I think these strategic differences are important to address. There is a huge, huge difference between a feminist who just believes in the patriarchy, and a feminist who thinks the patriarchy can only be toppled through revolution.

CommunicationDue9315 • 1 point • 10 May, 2021 05:23 PM

Well after the second wave of feminism, the normal feminists all quit.

The only ones left WERE the radicals. Hence all feminists today are also radicals because they were indoctrinated by the lunatics who couldn't quit when the normal women did.

Gold_Balance_9856 • 1 point • 18 May, 2021 04:28 PM

I just can't with this ☐♀☐ I'm a woman with a history of trauma involving men and here's my breakdown:

Feminists are entitled narcissists who prioritize looking for ways that they can continue to be constantly offended and victimized for their gender and sexuality. It's fucking insane. They obviously do not support equal gender rights...constantly being oppressed by men allows them to have an excuse for virtually anything, assume responsibility for nothing and to assert their superiority over men by cutting them down. The manner in which they treat men is appalling because it's straight up fucking abusive. Their entitlement gives them the right to say and do anything to anyone because THEY are oppressed victims, dammit.

As a woman with the wrong belief system, apparently, I am not accepted. Thank goodness for that. Women who don't support their specific bullshit ideals do not count. Isn't that ironic.

If I hear the words/phrases patriarchal system, misogyny, toxic masculinity, you fill in the blank.....whatever is in their cult manual....I'm going to scream.

I'm not exactly sure how these blood sucking b*tch's came to normalize their abuse of men but it's time that they hop aboard the Lolita express and go live in their own commune where they have plenty of Birkenstocks and koolaid.

I'm a fairly tolerant person of others, but I've recently come to see the light and this segment of the population is on my shit list.

sarahmarinara • 1 point • 29 May, 2021 03:02 AM

FUCK YEAH ITS FUCKING RADICAL TO BE A FEMINIST. Feminists have more fun, bitch.

ObviousObservationz • -49 points • 5 May, 2021 02:30 PM

You can believe the patriarchy exists without thinking men are actively oppressing women. In fact, that's what most people in the west think.

Wikipedia says the patriarchy is " a social system in which men hold primary power and predominate in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege and control of property."

It says nothing about how men are to blame as a prerequisite to existing.

Men holding more power doesn't mean men are oppressing women. It means women haven't completely caught up from a time when they were more oppressed.

Think of it this way, if men and women were in a race and men took off in 1900 AD. Women took off in 1970. Men aren't holding women back so they aren't inhibiting their progress at all. But that doesn't mean that starting right now everything is even. Women still need to catch up in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property.

In the half century since 1970, women have made tremendous growth in their political, social, and financial power. But arguing they haven't quite caught up yet is not the same as arguing that men are purposefully slowing them down. Those are VERY different statements.

I'd argue in favour that women haven't caught up. I would not say men are purposefully holding women down.

So there are crazy feminists that think men are oppressing women at every turn. But most feminists are much closer to the line of thinking that women were disadvantaged and haven't caught up. And 'dismantling the

patriarchy' means closing the gap that still exists between men and women.



ellipticurve5 • 17 points • 5 May, 2021 05:46 PM

You can believe the patriarchy exists without thinking men are actively oppressing women. In fact, that's what most people in the west think.

So you believe that men are *passively* oppressing women. How? This isn't what 'most people in the west' think.

Wikipedia says the patriarchy is " a social system in which men hold primary power and predominate in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege and control of property."

Alright.

1. Women have social privilege over men. I can give you numerous examples of this, let me know if you want to see them.
2. Women are and have always been seen as the more moral sex. If you were to ask the average person on the street, they will most likely say that women are more moral than men (<https://cosmosmagazine.com/people/behaviour/are-women-more-moral-than-men/>). For most people in the west, mothers are the ones that teach good behavior to their children: hence are the moral authority. In fact, radical feminism teaches this idea as well.
3. Men don't even completely predominate in control of property. More single women own homes than single men (<https://www.forbes.com/sites/alyyale/2020/01/22/single-women-own-more-homes-than-single-men--but-they-pay-more-too/?sh=6f1f846428ca>), and have more than half of all personal wealth in the US (<https://www.businessinsider.com/personal-finance/women-now-control-more-than-half-of-us-personal-wealth-2015-4>).

The only part of patriarchy theory that is true is that men predominate roles of political leadership. Furthermore, that isn't even because of men. In a democratic system, candidates are elected by their constituents. If people *voted* for female candidates less than male candidates, you might have an argument. But that isn't true. Women *run for office* less than men, and that completely explains the gender gap in political office (<https://www.nytimes.com/2016/10/25/upshot/the-problem-for-women-is-not-winning-its-deciding-to-run.html>). Women win political office at the same rate that men win *when they choose to run*.

It says nothing about how men are to blame as a prerequisite to existing.

True, but many use patriarchy theory to justify their hatred of men. There is no hate in the idea itself (although it is factually incorrect), but the people who employ the idea are hateful.

Men holding more power doesn't mean men are oppressing women. It means women haven't completely caught up from a time when they were more oppressed.

No, but when women face issues, it automatically places the blame on men i.e. men oppress women. This is because of the assumption that they have the power over women to "fix" women's issues. The fact that they are choosing not to fix those issues is why they are oppressing women. Hence, having more power implies oppressing the other group.

Think of it this way, if men and women were in a race and men took off in 1900 AD. Women took off in

1970. Men aren't holding women back so they aren't inhibiting their progress at all. But that doesn't mean that starting right now everything is even. Women still need to catch up in roles of political leadership, moral authority, social privilege, and control of property.

Like I said, women were already above men in 2 of those things even when the race started (moral authority and social privilege) and already surpass men in control of property (in 2015; see above). If men aren't holding women back from political office, then whose fault is it that women aren't being elected? Surely not men. Okay, you can blame the "system" but then since men control the system ("hold power over women") according to your theory, it reflexively puts blame on men. So in reality, women themselves are to blame for not being in political office, since they *choose* not to run. To say otherwise is to deny that women don't have freedom of choice, which in itself is misogynistic.

In the half century since 1970, women have made tremendous growth in their political, social, and financial power. But arguing they haven't quite caught up yet is not the same as arguing that men are purposefully slowing them down. Those are VERY different statements.

1. They already have higher social and financial power.
2. Who is slowing them down then? You can blame the system which, as explained above, reflexively blames men, or blame women, who choose not run for office.

I'd argue in favour that women haven't caught up. I would not say men are purposefully holding women down.

Again, who is holding them down? The "system" or themselves? Blaming the system within the framework of patriarchy theory is equivalent to blaming men. Hence, you are blaming women for not having caught up, which would contradict patriarchy theory, or blaming men, which would contradict your statement.

So there are crazy feminists that think men are oppressing women at every turn. But most feminists are much closer to the line of thinking that women were disadvantaged and haven't caught up. And 'dismantling the patriarchy' means closing the gap that still exists between men and women.

You will find that patriarchy theory itself implies that men are oppressing women since according to the theory, men hold the power to right the wrongs done against women, but choose not to. Most feminists that believe patriarchy theory, therefore, believe that men are oppressing women.

We should close the gap between men and women. Show people that men are also just as moral as women, remove the social privilege of women, equalize the wealth gap between men and women, and show women that they too are capable of running for office. None of those things implies the existence of a patriarchy.

EmirikolWoker • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 04:53 PM

If you believe that:

Society is Male Dominated

Male dominance privileges men over women

While some men can sometimes be harmed by this system, the system itself is set up to privilege men and subjugate women for mens express benefit.

Men are in power and the system operates to benefit and serve mens' needs, drives, and interests at the expense of womens' needs, drives, and interests.

The logical conclusion is that women are oppressed, and the fact that they still are expressly benefits mens'

needs, drives, and interests at the expense of womens'. If it didn't, men - whether as a whole, or a subset with the capacity to change such things - would change things to better suit their interests.

Whichever way you slice it, men aren't coming out of that looking apathetic to evil at best.

[deleted] 5 May, 2021 05:42 PM

[permanently deleted]

EmirikolWoker • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 05:46 PM

yet your shaming those same people

I'm actually calling out that behaviour, laying out why it's hateful. Did you mean to reply to me?

Zafkeil • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 05:55 PM

I didn't realize sorry.

mhandanna • 33 points • 5 May, 2021 02:51 PM

Thats not how feminsits see it though. Its seen as patriarchy and men opressing them

ObviousObservationz • -30 points • 5 May, 2021 02:56 PM

Maybe. But I'm not sure either of us are qualified to say how 'feminists' see it. I subscribe to a lot of aspects of feminism, and that's how I see it.

But I'm aware I can't speak generally about everyone that is a feminist. Although I don't believe anyone else can either.

JestyAverageJoe • 20 points • 5 May, 2021 03:36 PM

Fuck off, troll.

Hungry_Mr_Hippo • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 04:29 PM

No, no, no. This makes us seem like the baddys. Shutting down people who attempt to have helpful discord and conversation by calling them trolls or shaming is wrong. Downvoting and responding show how we disagree with their options better then just name calling them, and are more likely to make them think about what we are actually saying. These actions make YOU unhelpful and reduce the power and public image of the movement

[deleted] 5 May, 2021 04:32 PM

[permanently deleted]

Hungry_Mr_Hippo • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 04:35 PM

I have seen and read other comments of this user. I know what we are trying to do. The issue is that even if 99/100 of her comments are meant to be charged or meant to rile us, if we respond badly to the 1 clean one because of the others it's just fodder. They instantly turn it around and say look how fragile they are, look look they can't even talk to women. When we act defensive it simply feeds them and their bloated world view.

