

Whisper ARCHIVE

compiled by /u/dream-hunter

May 15, 2023

www.TheRedArchive.com

Table of Contents

Woman complains about "Sexism in the Atheist Community". The "sexist" act? Someone made a pass during a skeptic's convention.	7
Someone in r/seduction wakes the fuck up. These two subreddits need to talk.	8
A conscious and deliberate call for a double standard (crosspost from r/atheism)	9
Ahem.	10
So this is what we have come to. How sad.	11
An interesting window into attitudes about gender roles and violence.	12
Here's an example of how and why many people believe that rape is everywhere... because their definition of rape includes every sexual misadventure.	13
Each one teach one. Progress, one open mind at a time.	14
So many things wrong with this. Where to begin?	15
This is why you don't deprive children of their fathers.	16
What. The. Fuck.	17
Well, wouldya look at that...	18
Wife has problem, husband suggests solution, wife attacks husband. But wait, I thought domestic violence was male aggression? Someone please explain to me how this is the patriarchy's fault!	19
Wife has problem, husband suggests solution, wife attacks husband. But wait, I thought domestic violence was male aggression? Someone please explain to me how this is the patriarchy's fault!	20
Just a reminder that "Red Pill" does not mean "Let's go back to the OLD way of fucking men over!"	21
Sedditor lays down some gender role truth, triggers blue-pill hamster explosion in comments.	22
I do not know whether to laugh or cry.	23
Apparently, people deserve to be found attractive just because they are human. If only we could hook this hamster to the power grid...	24
Waking up is so gratifying to watch.	25
Discussion Thread: The Red Pill and other "unacceptable ideas"... Voting.	26
AskWomen finally notices people talking about the hamster. Contributor makes whole thread devoted to hamsterizing how there is no hamster.	27
A little something for those of you who have the feeling that women are no good and can't be trusted.	28
I keep doing things I don't want to do. I want you to know that I don't want to do the things, even as I do them. I am not the sort of person who does the things I keep doing.	29
Apparently, men are opting out to the point where women are starting to notice.	30
The Slut, and how not to be one.	31
Too concrete, too literal, take a step back.	33
What if women treated jobs like they treat marriages and other long-term relationships?	35
The difference between submissive and obedient.	36
Means, motive, opportunity: Why do women consistently fail to outperform men?	38
Means, motive, opportunity: Why do women consistently fail to outperform men?	39

A wise woman discusses how she feels about being "the most mature teenager in the house".	40
.....	40
This is just how entitled to your money the average woman feels.	41
Outward vs. Inward facing.	42
An open letter to single mothers.	43
Your partner count doesn't indicate how "easy" you are. It indicates how long you stay.	45
There's no such thing as an Alpha or a Beta male.	46
You know how the leftoids love to say that privilege is invisible to those who have it?	47
The Essential Difference Between Blue and Red Pill Mating Advice.	48
Measure your success not by how many people agree with you, but by how many people talk about you.	49
A woman cannot tell you how you must proceed. She can only tell you what she wants to experience.	50
Women aren't ALWAYS unaware of their sexual instincts.	52
The Five Stages of Red Pill, and how to read r/TRP textposts.	53
The Huffington Post Accidentally Red Pill. Please Check Outside Your Window for Pigs on the Wing.	54
Girls with an oppositional attitude towards men aren't able to enjoy sex very much.	55
What IS the Red Pill (an explanation accessible to those who have not taken it).	56
On the implications of powertalk and other language categories.	58
Spergs, Cynics, and Manipulators: How PowerTalk impacts the lifecycle of cultures.	60
The mainstream may not yet accept our answers... but they are starting to ask our questions.	63
.....	63
Complaining about women is not progress.	64
Complaining is not progress, Part 2: The space between despair and complacency.	65
Do not mistake pleasure for happiness.	66
The Redefinition of Marriage.	67
"Ruining Virgins for Everyone Else" (Another Case of the Myth of Female Hypoagency)	69
.....	69
The Redefinition of Parenthood	70
Here's a handy list of what not to do.	72
Why PPD, while sometimes diverting, is ultimately useless.	73
In which I explain to MGTOW that he is MGTOW, and why.	75
On the absolute necessity of patriarchy for women's long term welfare.	78
Don't let people AMOG you... even if they claim to be dispensing red pills.	80
Socialism, Feminism, Marxism, and the Four Basic Types of Human Interaction.	82
Marriage: Red Pill on Hamster Mode.	85
The most important two videos you will ever watch.	87
The Red Pill Hamster, part Two.	88
The Root Cause of the Anger Phase.	90
Small Dog Syndrome	92
The Principle of "Why?"	94
Eating 101: Fork use for Dummies	95
Anger Debt	97
Fork Use 102: Building Muscle	99

The Red Pill, You, & Modality	101
Chapter 17: In which PPD wets the bed, then triumphantly declares itself a sailor.	103
On the Folly of Mistaking a Throne for an Army.	105
What is a man's legitimate and effective defense against a mattress carrier?	107
What "vision" means to a leader of men.	108
The Redefinition of Marriage, Part Two: Sex	110
Men, even TRP men, love women very much.	113
What did she ever do to deserve being called a woman?	114
Innocence and Toughness	116
Trees.	118
First post syndrome	120
Don't Talk to Me Like a Bitch.	121
... And Don't Listen to Me Like a 'Sperg, Either.	123
Generalizations and truth.	125
Infatuation is not the only form of Oneitis.	126
Frame	127
Beating Infatuation (the most common form of Oneitis)	129
Strategy	131
Gronk	133
Respect and male social hierarchies.	135
Change your actions, and your thoughts will follow.	137
Ask Whisper: "How do I get attention while speaking?"	138
Startin' Shit.	140
Ask Whisper: The Fear and Shame Loop	142
If you don't sleep, you might as well not lift.	143
Insanity.	144
The Bitch Management Hierarchy study guide.	146
If only a verbal "yes" means sexual consent, are all nonhuman animals rapists? Were all pre- language homonids rapists?	148
Ask Whisper: Parents	149
Seduction in One Picture.	152
This is Rumor Control. Here are the facts.	153
Avoiding the Tradcon Trap	155
Passion	157
The Final Exam	159
Goldilocks and the Three Metabolic Pumps. (Trigger Warning: Science!)	162
Rule #6a	164
50% is a Failing Grade.	166
Who killed Marriage 1.0? (Trigger warning: dry theory)	168
Urbanism, Ruralism, and Dunbar's Number	171
Yes, Virginia, you *do* have to be an asshole.	173
You're not good enough, you're not smart enough, and people don't like you.	175
Pussy is a Commodity.	177
Kayfabe	179
Treating the Red Pill as a new way of being a follower.	182

Approaching Men: the Art of the Bad Excuse.	183
Good news: no one gives a shit about you.	185
Ignore the Peanut Gallery	186
The 237 Commandments of the Alpha Sperg	187
The Pedestal	188
Jordan Peterson is not your friend.	189
On unplugging all the way: You need to chew before swallowing.	190
Cancer	192
Assuming men are stupid.	193
The Talk is Socially Retarded, Don't Do It.	194
"The Talk" is Socially Retarded, Do Not Tolerate It.	196
Submissive Behaviour as Strategy	197
The Great Trad Con, and How Not to Get Conned.	199
Families and Children	202
LTR: The Bare Minimum You Need to Know	205
Still Wanna Get Married?	208
Indifference and Control: Why You Don't Wanna Be Chad	210
Tears	212
Your Devotion is Worthless	214
Plucked from AskTRP	215
Go Out and Test It.	216
A Field Guide to Retarded Bullshit	218
The Cult of "Self-Esteem"	220
You Don't Need a Wife, Just a Blowjob.	222
Distrust that Particular Flavour	224
The Second Fundamental Skill	226
Instant Gratification	229
Ditch the Resume	231
How Many Women?	233
Whisper's Comprehensive Guide to the Shit Test	234
Hypergamy is Monogamy	235
The Zeroth Law of Power	236
You NEED to Stick Your Head in this Bucket. RIGHT NOW.	237
Always Be Sure to Tie a Live Duck to Your Right Ankle.	238
How Do I Use This Thing?	240
The Why of Feminism	241
Chad, Dylan, and the Myth of "the Bad Man"	242
Don't fall for "natural".	244
Giant Heads	245
How to GET RICH OVERNIGHT with this one simple trick (Employers hate it!)	246
How to NOT argue with feminists.	247
How to be a Skeptical Bastard	248
Situational Metagame	249
Muscle Men, Intellectuals, and the Perpetual Student	250
Persuasion and the Modular Mind	251

No Means No Means ... What?	252
So what if you've had a lot of partners?	253
TRP has an End Game	255
(Endgame) The Lost Boys	256
The TRP Endgame: Financial Freedom	257
What, some of you clowns are actually MAD about OnlyFans?	258
Problems that are beyond the scope of RPW.	260
The Most Important Thing	262
This Article Will Infuriate You	263
How not to be fat.	264
Serotonin, Dopamine, and Covid-19	268
Many of you don't know what "Frame" is	269
Why They Hate You	270
NARS: The Real Epidemic	271
I owe you nothing, and I don't have to fix anything for you.	272

Woman complains about "Sexism in the Atheist Community". The "sexist" act? Someone made a pass during a skeptic's convention.

36 upvotes | June 22, 2011 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Someone in r/seduction wakes the fuck up. These two subreddits need to talk.

5 upvotes | June 25, 2011 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

A conscious and deliberate call for a double standard (crosspost from r/atheism)

7 upvotes | July 5, 2011 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Ahem.

1 upvotes | August 12, 2011 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://www.reddit.com/r/reddit.com/comments/jh04b/hey_reddit_we_need_to_talk_about_rape/

So this is what we have come to. How sad.

4 upvotes | September 10, 2011 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

An interesting window into attitudes about gender roles and violence.

2 upvotes | December 7, 2011 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Here's an example of how and why many people believe that rape is everywhere... because their definition of rape includes every sexual misadventure.

24 upvotes | January 25, 2012 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://www.reddit.com/r/atheism/comments/ourzc/if_a_child_conceived_by_rape_is_a_blessing_from/c3k9aon

Each one teach one. Progress, one open mind at a time.

9 upvotes | February 13, 2012 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://www.reddit.com/r/atheism/comments/pm8y9/scumbag_kansas_bill_protects_doctors_from/c3qlse9

So many things wrong with this. Where to begin?

0 upvotes | April 2, 2012 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

This is why you don't deprive children of their fathers.

23 upvotes | June 15, 2012 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

What. The. Fuck.

3 upvotes | July 29, 2012 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Well, wouldya look at that...

7 upvotes | October 31, 2012 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Wife has problem, husband suggests solution, wife attacks husband. But wait, I thought domestic violence was male aggression? Someone please explain to me how this is the patriarchy's fault!

1 upvotes | November 19, 2012 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Wife has problem, husband suggests solution, wife attacks husband. But wait, I thought domestic violence was male aggression? Someone please explain to me how this is the patriarchy's fault!

20 upvotes | November 21, 2012 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Just a reminder that "Red Pill" does not mean "Let's go back to the OLD way of fucking men over!"

4 upvotes | March 1, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<http://www.returnofkings.com/5145/john-the-baptist-syndrome>

Sedditor lays down some gender role truth, triggers blue-pill hamster explosion in comments.

45 upvotes | March 10, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I do not know whether to laugh or cry.

11 upvotes | March 16, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Apparently, people deserve to be found attractive just because they are human. If only we could hook this hamster to the power grid...

20 upvotes | March 21, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://www.reddit.com/r/Fitness/comments/1alg3b/some_thoughts_regarding_a_date_i_had_with_an/c8zo174

Waking up is so gratifying to watch.

14 upvotes | April 29, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

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

13 upvotes | May 9, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I think something ZionController said deserves its own thread.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**AskWomen finally notices people talking about the hamster.
Contributor makes whole thread devoted to hamsterizing how
there is no hamster.**

22 upvotes | May 10, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://np.reddit.com/r/AskWomen/comments/1e20h5/meta_we_often_get_accused_of_giving_answers_that/

A little something for those of you who have the feeling that women are no good and can't be trusted.

90 upvotes | May 13, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://np.reddit.com/r/fPUA/comments/1e9fz1/attracting_alphas_why_do_men_hate_us/

I keep doing things I don't want to do. I want you to know that I don't want to do the things, even as I do them. I am not the sort of person who does the things I keep doing.

29 upvotes | May 28, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://np.reddit.com/r/AskMen/comments/1f6rtt/men_please_teach_me_how_to_say_no/

Apparently, men are opting out to the point where women are starting to notice.

24 upvotes | June 19, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

The Slut, and how not to be one.

126 upvotes | July 25, 2013 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

It's been brought up many, many times.

The cock carousel. The penis train. Promiscuity. The partner count. The word itself.

Slut.

It's easy to see that there are drawbacks to being one. Feminists decry "slut shaming", redpillians often say that men shouldn't commit to one, men in general just say that, right or wrong, they don't *want* to commit to one.

But what is a slut?

Religious conservatives who claim to have red-pill values say that PUA shouldn't be a red pill thing, because it creates sluts. PUA redpillians say religious conservatism isn't red pill at all, because attempting to increase a woman's sexual partner count by one is what "male sexual strategy" is all about. How could it be otherwise, when religious conservatism is, at its core, an attempt to culturally restrain that which cannot be restrained... human nature?

But all these arguments fall flat unless we can answer one important question.

What is a slut?

And it is an important question, because there is an apparent contradiction in red pill theory, a self-swallowing aspect to the way many people think about it.

In attempting to be attractive to women, a man tries to increase their count of sexual partners. Yet he himself does not desire to commit to women with high sexual partner counts? Is he not creating the very thing he shuns? Is he not destroying the very world he wishes to live in?

But if he tells women not to submit to men's sexual advances, is he not defeating his own efforts at sexual conquest?

Is a man nothing but a hypocrite when he shuns the slut? That depends upon the answer to one important question.

What is a slut?

Will the correct answer to this question make this apparent contradiction go away? *I contend that it will.*

To answer this question, we must remember one fundamental truth about the sexual marketplace: *Women are the gatekeepers of sex, and men are the gatekeepers of relationships.* When we think of a slut as a woman with a high count of sexual partners, we must be aware of what this implies.

First, that she has allowed men through the gate of sex many times.

Second, that she has been allowed, by men, through the gate of relationships very few times... for otherwise, she would have slowed down her pace of acquiring new partners considerably.

Now we are ready to answer the question.

A slut is a woman whose sexual market value consists mostly of sexual availability, and little else.

Or, equivalently,

A slut is a woman who does not have the ability to turn sexual encounters into relationships.

Looked at in this way, *of course* men don't want to commit to sluts. The very definition implies it. High partner counts are a symptom of sluttiness, not its cause. Sluts acquire high partner counts not because they "open their legs too easily", but because the men they have coupled with do not wish to stay... and so they must, once again, find a new man.

A slut is pumped and dumped many times. But **it is being dumped, not being pumped, that makes a woman a slut.**

This resolves our apparent contradiction. If a woman's goal of avoiding sluthood is not to avoid sex, but to make a man stay afterwards, this is in no way opposed to a man's goal of getting to sex. It is the sex that is the male biological imperative, not the hasty departure afterwards.

In fact, that hasty departure provides him with no pleasure at all. Would he not rather meet a woman with whom he wishes to have sex *again*? Would he not rather meet a woman whom he prefers to a hasty departure? Of course he would.

But that is out of his control. Just a woman, the gatekeeper of sex, cannot control how sex-worthy the men around her are, a man, the gatekeeper of commitment and emotional investment, cannot control how relationship-worthy the women he meets are. The only power they have is the binary choice whether or not to open the gate.

So, to avoid being a slut, don't *refuse to have sex*. Instead, have value beyond just sex. Make men want to see you again. And your partner count will stay low without having to resort to withholding tactics.

Because withholding tactics don't work. A slut cannot "reform" herself by withholding sex. If her only sexual market value is availability, then withholding that leaves her with... nothing to offer. A slut can only reform herself by increasing her value in other areas. If she does so, men will want to stay, and her partner count will stop increasing so fast.

That partner count is only a symptom, not the disease.

To avoid being a slut, be a keeper.

Too concrete, too literal, take a step back.

26 upvotes | July 29, 2013 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Have you noticed it yet?

Every couple of days, a woman wanders in here with a throwaway account, and she's had twenty different sexual partners. Or she doesn't want kids. Or she has a degree in engineering. And she either whimpers that her life is over, or defies us to explain her in particular, as if her very existence disproved everything we know about men and women.

And it's not just the one-off, in-and-out posters, either.

You're taking this all way too literally.

The red pill is some information. Not instructions. And that information is about basic principles, not universal specifics.

There's a basic red pill truth in effect here, and it's impacting how you interpret the other information.

Women are generally more submissive than men. Not always, not entirely, but generally and mostly.

That's why you are all treating this as a list of instructions. It's not. It's information for *you* to use in figuring and planning out your life. Yes, there things you need to do. Yes, you're inclined to ask what you need to do. But, no, people who don't know you can't figure out the specifics.

So if you don't kids, or you want a career, or you're not so into powerful, dominant men... does that mean none of this applies to you? No. Because none of these are the real principles we're really talking about.

What are some of these basic principles we're really talking about?

- **Relationships, not achievements, are what makes women happy.** That's why redpillian advice says things like "have children when you're young", and "prioritize marriage over your career", and "don't slut around", and "be sweet and nice, not sassy and competitive".

You see, all of these things are intended to build you satisfying and long-lasting *relationships*. With your man, with your children, with your friends. And to persuade you not to sacrifice those relationships for a career that will not fulfill you. This is why women get paid less than men... because they make less sacrifices for their career. And that's *good* for them.

- **Masculine, not feminine, qualities are what women find attractive and fulfilling in a mate.**
- **Feminine, not masculine, qualities are what men find attractive and fulfilling in a mate.**
- **Feminine attractiveness becomes harder to achieve or maintain with age. Male attractiveness does not.**

Do you get the point? Stop looking for a precise set of instructions on how to live your life. I know you're somewhat submissive by nature, and precise instructions would be comfortable, but people who don't know you cannot give them to you.

Instead, keep the principles in mind, when making decisions. Should you move to another city with your boyfriend when he gets that better job? Should you be receptive to that 40 year old guy hitting

on your 22 year old self? Should you have the children you want at 23, or wait until 35?

So let's not hear anymore of this "Look, I have an engineering degree, none of this stuff must be about me at all!", "Oh, noes, I love a man who refuses to even consider marriage 2.0! I must be doomed!", "I don't want children at all, all your theories must be wrong, wrong, wrong!".

Okay?

What if women treated jobs like they treat marriages and other long-term relationships?