[deleted] 5 May, 2021 04:40 PM

[permanently deleted]

ObviousObservanz • -6 points • 5 May, 2021 04:48 PM

None of my comments have ever been hateful. Ever. Comparing me to Hitler seems a little bit extreme but shows a clear inability to view things rationally.

admins_are_pedos20 points 5 May, 2021 04:51 PM [recovered]locked comment

Get fucked, hateful feminazi troll...all you do is belittle men and argue in bad faith

You are no different than any other hateful extremist piece of shit...maybe kkk? skinhead? Pick one. These are your people...piece of absolute shit

Hungry_Mr_Hippo • 2 points • 5 May, 2021 04:37 PM

I also think allowing them to talk and enabling them are different things. I didn't cater or say we couldn't down vote, I didn't say you couldn't disagree or make them feel unwelcome for bad opinions. What I said was that we have to be more civil then her at all times or hurt our reputation, not hers. And if she is a troll, responding as such does nothing, she KNOWS shes a troll, why are we reminding her? Instead ingage thoughtfully and with purpose, cause that makes US look good and her look bad

admins_are_pedos2 • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 04:41 PM

If you enable a hateful feminazi to have a platform to spew hate, you contribute to the problem...would you say the same if Hitler wanted to give a hate filled speech? Don't want to look like we're being "defensive"...

No. You stomp out sexist misandrist hate. Immediately and always...there is no room in this world for feminazis

If YOU give a misandrist hateful feminazi a platform to spew hate, YOU contribute to the problem

Hungry_Mr_Hippo • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 04:49 PM

No, by giving them space to vent their woes with men in a space that actively fights against what they are saying you get an educated discussion that's makes them look like the delusional shits they are. By telling her she can't be here or discuss anything we are no better then any feminist talk group or subreddit. That's half of what we complain about, that they have echo chambers that day dumb shit and get mad if we talk. Us shooting them down with anything less then the well thought out opinions and issues I KNOW this sub can generate is not only a disservice to the movement, but this subreddit and it's survival. Again, even if they troll 99/100, if we act like an ass even just once we are the bad guys, we know that, it isn't new, and yet this is how we engage trolls.

And again, allowing them to talk without calling them trolls, actually rebutting what they say, will win us more hearts. We are fighting against mainstream opinion, news, policy, and actual evolutionary factors. We have to be smart to win

admins_are_pedos2 • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 04:58 PM

No.

This isn't that at all

A person with good faith questions is completely different than a hateful troll
Us supporting eachother and keeping eachother in check when trauma pushes us too far, is nothing like a hateful troll

According to you, we should give every hateful extremist a platform to vent and have discussion...kkk, skinheads, misandrists etc...

No. Extreme hateful bigotry needs to be stamped out immediately... there's no room for extremist hate, and we should NEVER give the bad guys a platform to spread and spew their hateful propaganda

We also have a duty to protect victims from being subjected to feminazi trolls, attacking and belittling their struggles

JestyAverageJoe • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 01:13 AM

Starving trolls of the attention they desire is how you get them to leave.

I see nothing wrong with repeatedly telling her to leave. I'm not stopping her from speaking. I'm not attacking or abusing her. I'm simply telling her -- repeatedly -- to leave. Nothing more. No responses to anything she says. No attention that she wants. She is a parasite on this community. There is nothing wrong with making cancer feel unwelcome. She's here to disrupt her. There is no need to indulge her with naivety.

ObviousObservationz • -2 points • 5 May, 2021 04:48 PM

Anyone who looks at my post history will see I have said nothing hateful or misandrist. Though I do say things people don't like.

[deleted] • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 05:40 PM

Depends on your definition of hateful, i have found some of your post to minimize or dismiss issues men experience and some of the things you bring up nobody is saying and I struggle to find the relevance.. I doubt you are intentionally derailing conversations but you still are.

admins_are_pedos2 • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 04:35 PM

You are nothing but a hateful misandrist feminazi troll, gaslighting male victims and causes

You are exactly why we need mods to actually step up and get rid of your pathetic sexist ass like other mens subs have

Fuck you feminazi troll

Note for the mods: it's good for us to have open discussions and help eachother. To pull our brothers back when the trauma may make us lash out or lose sight of justice and equality...but this piece of shit is NOT that. Just a troll, here to belittle, attack victims, and argue in bad faith

Ban this feminazi piece of shit

Zafkeil • 2 points • 5 May, 2021 05:57 PM

That small subset at the very top of this "patriarchy" is filled with rich men AND women who use everyone below them for personal gain. And men die on a daily basis to make sure everything in this damned country works yet your shaming those same people and labeling them as monsters of society that "use" women while

you use the technology they maintain to shame them. Also while men are on the top we are also at the very bottom and that isn't the "patriarchy's" fault that's the fault of a few individuals that bend the system to their needs.

maxlvb • 3 points • 5 May, 2021 10:53 PM

The 'patriarchy': Today women can vote, can own land, can do everything any man can do legally, socially, and culturally, but according to feminists and feminist dogma we still have the 'patriarchy' which is an oppressive male dominated society. Why is that?

Patriarchy The bogeyman that feminists blame for women's problems or under-achievements because their big-girl pants apparently don't fit.

Patriarchy A term used by feminists, to blame men for all their problems. Jane: "Why have we run out of bread?" Gill: "Because of the patriarchy."

Patriarchy No theory is more fundamental to academic feminism than the theory of the patriarchy. Quite simply - and perhaps too simply - patriarchy is the feminist theory that there is a regime of institutionalised male control over women.

Patriarchy In all, the thick academic prose of feminist scholars confers gravitas to what otherwise could resemble political propaganda. "The patriarchy is the root cause of everything! Fight it now!"... if only the word patriarchy was replaced with capitalism, it'd be similar to communist propaganda.

Patriarchy and genders are to feminism what capital and social classes are to Marxism.

The Patriarchy: Hate speech, against men.

*Feminism: Equality when convenient"

Oncefa2[S] • 21 points • 5 May, 2021 03:11 PM*

It's gotten to the point that I don't even read this guy's posts.

He's kind of like the boy who cried wolf.

And this might be his "there's a real wolf this time" moment.

He is clearly some kind of feminist so if he was ever going to come here and try to have constructive dialog this would be the place.

But I'm sure everyone here has seen him a thousand times. He's a troll. A wolf in sheep's clothing. So I'm not even going to bother reading his comment this time.

Too bad, obviouswhatever. You've run out of chances.

JestyAverageJoe • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 03:37 PM

The only thing that should be said to trolls, is to instruct them to leave. Do not engage with them further.

ObviousObservationz • -18 points • 5 May, 2021 03:25 PM

Shutting yourself off from any opposing viewpoints is easier. But it creates echochambers that don't foster any growth.

Mycroft033 • 11 points • 5 May, 2021 04:22 PM

This is true, but also your top level comment sounds really self-contradictory, and honestly a bit condescending.

armaadi • 6 points • 5 May, 2021 07:26 PM

Your viewpoints aren't "opposing". They are bad faith arguments not based on reality.

There are plenty of disagreements between users here in this sub, so your feaux concern over the creation of an echo chamber isn't warranted.

Nobleone11 • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 01:25 AM

Shutting yourself off from any opposing viewpoints

Because your viewpoints are ignorant and have completely missed the point of what this group is about since you first posted.

JestyAverageJoe • 12 points • 5 May, 2021 03:36 PM

Fuck off, troll.

maxlvb • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 04:40 AM

You mean like echo chambers of r/feminism, r/twoxxchromosomes, r/menslib, etc, etc etc...

Feminism: Equality, when convenient.

JestyAverageJoe • 12 points • 5 May, 2021 03:36 PM

Fuck off, troll.

Trosso • -26 points • 5 May, 2021 05:01 PM

Rather than tearing feminists down why not post something relating to men's rights?



EmirikolWoker • 23 points • 5 May, 2021 06:07 PM

The foundational principals of all flavours of feminism are inherently anti-male when you examine what needs to be true for them to accurately describe reality. Feminists can claim that it's "just about equality", but it's equality based on bigotted assumptions, presuming psychopathy on the part of men as a class.

Egalitarian values, and mens rights advocacy in particular, is innately antifeminist.

Trosso • -18 points • 5 May, 2021 07:01 PM

Yeh but can we focus on some actual men issues

EmirikolWoker • 20 points • 5 May, 2021 07:05 PM

Great. How do you propose we talk about child-custody without talking about the fact that the current paradigm is the result of first-wave feminist Caroline Norton's work that is known as the Tender Years Doctrine?

What about domestic violence? How do you propose we talk about it without talking about the feminist Duluth Model that marginalises male survivors and has resulted in men receiving next to none of the resources?

How about advocating for degendering the definition of rape, which means working against the work of feminist researcher Mary Koss, whose work continues to be used to demonise men and artificially inflate rape statistics?

Trosso • -11 points • 5 May, 2021 11:12 PM

That's different.

69_Watermelon_420 • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 11:34 PM

Are you an actual troll? "That's different" is something a literal child would say.

Zeebidy • -10 points • 5 May, 2021 11:39 PM

calm down mate the dude has a point. This sub has slowly been going closer to r/antifeminists and complaining instead of bringing awareness. If you want to improve anybody's view of yourself and your group you need to actually work towards fixing the problems not complaining

69_Watermelon_420 • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 11:43 PM

Feminists have been actively trying to restrict Men's Rights throughout history. Mary Koss is just a single example.

I can't fix problems 24/7, so I don't see the problem in bringing awareness to the faults of feminism, which do exist.

Zeebidy • -5 points • 6 May, 2021 02:52 AM

There is no benefit other than you fulfil your anger towards feminism.

Trosso • 0 points • 6 May, 2021 06:22 AM

Throughout history lol

Angryasfk • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 03:30 PM

Certainly throughout the history of feminism. Especially second wave onwards!

Frosty-Gate-8094 • 5 points • 6 May, 2021 04:52 AM

Feminism has already become synonymous with misandry.

So, men fighting for their rights have to take an anti-feminism stance...

Hatred begets hatred.. If feminism doesn't want to be hated, they should stop their misandry...

And no.... hating feminism (a political ideology) is not same as hating women (person).

But feminism hates men (people) - makes them misandrists..

Zeebidy • -1 points • 6 May, 2021 01:55 PM

mate you are just trying to do gotcha moments, especially with this post. You aren't going to get anywhere if you aren't willing to be the better person. Hate breeds hate and you are going to continue building up hate for this sub and for this movement. Don't let this sub become another useless echo chamber that achieves nothing, try and make it something better

Frosty-Gate-8094 • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 06:28 PM

Men are tired of being 'the better person' for 100+ years.

Where that has led men to?

Being labelled as rapists and murderer..
 Blamed for every ill in the society..
 Gender-biased laws against men..
 And more being proposed by feminists everyday...
 Falsely accused and jailed without any evidence...
 Having to pay alimony and child support, for children not even biologically his...
 The society has lost the right to tell men to be the 'better person'.
 Tell the politicians to be the 'better person' who still pass gender biased laws.
 Tell the feminists and 'killallmen' activists to be better people.
 Tell the CEOs and bureaucrats to better person and stop censoring male issues..
 When you successfully done so.... Then come back and tell me to be the better person.
 Coz fighting for the neglected and abused already makes me a better person..
 Just because i dont follow your 'religion' of 'feminism' doesn't get you to judge my moral compass..
 Its not your responsibility to teach me my morals. Worry about your own.

Trosso • 0 points • 6 May, 2021 06:22 AM

I was too tired to go into it

spaghettibaguett • 8 points • 5 May, 2021 08:10 PM

... when you're getting attacked, do you focus on stopping the bleeding or stopping the attacker?

In this case, the loud minority of feminists with power are the attacker, trying to make dudes unable to do shit, whereas bleeding is doing the mens issues, yeah, both are helpful especially if you do em at the same time, but I'd say stopping the radfems is currently more important.

Trosso • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 11:11 PM

Most men ignore the attacker and get on with their day

Frosty-Gate-8094 • 7 points • 6 May, 2021 04:54 AM

Ignoring the attacker doesn't solve the problem.

That leaves them free to attack other, especially defences vulnerable groups like young preteen boys. Who might internalize this misandry..

We want to nip it in the bud...

Trosso • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 06:00 PM

Be a good role model rather than a whiny bitch

Frosty-Gate-8094 • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 06:32 PM

Role models dont solve the problem either...

The vulnerable groups are still under attack...

Burying your head into the sand doesn't stop the sandstorm.

Standing up for them sets an example... I am doing it. What about you?

Angryasfk • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 03:41 PM

Ignore the attacker? If I came up to you and gave you a solid left hook to your jaw, you'd just "ignore" me would you? I call BS on that! You'd either fight back, or get away as fast as you could! In the case of feminism, it has very significant influence: not only does it affect the views of women, but it has very significant influence over laws, and their implementation, as well as things like hiring policies. Men are now significantly in the minority in university enrolments and graduates, yet there are still the same programs around to get more women into university and no sign of them being wound back, or redirected to get more men into university! I mean how can you seriously claim feminism has no impact on men's rights? They either lobby to change laws to reduce men's rights, lobby to prevent changing laws to improve men's rights issues, lobby companies into harming men's employment prospects and massively contribute to the anti-male sentiment in contemporary society. Plus they've disrupted discussion of men's rights issues, and assert a monopoly of truth and understanding of "gender issues".

Trosso • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 06:00 PM

I would run away, that's the first rule of self defence!

Get back to work son.

maxlvb • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 10:47 PM

What you mean men's right to talk about, and criticise feminism?

Feminism isn't above criticism. Most polls suggest that the majority of women don't even identify as feminists. Are we not allowed to question why? Or is that yet another topic that's off limits?

Luke Kinsella.

Trosso • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 11:10 PM

It's just a bit boring complaining about feminism. Let's do something productive instead

Angryasfk • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 03:43 PM

Well feel free to contribute your ideas for doing something productive.

Trosso • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 06:01 PM

I do, I challenge sad losers in this thread who need to step up and carry the boats.

Gsteel11 • -31 points • 5 May, 2021 05:22 PM

The problem with men's right is that all it does is complain about female rights and doesn't thrive one single fuck about one single men's right.

And every one of you would love to go back 40 years and stay there, even if zero men's rights issues were ever resolved.

One day... likely many years from now, a true men's rights movement will BEGIN and it will realize that women's rights are key to men's rights. And everyone's rights.

One day.

MotherAce • 15 points • 5 May, 2021 06:43 PM

Your argument doesn't correlate with observed reality. Feminists, and their agenda, rarely line up with men's rights, or even equality in general.

Gsteel11 • -11 points • 5 May, 2021 07:05 PM

Lol, so says this circlejerk.

armaadi • 13 points • 5 May, 2021 07:29 PM

And history.

Gsteel11 • -8 points • 5 May, 2021 07:35 PM

Eh.. not really.

armaadi • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 07:54 PM

Then you haven't exactly taken a look at the history of feminism.

Gsteel11 • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 07:56 PM

Of you have taken an extremely biased one.

armaadi • 13 points • 5 May, 2021 08:07 PM

I mean, pot kettle

Gsteel11 • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 08:24 PM

Im sure you're all the reasonable voices here.

armaadi • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 08:50 PM

Then you haven't actually read what's here with an open mind.

MotherAce • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 08:10 PM

why don't you actually read a little bit, instead of being combative and weird. Most, if not all, of the items mentioned here are rarely, if ever, brought up in feminist space or forum. If anything, they usually show up to picket or protest any MRAdvocacy. Thinking that any voice for men, is a voice against women. Much like you do just now.

If feminism spent at least a minority of its time improving men's issues, I'd at least entertain the idea they attempt to be a movement for equality. They've been a supremacy movement for as long as I've been alive, and I doubt they'll become better in the future. <https://www.reddit.com/r/rbomi/wiki/main>

Gsteel11 • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 08:23 PM

Most, if not all, of the items mentioned here are rarely, if ever, brought up in feminist space or forum.

Lol, I'm shocked, feminists don't bring up how horrible feminism is constantly! No way? Lol

If feminism spent at least a minority of its time improving men's issues

How often do you spend improving women's issues here? Lol

Talk about so deep in the weeds you can't see straight.

MotherAce • 8 points • 5 May, 2021 09:03 PM

You lost the plot. This was your argument;

The problem with men's right is that all it does is complain about female rights and doesn't thrive one single fuck about one single men's right.

And every one of you would love to go back 40 years and stay there, even if zero men's rights issues were ever resolved.

One day... likely many years from now, a true men's rights movement will BEGIN and it will realize that women's rights are key to men's rights. And everyone's rights.

One day.

...now you are pivoting since I addressed your first issue. I listed what men's right issues are in the above link, and I challenged you to name me a time feminism spent any effort attempting to better men's problems too. As in; Equality. My assertion where that they don't. And that they won't. Hence, men's right advocacy is needed to balance the inequality feminism creates by focusing on the issues of one gender only.

The rest is just ignorant bias and strawmen about what you believe men's right advocacy entails. I'm guessing you didn't even click my link, because you are not here to be corrected or informed, are you?

Gsteel11 • -2 points • 5 May, 2021 09:11 PM

Lol, I'm just swatting down your stupid ideas as you raise them.

And why would I click on a link that doesn't matter to any of you?

If you think it's just a strawman, lol. OK.

We see the content that gets way more votes on your sub right here.

MotherAce • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 09:23 AM

...well, if you are a representative of feminism, and your behaviour here is indicative.... Do you really blame them for engaging more with a post critical of an ideology that clearly villify MRAs unjustly?

You are kinda proving my point about the issues feminism have, by acting exactly like you are. We're done here. Go be a vile human being somewhere else.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:16 PM

...well, if you are a representative of feminism, and your behaviour here is indicative.... Do you really blame them for engaging more with a post critical of an ideology that clearly villify MRAs unjustly?

Lol, so only you guys can act like assholes and everyone else just has to take it or it's their fault! Lolol

Let me guess, you're so insulated that you can't see any fault on any of your actions here?

Everyone always proves your point because your only point is to be assholes and then say "look they're assholes to me" when people call you on your shit.

And yes. I absolutely blame you for this wasted of time activity.