93 upvotes | August 1, 2013 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

- I'm not going to build my resume. The right company will come along in the fullness of time, probably when I least expect it.
- I'm not going to look for a job, or read the ads. Companies should come and find me.
- I'm not going to dress up or wear makeup for my interview... I want to work with people who appreciate me for who I am, not my looks.
- Why should I have any job skills? Going out of my way to be useful to my employer sounds oppressive. It's more important to find a personality match, anyway.
- No matter who or what I am, I am some company's ideal employee.
- That last company I interviewed with had a problem with me having 27 jobs over the last 3 years. What a bunch of jerks. I want a company that values my varied work experience.
- If this job doesn't work out, that's okay. I'll just quit and take them to Professional Court and get an order for them to keep paying my salary for the rest of my life.
- I'm not going to get a job until I'm older. There will be plenty of time for career building after I've spent my twenties backpacking around Europe.
- Established Fortune 500 companies that want to hire young workers are creepy. It's much more sane to work for a garage startup that does something cool.
- I used to work a whole bunch of short-term temp jobs for minimum wage. But now I realize how foolish I was. I'm going to insist the next company hire me as a senior manager and pay me six figures.
- How come everyone thinks that a company that hires thousands of new employees every year must just be rich, but an employee that works for a new company every month must not be able to hold a job? It's a double standard!
- Companies should be impressed by my relationship skills, and want to hire me!

The difference between submissive and obedient.

29 upvotes | August 7, 2013 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

One of feminism's favorite sub-shaming tactics is the term "doormat".

By painting the submissive woman as nothing more than an object to be stepped on by anyone who walks by, feminism has so successfully characterized a submissive nature as a shameful show of weakness that I even heard hardcore BDSM submissives go out of their way to, quite unaccused, assure me that they aren't one, that they can stand up for themselves.

Blurring the line between submission and obedience may be the result of honest muttonheaded confusion, rather than tactical social engineering, on the part of feminists, but they couldn't have chosen a better tactic, both for their admitted goal of making women behave less submissively... and their apparent goal of making women disempowered and miserable.

But what is submission, if it is not obedience?

Well, obviously, obedience is doing what you are told to. Simple enough. And we all must be obedient sometimes, even the most alpha-male of us all. Don't obey your customers, your business goes under. Don't obey the custom of driving on the right side of the road, you're dead. And so on. Certainly submissive people are often obedient. But this does not define submission.

According to Wikipedia,

Submission is the acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the power of one's superior or superiors.

but in a more broad sense, submission, whether to is to a superior with power, or to someone who does not have any real power over you, is *treating someone else like a superior*, or, to put it another way, *treating someone else as if they were more important than you*, whether they are or not.

The idea of treating others as more important may raise a few hackles, especially when we explicitly connect it to notions of femininity or womanhood. Suggesting that a woman, in particular, ought to be submissive will prompt some strong objections indeed, from some quarters.

But what is so important about being important? About being superior or equal in status? About not being seen as an inferior? The goal behind all of these things to be treated well. Being seen as important is not, in many cases, an end goal in itself, but a means by which people seek to improve their treatment by others.

And certainly a man is treated better if he is seen as important. Feminists often complain (complaining is submissive, but they don't notice that) that men who behave dominantly are respected, while women who behave that way are seen as cold and bitchy. While many of the women so complained for are actually cold and bitchy (they don't know how to do dominance), it may also be true that dominant behaviour in women just isn't rewarded in the same way.

Feminists would cry "injustice", but as usual, they fail to examine the other end of the scale. A man who behaves submissively is seen as weak, whiny, cowardly, impotent, or at least unimportant and therefore not worthy of good treatment. But what about a woman who behaves submissively?

When a woman acts submissive, even without being particularly obedient, people, especially men, like her... and want to treat her well.

The word "empowering" probably doesn't work here, given what we're talking about, but submission is one of the most effective tools a woman has for being treated well. It often seems that women are treated not according to how important they appear to be, but according to how well others like them. When a woman treats others as if they were superiors, they feel valued and appreciated and loved, and, if they are not defective people, they wish to return that feeling, and encourage that behaviour. Being liked in this way is most useful indeed in building relationships, and, as I have stressed again and again, it is relationships, not achievements, that make women happy.

A woman who is deliberately submissive is pursuing her own highly effective strategy for being happy... one with the added bonus of making others happy as well. That's about as far from weakness as you can get.

If submission were obedience, this would be dangerous, of course. You can't just do what others tell you to if they haven't earned your trust. There are plenty of people out there willing to hurt or exploit you.

But when we understand that submission means treating others like superiors, it becomes very easy to understand how to submit without obeying.

Means, motive, opportunity: Why do women consistently fail to outperform men?

5 upvotes | August 10, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Everyone knows that men outperform women, and outnumber women, in the most intellectually demanding professional careers: Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics. The most vehement cultural Marxist reading SRS would agree with what few actual misogynists there are upon this point.

The great raging debate, of course, is about why. This debate becomes a great deal simpler to understand, and engage in, if we regard STEM field success as being like a crime (which SRS readers already do, but in the wrong manner).

A crime has three necessary components:

Means. Motive. Opportunity.

Women lack either the intellectual and cognitive **means** to perform at technical tasks and education, or the **motivation** to train for, and work in, these fields, or the **opportunity** to realize their potential within this arena.

If women are outperformed by men at STEM, they must lack one or more of these things. Positions in the great debate can therefore be easily broken down into which one(s) one thinks it is.

A cultural Marxist would say that women lack the *opportunity*; that an entire culture conspires to drive women away from the laboratory.

Some contributors here point to evidence suggesting that women may frequently lack the *means* to perform in STEM settings; that many of them just aren't smart enough to compete.

Others would say that women lack the *motivation* to pursue STEM careers, or even take math classes, because math is hard (for everyone), and women are made happy by social relationships, not intellectual or financial achievements; that, for them, the juice is not worth the squeeze.

From which of these, and in what proportion, would you construct your explanation of this?

Means, motive, opportunity: Why do women consistently fail to outperform men?

8 upvotes | August 10, 2013 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Everyone knows that men outperform women, and outnumber women, in the most intellectually demanding professional careers: Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics. The most vehement cultural Marxist reading SRS would agree with what few actual misogynists there are upon this point.

The great raging debate, of course, is about why. This debate becomes a great deal simpler to understand, and engage in, if we regard STEM field success as being like a crime (which SRS readers already do, but in the wrong manner).

A crime has three necessary components:

Means. Motive. Opportunity.

Women lack either the intellectual and cognitive means to perform at technical tasks and education, or the motivation to train for, and work in, these fields, or the opportunity to realize their potential within this arena.

If women are outperformed by men at STEM, they must lack one or more of these things. Positions in the great debate can therefore be easily broken down into which one(s) one thinks it is.

A cultural Marxist would say that women lack the opportunity; that an entire culture conspires to drive women away from the laboratory.

Some contributors here point to evidence suggesting[2] that women may frequently lack the means to perform in STEM settings; that many of them just aren't smart enough to compete.

Others would say that women lack the motivation to pursue STEM careers, or even take math classes, because math is hard (for everyone), and women are made happy by social relationships, not intellectual or financial achievements; that, for them, the juice is not worth the squeeze.

From which of these, and in what proportion, would you construct your explanation of this?

A wise woman discusses how she feels about being "the most mature teenager in the house".

63 upvotes | August 21, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://np.reddit.com/r/RedPillWomen/comments/1krml5/ponderings_on_maturity/

This is just how entitled to your money the average woman feels.

77 upvotes | August 29, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://np.reddit.com/r/AskWomen/comments/119oka/if_you_found_out_your_long_term_so_had_a_savings/

Outward vs. Inward facing.

4 upvotes | September 2, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We post a lot of "Bluepill examples" here. It's only natural. When you can see the insanity, and others can't, you naturally want to show it to someone who understands.

But every time we post a "Bluepill example" link to elsewhere in reddit, it's an np link. Which means we don't say anything in the actual discussion there, where there are people who still need the red pill so that they won't be celibate in their marriage, cheated on by their girlfriend, unable to have a husband and children, whatever.

The emergent effect of np link + blue example is that we are keeping the red pill for ourselves

An open letter to single mothers.

241 upvotes | September 5, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

You have been linked here because you asked why you couldn't find a relationship, or why you couldn't find one you wanted. I have written this same answer to so many of you, so many times, that now it's time to write it in one place, once and for all.

You've probably noticed that the men who used to pay attention to you are now staying away in droves. Perhaps you are wondering what's wrong with men. Perhaps you are wondering what's wrong with you. But you are certainly wondering what's wrong.

The first thing you must realize is that men are acting rationally and in their own best interest. Their reluctance to date you is not a form of neurosis, nor is it a character flaw somehow shared by an entire sex. You have made mistakes in your past that make you a bad catch, or, at the very least, a worse catch than you were before you made them.

There are two major reasons why this is so.

- **First, you have a child.**

This has several effects.

Obviously, the most important of these is that you are now a package deal. A package deal, not just with a child, but with *someone else's* child. Now, some men do not want children, and some men do. But even the ones who do, want to have children when they are ready, they want to have *their own* children, and they want to raise those children from the beginning. You might think children are just loveable, especially your children, but it is generally women who love children. Men love *their* children.

And it's no good to say "I wouldn't expect him to co-parent with me". There's no avoiding it. Any man in your life, who is closer than a one-night hookup, or a friend with benefits, is going to be in contact with those children, and is going to have responsibilities, express or implied, because of that.

Another, more subtle effect is that any man can now never be higher than priority three. If you are at all a decent mother, the most important thing in your life is your child (or children). After that comes you... because, after all, you have a responsibility to your children. That means he is, at most, priority three. Now, a man doesn't mind taking a back seat to *his* children, because they are his, and he feels the same way about them. But a stranger's? Not a good bargain.

- **Second, you have a poor track record with relationships.**

You were once in a relationship, which you saw as serious enough to have a child in. That relationship failed.

Now, this is either your fault, his fault, or some combination of the two. If it's your fault, you are a bad relationship partner. If it's his fault, you are a poor judge of character and a bad decision maker. If it's some combination of the two... well, you guessed it.

Now, perhaps not every woman whose relationship fails is going to take future relationships so lightly. Perhaps there are a few rare men out there who can truly turn psycho with *no warning signs whatsoever*. Perhaps a lot of things. But consider this: every man who gets involved with you is

making a bet on you. Why would he bet on someone with a history of failed relationships, when there are women available who don't have that?

Which brings us to our summary point.

You may be thinking that, yes, all this is true, but you are still a pretty good person. You might be attractive, funny, charming, nice, considerate, a lot of things. Don't you deserve a second chance?

It's not about what you deserve. Men are not impartial gods charged with running the universe, and given infinite cosmic powers with which to do so. They are not here on earth to make sure things are fair to *you*. They are here to live their own lives, and seek their own happiness.

Which means that any good quality you have might be nice, but they will seek it out in someone who doesn't come prepackaged with another man's child. If you are beautiful, there are beautiful women who aren't single mothers. If you are nice, there are nice women who aren't single mothers. If you are charming, considerate, low-maintenance, feminine, a wildcat in bed... well, you guessed it. There is only one man in the universe for whom you will retain your full measure of relationship-worthiness, and that is the actual father of your child.

Otherwise, the only way that any of your good qualities can outweigh your unwelcome additional feature is if he could never hope to attract the single, unburdened version of you. This means you are going to have to lower your standards. A lot.

In other words, no matter why you left the father of your child, whatever he was, whoever you get afterwards will be *not as attractive*. If he cheated, if he was boring, if he got fat, if he didn't have a job, if he was unconfident and awkward, if he was an addict, a gambler, whatever... your next one is not going to be better. Get used to it. Find a less attractive man whose drawbacks you can live with.

Or hope to find one of the few single fathers out there. Or swear off relationships altogether.

Your partner count doesn't indicate how "easy" you are. It indicates how long you stay.

9 upvotes | September 25, 2013 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://np.reddit.com/r/AskMen/comments/1n149v/is_the_number_of_guys_a_girl_has_been_with_really/cceqjhy

There's no such thing as an Alpha or a Beta male.

33 upvotes | October 17, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Trolling? No.

Just repeating a fact that most of us are aware of. We speak of alphas and betas, but we're really just using a casual shorthand for "someone who typically acts alpha" and "someone who typically acts beta".

Alpha and beta aren't people, they are sets of behaviours, like software programs, and both of them are hardwired into all of us.

- Alpha is a program for capitalizing on a dominant position.
- Beta is a program for getting along with people who have power over us, so we don't get our heads kicked in.

Despite what many of the haters think, we are not so simple as to believe that humans can be separated into the chosen and the defectives.

Instead, we point out that alpha behaviour protocols, and not their beta counterparts, are attractive to women. And that the typical modern man in the first world runs beta way too much, in situations where he doesn't need to and it doesn't help him.

Why is this so?

Because we live in a society where women, as a collective group, have artificially inflated social influence. And among women, being "nice" is a move that shows social value, rather than weakness. So, solipcistically, they tend to assume this is true for everyone, and they teach young men and boys to be "nice", so that people will "like them". But that's what works for little girls. Girls and the women they become really *will* prosper if they are nice, because people really will like them.

But teaching boys to act that way is teaching them to run that beta software, which causes them to be viewed with contempt, not affection.

This double standard is hardwired into the human species. Women who teach young boys to be submissive aren't being malicious (usually). They are just foolishly assuming that what works for them personally will work for everyone.

A woman who acts submissive gets treated better. A man who acts submissive gets treated worse. The conclusion is obvious.

You know how the leftoids love to say that privilege is invisible to those who have it?

194 upvotes | October 23, 2013 | /r/MensRights | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<http://i.imgur.com/bCJoJZw.jpg>

The Essential Difference Between Blue and Red Pill Mating Advice.

229 upvotes | December 23, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

... Can be boiled down to one principle.

Some people think that people are puzzle pieces, each a special unique snowflake with a different shape, and that each person needs to find someone they "fit" with. They advise people to look for someone "compatible", and if a relationship fails, well, the two of you just weren't "compatible" enough. Try the exact same thing again with a different person.

This is the Blue Pill.

Other people know that people are pretty much motivated by the same set of instincts, and their desires can be understood as similar. They know mating is about *attraction*, and that there are simple ways to work on being attractive, and that it's easy to tell who's attractive and who isn't.

This is the Red Pill.

And that's is why blue pill dating advice consists of "keep trying the same thing over and over again, hoping for different results", "just be yourself", "wait until you find the right person", "people are complicated, and all different. Just keep trying", and "changing yourself or your behaviour is dishonest, manipulative, and rapey". Because their notion that people are puzzle pieces means that they must find a fit the way puzzle pieces do... test each different piece the same way, until you get the right result. And anything you do to present yourself differently is just disguising what puzzle piece shape you are, and preventing others from finding a fit.

So why do they believe this lie? Because it is pretty.

Because it comforts them with the whisper that no one is *better* than anyone else. That we are all just *different* in our own unique, special way, and if we just be ourselves, that unique specialness will shine through and get us what we need. It whispers that the universe is *fair*. That no one's feelings ever need to be hurt, because no one is ever just plain not good enough the way they are.

One is inclined to wonder if these people have tried looking at the universe lately.

The beginning of the red pill is the realization that the universe is not fair, that we cannot make it fair, and we all must simply struggle as hard as we can to get by in an unfair universe. That some people are better than others (in the case of mating, this mean "more attractive"), and that we all simply have to work on improving what we have, and who we are.

The lie that no one is better than anyone else may stem from the commendable desire to hurt no one's feelings. But it ends up hurting more than feelings. It destroys lives. Not simply because it gives people fantasy expectations that the universe will crush, but because it *prevents them from doing the work they need to do to become better*.

Measure your success not by how many people agree with you, but by how many people talk about you.

66 upvotes | December 31, 2013 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

AskMen is lit up over the question "Do you agree or disagree with [/r/theredpill](#)", and I cannot help but chuckle a bit.

In life, just like in seduction, you wield influence not because people like you and think you're nice, but because people have strong feelings about you and are thinking about you.

On the flip side, a man who wishes to offend no one is a man who requires the permission of everyone to do anything.

A woman cannot tell you how you must proceed. She can only tell you what she wants to experience.

503 upvotes | January 14, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

It's well known that women give incredibly poor seduction and relationship advice. It's also well known that they are completely unaware of this.

But what if we were to ask ourselves "why"? What is the common thread in all bad female advice that makes them think it's good? How does it look good advice from their perspective?

The answer is **female solipsism**.

When you ask a woman for dating advice (not that you should, unless you could use a laugh), *she is incapable of imagining how the world must look through your eyes*. Therefore, she can only tell you what she wants it to look like from hers.

A woman who says you should do X or Y, therefore, isn't talking crazy talk. Just self-centered narcissism talk. She's giving you good information... IF you insert words like "I want it to look/feel like" or "I want people to think" in front of every statement.

Try it as a mental exercise.

"Just be yourself" == "I want to look like you're just being yourself."

"Act natural, don't force it" == "I want it to feel natural, not forced."

"Love will just happen when you meet the right person." == "I want it to look like it just happened without effort, because he was the right person."

"Be honest" == "Sound honest."

All the quotes on the left are bullshit non-advice. But the ones on the right describe the seduction magic we work to create.

Does it work on other statements women make, too? You bet it does.

"I want to be independent." == "I want to look independent." (I don't, however, want to actually take responsibility for myself. That's hard work.)

"I would never do that." == "I wouldn't want anyone knowing I did that."

"I am a good person." == "I want you to think I am a good person."

"I am spiritual, but not religious." == "I want you to think I am deep, but I do not want you to think I am dogmatic."

We can see that pretty much every a woman says makes perfect sense if you proceed from the assumption that she is the center of the universe, and hers is the only perspective there is. If we think about, we can even start to have ideas about where female solipsism comes from.

Women are both evolved and raised to deal with people, not things. In the world of things, there is one true set of circumstances, the way things really are. Fail to grasp it, and you can't get anything done. Your machines don't work, your bridges collapse, your software crashes and brings down the New York Stock Exchange. But in the world of people, what's important isn't what's really there, but what you can convince other people of.

To a woman, truth == consensus. It isn't important what's true. It's important what you can make

people believe. And telling any literal truth just weakens her ability to sell the story she wants to sell. So when a woman tells you something, she isn't stupidly unable to know she's bullshitting you. Nor is she maliciously trying to pull your leg. It's just that, to her, communication consists solely of people trying to bullshit each other. Any other possible way of communicating doesn't enter into her awareness. That's why you can stand ten feet from a woman and scream "What I mean is the literal content of the words I just said!", and she will look for the hidden meaning in both that statement and the one before.