That's the worst part. None of you are moving any needle. Do you think this

question convinces anyone that wasn't already deeply on your side? Do you think it sounds rational to any moderate? But you're not really going for moderates, are you.

Nothing I've said here has been unjust and you're so out of touch with any real sense of justice you can't even tell.

Angryasfk • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 04:03 PM

Well you're the one claiming that women's rights (by which I assume you mean feminism) is the "key" to men's rights. But you admit feminism couldn't give a flying f#### about men's rights. It's a female advocacy movement after all. But stop pretending it's about equality. To maintain this fiction they have to deny that men suffer discrimination under the law or social mores in any way (and I'm not talking about LGBT or racial "minorities").

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 04:08 PM*

feminism couldn't give a flying f#### about men's rights.

They don't give a fuck about your pet issues. Nor do you theirs. Nor should you, that's not the point of either group, but you do have some common point and enemies... like toxic masculinity.

To maintain this fiction they have to deny that men suffer discrimination under the law or social mores in any way

Feminism had ZERO to do with that. Yet that's who you attack to fix it? Lol do you think feminism messed up the courts that have been that way for 50+ years? Lol

That's because you don't really give a fuck about what men suffer from or why.

Edit: you have that lost that starts with homelessness.. and goes through alcohol abuse and the others. Did feminism do any of those? Any?

anonymous_153283 • 11 points • 5 May, 2021 06:45 PM

Do you engage at all with this subreddit?

Men's rights is the most peaceful equality subreddit I've ever participated in.

I wouldn't even label myself a men's rights activist, but every single feminist subreddit and egalitarian subreddit is extremely sexist towards men.

The men's rights subreddit does have some subtle sexism here and there, but overall it's much better.

And people do post about men's issues on this subreddit, if you don't think so, you haven't been paying attention.

Golfchild69 • -7 points • 5 May, 2021 07:39 PM

If this is the case then I'm scared to go to the other subs bc this one is pretty toxic.

anonymous_153283 • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 07:39 PM

If you're a feminist who thinks women are poor little helpless victims in society, then you'll love em.

Golfchild69 • -5 points • 5 May, 2021 10:54 PM

No but I also don't view them as evil as this sub makes them out to be, this forum seems

desperate to go back to 1940s.

Gsteel11 • -2 points • 5 May, 2021 07:06 PM

Men's rights is the most peaceful equality subreddit I've ever participated in.

Then why is this is this blatant unpeaceful comment so highly voted? Lolol

You think "calmly being a bigot" equals peaceful. And it just doesn't.

anonymous_153283 • 11 points • 5 May, 2021 07:11 PM

I mean that's a pretty shallow take.

I could easily call you unpeaceful for calling someone a bigot.

The fact that you give a fuck about labelling someone as a bigot tells me that you probably like to pour fuel on gender argument fires.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 07:20 PM

I could easily call you unpeaceful for calling someone a bigot.

It is unpeaceful. The truth can be unpeaceful. And I never said I was peaceful. The difference is, I'm not pretending.

you probably like to pour fuel on gender argument fires

Look up at ops comment and if that's not napalming gender fires, then I don't know what is. Lol
Yet.. massively upvoted.

anonymous_153283 • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 07:21 PM

So you admit that you're not peaceful? Yet criticise others for not being peaceful.

Understood.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 07:23 PM

I bring the energy to the conversation that already exists.

I don't go to a sock hop in my underwear. I match the style.

anonymous_153283 • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 07:25 PM

That's a recipe for disaster.

Not only will that infuriate both sides, but you'll both end up looking like childish morons by the end of it.

Calmly displaying your argument while the person across from you loses their mind, is an outstanding way of showing everyone that the person you're talking to isn't as intelligent as you.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 07:29 PM

Lol, that's the thing. You guys don't look calm. You look like guys trying to be really calm while presenting arguments that are very irrational and not calm at all.

You just look like you're losing your minds and poorly trying to hide it.

And you think you look really smart. Lol

anonymous_153283 • 6 points • 5 May, 2021 07:31 PM

Who is "you guys"?

ChiefBobKelso • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 06:15 PM

The problem with men's right is that all it does is complain about female rights

Feminism \neq female rights.

Gsteel11 • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 06:19 PM

Feminism \neq female rights.

The irony of your small statement being the exact opposite of what everyone here believes precisely.

ChiefBobKelso • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 06:56 PM

Except it's not. Please go ahead and ask the subreddit if feminism is just women's rights advocacy. Please ask if all the MRAs here are also WRAs and be amazed that they all are, and yet they aren't feminists. Almost as if they are two separate things.

Gsteel11 • -3 points • 5 May, 2021 07:08 PM

Bwahaha, every racist that hates black people these days will tell you they "love black people and they just want to do right by them." But they don't.

Actions show your words to be lies.

ChiefBobKelso • 8 points • 5 May, 2021 07:26 PM

And every feminist will tell you they love men and just want to do right by them. Oh wait, they actually won't. There is a decent amount who are just honest.

vwatchrepair • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 06:12 PM

The key?? ☐ ☐

Gsteel11 • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 06:18 PM

Yup. Real men's right are the same rights the women are fighting for.

Same side.

vwatchrepair • 10 points • 5 May, 2021 06:35 PM

Let's hire and fire based on merit and not on what's in people's pants. I've been called sexist for that statement. I'll let you guess by who. ☐

Gsteel11 • -4 points • 5 May, 2021 07:01 PM

Thats because they didn't think you meant it.

And I don't think you meant either.

I think you say that to remove regulations that would actually do what you're talking about because you don't want to do it.

vwatchrepair • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 07:33 PM

Wow. So even when I state what I mean.....I don't really mean it.

What an argument. □□□□♂□

Gsteel11 • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 07:36 PM

When your actions say otherwise, there's reason for doubt.

OccultRitualCooking • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 08:46 PM

Which of his actions have you observed?

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 5 May, 2021 08:57 PM

The replies on here. The fact that he's here.

tenchineuro • 9 points • 5 May, 2021 09:45 PM

Real men's right are the same rights the women are fighting for.

Women are not fighting for men's rights.

And a Real Man [tm] seems to be a male who does or does not do whatever random people in the internet tell him, especially regarding egg products for some reason.

Gsteel11 • 0 points • 6 May, 2021 01:09 AM

And a Real Man [tm] seems to be a male who does or does not do whatever random people in the internet tell him

Ironic for a circlejerk.

Frosty-Gate-8094 • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 04:58 AM

Yes, but feminists are not fighting for equality there..

Why aren't feminists advocating for banning MGM, conscription and gender neutral rape and DV laws?

Men are fighting for the same rights, but feminists are not...

Then dont want men to have equal rights. That's why we oppose feminism.

A lot of women aren't even feminists.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:27 PM

None of you are fighting for any rights. You just trash feminists.

Frosty-Gate-8094 • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 06:35 PM

Because feminists are misandrists and spew hatred towards men..

They also advocate for anti-men gender biased laws and get them passed...

They deserve to be trashed...

Or you think feminists are some kind of angels send by your 'religion of feminism'?

And opposing them is 'blasphemy'?

Well consider me an atheist then... The non-believer.

iaimf • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 02:32 AM

What would a true men's rights movement be advocating for?

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 04:05 AM

True equal rights and crushing toxic masculinity.

iaimf • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 04:33 AM

Can you give me some examples of the rights a true men's movement would advocate for?

I mean, what rights do you suggest I advocate for to improve men's situation?

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:54 PM

I think the worst is toxic masculinity, as mentioned. There are some issues with the courts in divorces, but even there, it is men dictating those ideas through their ideas about masculinity.

Someone mentioned male suicide... men aren't committing suicide because of women's rights, they're committing suicide due to what they feel their failures as a man are. Some imagined and some perhaps real, but we should help them on those issues.

And talking about feminism may create a focus or distraction, but no problem is solved.

NoMoreMisterMaybe • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 03:01 PM

And talking about feminism may create a focus or distraction, but no problem is solved

Agreed. Unfortunately, most our problems are resource-constrained. You can't magically solve every issue on Earth. So sides exist on what is more important. Lo' and behold, sides start fighting one another.

That's the main thing about men's rights' somewhat anti-feministic stance. Feminism has made it abundantly clear they will funnel most of society's resources to female-first issues, sometimes over egalitarian issues of equal interest to women, to the point of shaming people for not investing into feminism first and foremost. Freeing up resources to reallocate them to more egalitarian issues is also a step in solving a problem, as is raising awareness to this bottleneck. Idealism is cute in a resource-abundant world, not in real life.

it is men dictating those ideas through their ideas about masculinity.

This, however, I cannot agree with. Women aren't fragile flowers without agency who have zero impact on how men behave. If not through active participation, then through passive disinterest do plenty of women harm men in several areas. If women truly valued men who aren't hyper-masculine or the likes, surely, they could show that appreciation and extend kindness and appreciation towards them. Yet routinely, we see all types of men get labeled, trivialized and/or ridiculed. From the "nice guy who obviously has an ulterior motive", to the "incel", to the "gym bro who is compensating", to the "fragile internet warrior", to the "cute nerd who probably can't lead a relationship", to the "quiet creep", to whatever else.

Women's standards have gotten noticeably higher over the past decades, while feminism has pushed society to accept women of all types and sizes, whether the context be romantic, casual, business, whatever. If they can exert that amount of effort to make us accept whatever borderline degenerate and/or unhealthy label as "normal", surely, they can recognize maybe they are part of the problem and can be part of the solution.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 04:05 PM

This, however, I cannot agree with. Women aren't fragile flowers without agency who have zero impact on how men behave. If not through active participation, then through passive disinterest do plenty of women harm men in several areas. If women truly valued men who aren't hyper-masculine or the likes, surely, they could show that appreciation and extend kindness and appreciation towards them. Yet routinely, we see all types of men get labeled, trivialized and/or ridiculed. From the "nice guy who obviously has an ulterior motive", to the "incel", to the "gym bro who is compensating", to the "fragile internet warrior", to the "cute nerd who probably can't lead a relationship", to the "quiet creep", to whatever else.

This whole thing sounds like you're complaining about your dating life and. Has nothing to do with any issues or rights.

If this is a "dating problems" website. Then change the name.

Then finding you attractive or not won't fix any of the real issues.

Edit: To your other point:

Feminism has made it abundantly clear they will funnel most of society's resources to female-first issues, sometimes over egalitarian issues of equal interest to women, to the point of shaming people for not investing into feminism first and foremost.

But the slides they have made are limited and and are not the root cause of most of the major problems discussed on here that you claim are real issues.

Feminism didn't fuck up the courts. Feminism didn't increase male suicide.

NoMoreMisterMaybe • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 04:28 PM

This whole thing sounds like you're complaining about your dating life and. Has nothing to do with any issues or rights.

This is a really bold assumption. A stupid one too, considering just a few lines later, I am already writing about the insignificance of context regarding women's acceptance. I would urge you to throw away society's brainwashing that everything a guy says in regards to women's labeling of men immediately has to do with sex. It comes off very shallow and dishonest, too.

But the slides they have made are limited and and are not the root cause of most of the major problems discussed on here that you claim are real issues.

Feminism didn't fuck up the courts. Feminism didn't increase male suicide.

I repeat:

Feminism has shown itself capable of "improving" things.

Feminism has shown itself capable of controlling resources to the point of moving them away from egalitarian issues, preferring issues that only benefit women, whether that be to a higher degree, a lesser degree, or an equal degree.

At what point do we start admitting that a political movement with giant numbers in support, capable of controlling part of our limited resources unlike MRA, can also

cause harm to men simply by withholding resources? Your arguments are based on an idealistic world without resource constraints. That is not a world we live in.

As for active destruction. Feminism has actively pushed the Duluth model, putting men in a precarious position "at the benefit of women". Feminism has pushed for female-only education and career incentives, while whistling away when faced with study after study showing women are relentless in their partner choices and are very unlikely to date someone below them (ergo: they are quite literally pushing men to work way harder to earn more, just to be appealing, compared to their female equivalent). We know both male loneliness and inability of meeting standards set by society are prime drivers of male suicide, yet feminism has actively pushed projects which increased both of these as side effects, only to stick its head in the sand afterwards, or worse, ask for *even more*. When addressing these issues with any kind of incentive, varying from normal to insane, feminism will quickly fight to tear away potential resources to redistribute them towards other issues, even going as far as to shame men for even daring to acknowledge the problem.

Even if it is not their goal to actively detriment men, to not even *reflect and acknowledge* the side effects of their actions, is highly irresponsible. We teach children to do that, but apparently a whole political movement can get away playing the innocent angel.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 05:49 PM

As for active destruction. Feminism has actively pushed the Duluth model, putting men in a precarious position "at the benefit of women". Feminism has pushed for female-only education and career incentives, while whistling away when faced with study after study showing women are relentless in their partner choices and are very unlikely to date someone below them (ergo: they are quite literally pushing men to work way harder to earn more, just to be appealing, compared to their female equivalent). We know both male loneliness and inability of meeting standards set by society are prime drivers of male suicide, yet feminism has actively pushed projects which increased both of these as side effects, only to stick its head in the sand afterwards, or worse, ask for even more. When addressing these issues with any kind of incentive, varying from normal to insane, feminism will quickly fight to tear away potential resources to redistribute them towards other issues, even going as far as to shame men for even daring to acknowledge the problem

This is delusional and frankly has zero basis in reality and shows you have no clue how or why any of these issues are what they are.

You've simply hamfisted feminism as a cause because you're either emotional or ignorant.

And that's why no one will ever pay attention to you beyond those desperate to lay their emotional blame on women.

Angryasfk • 2 points • 7 May, 2021 05:45 PM

The Duluth model was developed and promoted by feminists who have promoted it around the world. You are the delusional one if you don't

understand that. They've also lobbied hard (and successfully) against things like default joint custody too. So unless you consider NOW to be part of "the patriarchy" then you'd better reconsider.

Angryasfk • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 03:57 PM

Yes of course. It's all "the patriarchy" and once women have torn it down to get their "rights" then men will have their "rights"! Tell me, what has feminism done to advance men's rights given you claim that women's rights (which you seem to conflate with feminism) are "the key"? I know major feminist organisations lobby heavily against things like joint custody, so that's a counter example right there. Nor is there any action to do anything about the declining proportion of men at university, in fact the scholarships and various programs meant to boost female enrolments remain. Surely they either be wound back or redirected to boost male enrolments. I won't hold my breath though.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 04:01 PM

Women's rights isn't the key, all working together for everyone's rights is the key.

And you would rather complain about Women's scholarships than fix one single problem you guys talk about.

You're obsessed with a tit for tat and you would rather bring women's rights down than fix any problem. That means you're more anti women's rights than pro men's.

Angryasfk • 2 points • 7 May, 2021 07:48 PM

The point is that you made the claim that when feminists (ie yourself perhaps) ultimately win, then everyone will be better off, and all these men's rights issues will be solved as "women's rights" (which is identical with feminist objectives in your apparent opinion). Well I've given some examples which would show otherwise. Women have not simply achieved parity in university enrolments and graduation, but are now an ever growing majority. And yet despite exceeding parity, there is no let up in the demands that special programs be implemented to promote female education. If parity was the aim, that was achieved quite some time ago. So why keep up affirmative action programs in education aimed at women? Why maintain the special treatment to boost women's performance? Why not redirect these programs towards boosting men in university? Oh I think we all know why! You yourself elsewhere posed the rhetorical question of why would feminists do anything about men's issues!

As for your insulting comment about my supposedly doing nothing about this. What exactly do you propose anyone here should do about this? March in the streets? Seriously that's just about "raising awareness" which is the first step to campaigning to change things. But in that campaign, we will be opposed tooth and nail by feminists - as the campaign against Florida's joint custody law proved. It's a joke when ignorant individual feminists come along and insist that feminists don't want fathers to lose custody of their children: firstly women retaining custody was one of the earliest victories of the feminist movement, and major feminist organisations have actively and successfully campaigned against changing this! Next you'll be claiming that it's not feminism's fault that men don't get jobs they're more qualified for because of "quotas" "affirmative action programs" and "diversity"! Yet these policies exist because of feminist activism and lobbying. And as the university sector now shows, women could make up say 80% of professional engineers, and you'll still have an insistence that pro-female hiring policies be maintained - because of historical disadvantage or some such thing. Now if you're really about equality you will at least acknowledge there are issues, and that feminism

won't deal with them. You may also reflect that at least some of the ways feminism has exposed pursued female interests have had a negative effect on the situation of men and boys, such as the current enrolment/graduate situation. And perhaps accept that once women have established parity in areas you seek to advance women into, then measures such as quotas and affirmative action should be wound back or ended as they've served their stated purpose. And that feminists should not campaign against things like joint custody or seek to shutdown meetings to discuss these sort of issues. I'm giving you the benefit of the doubt here and assuming that you are either unaware or have just not thought things through.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 7 May, 2021 08:39 PM

The point is that you made the claim that when feminists (ie yourself perhaps) ultimately win, then everyone will be better off,

I think thats mostly true.

and all these men's rights issues will be solved as "women's rights" (which is identical with feminist objectives in your apparent opinion).

Not really, as they're not focusing on some issues directly, but their cause will make your fight easier. The big bad/or main root of the problem is basically the same. But there will be work to do on specifics that vary.

Women have not simply achieved parity in university enrolments and graduation, but are now an ever growing majority. And yet despite exceeding parity, there is no let up in the demands that special programs be implemented to promote female education. If parity was the aim, that was achieved quite some time ago. So why keep up affirmative action programs in education aimed at women?

But thats a very wide sweeping look, they still lag in certain majors and I think most of their real efforts are focused on those ares where they still lag. And that makes sense.

If men's rights got a win overall on an issue but there were still minor interior issues left unresolved would you quit as soon as the "top number" hit your goal.

Oh I think we all know why! You yourself elsewhere posed the rhetorical question of why would feminists do anything about men's issues!

You seem to labor under this massive hypocrisy of everyone has to work for your rights and you don't have to work towards anyone else's?

Every rights group has their focus. And IF they're smart they realize that there are some issues that overlap with other groups that they can work together on. But that doesn't mean they're going to take up your mantle. Or that they should.

There's a difference between doing your job and helping where things overlap.

None of this is how YOUR group works or any group, yet you want all other groups to work this way, but not yours.

Thats immaturity and not understanding how any of this works. Or rhe point of any of it.

And as the university sector now shows, women could make up say 80% of professional engineers

But they don't and that's not even close to happening. If you think it is, you've been fed lies. Lol

as the campaign against Florida's joint custody law proved

How far did you get with that?