Someone steeped in that environment has no incentive to imagine what the world looks like from someone else's point of view. To attempt to do so would be a great weakness, because it would spoil her ability to push her own point of view.

Just remember that almost anytime a woman says "this is" or "do this", she is actually saying "this is the illusion I desire".

Women aren't ALWAYS unaware of their sexual instincts.

38 upvotes | February 4, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<http://redditlog.com/snapshots/190425>

The Five Stages of Red Pill, and how to read r/TRP textposts.

632 upvotes | February 4, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I'm probably not the first person to observe that taking the red pill is a gradual process, and that the loss of illusions, like any other loss, initiates a grieving process.

But it's worth pointing out that psychology's general "five stages" model of the grieving process applies to TRP.

1. Denial: "Women aren't like that! They're people just like everyone else! Treat them all as individuals, and you're sure to find the right one!"
2. Anger: "WTF! Bitches are all like this! They have no honour, no loyalty, and they don't really love anyone but themselves! Fucking cunts!"
3. Bargaining: "If I work real hard and learn all the pickup moves, then at least I'll get laid."
4. Depression: "Getting laid by shallow, obnoxious women has become dull and unrewarding. And there's no sense looking for a unicorn. Maybe I'll just be MGTOW for a while."
5. Acceptance: "Women aren't bad. My expectations of them, and theirs of me, were based on faulty premises. They are creatures of instinct, just like I am... but of different instincts. If I learn what those instincts are, and teach them about mine, we can develop realistic expectations of each other and get along just fine."

If we really want to understand what gets written here, in its proper context, we need to understand that most "Red Pill Theory" posts will belong to one of these five stages. *Each stage has value*, because to reach a later one, you must go through the earlier ones. And, as in grieving, the progress through is seldom linear, smooth, uniform, and one-directional.

But to understand each post in context, it helps to mentally decide which stage it belongs to, and read it with that in mind.

This is why concern trolling and tone policing have no place here. Not because extremism is our banner (we have no banner, we are not a crusade), but because venting, discussing and understanding anger is a legitimate part of phase 2. Saying that women aren't worth hanging about with, even for sex, is part of phase 4.

If I were to say "don't be so angry" to someone who comes here to say "all women are bitches and whores", then I would be *interrupting his process of coming to terms with the loss of his illusions*. It would be far better for me to tell him that his feelings are important (because feelings are actually sometimes *are* important), and that his anger is *not* bottomless, and that it will eventually run dry.

So when I read a text post here, some red pill theory, some rant, I just say to myself "stage 2". Or "stage 3". Or "stage 5". And then I continue reading. Because they are all useful. Even if I am (mostly) over my own anger, understanding other men's anger *helps* me, because it teaches me more about where the disconnect between reality and our expectations occurs.

But to anyone who doesn't understand that TRP posts come from different stages of the process... well, a lot of what's written here just isn't going to make sense.

The Huffington Post Accidentally Red Pill. Please Check Outside Your Window for Pigs on the Wing.

33 upvotes | February 7, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

http://www.huffingtonpost.com/matt-walsh/if-i-cant-accept-you-at-y_b_4673582.html

Girls with an oppositional attitude towards men aren't able to enjoy sex very much.

10 upvotes | February 24, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<http://thoughtcatalog.com/lady-goodman/2014/02/6-manipulative-things-every-girl-should-do-when-dating/>

Read the article. Note the anti-male hostility. And then focus your attention on this gem:

Fake an orgasm the first time you have sex, unless he happened to magically know how to get you off the first time you sleep together, which rarely happens.

That's right, sweetie thinks the female orgasm is difficult.

Anyone surprised? Of course it's difficult when you hate and fear men. Orgasms come from arousal, which comes from emotional state, which comes from attitude. Too much bad attitude, not enough fireworks.

I wonder how many RPWs complain about difficulty reaching orgasm?

What IS the Red Pill (an explanation accessible to those who have not taken it).

84 upvotes | March 4, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

- What is the Red Pill?

The idea of a Red Pill is a metaphor from a bad science fiction movie. It references a scene where a character is given a choice between a blue pill which symbolizes a return to his comforting delusions, and a red one which awakens him to some very unpleasant truths about the reality he is living in.

So the words "Red Pill" just mean "unpleasant, but true".

- So what do we mean by this metaphor, Red Pill?

Specifically, we use it to refer to a group of very unpopular and sometimes frightening observations about human mating behaviour, and about its effect on society. These ideas, while unpopular and often considered shocking, are empowering because they are more or less accurate generalizations of which most people in our culture are unaware. Sometimes wilfully so.

- So why do we buy into these "Red Pill" ideas? Why do we believe they are true?

Because when we test them, we get the results we would expect if they were true. When we apply these ideas about human sexuality (basically, that it's not much different than the sexuality of other large primates) to our own sex lives, we are more able to predict and control what we get.

- Do we really need the Red Pill? If so, why?

Yes, we do. Because our society has no win-win plan for men.

Throughout history, successful cultures have been those that linked their mechanisms of collective prosperity to mens' personal mating success. A society in which men who produce earn mating privileges... becomes a rich and successful society. A society which doesn't, stagnates.

This is because men are evolved to mate. It's our primary drive.

We live in a culture that either does not know, or refuses to admit, that men work and strive and risk so that they can have reproductive success: a pretty wife, or a lot of wives, or a vast array of star-struck, horny groupies, or a secure nest egg for their children and a safe space to raise them in, etc. Because of this, our culture has not presented men with a plan for how to act in order to achieve this. Instead, it has simply said: here is what we expect you to do for society. For your needs, you're on your own.

This is not a win-win situation. It's not a deal. It's not a social contract. It's exploitation if we go for it. And alienation if we don't. Because *even men who achieve mating success in this culture did so on their own*. Not as a result of benefiting society or following its plan.

So we cannot win by following the rules. The rules are intended to make us lose.

We have to make our own rules.

- What's in the Red Pill?

The Red Pill contains the new ~~rules~~ roadmap that we have made. A new social "contract" with no one but ourselves and the laws of nature. Do this, and you will get mating privileges (whether that means a busload of sluts, or one wife who treats you right is up to you).

What it doesn't contain is "how to benefit society". And that's on purpose.

Society broke the contract first. It made a plan for our behaviour, with no win for us, and said, "You're on your own, boys".

So we've made a plan for our behaviour, with no win for society. You're on your own, economy. You're on your own, government. You're on your own, next generation. You're on your own, infrastructure. You're on your own, community. You're on your own, moral watchdogs. You're on your own, science and industry. You're on your own, feminists. You're on your own, women. Because you bailed on us first.

- What do we want from the Red Pill?

Not just sex.

What we want is control over our lives. Sex lives, yes, but also just plain lives.

Some understandable correlation between what we do, and what we get. Our grandparents had that. Our parents dismantled it, and replaced it with idealistic nonsense. The Greatest Generation gave birth to the worst one.

The Red Pill gives us autonomy. Yes, it's salted with alienation, but it's real autonomy, and it works.

- What would it take for us to give up the Red Pill?

A social contract that works for us as well as society. It doesn't have to be the old one. It could be a new one. But it has to be win-win.

We are not at home to harangues. You will not shame us into going back to the plan of giving, and giving some more, and getting "you're on your own" in return. We no longer value your approval, because your approval comes with no benefits.

We are making our own societies of one, because yours has failed us. Make a new one that works, or shut up.

Ball's in your court, society.

On the implications of powertalk and other language categories.

310 upvotes | March 6, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

By now, many of us have read Venkatesh Rao's interesting column, linked ~~here~~ (bot doesn't allow links) by TRPsubmitter, on different kinds of language in the workplace.

Already it is ~~generating some commentary~~ (bot doesn't allow links), mostly focused on the concept of the "PowerTalk" language... because communications in that language are the ones which cause real change.

However, in order to understand the concept of powertalk in general, we have to tease it away from examples that make it specific to "The Office" as a story, and the workplace as a setting, and create some more general definitions.

What are distinguishing characteristics of powertalk?

- It is used to get something for oneself, rather than to convey information.
- It can be truth or lies, according to the needs of the speaker.
- It is plausibly deniable.

The distinguishing feature of sociopaths, or power players, if you will, is that they are fluent in powertalk. This sets them apart from the group Rao calls "Clueless", which we might call naive, or surface communicators, or spergs, in that this group mistakes powertalk for straighttalk.

Now, EVERYONE engages in straighttalk from time to time. How long does that machine bolt need to be? Where is Sausalito? Will you that be for here or to go? What were the results of our wind tunnel study? Straighttalk just means language used to communicate a piece of information.

But the distinguishing characteristic of the sperg is that they engage in straighttalk *all the time*.

The third type, whom Rao calls "Losers", which we might call "awakened" or "cynics", is that they are aware of the existence of powertalk, but are unable or unwilling to accept it as just a morally neutral reality, and to employ it to their advantage. Instead, they observe and often resent it. They are stuck in the question of whether powertalk is "good" or "bad", and unable to consider the "how" of using it.

They engage in straighttalk at times, but not always. They also engage in what Rao calls "GameTalk" which is like powertalk, but with out key difference... it is self-oriented.

In other words:

- It can be truth or lies, according to the needs of the speaker.
- It is plausibly deniable.
- BUT unlike powertalk, is it used to make oneself feel better, or feel a certain way that one wants to feel. Instead of being oriented towards external goals, it pursues internal ones.

So, having taken a slightly different spin here, what does this get us?

Several startling but enlightening conclusions:

- Women are usually far more skilled at powertalk than men. Most of them instinctively understand that you don't say things because they're true, you say things to get what you want. If they're true, that's just a coincidence.
- Women's alternative to powertalk is usually gametalk, men's is usually straighttalk.
- This means that where and when men or women are successful and in power, they are both "power players/sociopaths", but the failure modes are different.
- Where and when women are unsuccessful, their failure mode is often "gametalk". They are in too much emotional turmoil to manipulate effectively, and must spend energy making themselves feel better.
- Where and when men are unsuccessful, their failure mode is mostly "straighttalk". They are unable to see that they are not being given the actual story, and that they must sniff it out for themselves. They waste energy responding to illusions someone else has created for them.
- What we are doing here in TRP is trying to engage in straighttalk ABOUT powertalk. This purpose of this is for people who are used to straighttalk to learn powertalk. This requires straighttalk because the number one rule of powertalk is that you never admit to the existence of powertalk.
- This is why women hate TRP and love the techniques it teaches. A man who can engage in powertalk, and use its rules to make himself attractive, turns them on. But TRP isn't powertalk. It's *straighttalk ABOUT powertalk*. The more they love skilled and fluent powertalk, the more they hate seeing the veil ripped off it (because doing so is bad powertalk).
- Feminism is powertalk. Example: Not only does no not always mean no, "No means no" doesn't mean "no means no". It doesn't mean "All men must ask permission before mating". "No mean no" means "If you can't both discern the difference between no that means no, and no that means yes, AND you can't discern that 'no means no' doesn't apply to everyone, then we want YOU to be in the group of men that asks permission before mating. Because your lack of powertalk skills is unattractive, and we want to make sure that you don't try to sex us without first giving us an escape valve that we can use without looking mean."
- The only way to tell the difference between skilled-enough powertalk, and straighttalk is observe the actions of the speaker.
- Feminists calling TRP neckbearded quasi-rapists is more powertalk. Neckbeard is their powertalk code word for "unattractive", but the real unattractiveness they fear is his lack of mastery of powertalk. They're afraid of the creation of a sort of hybrid, a man who understands powertalk well enough to see through their bullshit, but not well enough to create his own bullshit and actually thus BE attractive. That's why they use the term "rapist"... because such a man is indeed frighteningly like a rapist... he ignores social defenses against unattractive men (because he can READ powertalk), but he can't make the leap to being an attractive man (because he cannot WRITE powertalk).
- For this reason, TRP is and must be, not a public forum for calling women out on their bullshit, but a private lab for teaching each other to play the bullshit game.

Spergs, Cynics, and Manipulators: How PowerTalk impacts the lifecycle of cultures.

40 upvotes | March 7, 2014 | /r/AlreadyRed | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

The conversation so far:

http://www.reddit.com/r/AlreadyRed/comments/1zmm02/four_major_languages_spoken_in_organizations/

http://www.reddit.com/r/AlreadyRed/comments/1zpofw/some_people_will_never_get_it_xpost_now_30_longer/

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/1zrcs3/on_the_implications_of_powertalk_and_other/

So we can separate people and their modes of speech into:

- Spergs (not literally people with Asperger's syndrome, but kinda like that): Speak StraightTalk (saying exactly what you think is the truth). Believe what they are told. Spergs are *believers*... people who cry at sad movies, people who believe in god, people who are patriotic, people who try to do the right thing, people who think Coke tastes better than Pepsi (or vice versa), people who buy lottery tickets.
- Cynics: Speak StraightTalk, GameTalk (manipulating others to make themselves feel better), and a small amount of PowerTalk. But unlike manipulators, they aren't very comfortable speaking it, or very good at it, and they tend to slide back into straighttalk if they try to relax or stop paying attention. Cynics are *unbelievers and iconoclasts*. Angry atheists, people who think all politicians are corrupt, people who think Coke and Pepsi both taste like malted battery acid, and probably have the same formula, people who think gambling is a tax on people who can't do math.
- Manipulators (usually not actually sociopaths, who are rarer altogether): Speak PowerTalk fluently and naturally. They don't have to school themselves in powertalk, because it is easy, relaxed, and natural for them. Manipulators are *pretend-to-believers and convincers of others to believe*. Cult leaders, people who write ads to convince people Pepsi tastes better than Coke (or vice versa), people who pass laws named after dead children, people who sell lottery tickets.

All societies and cultures are built and sustained by Spergs, because Spergs are the only ones that create real and lasting economic value. Cynics get by putting in as little effort as they can, and Manipulators never willingly build anything... it's much more efficient to let it Spergs build it, and then take it from them. Cynics can build things when they are forced or bribed into it. Manipulators only build things when they have to act like Spergs, either to pass for one, or because there's no opportunity to steal. But Spergs are the actual builders.

Societies start out innocent, whether they are nations or subcultures, whether they begin with revolution or exodus or simply through joining together to form a collective. What innocent means, in this case, is that spergs vastly outnumber cynics and manipulators. These societies are highly productive and good to live in... people work together, trust each other, and produce.

The problem is they aren't stable, because, while the strongest societies are made of spergs, those who

prosper most in society are the manipulators. So while its in everyone's best interest for spergs to outnumber everyone else, it isn't in anyone's best interest to *be* one of them.

This means there is an inevitable flow. It's slow at first, of course. In innocent societies, cynics point out manipulators... and the spergs lynch them. So manipulators have to hide very well indeed, and have to act very sperglike. But eventually, the number of manipulators grows, and with them, the number of cynics (since manipulators create them). But the rising number of cynics actually makes it safer to be a manipulator. There's a boy-who-cried-wolf effect, and gradually the manipulators become common enough to form alliances.

The tipping point is when there are enough manipulators that their activities appear mainstream... and then, when the cynics point them out, the manipulators can call the cynics crazy, and instead of being lynched themselves, they can *actually get the spergs to lynch the cynics*. Using words like "negative", "crazy", "unpatriotic", "conspiracy theorist", "tax dodge" and "part of the problem".

They come up with soundbite political slogans to keep the spergs yelling at each other, and different political parties that pretend to hate each other so that it will look like voting matters. And then say that the problem is people who don't vote.

If they want to spy on internet traffic, they just say it's full of terrorists and pedophiles. If they want to silence someone, they call him a racist or a sexist. Whatever.

Point is, when there's enough of them, the cynics stop wanting to get manipulators lynched (because it's hopeless), and start wanting to become manipulators. They stop hating them and start envying them.

This leaves manipulators free to devour the spergs as fast as they can. Now, here's the tricky part. The manipulators don't win.

Because manipulators are utterly dependent on spergs for survival. Manipulators don't produce anything, so they can't survive on their own. And once the manipulators' numbers are no longer being kept in check, they run out of spergs. They either turn into cynics (who limit their production to preserve their quality of life in a parasite-rich environment), or they're just supporting too many manipulators and don't have anything left to steal.

Manipulators are the ultimate survivors in a stable society, but they destroy the very thing they depend on for survival.

Cynics can spot the decay, but they can't stop it.

Spergs can produce, and could save society if they could work together... but at the head of every SAVE SOCIETY NOW march is a manipulator, quietly lining his pockets with the donation money.

Such a society has left innocence far behind and is now in a state of rot. This rot cannot be stopped. Because it makes no sense to be a sperg in this situation. It's suicide. But spergs are the one thing society needs to save itself and survive. So people run about trying to make everyone else bake more pie, while they themselves concentrate on fighting for a bigger slice. But anyone who actually stops fighting over slices in order to bake... immediately loses his whole slice.

When the decay has become so advanced that even the spergs can spot it, who is who, and to what degree, can be measured by their responses.

Spergs ask themselves how to save the culture.

Cynics ask themselves how to avoid going down with the ship.

Manipulators ask themselves how to use the collapse to make a buck and get laid (by pretending to care deeply about saving society, for example).

Who wins? No one. You can't win, you can't break even, and you can't quit the game. Spergs get eaten, cynics become metaphorical (or literal) refugees, and manipulators run out of spergs and eat each other. Or get burned at the stake.

And the cycle begins anew.

The mainstream may not yet accept our answers... but they are starting to ask our questions.

111 upvotes | April 30, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Complaining about women is not progress.

321 upvotes | May 12, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We've all done it.

We've all experienced that frustration with dealing with someone very different than ourselves, and that frustration is redoubled and redoubled again when we live in a place and time that discourages and even punishes criticism of certain people.

So, when we find a discussion venue or a private conversation where women are NOT held as sacred cows, immune to censure of any kind, the temptation to bitch endlessly is strong indeed, especially when we are in the angry phase.

And often others in this sort of conversation are reluctant to demur, because they know that white knighting, tone policing, and concern trolling are real things, and dangers to be avoided.

But complaining about a problem doesn't fix the problem. In fact, it is the opposite of fixing a problem. We complain to make ourselves feel better, and much of the time we do this by laying the blame for our difficulties on others.

But when we lay the blame on others, we surrender to circumstance and relinquish power. We say "this was done to me" instead of "I made this mistake, and suffered harm as a result".

Whenever a bad thing happens to us, or even whenever we are disappointed and frustrated, the blame lies partially with others and the universe, but partially with ourselves. The path to power, power in the sense of control over our own lives, lies in seeking out the ways in which we are at fault. Because these are the parts we can change.

You're not going to change women. You wouldn't even want to. The same things that make them frustratingly irrational on facebook posts are the things that also make them feminine and loveable to us. They live with their hearts. You wouldn't want them to live with their heads. If you did, you'd be gay. (And if you ARE gay, you probably don't find women all that frustrating, because you can take them or leave them.)

If you blame women for being how they are, instead of looking for the ways that your expectations of them are flawed, instead of looking for the ways that it is good for them to be as they are, instead of seeing the ways that they *must* be as they are... you are hurting only yourself. You are taking the path of least resistance instead of the path of self-improvement. You are sparing your feelings at the expense of your ambitions.

This is indeed an open forum for you to say socially unacceptable, politically incorrect things, if you wish. It must remain so, because some of those things are true, or useful, or both.

But consider your own progress, worth, and control over your life.

Laughing at women for being bad at obstacle courses, for example, is just a sop to your inner weakness. Because you know full well that women aren't *for* obstacle courses. That's *your* job.

Women are for other things, and you want and need them for those other things, just as they want and need certain things from you.

You will grow if you understand how they operate and how to deal with them. You will stagnate if you sit around blaming them for not being like you.

Complaining is not progress, Part 2: The space between despair and complacency.

30 upvotes | May 13, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So we've talked about how sitting around bitching about the gap between your precise desires and women's behaviour won't help you any.

But what will?

We can imagine what call the "Red Pill" as any or all of the following:

- The idea that our dialogue about the sexes and the relationship between them must, to be useful, be based on observations and what we think is true, rather than what is politic and inoffensive to say.
- The ideas that we come up with from the resulting observations and dialogue.
- The discussion group where we exchange these ideas.
- The course of action suggested by those ideas we have exchanged.

The last one can be envisioned as sort of a road between the states of what we stereotypically imagine as a neckbearded, angry, fedora and trenchcoat wearing outcast, and that of the (perhaps vaguely-described) self-actualized man who is in control of his own life.

Moving from one to the other (or from some midpoint to the desirable end, since most of us didn't start out as neckbeards) requires knowing which direction to go, and fucking walking.

We've already seen how complaining is the enemy of motion. When we blame others for our problems, or when we focus on the part of our problem that is someone else's fault, we fail to focus on the part that is our fault... the part we can change.

If we do otherwise, we create the belief that we do not need to change, that we are fine as we are. This is the error of **complacency**. It comes from the beliefs that we are "good enough", or from the Dunning-Kruger effect making us think we are better than we are, or the belief that the problem is with others and it is they who must change to solve our problems (as if they would), or from smug self-satisfaction with the progress we have already made.

The other enemy of progress is the opposite of complacency... **despair**. This is the belief that we cannot change in the ways we need to. That we are genetically cursed to be fat. That we weren't born to parents with the right connections. That it's too late to go back to college. That only steroid-using "douchebros" can have muscles. In general, that there is no point in trying to get better.

To improve ourselves, *we must exist in the space between complacency and despair*. We must believe that we are worth investing in, and that we are strong enough to change our lives for the better. But we must also see our own weaknesses and shortcomings, and be dissatisfied with them, ashamed of them, worried about them enough to motivate a change.

Whether we want to become more attractive to women, more successful in our careers, more fit and strong, more socially apt and confident, or just learn to play the guitar, whatever, we need to balance these two forces against each other, and not give in to one or the other.

<http://watermarked.cutcaster.com/902149191-I-039-m-not-ready-to-improve-my-life.jpg>

Do not mistake pleasure for happiness.

162 upvotes | June 3, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

When we contemplate the interesting point raised by this cartoon:

<http://explosm.net/db/files/Comics/Dave/yummyyummyyummyyummycake.png>

... we have a bit of a philosophical problem.

The cartoonist's point *seems* to make sense. But we know from experience, those of who lift, or do other hard physical exercise, that the lifter is living a better, more enjoyable life than the cake-eater. Cake tastes good, and lifting hurts. But people who eat cake a lot are fat and miserable, while people who lift a lot are usually healthy and happy about their bodies.

The cartoonist has mistaken pleasure for happiness.

Pleasure is what feels good right now... but that good feeling goes away as soon as the pleasure stops. Happiness is overall, lasting satisfaction with your life. The cake-eater's good feelings will go away as soon as the cake is gone. The lifter's good feelings won't be there while he's lifting, but when he sees the results, the good feelings are there to stay.

When we see people compulsively pursuing pleasure (making themselves fat with too much sugar, feeding drug habits, trying to have sex with as many new women as possible, working like slaves trying to become rich, gambling, compulsive spending, etc), consider the possibility that they are trying to treat their lack of happiness with pleasure.

This only works while they are actually experiencing the pleasure. The moment one hit wears off, they need the next. Their overall level of happiness hasn't changed... that's if they haven't made themselves *less* happy with what they had to do to chase pleasure.

Our society's plan for men, of course, includes no happiness, and as little pleasure as possible while still anesthetizing us enough to make us keep working and paying and supporting and contributing. When we wake up to this fact, we realize we must make our own plans.

But filling those plans with pleasure at the expense of happiness is a bad trap to fall into.

Instead, the wise man will pursue happiness, not pleasure. He will lift weights instead of a dessert fork or shot glass. He will pursue the awesomest career instead of the most highly paid. He will surround himself with the best women, instead of the next woman.

We needn't become monks or Amish farmers... we can sometimes indulge in pleasure without damaging our happiness. But when choosing between what feels good, and what gives a lasting sense of satisfaction and accomplishment, choose the latter.

The Redefinition of Marriage.

145 upvotes | August 11, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I think there is no group in America quite so awful at explaining its point as the so-called "Religious Right", that group of Christians-with-a-capital-C who are the populist voice of social conservatism in the American political landscape.

Their grasp of apologetics, outside of a few voices like Dalrock, is so bad that no one outside their community even understands their talking points.

When they said "family values", everyone else thought it was a code word for hating sex. When they say "defense of marriage", everyone else thought it was a code word for hating gays.

But the truth is more complicated.

The core of religious values, for almost all religions, not just christianity, is reenforcement of existing social structures. Now, the construction of a mythological framework for that is just what most religions DO. But when that framework becomes the only reason for those values that people understand, then they cannot explain the values to anyone who doesn't share their supernatural beliefs.

CCs (conservative christians) can't explain their values, because they don't themselves understand the real reasons behind them.

It never occurs, not only to cultural Marxists, SJWs, and other ultra-liberals, but also to the average moderate, that these values are wrapped around a correct idea.

This idea is that the basic unit of a society is not an individual, but a family. A society composed of weak, disconnected, or broken families is a broken society.

And the way *our* society has traditionally formed families is marriage. (Followed by children).

Now, marriage, at its core, is a contract. (Just like pretty much any human relationship that is formalized.) Contracts have a couple of things that distinguish them.

- They have terms. (These theoretically benefit both parties.)
- They have consent. (Both parties agree to the terms.)
- They have enforcement. (Some negative consequence to the party that breaks the agreement.)

Now, in the idealized version of the past that CCs want to return to, all these things supposedly worked.

- The wedding vows were the terms.
- Informed consent was obvious, because both parties recited the terms out loud.
- Enforcement was a social act by the community, because the vows were spoken in front of that community, who would socially enforce them.

Now, CCs think wedding vows are spoken in front of "God", but when was the last time you saw god punish a cheating wife, or a neglectful husband? No, the real enforcers of wedding vows were the tight-knit local communities people lived in. If the marriage contract was broken, the community would judge who broke it, and ostracize that person. Effective.

But because marriages have consequences in civil law, the government needed some notion of who

was married. And this was the thin end of the wedge. Once people started having to sign papers declaring that they were married before the law recognized it, the enforcing authority passed from the hands of the community, and into the hands of the law.

And the law, in its need to standardize everything, began to standardize the contract.

So now, what do we have?

- The wedding vows are just poetry. The law defines the terms of the contract, and it can and will retroactively redefine those terms at any time.
- Informed consent is impossible, because the papers the couple sign don't contain the terms, which occupy volumes of lawbooks unavailable to most couples, and which can change at any time.
- The law does not enforce the marriage contract (no-fault divorce), it simply recognizes the dissolution of the contract, and divides the assets of the partnership (money, property, children) without any regard to who broke the contract.

So, when the modern couple gets "married", they are agreeing to terms they don't know about, breach of which will not be punished, and the dissolution of which will be handled by a templatized process that someone else has decided is fair for everyone. Is it any surprise this doesn't work? The favoritism courts show to women doesn't even enter into it. The problem runs deeper. **When the government defines the terms of a contract, the parties to that contract do not know what they are agreeing to.**

This is what CCs are on about when they don't want to let gays get "married". They have no idea of the reasons underlying their own values, and they're closing the barn door decades after the horses have fled, but they have some vague notion that the government mishandles the institution of marriage, and they want to resist that somehow.

So how should we fix this problem....?

....

....

We shouldn't, you fool. We can't. Have you forgotten where you are? You're reading TRP. We are not here to fix society, because our society *eats self-sacrificing heroes* for breakfast, then demands they buy it lunch.

We are here to *survive the collapse*.

So how do you do *that*? **DON'T GET MARRIED, DUMBASS.**

- It doesn't matter if you want children.
- It doesn't matter how much game you have.
- It doesn't matter how ironclad your prenup is.
- It doesn't matter how high your SMV is.
- It doesn't matter if you could have another her in thirty seconds.

You are still signing a contract you don't get to read. Would you hand a stranger a signed blank cheque? It's just retarded. There is nothing that all the redpillian advice in the world can do for you, if you are such a rube that you sign things without reading them.

"Ruining Virgins for Everyone Else" (Another Case of the Myth of Female Hypoagency)

156 upvotes | August 12, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Some myths are like the walking dead. No matter how many times you refute them, debunk them, pound a stake through their heart, cut off their head, fill the mouth with salt and sew it shut, bury it face down on consecrated ground, and pour sixteen tons of concrete over the top, the nonsense just springs to life again.

Every man wants to have his decade of pumping and dumping dozens of unspoilt virgins before he finally marries one and has kids. That's only possible if we live in a traditional society wherein he breaks the traditional rules every other man plays by. Kind of like AF/BB inverted, it's the male version of cheating the system. RVEE (Ruining Virgins for Everyone Else)?

We do not ruin virgins. They ruin themselves.

Look, it's perfectly simple.

Women are the gatekeepers of sex. Getting to sex is a man's responsibility.

Men are the gatekeepers of relationships. Getting to a relationship is a *woman's responsibility*.

If a man gets friendzoned, it's his own fault, because he wasn't sex-worthy to the woman he choose to spend his time, energy, attention, money, and emotional investment on. He should have either had better game or picked an easier target.

If a woman gets pumped and dumped, it's her own fault, because she wasn't relationship-worthy to the man whose dick she choose to leap onto. She should have either had better game, or picked an easier target.

Just as all women can be seduced under some set circumstances, all men can stick to a woman under some set of circumstances. Being pumped and dumped just meant you were good enough to lay, but not a keeper. Just like being friendzoned meant you were good enough to hang with, but not good enough to fuck.

The sexual marketplace is a game of luck and skill for everyone. You enter, you play your best hand, and you take your chances.

You can play it risky, or you can play it safe. You play it safe, you're unlikely to lose big, or to win big. You play it riskier, you win bigger, you lose bigger.

Sleep with a hot guy, you better bring your A game, because you're competing not only with all the other women he's banging, but all the women he might in the future. You don't wanna take the risk, bang a beta.

It's easy to spot guys who might pump and dump you. They're the attractive ones. You want lower risk of that? Bang an unattractive guy.

Women who whine about "players" are just trying to have their cake and eat it, too. They want a hot guy, but they don't want to have to work at keeping him, or risk getting dumped.

The Redefinition of Parenthood

13 upvotes | August 19, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We have already seen that marriage is not what it was.

When I pointed this out, there was a great deal of agreement.

However, when I proceeded to the obvious conclusion:

| **DON'T GET MARRIED, DUMBASS.**

... there was a great deal of whinging and crying from those who haven't quite coped with the loss of their dream of a pretty and faithful wife, a house, two kids, a dog, and a presumably a white picket fence.

It went kind of like this:

| You're welcomed to avoid marriage & neither start nor be a part of a legacy, with your family likely descending back into the lower/middle class chaos and ecosystem of perpetually broken and dysfunctional homes & children.

In other words:

"Yes, getting married is bad for YOU, but if you don't do it, your kids are screwed."

... And these misconceptions are why we are having this little talk.

Yes, it is true that children of single mothers are screwed. That's not the misconception here. The misconception here is the words *"your children"*.

YOU CAN'T HAVE CHILDREN, DUMBASS.

Not "you shouldn't". Not "don't".

You. Can't.

If you get a woman pregnant, married to her or not, she can take those children away from you at any time, and be rewarded with cash and prizes for doing so. You will have a piece of paper saying you can visit them on weekends, and nothing at all will happen if she ignores it and moves to another state with them.

So you can't have children. Men don't have children in this society. Women have children, and they allow whatever man, willing or duped, they choose whatever level of parenting and contact they choose.

Marry a woman, father two children on her, buy a house, a dog, and a white picket fence, doesn't matter. You will lose everything except possibly the dog, the moment she decides cash and prizes are better for her than your continued presence.

You can't be a father, because fatherhood has been abolished. There is only the "baby-daddy" who has responsibilities and no rights, and the stepfather, who has whatever the mother chooses to give him that day.

You. Can't. Be. A. Father.

What, did you think that if you just took the Red Pill, if you just worked real hard at having tight game, if you just did enough deadlifts and learned how to pass a shit test, none of this bullshit would

affect your life in any way?

What a grand and intoxicating naiveté.

"But... but... but... Whiiiiiiiiiiisper, what if I waaaaaaaaaaaaaant kids?"

Well, what if I want telekinetic powers and a ten thousand year lifespan? So what? Since when did the universe start caring what we want?

What you have is a choice. Get a woman pregnant, and hope she'll let you see the kids, or don't.

Here's a handy list of what not to do.

87 upvotes | November 17, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<http://www.redditlog.com/snapshots/1276125>

Consideration may not be inherently weak beta behaviour, but in a culture where women's perceived SMV is much higher than men's, nothing dries up a vagina faster than trying to butter her up.

The more weak-ass men there are out there, the more your girls are going to watch you to make sure you aren't one. The more of these things you do, the more they will suspect you are.

Women don't want be treated *awesome* by someone *nice*, they want to be treated *okay* by someone *awesome*.

Don't be nice. Be awesome. The only safe way you can be nice to a woman is to give her the awesomest possible version of you to be with.

Why PPD, while sometimes diverting, is ultimately useless.

61 upvotes | December 23, 2014 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

You're expecting me to say that no one will ever change anyone's mind.

But the issue runs much deeper than that.

RP and BP end up talking past each other because they cannot even agree on what they should be debating *about*. The sets of values they hold are completely disjoint. They cannot even agree on what a "debate" is, and what the goals of a "debate" are.

RP people generally bring the following assumptions to a debate:

- They believe that there is exactly one reality, and that truth is what accurately describes that reality. The better a statement describes reality, the more true it is. They are **factual absolutists**.
- They believe that whether something is "good" or "bad" is a matter of opinion, and that all systems of morality are things societies invented to get a result, and it is therefore pointless to argue about whether something is "evil" or not, instead of about what effect it has. They are **moral relativists**.
- They believe that the goal of a debate is to establish *what the facts are*, and how this knowledge can be used to *control outcomes*. They **argue about what is true**.
- They believe that debates are a cooperative process between two or more people who have the shared goal of achieving a more accurate picture of absolute reality, and that, while people may stick vehemently to their positions, they can also reverse them on a dime if new information comes to light, because the only real attachment is to the truth. They believe **debates occur between theories, not people**. Thus **questioning someone's character is off-limits**, because it is irrelevant.

BP people generally bring the following assumptions to a debate:

- They believe that reality is subjective, and what is "true" is simply a matter of who you ask. What is called "truth" is simply a codification of someone's perspective, and it is therefore pointless to argue about what is "true". They are **factual relativists**.
- They believe that there is exactly one set of moral laws, which human beings have gradually discovered in a historical climb towards ethical perfection. Certain people are ethically better or worse based not only on what they do, but also on what they believe. They believe that different ethical systems exist, but they can be ranked from ethically worst to ethically best based on a sort of meta-ethics whereby they can be tested for degree of compliance with the one absolute set of ethics that underlies reality. They are **moral absolutists**.
- They believe that the goal of debate is to establish what is morally better, and what everyone should do. They **argue about what is right**.
- They believe that debates are a competitive process between two people, who each have the goal of establishing their views about right and wrong by attaining a state of *moral ascendancy* over the other person. They believe that anyone who changes their views in revealing a flaw in

their moral character (because their previous views were not morally correct), and must thereafter relinquish the moral high ground and submit their actions to the moral judgement of others (usually the person who won the debate). They believe **debates occur between people, not ideas**, for the precise purpose of establishing who should be allowed to set standards for the behaviour of others (because they are morally superior). Thus, **questioning someone's character is not only relevant, it's the whole point**.

This is why BP think RP are "misogynists" or bad people. Because they cannot imagine an analysis that does not occur for the purposes of judgement, much less one that doesn't include any idea about what people "should" do.

This is why RP insist that BP are willfully blind. Because, to them, anyone who doesn't admit the truth must be unable to perceive it. They cannot imagine anyone not caring what the truth is.

This is why BP keep thinking that RP are trying to restore Dark Ages. They cannot imagine any group with shared views not having one moral agenda that they wish everyone to abide by.

This is RP think that BP must be hopelessly bad at understanding human social structures. They cannot imagine anyone not wanting to do things in the most effective possible way.

Here are some examples of this kind of misunderstanding in action:

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheBluePill/comments/2nvw9v/so_much_for_mens_rights/cmhox1d

Here we see an interaction between RP and BP regarding age of consent laws.

- RP's primary objective to propose an algorithm for making legal judgements about consent or lack of it, which he believes will best serve what the majority of people desire to see these laws do. He looks at the issue as an *engineering problem*, and he *proposes a solution*.
- BP's objective is to establish whether or RP is a bad person. If he can be gotten to agree to a statement which BP thinks of as diagnostic of "evilness", then the debate can be won, and anything RP says can thereafter be dismissed as originating from an evil person.

Thus RP and BP cannot even agree on what to argue about.

http://www.reddit.com/r/PurplePillDebate/comments/2pw76h/q_a_on_basic_trp_premise_everyone_welcome_to/cn20sx9?context=3

The debate is rather tedious up until BP's parting shot.

- BP says "All this so you can justify getting laid.". BP thinks RP is trying to "justify" something according a set of moral rules, because to BP, every act has a moral valance, and anyone who wishes to do anything must at least be ready with a moral excuse.
- RP has been arguing, meanwhile, about which metaphors best illustrate human social and mating dynamics. RP does not address the issue of right or wrong at all, and seems to believe BP is engaging with him on factual level.