Punder_man • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 07:31 AM

When was the last time a Feminist campaigned about the high work place fatalities suffered by men?

Or the fact that men on average receive 60% longer prison sentences than women for the same crimes?

Or family court bias?

The answer is NEVER.. because they are focused on woman's issues to the detriment of men and their issues.

I've heard feminists talk on and on about how "Once we overthrow the patriarchy then issues affecting men will be fixed..."

But I fail to see how overthrowing the patriarchy is going to solve:

Female on Male Rape

Paternity Fraud

False Rape Accusations

Male Homelessness

To name a few..

Also, way to go strawmaning the Sub.. Many MRA's are actually pro Woman's rights (just like they are pro Men's rights) the difference is we just want issues affecting men to be discussed as currently all we ever hear about is issues affecting women and how worse they have it and how men are all privileged etc..

We just want to bring some balance to the discussion

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 12:18 PM*

When was the last time a Feminist campaigned about the high work place fatalities suffered by men?

Why would they? You've never campaigned on their issues.

When was the last time you campaigned on that?

I've never ever heard one of you say one fucking word about it? Where are your marches on that issue?

Never

Their job isn't to campaign your issues because you never do. Lol

None of you even have a clue what the clue what your point is.

What have you don't on any of those issues?

And why aren't they the highest rated comments instead of this shit?

Because you don't give a fuck. Not one of you. And if someone did, they would leave here quickly. And surely do.

Many MRA's are actually pro Woman's rights

More democrats are trump fans. Lol

Punder_man • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 11:44 PM

That's funny.. because when ever MRA's try to setup a function or discussion around issues facing men and how we AS men can go about fixing said issues Feminists storm the area and protest it being all about hate speech towards women!

So yeah.. If we can't do it ourselves because feminists keep shutting us down how do you expect us to campaign for ourselves genius?

Thank you for proving my point here I really appreciate it.

Gsteel11 • 1 point • 7 May, 2021 12:13 PM

because when ever MRA's try to setup a function or discussion around issues facing men and how we AS men can go about fixing said issues

Thats because you obsess over feminism which won't fix the issue. Lol

SnooCheesecakes7314 • -60 points • 5 May, 2021 02:33 PM

why are u so focused on researching reasons to hate women my man

EmirikolWoker • 27 points • 5 May, 2021 04:49 PM

Are you aware that "feminist" and "woman" aren't synonyms?

Also, that showing, for example, that the foundational principals of all flavours of feminism are inherently anti-male when you examine what needs to be true for them to accurately describe reality isn't hate if it's descriptive?

Gsteel11 • -9 points • 5 May, 2021 05:25 PM

Are you aware that "feminist" and "woman" aren't synonyms?

Ironic coming from the same crowd that instantly replies "toxic masculinity means all men". Lol

EmirikolWoker • 12 points • 5 May, 2021 05:31 PM

If you could separete toxicity from masculinity, what is left that isn't a gender-neutral trait?

Also, "tu-quoque" is a weak response that doesn't address the point.

Gsteel11 • -9 points • 5 May, 2021 05:50 PM

If you could separete toxicity from masculinity, what is left that isn't a gender-neutral trait?

Lol, wtf? So toxicity is the only thing that makes you a man? Lolol

Good god, you guys are so far down the tunnel you've just given up.

EmirikolWoker • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 05:58 PM

No. You implied that "toxic masculinity means all men" is an absurd interpretation. I invited you to prove it by naming specifically masculine traits that aren't toxic. And you've failed to do so, implying that you do mean "all men" when you say "toxic masculinity".

All you have to do is name a non-toxic specifically masculine trait. That's it.

Gsteel11 • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 06:09 PM*

Lol, holy fuck, you can't think of one? Lolol

Here, let me educate you as you seem to be incredibly ignorant of it, despite being in this sub pretending to defend it fights for rights:

Traits/actions of masculinity that are not toxic:

-taking care of others, particularly physical defense in a harmful situation.

working hard to provide for a family

enjoying physicality, with consent, while respecting the limits of others.

doing the hard things that you know are right, even though they're hard.

working out, getting fit, enjoying the process

Thats just off the top of my head.

Edit: And by the way, not answering your troll question, which was never a direct challenge, but phrased exactly like a sarcastic point, does in no way imply the opposite.

Your logic is nonexistent and. Full of childish emotions where you only assume the worst with zero evidence.

If you want to challenge, tell me it's a challenge, not some vague ass sarcastic question. .

EmirikolWoker • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 06:32 PM

Lol, holy fuck, you can't think of one? Lolol

I don't believe in gendering traits.

taking care of others

So you think women aren't nurturing?

particularly physical defense in a harmful situation

So you think women are weak?

working hard to provide for a family

So you think women lack work-ethic?

enjoying physicality, with consent, while respecting the limits of others.

So you think women don't enjoy "physicality", don't consent, and don't respect others limits?

working out, getting fit, enjoying the process

So you think women don't take care of their bodies, and don't enjoy it when they do?

And by the way, not answering your troll question, which was never a direct challenge, but phrased exactly like a sarcastic point, does in no way imply the opposite

I asked you to back up your implied claim that "toxic masculinity means all men" is a ridiculous position. It looks like you can't tell the difference between Socratic Method and trolling.

Gsteel11 • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 06:55 PM

I don't believe in gendering traits.

I do. Obviously. Most people do. Most people have an idea about what masculinity and femininity is, at least as a social construct. Kind of daring to just instantly dismiss the entire idea with no real reasoning.

If you don't believe in it, you're probably going to have a bad time here. Lol

So you think women aren't nurturing?

Don't divide my comment in half, reply to the whole thing in context. I dare you to even try and be fair.

So you think women are weak?

(Really this reply fits for the rest of your questions)

Just because I associate an idea with a gender it doesn't make the far random opposite also true.

If I am talking about apples and oranges and I say apples aren't poisonous, you assume that means oranges are? What pathetic weak troll logic.

If a woman was defending someone who needed help physically, I could well think that's a masculine trait but also awesome. And women can do that, it's socially viewed as masculine.

And that's OK.

I asked you to back up your implied claim

You asked a vague question that you didn't seem to want answered and in no way asked for a direct answer.

You never asked me to back up shit until the next reply.

And I did.

The Socratic method doesn't rely on making extreme assumptions about every claim. That's trolling.

Fucking go back to school.

EmirikolWoker • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 06:58 PM

Just because I associate an idea with a gender it doesn't make the far random opposite also true.

So when I asked "If you could separate toxicity from masculinity, what is left that isn't a gender-neutral trait?", you responded by listing a bunch of traits that women exhibit too.

Fucking go back to school.

Glass houses, buddy.

Frosty-Gate-8094 • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 05:09 AM

working hard to provide for a family

enjoying physicality, with consent, while respecting the limits of others.

doing the hard things that you know are right, even though they're hard.

working out, getting fit, enjoying the process

These are qualities even women are expected to possess...

There is nothing masculine about them. In a quality of a good human being.
The only reason you are allocating them to a man is to re-enforce toxic gender norms onto men..
Feminism wants women to be freed of toxic gender norms but if men want to do it, they are termed not-masculine or toxic masculine...
There should be no obligation on a man to provide for his family. Or to sacrifice himself for the society.
He can choose to do easy things if he wishes to.
That doesn't make him less masculine..
Feminists have to right to teach masculinity to men.
Stick to women's rights. And teaching 'good femininity' to women.
Instead to teaching them to 'killallmen'. That should help.

Gsteel11 • 0 points • 6 May, 2021 12:23 PM

The only reason you are allocating them to a man is to re-enforce toxic gender norms onto men.

Why am I not surprised at all that you find these toxic and I bet you love actual masculine toxicity ideas. Lol

Hilarious.

Feminists have to right to teach masculinity to men.

I'm a man. And none of you are. And your fathers failed you because they created victims who blame women and have no backbone to stand up for any actual real ideas.

And that is why your movement is trash and gets nothing done.

Frosty-Gate-8094 • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 06:52 PM

Why am I not surprised at all that you find these toxic and I bet you love actual masculine toxicity ideas. Lol

I ll debunk this statement of yours.

What would you call 'healthy femininity'?

Being caring and nurturing.

Taking care of her family and kids.

Making sure they get healthy meal to eat and clean clothes to wear.

Working out, staying fit and healthy.

Will it be acceptable for me to define femininity this way?

Or you'll call it sexist?

Because it is... A woman isnt defined by her gender roles. Neither is a man...

Allocating sexist roles to one's gender is sexism... Masculinity is defined by the man who possesses it.

You define yours. And let others define their own. You have no right to virtue

signal.

As long as no crime is committed, each type of masculinity is healthy masculinity... It has no narrow definition, as stated by your.

(Same thing goes to femininity, which you will agree i guess)

I'm a man. And none of you are.

I said feminists have no right to teach men..

You are a feminist. That disqualifies you too. Your gender is irrelevant here.

And you think I respect male feminists?

They are 100 times worse than female feminists...

At least women have genuine fears, which are amplified by fear-mongering carried out by feminists..

Male feminists are only there to get one thing. They dont even deserve my respect...

And that is why your movement is trash and gets nothing done.

It encounters hurdles because of imbeciles like you. But your power is limited..

We will spread the truth until you are rendered irrelevant..

Yourhighschoolcrush_ • 28 points • 5 May, 2021 02:55 PM

Lol,you're so wrong...Feminists hate men,we're just exposing them.