Thus RP and BP cannot even agree on what the argument is about.

It is for this reason that PPD is pointless. RP thinks right and wrong are a matter of opinion, and BP doesn't care what the facts are.

In which I explain to MGTOW that he is MGTOW, and why.

148 upvotes | December 26, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<http://www.redditlog.com/snapshots/1416693>

Copied and pasted for your convenience.

As for my metaphor, I'm saying that when men complain about marriage rape, while I agree losing most your shit and you children is horrible, I still don't see them dying of starvation in a mud hut.

How is that important?

The logical conclusion of this argument is that there one single most wretched individual in the world, and he is the only one allowed to complain, or to strive to better his lot in life. This is ridiculous. The fact that someone else has it worse is a non-sequitur.

Think of it this way. If I stab you in the stomach with a box cutter, and you are bleeding profusely, then you have a problem.

If I stab the guy next to you twice, or three times, or fifty-seven times, does that do anything to fix your problem? Does that make it one iota more bearable? No, it does not.

I don't see many western problems as that big of an issue and easily solvable, but are not due to human emotion and an unwillingness to bend.

Foolish and naive. Knowing what to do is only half the solution. Getting people to do it is the other half, and usually the more difficult one. People have a lot less control over their behaviour than most people think.

And I son't exactly care about those not getting enough of said pie because the physical world is a harsh place and luck has everything to do with your lot in life.

You don't care because you've given up hope. You feel like you have no chance at a pretty and feminine wife, a stable job with enough money to raise a family on one income, two or three children who respect and obey you, and a close-knit community with friends and acquaintances who treated you with courtesy.

You don't feel like you are entitled to any of those things. If you were born in an another era, you would have. Not entitled to just get them, but entitled to chance to work hard and earn them. And if you did have that fair shot at those things, you'd be out there now, busting your tail to reach that goal.

THAT is why I say the male sex drive (along with, yes, the male urge to dominate or lead) is the engine that drives both the economy, and civilization. Men want high-quality mates for long-term relationships. Men want families and children, in societies where fathers are the respected head of the household, rather than a figure of derision.

You have given up on busting your tail to afford and support a family, because society was restructured to remove the rewards. Some very broken people looked at the rewards men got in exchange for their responsibilities, and called them "male privilege". Then they persuaded our society to remove them. It never occurred to these people that this was what motivated men to keep the

power running, and the grocery stores stocked with food. That, to them, was just background stuff that happened automagically, because you had "an economy", which is their word for "somebody else does the dirty jobs, because I am doing the important work of complaining about the Patriarchy". So the rewards of fatherhood vanished, but the expectations remained. Is it any wonder you don't want the job now? You're not lazy. You're sensible.

I don't want the job either, not under these conditions. Fuck that. I'm going to bang sluts, get high, keep my money, buy expensive toys, and not have or raise children, not bankroll anyone, not contribute to my community or my society.

Because "my" community and "my" society aren't mine. They never were. They see me as an ATM. A special, wicked kind of ATM that they insult as they withdraw money from, because it's "privileged" and "greedy" for not giving them more.

My society does not give a fuck about one thing I want or one problem I have. Certain companies won't pay for women's birth control pills? Everyone loses their shit.

I want a job? I better figure out myself how to make that happen.

I want to get laid? The only thing my culture cares about is to make sure I am not "pressuring" or "coercing" anyone. Actually making that happen? That's my responsibility, and figuring out what I need to do is my responsibility, and when I figure out what I need to do, I'd better not say openly what it is, if that description hurts the feelings of real person.

Our society doesn't consider anything a problem until it starts hurting women. We have a metric fuckton of young men in their twenties living lives of involuntary celibacy, and our culture doesn't consider that a problem until they start reading something like TRP, and then it's a problem because, and only because, they say mean about women and hurt their feelings. We have a metric fuckton of older men in their thirties and forties, paying to support children they have been cut off from, and that's not a problem for our society until they stop paying, often because they no longer can, and then it's a problem because they are "deadbeat dads", and we need to hold them upside down and shake vigorously with a basket underneath them.

Some people need to figure out that if you give nothing to men, you get nothing from them.

That is why TRP exists. Our society has abandoned men, so we are starting to form our own social structures, our own communities, our own support networks. And we are loyal to the communities that support us, not the ones that just try to use us and cast us aside.

Now, if you tell certain people, most likely the SJW/feminist/BP crowd that, they say "oh, you're being overdramatic", "you have all this male privilege", "you have it good, because you live in America and aren't worried about where your next meal is coming from". (These are the same people who think overhearing a joke about dongles is a grave injustice that requires immediate action.)

But this is, ultimately, an excuse. They want to worry *about* men, never *for* men. Why?

Because men are the economic powerhouse. Men build things. Men produce wealth. If they admit men have problems, not just as people, not just as black men, gay men, or poor men, but as men, then there is a limit. They have to stop squeezing. They have to limit their demands. And their real goal is extract the maximum amount with a minimum of effort. Socialism, feminism, "social justice", arguments about fairness... it's all just a power play. They want more cookies. That's all.

The non-bakers want more pie. And the best way to do that is to gaslight the bakers. Make them feel inadequate. Guilty. Tell them they have "pie-baking privilege", and they better give away all the pie

to cleanse themselves of this sin.

That is the real source of the rage against TRP. It supports men. Makes them stop feeling guilty. Makes them hard to control. Makes them not only want things for themselves, but feel like they can get them.

On the absolute necessity of patriarchy for women's long term welfare.

118 upvotes | January 11, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So, [/u/TRPsubmitter](#), in his usual fine form, gave us this

Beta bf who almost got cuckolded by Mario Balotelli mistakenly thinks he can negotiate attraction by publicly outing his gf into not cheating on him

and it's full of juicy analysis, very enlightening, go read it. But it also brings up a more general principle that deserves to be called out on its own.

Why did the girl do this dumb shit?

Well, consider what would have happened if she fucked Mario Balotelli. She gets thirty minutes of sex, probably very good sex because she's super turned on by him. Then boyfriend dumps her, and she spends the rest of her life as an alpha widow, propping up her self-image by reminding herself that she fucked Mario Balotelli once. (That's how *she* puts it, of course. The truth is that Mario Balotelli fucked her.) Until, one day, she tells the story, and someone says "Who the fuck was Mario Balotelli?", and she realizes she has nothing.

So, bad for her. But her instincts drive her to do it. Why? **Because our instincts drive us to act in the interests of our genes, not ourselves.** Her genes "want" to be mixed with Mario Balotelli's, because that will give them a better chance of making more copies of themselves. That's the mechanism that created instinct. That process doesn't give a fuck if we get hurt along the way.

So what kind of girl would have reacted differently?

A girl who had been raised by a patriarch. If she had been steeped in all that ludicrous-sounding old-fashioned shit about "guarding her virtue", she would have realized, that, hey, she ain't gonna be able to hold on to a guy who has that kind of pulling ability. She's going to get pumped and dumped. She might have still felt some attraction, but it would be balanced with revulsion at the idea of being "cheap" or getting "used". So she doesn't respond to his message, but shows it to her mate instead, and they have a good laugh about it.

Patriarchy was a thing because girls self-destruct without it. Their instincts compel them to act against their long term interests.

But why girls in particular? Is the male of the species so much calmer, so much smarter, so much more logical, that he's planning ahead every second of his life and never makes a dumb shit move?

Bitch, please. Have you *seen* some of the things men do? Ha. No, the reason is that, by dint of biological happenstance, **male mating mistakes don't have permanent consequences.**

Imagine, for a moment, **what it's like to be a woman.** Imagine that every dumb shit move you ever made in the past, that thing you did when you were fourteen, that time you got drunk and had beer goggles, that thing with your brother's girlfriend in the cabin... **imagine that all that shit stayed with you and permanently affected how attractive you were.** Remember some of the stupid shit you did before your dark enlightenment? I'll bet some of you fuckers wrote *love poetry*.

And, just like you, the modern woman has had no guidance in how not to fuck up her SMV. Just like you, she has had to figure that shit out for herself. Except, **unlike you, she isn't able to erase her past or make it irrelevant. She has to live with it.** You get a whole lot of tries, opportunities to

learn from your mistakes and fix them. She gets the test, and then the lesson, and no do-overs.

This is why women lie to you about their partner count. Once they figure out that it matters, what the fuck else are they supposed to do?

This is why little girls need a patriarch. Because they could figure shit out for themselves, **they are capable of learning, but by the time they've had a chance to, it's too late.**

Little girls who grow up without a strong male authority ruling the family have five to six years of non-stop party, then a lifetime of wondering what went wrong. Little girls who do, they miss the early-twenties sex party, but they have more fulfilling lives.

Don't let people AMOG you... even if they claim to be dispensing red pills.

226 upvotes | February 1, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So, once again, someone posted a link to, among other stuff, that tired old screed about how "everything is sales".

Then some other people started throwing around income numbers that were somewhat on the high side (a favorite trick for old men who wish to intimidate younger ones).

And there was a lot of very low quality discussion that followed. Guys who were butthurt about getting AMOGed. Guys who wanted to wave their dicks around about how much they make in sales, or about how they were a physician, and how physicians were just cooler and smarter than anyone. And a whole lot of sound and fury ensued, to no particular purpose.

Nothing of value was learned.

Having arguments, explicitly or otherwise, about who is "most alpha" is not only a waste of time, it's backsliding.

Why? Because people do it to make themselves feel better. They are selecting their actions, not for some purpose in the external world, but in order to adjust their own emotional state. They are trying to AMOG someone.

But what do we know about *how to pass a shit test*? You don't pass one by talking about how awesome you are. Everyone here knows that's a massive fail. It shows you can be rattled. That you have to prop up your self-image when someone attacks it.

Well, AMOGing someone on the internet is even worse, because it's doing that even when you haven't been shit-tested. Oh, it may feel good for a while, but it impedes your progress in reaching that state of *Not Giving a Fuck*.

Situational dominance is just that, situational. It's not a worthwhile end goal, because all situations change. If you start thinking you're "sooo fucking alpha, bro" because you make a lot of money, then what are you going to do about the fact that *Miley Cyrus makes more than every TRP subscriber put together*? Are you going to just try not to think about that? If you start tying your self-assessment to how ripped you are, and how much you can lift, what happens when you get sick?

The moment you start striving to "be alpha", you are no longer a man with a mission. You are a man trying to manage his public image.

Don't that, and don't let men who do that suck you into their madness. Even if they dress it up as red pill advice. Letting yourself be patronized erodes the confidence you need to pursue your goals, and worse yet, you're submitting to someone else's frame, which is precisely the habit you're trying to get out of.

Do not let someone else choose your goals for you.

If you start hearing advice that sounds like it's calibrated to make the giver sound fuckawesome, get suspicious. Is it really designed to help you? Or is it just an AMOG play?

If it is, treat as a shit test. Learn to laugh it off. Agree and amplify, if some other clever response doesn't occur to you. Above all, don't start asking yourself how "alpha" you are, or worse yet,

answering that question according to someone else's measuring stick.

Instead, get your head unfucked, and work on being adaptable and unshakeable. You will never be the strongest man in the world, or the richest, or screw the most lingerie models, or whatever the fuck. There's six billion people in the world. Get over it.

The only thing you can do is get good at playing the cards you are dealt. Because your cards might be different tomorrow. Situational dominance means nothing. Because you can never have enough of it to avoid the need for good mental game.

Socialism, Feminism, Marxism, and the Four Basic Types of Human Interaction.

146 upvotes | February 20, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So, it's pretty easy to go on endlessly about the evils of feminism. And it's pretty easy to describe feminism as a special case of Marxism. And it's pretty easy to describe Marxism as a special case of socialism.

But what exactly is socialism? What causes it? And why does it always go wrong, screw everything up, and hurt people? After all, if we can explain how feminism causes all sorts of bad shit, but can't explain what causes feminism, then we really haven't explained anything, have we?

So, for the purposes of understanding, we will sort human interactions, and, in a larger sense, relationships, into four basic categories:

- **Forcible:** One human being uses force or fear to coerce another into providing X. There is no reciprocal benefit.
- **Feudal:** One human being subordinates himself to another in exchange for X. His subordinate status allows the other to obtain Y from him.
- **Transactional:** Two human beings arrange an exchange of X for Y.
- **Communal:** One human being does X, without arranging any sort of repayment. The other human being does Y, without arranging repayment.

Obviously, these interactions exist on a continual scale. A relationship with an employer is partially *feudal* and partially *transactional* (to varying degrees). Splitting a restaurant cheque with friends is partially *transactional* and partially *communal* (to varying degrees).

So, if we regard this as a continuum, what determines where an interaction falls? Clearly, expectations do, but that's not an answer, because what determines those expectations?

The answer is that the direction of this continuum is the direction of trust.

Near the bottom of the scale, resource transfers are very inefficient (violence is hard work), but the system requires very little trust. Near the top, resources are very easily distributed, but great trust is required.

But why is trust required? Because the higher you go on this scale, the more vulnerable the system is to bad actors. On the bottom, safeguards are built-in (you are not vulnerable to betrayal by the guy you are beating in order to steal his wallet), but there is a great waste of effort. At the top, there is no wasted energy on violence, systems of currency, or encryption schemes, but one bad actor can destroy the whole system.

Trust is determined by our assessment of the likelihood of a bad actor, and of the damage a bad actor could do. We will happily buy a backpack over the internet, sight unseen, but not a house.

This, in turn, means that the nature of an interaction is determined by the balance of trust and efficiency.

So what *is* socialism, and where does it come from?

Socialism is an attempt to force a move up the trust scale. It uses a *forcible* interaction to make

others' actions more *communal*.

- "You *must* buy into the collective retirement plan, rather doing your investing."
- "You *must* buy into the school-funding pool, rather than teaching your children yourself, or choosing someone to do it for you, and paying them."
- "You *must* pay tax dollar into women's programs, rather than choosing a wife, and supporting only her."

So now can we answer the question, "Where does socialism come from?" ? Yes, we can.

Socialism comes from the misconception that communalism can be established merely by having the political will to do so.

The wealth of societies is, by large, a matter of how much internal trust they have. Societies who have a high degree of internal trust, and very few bad actors, can cooperate very efficiently. They are strong, productive societies. They are pleasant to live in. They take care of their own. They *look like what socialists think they are working towards*.

But where socialists go wrong is in thinking that having trust is a matter of just *making people act trusting*, by force if necessary. They are wrong. **Trust is built by eliminating bad actors.**

Socialism assumes that no member of society will be a bad actor, so all we need to do is trust each other and work together, and no one will ever game the system.

Feminism assumes that no woman will be a bad actor, so all we need to do is give women freedom and resources without any oversight. We must, for example, believe all rape allegations made by women, because no woman is a bad actor. Due process is inefficient... all we need is more trust.

The Red Pill, then, is a dose of cynicism. The first painful truth we realize upon awakening is that *bad actors are all around us*. We must learn to spot them. We must learn to protect against them by limiting trust. Often this means moving our interactions down the trust scale, making our relationships more transactional and less communal.

This is the basis of [/u/HumanSockPuppet](#) 's [Bitch Management Hierarchy](#). A bitch moves up the hierarchy by amassing evidence of trustworthiness, and is permanently demoted if she demonstrates the capacity for betrayal.

What's the moral, here?

- Trust cannot be gained by demanding it at the point of a gun.
- Trust cannot be gained by demanding it at the point of a idealistic moral argument.
- Trust cannot even be earned, because what can be earned can be owed.
- Trust must inspired.

Communal relationships are the most desirable. They are a society's greatest asset, and the real measure of a person's wealth. But they cannot be gotten just by deciding to have them. They must be slowly and painstakingly built, both by people and by society, and no amount of idealism will speed this process.

In other words, a functioning communist society is the most desirable end state. But when the size of your society exceeds [Dunbar's Number](#), trust must be created through social mores, shared cultural values, and weeding out bad actors, a process taking many generations. Trying to jumpstart this process with ideologies or government force actually results in less efficiency than ever, as more and

more effort is consumed in the creation and maintenance of the coercive mechanisms that force people to act as if they trusted each other when they do not.

On a personal level, you must behave very differently with different groups if you wish to prosper. You need a communal group. But you must be very careful who you let into it, the admission process must be gradual, and demotions down the trust scale should usually be permanent.

Marriage: Red Pill on Hamster Mode.

79 upvotes | March 12, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

If you ever doubt for moment that the Rationalization Hamster exists within the male of the species, talk to a bunch of married TRP subscribers.

And you will come face to face with it.

We all know that marriage has been twisted into something that isn't good for you. We've all seen the evidence that fatherhood no longer exists.

Yet certain men, knowing they have failed to properly apply Bitch Management 101, looking at the same reality as the rest of us, allegedly having taken the red pill and unplugged...

... suddenly start making up reasons why they didn't actually fuck up.

So it's time to play:

"Married Red Pill" or Bitch Hitting the Wall!

Just peruse this list of common sayings, and guess which ones come from married TRP readers (A), and which ones come from bitches hitting the wall and marrying a beta (B)! Keep track of your answers!

- "I wanted to settle down and build something."
- "I needed a stable relationship to have kids in."
- "My tastes have matured."
- "I grew up."
- "My (partner) is awesome."
- "(Someone) without kids is (someone) without a legacy."
- "If you don't reproduce, you lose at evolution."
- "It's (relationships) on Hard Mode."

Got all your answers written down? Good. Now throw them away, and smack yourself upside the head for submitting to a stranger's frame on the internet. And when you're done with that, pay attention to my actual point.

Some men don't want to admit they made a mistake, and would rather rationalize like bitches instead of owning up to it.

We all made mistakes before we woke the fuck up. And some mistakes are not easily undone. And when you make a permanent mistake, you certainly want to do everything you can to minimize the damage instead of lying down and dying. And yes, the red pill can help with that.

But do not pretend that marriage is anything but a mistake. When you start telling others to imitate your mistakes "so they can have children", you're not only delusional and dangerous to yourself, you're malignant and dangerous to others.

Men cannot have children. Men have no legal rights to speak of, where children are concerned. We know better than to give women things in the hopes that the rule of reciprocity will suddenly, magically start working on bitches, and they'll want to repay us with sex... that's pussy begging, and we know better.

Putting a ring on it in the hopes that the rule of reciprocity will magically start working on this one

bitch is **uterus begging**, like pussy begging, but taken five inches further.

If you want kids, adopt (very low risk). If you want your biological kids, hire a surrogate (not zero risk, but lower). If you want kids in a relationship, have an LTR and get her pregnant (high risk, but still not marriage).

Marriage provides you zero protection. Remember Briffault's Law... reciprocity does not work with females. Your only protection in a relationship is ever-present willingness and ability to kick her to the curb.