DarkWizard2207 • -1 points • 6 May, 2021 07:36 AM

That's like someone saying 'all men are bad'. Feminists aren't the problem, the ones who actually want equality aren't the problem. It's 'woke' culture and the whole cess pool of men hating morons that reside within it.

Angryasfk • 3 points • 6 May, 2021 05:39 PM

I think the point of the OP was that most feminists actually are buying in to that because they accept "patriarchy theory". So that's the real question: can you be a feminist and not believe in "the patriarchy"?

darealc • -17 points • 5 May, 2021 05:17 PM

How did you go from "believes in the patriarchy" to "appropriated black struggles and hates men" seems like kind of a stretch to lump all those who believe in the patriarchy under the "women supremacy" bubble

EmiricolWoker • 14 points • 5 May, 2021 05:44 PM

The foundational principals of all flavours of feminism are inherrently anti-male when you examine what needs to be true for them to accurately describe reality..

Creating a moral hierarchy with women as superior to men is pretty hateful, unless it's descriptive. And if it's descriptive of reality, it shouldn't be any trouble to prove.

As for "appropriated black struggles", that's intersectionality at play as follows:

Women have it worse

Black people are oppressed by white people

Therefore black women are oppressed by black men, because women in general are oppressed by men.

Therefore, black issues are womens' issues.

You'll find even some non-intersectionals like Gloria Steinem making claims that the rights of slaves were modeled on the rights of wives (with zero evidence), appropriating race issues for white women.

darealc • -8 points • 5 May, 2021 05:51 PM

Ok all of those first criticisms could be applied to the civil rights movement.

Furthermore you don't have to be a woman to be a feminist so it's not really a men vs woman thing. And no one is creating a hierarchy where women are above, most feminists just want equal treatment.

As for "appropriated black struggles", that's intersectionality at play as follows:

- Women have it worse

Black people are oppressed by white people Therefore black women are oppressed by black men, because women in general are oppressed by men. herefore, black issues are womens' issues.

Yea the problem here is that you don't know what intersectionality is. The point of it is that these issues often intersect, a black woman deals with a sexism deeply rooted in racism, therefore in order to address that sexism the underlying racism must also be addressed.

I think your problem is that you don't actually read feminist criticisms of society, most are literally just like "rape is bad". This whole post is really overblowing the whole rad fem thing

EmirikolWoker • 8 points • 5 May, 2021 06:25 PM

Ok all of those first criticisms could be applied to the civil rights movement.

Gender dynamics aren't comparable to race dynamics - society hasn't depended on white and black people forming relationships to form the next generations. You get predominantly black areas, predominantly Arab areas, predominantly white areas, etc, rather than necessarily mixed like men and women.

Class Warfare Between Men And Women With Men Winning is hateful to men. All of them, regardless of race, class, etc. Feminism is just as hateful to black men as any other men.

The point of it is that these issues often intersect

Quite so. So whatever black men go through (increased chance of homelessness, unemployment, suicide, drug problems, police brutality, longer prison sentences) compared to black women, black women still have it worse, because they have all of the problems of being black, *and* class warfare between men and women with men winning.

I think your problem is that you don't actually read feminist criticisms of society

Former feminist here, hi.

darealc • -9 points • 5 May, 2021 07:19 PM

Gender dynamics aren't comparable to race dynamics - society hasn't depended on white and black people forming relationships to form the next generations. You get predominantly black

areas, predominantly Arab areas, predominantly white areas, etc, rather than necessarily mixed like men and women.

My point was that you claimed that because feminism claims there is a system designed to oppress women they are anti men. The civil rights movement did the same thing for race, yet you wouldn't call it anti white. You keep saying feminism hates men but you don't substantiate it

Former feminist here, hi.

How can you both be a feminist and not understand any arguments feminists make?

armaadi • 8 points • 5 May, 2021 07:43 PM

Feminism, while being modeled after civil rights, isn't civil rights.

Objectively, there were rights that black people didn't have or laws that were harmful to black people. None of this applies to women, as women hold all the rights men hold, and there are no laws that are harmful toward women. Women outperform men at school, university and work. Studies after studies going back for 20 years have shown women gaining ground and surpassing men.

Instead of acknowledging these advances and then working on male issues, which is what feminists love to claim would happen, increasingly more issues are brought up that are smaller and less important than the last. Apparently, we can't address male suicide as long as Frank sits with his legs apart on a train or David is condescending to a woman, or she feels David was condescending.

Feminism had ample opportunity to be the equality movement and has proved over and over again it isn't. It has proved it is purely for women's and only women's rights, and it has proven it is antagonistic and harmful to men.

darealc • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 08:08 PM

Ok so you're just brain dead.

You realize that women couldn't vote till the 20's right? Even after that they couldn't open bank accounts or advance their careers. Women have been legally oppressed for centuries.

Secondly just because no law says women have less rights doesn't mean in practice men and women are equal.

As for women and school just because women do better in school doesn't mean shit. That stat is over shadowed by the crazy shit we as a society put women through.

Ok so it's total bullshit with the whole "feminists don't care about male suicide", first of all women have their own issues and aren't required to advocate for men as well and second of all the reason so many feminists hate talking about male suicide is because it's only ever brought up in response to women bringing up their issues. Every time women's issues are discussed men constantly are in the comments talking about suicide rates yet they never discuss it them selves. Problems men face are too often used as a cudgel to beat feminists over the head with accusations of hypocrisy or insincerity instead of addressing the ideas.

Feminism had ample opportunity to be the equality movement and has proved over and over again it isn't. It has proved it is purely for women's and only women's rights,

and it has proven it is antagonistic and harmful to men.

Said in the “men’s rights” subreddit lmao.

Also how is advocating for equality harmful to men? All feminists want is for use to stop treating women like shit it’s really not hard

armaadi • 7 points • 5 May, 2021 08:32 PM

"You realize that women couldn't vote till the 20's right"

And most men couldn't vote until a few years before that, and men only received the right to vote in exchange for the draft, something feminists avoided. Both men AND women have been legally oppressed for centuries.

"Secondly just because no law says women have less rights doesn't mean in practice men and women are equal."

You are right, there are areas where women have a lot more rights and areas where men do. Feminism loves to claim the areas where they may not have the same outcomes as a lack of rights all the while ignoring areas where women have much better outcomes.

"As for women and school just because women do better in school doesn't mean shit. That stat is over shadowed by the crazy shit we as a society put women through."

Wtf you on about? It means shit? Getting into better schools and being more educated means shit? Are you high or stupid? What crazy shit is overshadowing this? Better education leads to better employment opportunities.

"Ok so it's total bullshit with the whole “feminists don't care about male suicide”, first of all women have their own issues and aren't required to advocate for men as well and second of all the reason so many feminists hate talking about male suicide is because it's only ever brought up in response to women bringing up their issues."

Of course they hate talking about suicide with women when men make up the *vast* majority of victims of suicide, so feminists using suicide as evidence of oppression are being 100% dishonest.

"Every time women's issues are discussed men constantly are in the comments talking about suicide rates yet they never discuss it them selves. Problems men face are too often used as a cudgel to beat feminists over the head with accusations of hypocrisy or insincerity instead of addressing the ideas."

Yeah? Everytime? I guess you miss where women bring up their issues near constantly across all sorts of media outlets and social media and they get the majority of the attention on their issues. And of course problems men face are used as a cudgel to get it through the thick skulls of feminists who claim that women are always oppressed all the time and men are never oppressed and it's all men's fault. Feminism could have avoided all of this by policing the blatant misandry in their ranks and shoot for actual gender equality.

"Also how is advocating for equality harmful to men? All feminists want is for use to stop treating women like shit it's really not hard"

Ah, the lie that won't die. Feminists aren't advocating for equality, they are advocating for women's rights. And bullshit about thats all they want.

The Duluth model paints DV as something men do to women, and all research done on DV shows its not gendered. Child custody could have been default shared well over a decade ago, but was shot down by feminist organizations. Mary Koss has pretty much single handedly ensured that male rape victims are completely dismissed by redefining rape to exclude male victims. She is the one behind the 1 in 4 myth that led to Title IX changes. Every feminist scholar that pushed the wage gap nonsense completely discarded reasons for why women and men do not make the same amount, which leads to quotas, which leads to stigmatizing women who are hired or promoted. Metoo has harmed women in the workforce by removing mentorship opportunities, and it has harmed men by women maliciously using metoo to falsely accuse men of inappropriate conduct.

"Said in the "men's rights" subreddit lmao."

Yeah, because feminists go ban happy when you challenge their dogma.

darealc • 0 points • 5 May, 2021 08:59 PM

And most men couldn't vote until a few years before that

Literally irrelevant there couldn't vote because they were poor not because they were men.

You are right, there are areas where women have a lot more rights and areas where men do. Feminism loves to claim the areas where they may not have the same outcomes as a lack of rights all the while ignoring areas where women have much better outcomes.

Most real feminists acknowledge this, patriarchy fucks over men in a lot of ways.

Wtf you on about? It means shit? Getting into better schools and being more educated means shit? Are you high or stupid? What crazy shit is overshadowing this? Better education leads to better employment opportunities.

That one stat doesn't prove much, why women perform better is more relevant and if women have more employment opportunities how come women consistently make less? Maybe there is more going on.