And if you *are* married, good luck to you. But don't be bucket crab. Don't trick younger, more naive men into emulating your mistakes just so you can prop up your wounded feels.

The most important two videos you will ever watch.

156 upvotes | March 15, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

... are not directly about sexual strategy.

But do you want to not be fat?

Do you want to not date fat chicks?

Do you want your LTR to not get fat?

Do you want to not have fat children?

Then you need to sit through these ~~two~~ **three** videos, and understand what fat is, and how it happens. Y'all need this... because I was reading [this](#) excellent post, and I saw some appalling bro-science in the comments.

So take two hours, out of your whole life, to learn you some real facts that will help you forever.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dBnniua6-oM>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ceFyF9px20Y>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IDneyrETR2o>

Now, I could go all GayLubeOil up in this bitch, post pictures of hippos and walruses and fat chicks, and then contrast with one or two of fine women and ripped men. But that's not my style, so I'm just going to give you this instead:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0OtFSDKrq88&t=1m>

tl;dr: No. Fuck you. This isn't a field report, or rambling story of my personal life. This is dedicated physician who devoted years of his life to wiping out the scourge of the horrible hambeast, condensing all his research down to a pair of lectures. That *is* the tl;dr. You don't get it condensed further. You do not need to be spoon-fed.

EDIT: added another excellent video from the comments.

The Red Pill Hamster, part Two.

108 upvotes | March 25, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So, last time, your resident mad scientist exposed how taking the red pill doesn't automatically grant immunity to rationalization, and there was much wailing and gnashing of teeth.

Now it's time to piss off the rest of you.

Because there's still more shit red pillers have just as much trouble facing.

You are not completely in control of your own behaviour.

No one is. The science is in. Your metabolic health controls how much you eat. T levels change your personality. Blah blah fucking blah... but here's the clinch. The Max Planck Institute for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences proved that some decisions happen (and can be read in an MRI) as much as seven seconds before the conscious, self-aware portions of the brain become aware of what the decision is.

That means the parts of you that you are aware of as "you" aren't making those decisions.

We are a monkey on the back of a lizard, and sometimes the lizard runs off in one direction or another, and the monkey invents stories about how that was where it wanted to go, and it's doing the steering, really.

And we all know about Phineas Gage.

But there are some people who can't accept this. It seems especially hard for red pillers. A dedication to relentless self-improvement makes us *want* to have absolute control over our behaviour and our destiny.

People who are improving themselves *want* to believe that they can do whatever they need to do if they just *try*. And people who have done awesome want to take credit for it. But these two attitudes are just as self-deceptive as the fattie who thinks she has a special gene that turns the air into marshmallows as she breathes it.

The words that sum up the basis of the red pill aren't "everything is up to you". They are "**it is what it is**". With the possible addition of "now what are you going to do about it?" If we want to make progress, we have to deal with reality as it is.

If we don't have total control, then we don't. So we control what we can, and also control ourselves by controlling the things that control us. Don't keep complex carbs in your kitchen. Don't hang out with betas who tempt you to old bad habits. Take steroids. If you're beginning your recovery, and coming from an incel streak, hire some beautiful whores to get abundance mentality rolling.

And don't let your woman hang out with Chad Thundercock, even if she respects you. Same principle.

Call it "lifhacker bullshit" if you want (I hate the word myself, it reeks of beta male herb), but either it works, or it doesn't. *Pride* doesn't matter. *Playing by the rules* doesn't matter. *Only winning matters*.

Use every tool available. Cheat. Win.

You can white-knuckle it if you want. But are you doing it because you think that's the best way? Or because you can't admit to yourself that you might need a little help? That you might not be fully in control?

That's the Hamster.

The Root Cause of the Anger Phase.

202 upvotes | March 28, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

The anger phase is important. Without it, we never would have woken up in the first place.

But where does it from? What starts it, and when does it stop?

Well, the best local source for directly observing angry-phase men in the wild is [/r/askmen](#) (trp has plenty of angry-phase men, but your observations will be diluted with men in later stages). Reading this <https://archive.today/ny1mk> thread, where men talk about annoying shit women say, we can start to get an inkling.

What do all of these men, annoyed by women, angry at women, have in common?

They all expect women to be adults.

They were raised to think of women as adults. They were told over and over again that the differences between men and women were purely sexual. And they believed it. So they grew up and became adults, and expected the women around them to be adults. They just assumed women would make an effort to be objective, see things from others' points of view, finish what they start, keep their promises, take responsibility for their actions, and so forth.

When adults refuse to do these things, it's annoying. We get angry at them. Because they have failed a reasonable expectation. When children refuse to do these things, we're not annoyed or surprised. They are children. They are not capable of adulthood yet.

In the denial phase, we rationalize away women's childish behaviour, making excuses for them in order to preserve our delusion that women are peers we can rely on.

In the anger phase, we are awakened to women's childish behaviour, but it angers us because of the gap between the actual behaviour and our expectations. The anger ends when our expectations realign to women's actual patterns of behaviour.

The cause of the anger phase is the lingering belief that women are adults. Now, we *learn* to be more attractive by treating women like children. For example, the basic principle of all shit-test handling techniques is "don't take anything they say seriously". That's treating someone like a child.

But, like a religion taught to us in childhood, expectations and beliefs we held for that many years will linger, and we will slide back to thinking of women as adults. We make the mistake of arguing with them, instead of laughing at whatever ridiculous bullshit they say, and patting them on the head. We make the mistake of listening to what they say instead of watching what they do. We make the mistake of expecting them to handle their own shit instead of managing them and telling them exactly what we expect. We make the mistake of bargaining with them instead of instructing them. We expect them to not let themselves get fat, instead of controlling what they eat. We expect them to make good decisions, instead of simply telling them what to do.

The reason we must repeat simple lessons to ourselves over and over again is that it takes a long time to transition from "treat her like a child" as a *tactic*, to *actually fully realizing and believing that she, and all women, are really children in adult bodies*. It's slow, and difficult, but this is the step you must take before women stop being a source of pain in your life, and start being a source of happiness.

Many men in the anger phase linger there because of the dream that someday, they will find that

unicorn, that one special woman who actually takes responsibility for her actions, can be an equal partner, can both take and provide emotional support, doesn't have to be managed, etc. But there is no such woman. (You know who actually can have equal relationships like that? Faggots, that's who. And if you're not a faggot, you wouldn't like it much. It would be like dating a dude in drag.)

Men who are looking for an "adult" woman are axiomatically in the anger phase, because if they were in denial, they would think all women were, and if they had passed anger, they would be aware that no such woman exists. And by doing so, they make themselves angrier, because *the more a woman is able to present the appearance of an adult, the more she is simply a child who expects to be treated like one.*

The desirable woman is not a woman who acts adult, she is the woman who is aware and accepting of her own childish nature. Such a woman can submit to a man without shame, and provide things to a relationship that no adult can.

- Tirelessly remind yourself that women are children.
- When a woman makes you angry, look for the place where you made the mistake of thinking of her as an adult.
- Stop looking for adult women. They don't exist, and you wouldn't want one if they did.

Small Dog Syndrome

166 upvotes | April 2, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

A condition termed "Small Dog Syndrome" is a common malady I encounter in training dogs. It is frequently presented in small breed dogs and the general symptoms are problems with dog house training, aggression, separation anxiety, phobic reactions and diffused stress reactions.

The reason this is seen so frequently in small dogs is normally the fault of the owners. Accordingly, remedy for this Syndrome is only possible by owner education and owner behavior modification.

This may seem surprising since many people view the task of a dog trainer as one of strictly "fixing" the dog. However, the source of this problem is the owner and rehabilitation is impossible without the owner acknowledging and discarding bad owner behaviors.

The owner must first recognize that a dog is a dog, and **All Dogs Are Like That**. Because a dog weighs under ten pounds does not change the fundamental fact that it is still a dog. Consequently, just like you would not allow a 150 pound Rottweiler to jump up on you, one should not allow a small breed dog to jump and paw humans. To take the point further, if a 150 pound Rottweiler were to lunge and bark uncontrollably at every animal and human that they encountered on a walk, it is likely the owner would be reported to law enforcement. Yet it is a frequent sight in every neighborhood to encounter small breed dogs that lunge and bark like little demons until their owners scoop them up into their arms like naughty children. This strategy may keep the small dog from biting, but it is a short sighted strategy that actually worsens the problem.

Just like any other canine, small breed dogs need training, discipline and exercise. The dog must be taught to walk at a heel, sit, down and stay on command. Yet the major problem owners have is to recognize that all dogs need to work to earn food, praise and treats. It has been my experience that **small breed dogs are often lavished with affection, food and treats for no other reason except that they are small and cute**. Dogs do not understand this. In fact it makes them mentally ill. **They interpret this cascade of affection without reason as submissive puppy-like behavior from their owners**. In turn, they attempt to dominate and control their puppy/owners which can lead to aggression, separation anxiety and a host of neurotic behaviors. This is truly an instance where the phrase "killing with kindness" rings true.

There is no doubt in my mind that owners who smother their dogs with affection and fail to discipline their inappropriate behavior do very much love their dogs. However, I am also of the opinion that it is the responsible dog owner's duty to respect that their dogs are indeed a different species with different needs. Truly loving your dog entails a responsibility to cast aside your misconceptions. Your dog is not a little four legged human and does not want to be human. Your dog, no matter how small or cute, wants to be a dog.

1. If your dog sleeps in the bed with you, stop it. Now.
2. Teach your dog to walk at proper heel. Do not carry your dog. His paws are for walking.
3. Nothing in life is free. Have your dog work for food, rewards and especially affection.
4. Do not tolerate bad dog behavior because your dog is small. Consistently enforce all your commands.

Finally, always remember that **if you treat your dog like a human, they will treat you like a dog.**

The Principle of "Why?"

23 upvotes | April 21, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Even OP thought that this:

http://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/33cj3s/i_know_this_idiocy_is_common_place_and_t_his_is/ was just a rant post, but as is often the case, the little annoying things in life, if examined carefully, can provide us with greater understanding.

If you read the link (or even just skim it), you will see the typical pattern of a woman's selfish behaviour being excused or explained away.

What's interesting is *how* the quoted poster does so.

You see, people always ask "why" about behaviours they wish to excuse, in a moral sense. If a *cause* can be found, or even, in this case, *assumed to exist*, then the the behaviour isn't "vile" it's merely "cause and effect". Often people will go through multiple layers of "why" until they reach the behaviour or person they wish to morally condemn, at which point they abruptly stop.

Thus you can always tell where someone's sympathies lie, simply by watching which explanations they look for.

So how to be objective? Simple... don't stop asking "why?". This is why TRP as an intellectual tradition is explicitly amoral. Because when moral evaluations start, understanding stops.

Why do women blow up their marriages and abandon their children to do drugs and screw random dudes? Whatever you think of the behaviour, there is a reason. In this case, it is probably lack of a strong father figure early in life, who would have taught her to distinguish pleasure from happiness. Why was has absent? Because of the changing nature of marriage, skyrocketing divorce rates, and the emasculation of men who remain married. Why that? Feminism invading the cultural zeitgeist? Why feminism?

And so on.

1. Watch when people stop asking why, and you will know the conclusion they want to reach.
2. Watch when *you* stop asking why... and make yourself continue.

Eating 101: Fork use for Dummies

255 upvotes | May 6, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

You know you need to lift. You know you need to lift heavy. You may even know that steroids are the smart choice.

But I'll bet some of ya'll still look like fat slugs. Strong fat slugs, maybe, but fat slugs nonetheless.

Why?

Because of some of the astonishing misinformation I see in the comments every time we talk about diet.

Now, most of you have heard how not to be fat:

- Avoid sugar
- Reduce starch
- Eat fat.
- Eat protein.
- Eat fiber.
- Eat often.

... but a lot of you don't believe it, or don't do it, or don't do it enough. In my experience, people don't usually follow instructions they don't understand the purpose of. So we are going to talk about **why**. Why these instructions work. And what it is that actually makes you fat.

The thing that makes you fat is the same thing that makes your cells fat. This is should not surprise you; you are made of cells. Cells become fat when more fat moves into cells than out of them. This also should not surprise you if you think about it for a few seconds. But what moves fat into cells?

It's called "*Insulin*". You've probably heard of it.

Insulin (from the Latin, *insula* meaning island) is a peptide hormone produced by beta cells in the pancreas. It regulates the metabolism of carbohydrates and fats by promoting the absorption of glucose from the blood to skeletal muscles and fat tissue and by causing fat to be stored rather than used for energy.

You see, most fats you eat are in the form of "triglycerides". That's three fatty acids joined together at one end by glycerol. This whole structure is *too big to pass through cell walls*. It has to be broken down into fatty acids, which *can* pass through the cell wall, and reassembled within the cell. To retrieve fat from cells, this process must be performed in reverse.

It is insulin in the blood which triggers the process of breaking triglycerides in the bloodstream. It plays a similar role in glucose (sugar) uptake.

Now, it should be obvious that insulin is a vital hormone that plays an important and necessary role. You *need* to store fat and sugar. But you become a fat fuck when you store *too much*. This is the real reason why you are fat. Not too much food. *Too much insulin*. Do you seriously think that billions of years of evolution produced a species that becomes fat and unhealthy every time there is an abundance of food? That food scarcity was so universal, so uniform, so constant, that we have no biological mechanism for stopping ourselves from eating too much?

Of course we do.

We do not get fat because we eat too much. Instead, we eat too much because we are getting fat. Specifically, when we have insulin levels that are way too high, our body moves huge amounts of fat and sugar into cells. Now we have low levels of triglycerides and glucose in the blood. So we become ravenously hungry. That's why fat people eat like greedy pigs. Not because they have weak "willpower", but because *their brainstem is convinced they are starving*.

So now that we understand all that, where are these hyperelevated insulin levels coming from?

Insulin levels rise in response to elevated blood sugar. The more sugar, and the faster it hits your bloodstream, the more insulin, and the faster it spikes upwards. And the more often this happens, the more insulin levels become chronically elevated. (That's bad, in case you couldn't guess.) And the more you start to get something called "insulin insensitivity". And the next step after that is Type II diabetes.

So now that we understand *that*, where is are all these rapid spikes in blood sugar coming from?

Does anyone want to take a guess?

Starch is made of sugar. Sugar is also made of sugar. The more processed and refined it is, the quicker and easier it is to digest, and the quicker it hits your bloodstream... all in one big lump. Now your insulin goes through the roof, and your body starts busily working on turning you into a hamplanet.

So there it is. **A calorie is not just a calorie. That is the biggest lie ever told about food.** Instead, substances you into your body are *different* substances, and they do different things.

- Avoid sugar (it hits your bloodstream fast, and spikes your insulin)
- Reduce starch (it turns into sugar... and the more refined it is, the more quickly it does)
- Eat fat (fat calories don't spike insulin)
- Eat protein (muscle is made of meat. Muscle consumes stored fat. Muscle increases insulin sensitivity. Muscle is good. Strong people die less.)
- Eat fiber (Fiber slows the digestion of whatever you ate with it. It also does many, many other things for you, all of them good. Most of your carbs should come from vegetables.)
- Eat often (smaller more frequent meals stabilize insulin levels).

It's not so funny anymore, is it?

Anger Debt

102 upvotes | May 12, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We have talked about the validity and importance of anger.

When I first opined that the stages of red pill digestion were similar to the stages of grieving, I didn't think it likely that this would be twisted into another tool to dismiss male anger. Yet I have seen precisely this happen, not only in PPD ("*Oh, those guys are just in the anger phase, we wash our hands of them*"), but even here ("*get over the anger phase, bro, get out there, and start approaching*").

Nothing could have been further from my intent. So we need to talk some more about anger.

We have a concept in engineering called **Technical Debt**. It works like this: *When you do something quick and dirty (or don't do it at all) on a technical project, the time you saved has been borrowed from the future, and will need to be repaid, with interest.*

Well, men who take the red pill are in **Anger Debt**.

Anger is not only healthy, but vitally necessary for a properly functioning male human being. If you never get angry, you are mentally ill.

And mentally ill is just what Stage One (Denial Phase) men are. They fail to become angry at treatment that would, and should, anger them... because they have been led to believe that it is normal, and natural, and that any discontent they feel at it is their own fault for all various forms of ThoughtCrime that feminists and their fellow leftoids are all too fond of exhaustively listing. Men buy into this for the same reason that abused children usually believe it's their fault mommy hits them; This is actually a *comforting* belief, because if mommy hits them because they *deserve* to be hit, then all they have to do be better. If they were to realize that mommy is a psycho, then they would have no hope to cling to.

Stage One men are abuse victims who believe they deserve abuse, and trying to appease their abusers in order to make it stop. From Tiger Woods apologizing for being attacked with a golf club by his abuser, to Joss Whedon endlessly groveling about how feminist he is even as feminists spew vitriol at him for not toeing the line *enough*, to the president of the United States using the Father's Day address as a bully pulpit to tell men that they need to sacrifice more and expect less, Stage One men are not only accumulating *anger debt*, they are creating it in others as well.

Stage Two, the much-referenced Anger Stage, begins when a man says to himself "Hey, I don't deserve this. I am a person, and pursuing the things I need and desire is natural and healthy behaviour for me.". At that moment, he begins to pay down his *anger debt*. A healthy person *would* become angry at all the ways he has been cheated of opportunities, treated as a scapegoat, and held in contempt over the years. *So he cannot be a healthy person until he experiences all the anger he has put off.*

The purpose of anger is to motivate change. A man who cannot get angry accepts that which should not be accepted, endures that which should not be endured. He allows his time, money, love, energy, and health to be burned for the benefit of others who show him no gratitude.

A man must pay down this anger debt in order to motivate changes in his life. Yes, he needs, *eventually*, to be able to laugh and say "Yeah, that's women for you, can't expect 'em to be adults", and use amused mastery to be attractive to them. But if he is never angry at them, he cannot correct

their bad behaviour, and they will behave, not just like children, but like spoiled, bratty children.

- AWALT is not an excuse for letting women behave badly.
- Amused mastery and stoicism are not an excuse for letting people piss on your neck and tell you it's raining.
- Anger drives change. No anger, no change. If you haven't spent enough time in Stage Two, go back and pay the rest of that debt.

Fork Use 102: Building Muscle

91 upvotes | May 18, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Now that we know how not to be fat slugs, we can address our next problem: How do we build muscle? Losing fat, after all, is not enough.

We already have the information we need. We know about insulin. We know about leptin. We know about protein. We know about triglycerides and fatty acids. We know that trying to predict weight gain by caloric intake is like trying to guess the size of a building by reading the electric bill.

We just need to put the knowledge together. So, what is necessary for muscle to grow?

Well, why hasn't it already grown? Why don't our bodies just pack on as much muscle as we have the protein to build?

Because **muscle is expensive**. Not only to build, not only to use, but to maintain. Even sleeping, giant ripped dudes burn a lot of calories. **Your body is evolved to budget smartly**. Under primitive conditions, when scarcity was not universal, but could occur at any time, there was a serious tradeoff between being strong, and wasting precious resources.

If muscle is a large expense, your frugal body is only willing to incur that expense when the purchase is:

- Affordable.
- Necessary.
- Available.

In other words, you need:

- Abundant calories.
- Progressive overload.
- Protein and testosterone.

Let's break that down.

- You must eat a lot of calories. Your system must be convinced that it not only can support the muscle, but is likely to be able to do so in the future. Frugal, smart people don't have one good month in sales, then go out and buy a yacht. They have to be convinced they can afford it in the future. That means *lots of calories*. Consistently over time.
- You must overload. Lift heavy things. If you don't how to do this, there are plenty of resources out there. But "exercise" isn't enough. Jogging is "exercise". **Unless your muscles are unequal to the strain you put on them, they will not need to grow to become equal to it.**
- You must have not only the raw material to build muscle *with*, but also the machinery to produce muscle. This means not only lots of ~~protein~~ *meat*, but also ~~healthy~~ *elevated* levels of testosterone or even more effective testosterone analogues. Needles don't really hurt that much, you know.

Calories, overload, meat, testosterone. If you are not getting stronger, one of those four things is the

bottleneck.

And if you don't know which one it is, it's probably calories or protein.

One of the most common traps to fall into when trying to gain, especially for those of you who tend to be skinny fucks rather than fat fucks, is to assume you are eating enough when you aren't. Anyone knows when they are not lifting.

"But I eat a lot." Yeah, and are you gaining? Eat *more*.

"I eat whenever I am hungry".

And there's your problem. Hunger is not your guide. **Most men think that they will become hungry if they are building muscle**, so they should lift, wait to become ravenous, and eat until they are satisfied. **They are wrong**. All your frugal body wants to do is put back what was damaged. **If you want to become stronger, the calories must already be there.**

Think about this for a moment. Hunger is what you feel when gastrointestinal cells release ghrelin in response to elevated glucagon levels, in response to low blood glucose. What lowers blood glucose? Consumption by cells, of course, but too consume glucose, a cell *must exist*. It can't eat if your body hasn't built it yet.

Which means **you must feed the body you want, not the body you have**. If you are already lifting heavy, you must convince your system that calories are readily available. Then, and only then, will it splurge on big-ticket items like large muscles.

The Red Pill, You, & Modality

62 upvotes | May 19, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

A **modality** is the way or mode in which something exists or is done. You might often see it used with reference to diagnostic modality, which is the way in which a disease or illness is diagnosed by a doctor.

Whenever someone talks about a way of doing something, or even, say, creates a subreddit to discuss ways to do a certain thing, sooner or later someone is going to come along and say

"Yes, we **can** do it that way, but **should** we?"

The word "should" is a slippery one. It really has two meanings.

1. "This is a moral imperative." (You "should" not have sex with someone else's wife.)
2. "This is the most effective way to achieve X.", where everyone agrees that X is a desirable end. (You "should" not run with scissors.)

The problem with the first one is that it's based on fundamentally flawed premise... that an absolute morality exists which can be discovered. That, of course, is bullshit. You cannot get "ought" from "is", never could, never will.

Does this mean that moral codes are fake, and we can do whatever we want? Well, we *can*, but morals *are* useful because they exist in the second sense. **Moral codes are transactional, not absolute.** In other words, they are a piece of social technology that cultures come up with for the purpose of achieving their ends, a social contract that we indoctrinate people into so that they can *get along and work together*, and thus achieve more than they could in an atmosphere of strife.

This means that **an effective man does not have one code of moral behaviour**. He has different types of moral behaviour, depending on who he is dealing with, what level of trust he has with them, and what level of reciprocity he can expect from them. The more internal trust a group or culture has, the more elaborate its moral code can be. **Moral codes are tools, pieces of social technology**, and different tools are appropriate for different tasks.

Losing sight of this is the root of the blue pill, and of the downfall of both civilizations and individual men. When a man can be suckered into acting against his self-interest and in the interest of others *who will not do the same for him*, he allows himself to be taken advantage of. This is Phase One, "Denial", when a man is unhappy with his lot in life, but refuses to act to change it, because "that would be wrong".

The moment of awakening (beginning of Phase Two) is the moment when a man realizes that the notions of right and wrong which he was taught were not absolutes. They were not even a social contract. They were a slave collar to extract the maximum of labour from him with the minimum of reward. The blue pill is the weaponization of morality. This is why there is a big difference between dispensing blue pills and swallowing them. One is using weaponized morality against others. The other is allowing weaponized morality to be used against you.

Thus, the question of whether you "should" sleep with someone's wife has two answers:

- The Blue answer ("no, it's wrong" or "yes, he doesn't own her")
- The Red answer("what is he to me? Do we have trust? Is there a social contract? Would he extend me the same courtesy? Does he have my back? Is this my friend, or a stranger?")

The difference between RP and BP is not the difference between "keep the code" and "violate the code", but between "the code is absolute" and "the code is situational".

"I against my brother, my brothers and I against my cousins, then my cousins and I against the stranger."

Chapter 17: In which PPD wets the bed, then triumphantly declares itself a sailor.

49 upvotes | May 25, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I've often maintained that PPD is an exercise in futility, but I sometimes hang out there for rhetorical practice, and most of all, for the lulz.

Recently, PPD, delivered, in spades.

For those who hadn't heard, the sequence went like this:

1. The rather eloquent and always entertaining MRA voice, GirlWritesWhat, shows up in PPD, and fails to denounce us as a bunch of awful misogynists. Quite the opposite, in fact.
2. The also eloquent Undead_Keyboard (is this guy on the fast track to EC-dom when he's been here a little longer? Definitely a pen to watch, folks) writes the event up in TRP, and Karen (GWW) shows up here, too.
3. Somehow, we horrible misogynists fail to denounce her for the awful crime of being born with a vagina.
4. In fact, she's met with an outpouring of love and appreciation... at which point **the hilarity begins**.

Observe, class, the action in this footage, shot in the wild. The Hamster is attempting to engage and defeat its natural enemy, ~~reality~~ ~~common~~ ~~sense~~ TRP. But the venue has gone off-message and refuses to serve up examples of "misogyny" as ammunition. Behold the ingenuity of the the wild Hamster as it quickly changes tactics and fires of accusations of *not being misogynist enough*.

That's right, folks, if you express anger at a woman, the Hamster will accuse you of being misogynist. If you express love for a woman, the Hamster will accuse you of being unfaithful to "your" principles (that is, the principles the Hamster has just got done angrily accusing you of having, and being a bad person for having).

What's my point, here?

Haters gonna hate.

Do not let yourself be fooled into thinking that you are dealing with honest, well-intentioned folk who simply disagree, or don't understand. No, these people are not straight shooters.

Do not debate with them, except to for your own entertainment. A debate is a process of structured discussion between two people who honour certain basic principles. TRP haters do not honour the principles of debate. They are not honest. They do not say what they mean and mean what they say. They do not care about what is true.

They do not even disagree with you, because to agree or disagree, they would have to care about truth. No, their reaction to you is that **your words are painful for them to hear, and so, truth or not, they must be silenced**. This is why, like the Bush administration in Iraq, they will change mission statements on a dime. *Because the mission of the mission statement isn't to state the mission, it's to rationalize the real mission.*

So do not debate them, because they do not care about truth. Truth is a weapon against mistaken or

false ideas. But these people have *no ideas at all*, so truth doesn't work against them. They don't care if they are wrong. The weapon against haters is *laughter*.

This works for blue pillers. It works for shit tests. It works for people who are "just asking questions". It works for concern trolls, and disingenuous politicians, and feminists.

Any time you detect a hidden agenda, stop debating and start mocking. Because debate only happens between honest men.

On the Folly of Mistaking a Throne for an Army.

186 upvotes | May 25, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I thought I was done talking about how Reddit wants to "share its values with the world". After all, I'm not all that broken up about the idea of finding a new place to talk. Internet's a big place, and so long as there's a corner of it I can scribble on, scribble I will. Even if I must build that corner myself. (I'm a software engineer, I can do that.)

But BluePillars, leftoids, feminists, SJWs, multiples with headmates, toasterkin, and Ellen Pao can all be useful, in a way, as sort of a reverse compass. Look in the opposite direction they are marching, and you just might find some nuggets of truth glinting from the roadside bushes.

There are many people who want to "share their values" with you. To become a "council of elders" and provide you with "direction". To "steer the discourse" into something "productive". What all of this means is that they wish to control you. They call it leadership, but that's because they don't understand what leadership is.

Because such people have status, or a position, or a well-known name, or a corner office, or what have you, they imagine that they get to decide what happens next. This is the control I speak of.

They have forgotten the 5th Law of Power, and the 18th.

All these things they have are perks of power, *symptoms* of power, not power itself. Power itself comes from skills and capabilities, and, on a broader scale, the support of others who have skills and capabilities of their own.

Without an army, a throne is just a chair.

Those who hunger for the return of kings (usually because they imagine themselves in the big chair), usually do not understand what a king is. A king who sits on a throne is merely a symbol of the real king who came before him; he is obeyed out of habit, and will be destroyed by the first serious challenger. A king who can *seize* a throne is a man who leads an army; that is, a man who has supporters who will back his play.

With an army, a throne is yours from the moment you reach out to take it.

You need not fear those with thrones and no armies. They can make pronouncements and write laws, but who will enforce them? They can kick you off a website, but what is a website? It is a small humming box in an air-conditioned closet, that's what. People who prize position and status, and seek to wield power through them, are dressing themselves in fancy costumes and issuing "Royal Edicts", but they have forgotten that kings don't wear silk and jewels and fur. They wear chainmail with someone else's blood on it.

So where do armies come from? From each man's decision to follow, and nothing else. You cannot force an army to follow you, because... what would you force it *with*? It *is* the force you seek to wield. You must instead make each man think that following you is a good idea that will work out well for them.

This is why I say that **leaders do not ask permission to lead**. They do not make a play to be appointed to the big chair. They do not announce their candidacy for Chief High Panjandrum of Lower Tuli.

They simply **pick a direction, march in it, and inspire others to follow**. They crave friends, not

titles.

TRP is a lesson in this. In a sea of hatred, a handful of mods and other speakers have something going. Sure, they have position, they can ban people, but if a great number didn't agree they liked it here, they could *simply vote with their feet*, and all the mods would have left would be the power to ban people from a ghost town. The strength here isn't master passwords and website control tools. It's *"over 100,000 people think this is good idea"*.

This is free market leadership. Strong men, men worth leading, will only follow someone who's going where they want to go. **No one can control you if you have the power to walk away.** An "alpha" isn't necessarily the man who fucks all the women. That's just a perk. An "alpha" is the one who leads the men. And to do this he must inspire them.

Never follow anyone who doesn't inspire you. And remember that you can have power anywhere if you learn to be the man who inspires others.

What is a man's legitimate and effective defense against a mattress carrier?

34 upvotes | May 25, 2015 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Since crazy people do not carry signs or have large glowing runes on their foreheads, any man who is sexually active has some, non-negligible percentage chance that some time in his life he will have sex with a full-blown mattress carrier.

If, as many of you have said, we not to distrust women and take elaborate precautions (because that reveals a negative expectation of women and is therefore "misogynistic"), and if, as many of you have said, the legal system and the press should not examine a "victim"'s behaviour or check their story (because that is "victim blaming" and therefore "misogynistic"), and we are not to treat "date rape" or "acquaintance rape" less seriously, either at trial or at sentencing, than "stranger rape" (because that is "trivializing rape" and therefore "misogynistic"), please describe how men are to be protected from mattress carriers.

Note that the following suggestions:

- Celibacy
- Never disappointing a woman ever.
- Magically acquiring the infallible power to detect psychopaths
- Accepting status as "collateral damage" with a smile.

... will be greeted by the laughter they richly deserve.

Any notions?

What "vision" means to a leader of men.

41 upvotes | May 26, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Not long ago, [/u/Fred_Flintstone](#) gave us this:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-S1ZfjZmjgA>

... treating as a text on how to deal with a shit test. This was a fairly good read, but I believe that there is more value to be had here.

Because when we speak of leadership in terms of having a plan or direction which others are inspired to follow, we introduce the concept of **vision**.

But what *is* vision, apart from a vague and really cliched way to praise some boring congressional candidate from a flyover state? **Vision is the ability to see.** When a man has vision, he sees things. When he has extraordinary vision, he sees things further away, in space or time, than others do.

We can see this at work if we mentally examine the possibility that perhaps in this video, Putin is *actually answering the reporter's question*.

It seems like a nonsequitur, and one with a dick joke, at that, but what's really going on? Let's run it through our subtext translator.

Reporter: {In taking military action against violent muslim extremists in Chechnya, you are going to get some poor innocent people hurt.}

Vlad: {Do you wish to become a muslim? Because those are your two options, dude.}

The reporter sees the world in terms of *individuals*. Violent muslim terrorists who must regrettably be stopped, with minimum force, and nice innocent muslims standing right next to them. Putin sees the world in terms of *cultural, economic, and geopolitical forces*. Islam is on the rise, and these terrorists are not lone criminals, they are the claws and teeth of a much larger beast, one that acts not through plans and intent, but aggregate actions of populations.

Pull the claws and blunt the teeth, or your daughters will be wearing burkas.

Religions and cultures are ideas at war for control of the human populations. Human populations, united by cultures, are in a slow-motion war against each other to spread and control territory and resources. The threat Putin is addressing is not some bad guys blowing up a church. It's the slow spread of a foreign and backwards culture that doesn't care much for his people, or their values.

It's so cliched as to be almost meaningless to say that leaders must see the big picture, but to shape the future, a man must understand the forces that make it the way it is... whether that is the future of nations and cultures, or of that man's own life.

We see an example of this lack of vision in men who get married. They *know* the divorce rate is 51%. They know about the cultural forces leading up to this. But they are only capable of seeing their lives in terms of the individuals around them. *Their* snowflake would never do that to them. They are unable to imagine how their lives are shaped by larger, aggregate forces of cultural trends, ideas, demographics, and other emergent, aggregate forces.

Without this kind of vision, we do stupid things because we are driving with the headlights off.

This is why TRP haters see us as "excessively paranoid" or "misogynist", "over-generalizing" or what have you. Because where they see individual people, and every circumstance being different and

unclassifiable, we see interactions between people as being affected and even controlled by larger forces within their society, the nature of which we discuss and pick apart.

Vision is the act of broadening the scope of one's perspective to understand what is really going on.

The Redefinition of Marriage, Part Two: Sex

108 upvotes | June 8, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We have already how marriage has lost its status as an enforceable contract.

But in addition to being a partnership, marriage also served as a sexual outlet, a means not only of channeling and controlling the sexual urge into safe and productive expressions, but also of guaranteeing release for a near-irresistible biological drive. This, too, has been abolished.

Marriage, at its core, was not only a contract, but an emotional and sexual relationship. It provided certain guarantees to men in exchange for the sacrifices made to, and by, entering into it.

- It guaranteed a safe and reliable outlet for the sexual appetite.
- It provided a defense against cuckoldry and paternity fraud.
- It provided a promise of sexual and emotional prioritization in a woman's life.

The first is easy to understand. Married men didn't have "dry spells". While passionate sex could decay into duty sex if the man failed to remain attractive, the level of respect (and thus attraction) commanded by a competent and productive protector and provider was not insignificant, and the wife was held at least partially responsible for her husband contentment.

This is of course no longer the case. While charges of "marital rape" are fortunately rare, the redefinition of rape to "any sexual encounter not desired by, and controlled by, the female" has made this absurd shibboleth seem to the more crazy among as a thing that can actually exist. What this is symptomatic of is the widespread attitude that, marriage being about desire rather than duty, a woman has *no responsibility whatsoever* to have sex with her husband, much less to make that sex satisfying and fulfilling to him. Just look in [/r/deadbedrooms](#). Once, any of these situations would have been a *breach of the marital contract*. Now, people complain of it to strangers on a public forum, because wifery is under no obligation to listen.

The second is also a simple idea. While female fidelity was much harder to confirm in the age before the paternity test, the invention of such has merely shown us how real the threat is. It is no coincidence that France has banned them. Expect more first world nations to follow suit. While an adulterous woman can still be divorced if a man wishes, no-fault divorce has ensured that this will be no punishment or deterrent at all... simply a guarantee that his wealth and children will be divided between them by strangers with guns.

It is the third point that requires some explanation.

What does it mean to be an emotional and sexual priority for a woman? It can be hard to understand for many women, but sex is what makes men feel loved; not the only thing, perhaps, but the thing without which nothing else works. This is why female virginity at marriage is and was a priority for men whenever and wherever it could be had. A man who knows he is only man she has ever shared sexual passion with... is a man who knows he is the top priority in her life. Women now, who cannot deliver virginity, make rationalizations like "How can I be an expert at touching your penis if it's the first one?" But sexual pleasure is predicated on animal passion, not clinical skill. *The primary organ of sexual excitement lies between the ears.*

But virginity is not to be found today. In fact, it is widely accepted that the "requirement" of virginity at marriage was complete unreasonable, and ridiculous and tyrannical, and totalitarian religious

practices were required to enforce it, on pain of death or shunning. Is this the case? Was history one long vignette of a boot stomping on a human face, as feminists would have us believe?

Well, if a feminist tells you a drought is coming, better buy a canoe. No, here's the truth of it.

Ever wonder why the early parts of the bible are silent on the subject of fornication? Adultery is strictly forbidden, but not a word is spoken about sex between unmarried people. Why? For a long time in prechristian jewish culture, premarital sex wasn't *forbidden*, it was *impossible*. **Sex was marriage**. A man who took a woman was responsible for her, and their children. That's what marriage was. The ceremony was a formality. Thus, you couldn't have premarital sex, only marital sex, and adultery. That's why the ten commandments forbid the latter but not the former. It wasn't a thing.

As the nomadic, herder jews settled down and began farming, marriage as a formal relationship grew into a thing in its own right. That's the era when the bible starts to talk about "fornication", the act of having sex without marrying. This became more of a thing as polygyny fell out of fashion, creating the idea that a man couldn't marry some women he'd had sexual relations with, because he had previously married another one.

The next change to was twofold; the ongoing development of industrial technology, and the "equality" meme.