Yeah? Everytime? I guess you miss where women bring up their issues near constantly across all sorts of media outlets

How dare women complain about sexual assault and other issues facing women.

armaadi • 4 points • 5 May, 2021 09:09 PM

Literally irrelevant there couldn't vote because they were poor not because they were men.

Iterally relevant because women who were land owners could vote.

Most real feminists acknowledge this, patriarchy fucks over men in a lot of ways.

Then it isn't a patriarchy by feminist definition.

That one stat doesn't prove much, why women perform better is more relevant and if women have more employment opportunities how come women consistently make less? Maybe there is more going on.

Women 22-30 make more than men, not less. Women who don't leave the work force, negotiate higher starting salaries and promotions make as much or more than their male counterparts. So you are right, there is much much more going on that feminism's wage gap nonsense. Further more, feminism used lower school grade and lower higher education acceptance and graduation (which is far from just 1 stat) as reasons women were oppressed. If women are getting better grades, graduating with more degrees, then how are women oppressed? It's almost like feminism is hanging on to past grievances in an attempt to remain relevant.

We already know why women make less, overall, and feminist don't like the answers.

How dare women complain about sexual assault and other issues facing women.

Yeah, how dare I annihilate the bullshit claim that women's issues aren't vocalized.

EmirikolWoker • 5 points • 5 May, 2021 07:30 PM

My point was that you claimed that because feminism claims there is a system designed to oppress women they are anti men.

Not quite. Feminists claim that men oppress women, including the women they claim to love - their mothers, sisters, wives, daughters, all of them. They enable their oppression, and/or stand idly by while others oppress their loved ones. And have done so for all of history.

You keep saying feminism hates men but you don't substantiate it

I laid out the principles and ramifications of class warfare between men and women with men winning in my original comment. Is the following an innacruate assessment of the principles of Patriarchy?

Society is Male Dominated

Male dominance privileges men over women

While some men can sometimes be harmed by this system, the system itself is set up to privilege men and subjugate women for mens express benefit.

Men are in power and the system operates to benefit and serve mens' needs, drives, and interests at the expense of womens' needs, drives, and interests.

darealc • -2 points • 5 May, 2021 08:01 PM

I feel like your responses to what I say have very little to do with what I actually said and you are just repeating your positions.

You didn't substantiate your claim that opposing patriarchy is anti male, you just repeated what you said earlier.

How is recognizing systemic inequality anti male?

EmirikolWoker • 3 points • 5 May, 2021 08:08 PM

The principles I listed above can only be true if men as a class are innately oppressive to women. The way around it is for at least one of the principles to not be true (i.e., society is not male dominated, men are not privileged over women, the system is not set up to privilege men and subjugate women, and/or the system does not operate to serve mens needs drives and interests).

That would undermine the central premise of all varieties of feminism.

How is recognizing systemic inequality anti male?

It isn't. You're equating the conjecture of class warfare between men and women with men winning with actual systemic inequality.

So, to back that up, what rights to women lack that men have? If you can find any, are there responsibilities that go along with those rights? What about the inverse?

darealc • -1 points • 5 May, 2021 08:24 PM

Wait what? So sexism can only exist if men are innately sexist? Do you think MLK thought white people were innately racist because he believed they participated in a system of racism?

As for systemic inequality it's lazy to just say there are no legal rights women lack compared to men. There are a lot of aspects of society that are oppressive to women however. A great example would be how dress codes almost always are designed to tell women not to distract men, how they need to not dress a certain way because their body distracts the students and the teachers. We tell women they have to shave their legs and armpits and wear makeup so they can look good. Now I know you are going to dismiss all of those. Besides culturally women face discrimination in the workplace where they are often paid less and passed up for promotion more often(yes this accounts for job differences), women are underrepresented in politics and in the top classes of America. Women have on average less then men and this can only be due to either discrimination or that women some how innately achieve less than men

It isn't. You're equating the conjecture of class warfare between men and women with men winning with actual systemic inequality.

Wait this is literal patriarchy, if men are the dominant class then that's the literal definition of patriarchy.

EmirikolWoker • 3 points • 5 May, 2021 08:49 PM

Wait this is literal patriarchy

Feminist Patriarchy conjecture isn't synonymous with systemic inequality. For example, here are actual legal rights that men lack and women have:

Presumed custody of children in the case of divorce. This was exacerbated by the Tender Years Doctrine, spearheaded by first-wave feminist Caroline Norton, and perpetuated by modern feminists through lobbying groups' efforts

against rebuttable presumed shared custody.

Separation of consent to sex from consent to parenthood and the responsibilities thereof. Feminist commentators have said that a unilaterally male-controlled contraceptive would "take away women's choices".

Bodily integrity (i.e., genital mutilation. For girls it's a violation of international law; for men it's at best unusual but tolerable, and at worst actively campaigned for as an erroneous means of combating AIDS). Feminists, while claiming to be advocates for "equality", are curiously quiet on this issue, compared to their efforts on FGM.

Immunity from accusations of rape. Rape requires the perpetrator to have a penis, so when women engage in nonconsensual sex with men, he is more likely to be charged than she is. This is mainly the work of Feminist researcher Mary Koss, from whom feminists get the erroneous 1-in-4 statistic. And if a woman gets pregnant from raping a man (or boy), she can sue her rape victim for child support.

Now, for the examples you've given of women's oppression: Have you considered the situation for men?

For instance, men are also subject to dress-codes and beauty standards. They are also held to success standards if they want to be seen as attractive.

| women face discrimination in the workplace where they are often paid less

Women on average, make less than men on average. Despite this, they spend about as much, accounting for roughly 80% of domestic purchases. This means that a woman's 77c is about equivalent to a man's \$1. Can you find any other example of an oppressed class that controls more wealth than they produce?

| women are underrepresented in politics

The gender of the politician is irrelevant compared to whose interest they serve. As I outlined above, there are legal rights that women have and men don't, which wouldn't be the case if male politicians serve men's interests at the expense of women's.

Thought experiment: imagine one of these two groups would spearhead a campaign on abortion. Which would you expect to be more permissive to women's freedoms?

Bernie Sanders, Barack Obama, and Joe Biden

Ann Coulter, Michele Bachmann, and Sarah Palin

| Women have on average less than men

Can you back this up? Because men make up the majority of unsheltered homeless, majority of suicides, live shorter lives than women, make up the minority of students in higher education, and (as stated above) literally have fewer legal rights than women.

Angryasfk • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 08:02 PM

Oh come on. MLK (if you're talking about his civil rights actions rather than his anti-poverty activism he took up later in his career) dealt with laws that disadvantaged black people in large swathes of the US. And there were many measures to "discourage" blacks from voting or even registering. Segregation was the law and whilst officially "separate but equal" facilities for blacks were generally inferior, often grossly inferior, and often absent (like rest rooms at gas stations). I mean you're reaching to compare the position of women in contemporary society with the issues MLK and his contemporaries dealt with.

Angryasfk • 1 point • 6 May, 2021 10:01 PM

Now regarding shaved legs etc. Please explain how this "patriarchy" nonsense fits into this. Much (most?) of the pressure to do this comes from other women. But why do women shave their legs? Well a secondary sex characteristic is that men tend to have more body hair than women (you actually highlighted this yourself below quoting growing beards as an "example" of "non-toxic masculinity"). So women, shaving their legs are emphasising their lack of body hair and hence their femininity! You may as well rave on about the evils of the "matriarchy" "forcing men" to work out at the gym to get good muscle tone to emphasise their masculinity (and impress women).

Not sure what dress codes you're talking about. Islamic dress codes? Or are you arguing that women should walk around topless in western cities? Well I'm not going to stop them! But if you're talking about work in say an office, these apply to men as well. You're supposed to look professional, not as if you're going to a nightclub. How many offices would allow a man to go to work shirtless, or wearing a tight form fitting pair of pants to show off his bulge. I'd imagine many (most?) of the women there would find that "distracting" and somewhat disgusting and certainly unprofessional.

Regarding discrimination in the workplace: in my field, engineering, there is most definitely discrimination. Women are much more likely to be hired due to affirmative action and "diversity"! And I've never seen a female engineer made redundant although this has happened to quite a few men! But I somehow think that you're in favour of retaining that sort of discrimination at work. Just as the various pro-female programs at university are not reeling back despite women now being a large and growing majority of the student population. In fact I have little doubt that if 80% of engineers were women feminists would still argue affirmative action in favour of women was needed. These university programs are evidence of that, as is the dismissal of things like Christina Hoff Summers' attempt to start a conversation about how changes to the education system in schools is leading to boys falling behind (which is likely a major factor in the university enrolment issue).

Oncefa2[S] • 6 points • 5 May, 2021 10:34 PM

Did you read my sources?

In particular the very first link to the Wikipedia article about radical feminism?

albatross_salsa • -10 points • 6 May, 2021 03:34 AM

We men are absolutely the problem lol how is this circle jerk even a subreddit

[deleted] • 4 points • 6 May, 2021 06:50 AM

Looking for some attention, beautiful troll.

TheMediocrity21 • -2 points • 6 May, 2021 05:56 PM

No he's right, most feminists are gunning for equality, I don't doubt there are people that think females should have more rights than men but they're a very small minority. Feminism is awesome.

Angryasfk • 2 points • 6 May, 2021 10:37 PM

You're the problem are you? Well good. Perhaps you can go and become a hermit and all will be well.