Industrial development shifted economies away from physical labour and towards mental and social tasks as trades for income. As this happened, more and more education was required before youngsters could ascend to economic adulthood. This began to delay the age of marriage. **When a girl can reasonably be expected to be married at 16 to 18 years of age, society can reasonably expect her to keep her legs shut until then**. If she's going to be married at 21, it's a riskier proposition. At 25, forget about it. At 28, absurd. And when young people cannot afford a home or to support children, they cannot afford to get married.

The final blow was the equalist meme. The notion that women must have power and authority within the family at least equal to that of men, not merely as a safeguard against exploitation or unhappiness, but because anything else was held to be exploitation in and of itself.

Now it was no longer normal and acceptable to a young woman (16 to 18) to marry a man who had lived long enough to establish his career (28 to 40s) and be able to afford a home, a wife and a child. Industrial development forced men to wait longer and longer to get married. Equalism forced women to wait longer and longer as well.

Thus **the task of "saving it for marriage" developed from automatic to easy to difficult to unrealistically absurd**.

The process of redefining marriage has been gradual, and not simply a matter female selfishness expressed as feminism, but also economic and technological change, allowed to reshape the family as it would, without an eye to male instincts and needs.

Now the juice simply isn't worth the squeeze. I suspect the divorce rate will actually even begin to go *down*, sooner or later, simply because only the sappiest and most controllable of men will get married. And without stable, loving, two-parent families, each generation is successively more fucked.

We all secretly know that banging a succession of sluts is second prize. But no one gets first prize anymore. There is no marriage to a worthy woman anymore, because she cannot be a worthy woman

in a culture that railroads her in the opposite direction.

Do not hunt unicorns. Do not put a ring on it. Give women only the intimacy they earn. Do not bargain with them, do not make deals with them, give them no promises, enforceable or not. Always be able to walk away. That is your power. Do not give it away.

Men, even TRP men, love women very much.

560 upvotes | June 12, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We don't talk about it because we live in a time and place that mistakes it for weakness. We don't even talk about it here because it's an instinct we often find ourselves having to suppress for our own good. But when [/u/girlwriteswhat](#) pointed out that if we didn't love women, there would be no anger phase, she absolutely right.

You are hardwired to be sympathetic to, and protective of women. Evolutionarily, that's what you are for. Keep the eggs safe. Ensure the next generation.

This is why there is an anger phase. This is why men have to come here and read motivational crap about not overvaluing bitches. Because it's easy to fall into that pattern.

You're all here, so you all know why you need to control it. We live in a culture that browbeats men into obeying women and fearing them, and this has been so successful that women now cannot tell the difference between healthy love, and spineless cowardice. We all know we have to clamp down on that instinct, and reserve that affection for the few women who are truly worthy of it, and *have proven themselves so by earning it from us*.

Once, our healthy instinct to protect was once in harmony with women's healthy instinct to respect men and obey male leadership. Why do you think feminists have to froth at the mouth so much about not being led or dominated by a man, ever? Because they are secretly tempted just like any sane woman, that's why.

Entire books could be written about why some women suddenly decided to wage war on their feminine instincts, and about why other women followed them, unawares, into that psychological desert. But regardless of why, that's where we are now, and we know we have to control the desire to see them smile.

The kind of love we need now is what used to be called "tough love"; not the love of a parent for a healthy, happy, well-adjusted child, but the love of a parent for the child whose heroin addiction is destroying the family.

"I cannot stop you from destroying yourself, but I will not allow you to take me or this family down with you. Next time you're in jail, use your phone to call someone else. Because I am done rescuing you."

Hide the protective instinct from women if you must, or admit it's there if you think you can do amused mastery well enough, but **never deny its existence to yourself**. Self-deception is not what we do here. This is why the anger phase is important. Pass through it and move on, but hold the memory of that anger, and of why you were angry, with you. Remember it when you need it to stiffen your spine.

And don't let your LTR turn you into a bitch.

What did she ever do to deserve being called a woman?

367 upvotes | June 15, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Men are evolved for hardship. Without enemies to fight, wild animals to hunt, or frontiers to explore, we wash up upon adulthood feeling lost, living pieces of our lives through vicarious films, books, computer games depicting adventures we will never get to have.

And that means all of us. These adventures are hardships undertaken *out of necessity. For the sake of survival, or advancement, or duty.* They are not fun. They are not pleasant to have. They are harrowing experiences we are glad of afterwards, because they make of us what we would not otherwise have been.

Richard Branson skydiving out of a hot air balloon onto his private submarine that's launching a rocket isn't having an adventure. He's playing with toys, and he is in no way making himself more of a man than I am when I get scuba certified, or go skydiving. Our grandfathers didn't fight WWII because they wanted to be cool. They did it because they had to. And that was the important part.

We have automated ourselves a cozy womb to live in, and we are banging on the walls in frustration. But if we have failed to become the men we could have been, in a world that might just no longer need warriors, hunters, and explorers, **how much more profound is women's failure to become women, in a world that still needs nurturers?**

Select your average woman. Not a horrible tumblr SJW harridan, not a legbearded feminist hambeast, but just the average modern specimen of womanhood. **What has she done, what can she do, that is useful to anyone other than herself?**

- She is not fit, strong, and healthy.
- She is not beautiful.
- She is not loyal.
- She does not uplift the spirits of those around her.
- She has no useful productive skills, other than "getting paid for doing something or other in an office".
- She can't cook.
- She can't manage a household.
- She waits until the least healthy possible time to have children.
- When they are born, she feeds them from a plastic bottle instead of her breast.
- If they are male, she has a piece of their cock sliced off with no anesthesia, instead of fighting to protect them like any decent mother would.
- When they are older, she feeds them food made in a factory and packaged in bags and boxes, instead of fresh vegetables, fruit, meat, and cheese.
- She gives them carbonated sugar water to drink, and "treats" made from corn syrup.
- Instead of devoting her time to loving them, she puts them in the care of a stranger so she can go back to doing things in an office.
- When they are older, she sends them to public school where they learn to be good, obedient, factory workers and buyers of consumer junk, rather than strong, independent, self-reliant adults.
- Odds are good she deprives them of their father, if they ever had a chance to know their father

at all.

It is arguable that our society no longer needs warriors, hunters, explorers, men of adventure. If so, perhaps it is our lot to find some way to survive and make accommodation with being none of those things.

But our world has not stopped, and as long as there is a human race, will *never* stop, needing strong, healthy, happy children, a next generation that is mentally stable, physically sound, who can create their society's future without laziness or crippling fear.

This is women's ONE JOB. And they have failed for generations.

Men are not men because women are not women. And women are not women because men are not men. The Greatest Generation gave birth to the worst, and together they pulled apart the very thing upon which all societies are grounded.

The family.

Selfish women demanded its destruction for the sake of poisonous ideals, and selfish men gave them what they wanted for the sake of looking like nice guys and maybe getting some of that "free love". It is the family which creates each future generation, which passes on the practices and values which make people healthy, happy, and whole, and allow them to create their own family, their own next generation.

So what, indeed, will you tell your grandchildren?

Nothing. You won't have any. **We are not the heroes who are going to save society. We are rats deserting a sinking ship.** It is vain and foolish and prideful and disingenuous to pretend that just by lifting enough black iron plates, injecting enough trenbolone, earning enough money, or inspiring enough vaginal moisture we can "save" society. We do not control society. It will not listen to us, and I, for one, will not bend the knee and beg for its attention. My missions will be my own, in the service of myself and those few people who earn a place in my tribe with their proven loyalty.

Adventures are heroics and heroics are self-sacrifices, and thankless self-sacrifice is the province of the slave, not the hero. Someone else can have the grandchildren and work out what to tell them.

Innocence and Toughness

474 upvotes | June 20, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

A poor confused young thing asked me the other day "So oral sex is still sex?".

Yes, dear, all that head you gave increased your partner count. And it sucks for you that no one told you that. That no one ever bothered to explain just what the realities of men's desires are, because they were all too busy trying to change those desires.

So it's time to tackle, once and for all, the question... what do men want? Why do men prefer virgins to sluts? And why do women prefer players to virgins?

Well, today, we're going to explain this point. Not *prove* it, but *explain* it. Let's look, not at some real pictures, but at some *drawn stereotypes*.

Here are two drawings of young, innocent looking people.

A girl.

And a boy.

Here are two drawings of old, tough, grizzled looking people.

A woman.

And a man.

You can already see. The pictures are carefully selected for similar style and representation. But notice how in the girl in the first set is much more appealing than the woman in the second set, while, if you are a woman, the man in the second set is more appealing than the boy in the first set. Why? Because we are evolved to select mates for health (in both sexes), but also for *parental fitness*.

What is parental fitness in a male parent? The ability to protect his offspring (by fighting), and provide for them (by hunting). In other words, a man who is **tough, a proven survivor, and good at killing**.

What is parental fitness in a female parent? The ability to bear healthy children (youth and fertility), and also the ability to raise healthy and confident children (by nurturing and interacting with them). In other words, a woman who is **young, innocent, and good at loving**.

Everyone, male or female, exists on a continuum from innocence to toughness. But what's important to understand is that this is a one-way street. The innocent can become tough. The tough cannot become innocent.

This is why men desire sexually inexperienced women. With every new partner, a woman becomes more experienced. With every breakup, she becomes more toughened against heartbreak, and less liable to emotionally invest. Each new penis removes some of the quality and air of innocence that men desire, and *the less emotionally attached she is to the owner of that penis*, the more innocence is removed.

The classic slut/feminist shibboleth "Don't you want an experienced woman who knows exactly how to touch your penis really well?" is nonsense. The organ of sexual excitement is *the brain*. An inexpert, but enthusiastic and highly attractive woman is a much better sexual partner than seasoned penis handler who's seen it all before and doesn't think you're anything special. She's less excited, and so are you. This is why feminists love vibrators. Because they've destroyed their innocence, and have

no adoration for their sexual partners. Their dull, flat, lifeless emotional involvement inhibits their orgasm, and they need lots of "just right" physical stimulation, right on the clitoris. A high school girl having an affair with her teacher can come from his fingers on her nipples, because it's the first time anyone ever took her bra off, and she's excited and nervous and *overwhelmed*.

This why girls need a patriarchy. Because they start their sex lives at the peak of their sexual attractiveness, both physical and emotional, and without guidance, they will fritter away that quality of innocence before they even know it exists or is important.

And there's no going back. A young man who errs by being *not tough enough* can always harden the fuck up later. But a girl who errs by hardening up cannot go back down that one-way street.

Men wanting virgins isn't just about literally virginity, it is about the qualities of youthfulness and innocence.

So, no, dear, keeping your legs closed and sucking cock instead does not make you stay desirable.

Trees.

202 upvotes | June 24, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

“A society grows great when old men plant trees in whose shade they know they shall never sit.”

This is what morals are. The planting of trees for others. Now, we can argue all day about whether we "should" or "don't have to" do this. But "should" is just a one-word synonym for "I want".

The benefit of shade trees planted by the previous generation (or just other people) for us is obvious. We get to sit in the shade. But why do people do this?

Old men plant shade trees for the future, because the past planted shade trees for them. Those who receive, are willing to give back to the system they received from, because they buy into it, believe in it. Trust and cooperation go together.

What this means is that **morals are a contract**. We hold up our end of the bargain, and others hold up theirs. But there are many different contracts, and many different people to have contracts with. Whenever we are faced with a moral question, we cannot simply ask *"What is right?"*, as if morals were a single, universal absolute. We must ask *"What is the contract?"*, *"Who is it with?"*, and, most importantly *"Have they kept their end of the bargain?"*.

This is how to consider a moral question, from an awakened, eyes-open, red pill perspective. Is it to see moral systems from the outside, as a piece of social technology, and to evaluate them by their results, not to cling to them because they've been repeated to us over and over.

Let us suppose you are faced with the moral question of whether to fuck another man's wife. Now you could say "This is wrong, because it harms the man", or "This is not wrong, because the girl is free to do as she likes with her vagina". But both of those fail to consider the question properly. They simply repeat the principle they think is most important, without any evidence of *why* it is important, or what is the reason that people might wish to honour it.

That's not *thinking*. That's just obeying whoever was most successful in chanting slogans at you. The red pill means looking with your own eyes, and thinking with your own brain.

Instead, look at the morals, the **contract**, from the outside. What is the agreement, who is it between, are both ends being upheld?

For our example:

- Marriage is an agreement of monogamy (usually). Who is it between? The man and his wife.
Are you responsible for upholding a contract you are not part of?
- Is there an agreement between you and society, or all other men, not to fuck each others' wives? Maybe. But has it been upheld? *Well, what has society done to protect you from cuckoldry? It has given wives cash and prizes for engaging in it and divorcing their husbands.*
- Is there an agreement between you and the other man, as a person? Maybe. Would he fuck your wife? Who is he to you? Your brother? Your friend? An acquaintance? A stranger?

Obviously, I have some thoughts on these questions. I will not hide them. But the important thing for you is not what I think, it's to think about it for yourself.

When someone tells you to plant trees for others, ask yourself... do I sit in the shade of trees planted for me? How you answer that question is up to you. But don't let people control you with guilt and a lecture. And if you find yourself the sons of men who sat in the shade and planted no trees, I recommend you not stand out in the sun with a shovel.

First post syndrome

352 upvotes | July 13, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

About one to four months after finding the red pill, a lot of you young bucks have a bad idea.

"My eyes are open now", you say to yourselves. "I can see now that it is all about being Alpha. I need to do what Alphas do, and then I will be Alpha. Alphas are teachers and leaders. I will become Alpha by teaching and leading."

"I will make a post!"

"Errr... let's see now... what am I going to say?"

Usually the result contains:

- Platitudes.
- Vague encouragement.
- The words "brothers" or "gentlemen".
- Nothing of value to anyone.

Well, "brothers", "gentlemen", let me remind you of something. TRP does not have democratic values. It is probably the first community with non-democratic values that you have ever lived in. It is this way because democracy, specifically the kind of fetishized democracy that insists that everyone's voice has equal value and weight, and that every voice needs to be heard... well, that's what fucked up the social order so bad we needed to invent TRP.

Your opinion is not valuable just because it's your opinion. Your voice does not need to be heard just because it's yours. You do not have the right to waste people's time to because you want to see yourself in print.

Every time I write something, you are doing me favour by reading it. You are giving me something you have a fixed amount of, and will never get any more of... your time. And either I repay that favour by making what you get worth your time, repay it so much that I've done *you* a favour by giving you something that was worth far more than your time, or I fail to repay the favour by wasting your time with words of little worth.

Either you either profit by reading, you break even, or you lose. Which one do you think would make me a teacher, and a leader of men?

Resist the impulse to speak because you want to be the guy speaking. The path to being a quality speaker is to **wait until you have something you are burning to say**. Something that has blown your mind and everyone else needs to hear it. Something that repays the precious gift of their time. Yes, it's a problem that RPS has to sticky something saying "Don't post pabulum", but writing pabulum isn't good for you, either. If you don't have insights or experiences you are burning to write about, then lurk, learn, and practice until you do. Ultimately, TRP is about the quality of your life, not the size of your metaphorical internet penis.

You do not need to see yourself in print to prosper.

Don't Talk to Me Like a Bitch.

719 upvotes | July 14, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

"Hi, I'm Noh Wang, and I think I'm a hopeless case. I'm Chinese, 5'1, 110lbs, a virgin, and hopelessly shy. Women never notice me, and I can't muster up the courage to talk to them. I've never looked anyone in the eye since I learned to walk. Every night I go home and soak my pillow with tears, hating myself for being me. I know I will never be Alpha, but can you please help me, or just tell me it's hopeless so I can kill myself (except I'm too much of a pussy to actually do it). I'm so miserable. Please help."

You are talking like a bitch. Don't talk to me as if you were a bitch.

I'm going to take a wild guess here, Wang, and say you were raised with an absent, uninvolved, or pussified father. Because you are speaking woman-language to me, and you are trying to get woman-help.

You are trying to get me to rescue you. To fix your feelings. To dry your bitch-tears and tell you it'll be all right.

That's how bitches talk. Bitches talk like that because it works for them. If I see a cute little piece of girl crying and begging for help, my male protective instincts are going to kick in. I'm going to feel some sympathy, and maybe pick her up, dust her off, and parent her a little bit, teasing her for being so upset at this silly little problem, and here's what we're going to do about it. Then I will fuck that bitch so deeply that whoever pulls me out will be declared King of All England and Scotland, and things won't seem so bad anymore.

That's men are wired. **Bitches talk like that because it works for bitches.** If they cry, big strong Vikings like me come along and give them a big helping of Alpha male attention and Alpha male cock, after which they have nothing to cry about anymore.

And bitches taught you to talk like that because they are bitches and that's what they know.

Bitches aim for sympathy because it works for them when they do.

But you know what you get if you talk to me like a bitch? Contempt, that's what. You disgust me. It's as sickening as if you had put on lipstick and a dress. Because you are not a cute little piece of girl, **you are a man. And you sicken me when you don't talk like one.**

The first thing you need to do, Wang, is talk like a man. **Don't aim for sympathy. Aim for respect.** The bitches who raised you never taught you to aim for respect because they don't know how, and it doesn't work for them anyway. Of course they don't do it. A bitch aiming for respect is as disgusting as a man angling for pity. It's as sickening as if she had stopped shaving her legs, put on a false mustache, and started swearing like a sailor. Bitches get sympathy. Men get respect. Drill that into your fucking skull, Wang. I know you have very little to brag about right now, but **if you do not strive for my respect, I will not help you.**

So if all you have is pain, then impress me with how manfully you bear it. Take responsibility. You have a long road ahead of you, but show me you're ready to pick up your fucking backpack and march, and I will point you in the right direction.

Tell me this:

"Hi, I'm Dam Sun, and I've got a shit-load of work to do. I'm Chinese, 5'1, 110lbs, a virgin, and

hopelessly shy. Women never notice me, and I haven't yet mustered up the courage to talk to them. I don't look people in the eye, and I have a lot negative self-talk that I need to fucking stop doing. I've read the sidebar, and I know many of the places I need to go, but there are so many things to fix that it's hard to know where to start. What I think I need is a set of easy intermediate goals, a few homework assignments to get me started. So I'm asking for suggestions."

Now **at least you're talking like a man**. I'll still kick your lazy ass for being lazy and needing your hand held, because *I came up with this shit and did it when there was no TRP at all to help me*, but at least that kick will be a force pushing you in the right direction. At least you'll be worth berating, which is a start, and more than you'll get from talking to me like a bitch.

Better yet, read the fucking sidebar, lurk TRP and askTRP, work on yourself as if you were just another man who needed the standard advice and not a custom program, and, a year later, write me this:

"Hi, I'm Long Wang, and I've made some progress I need to know how to capitalize on. A year ago, I was a 5'1, 110 lb Chinese guy with severe shyness. I read the sidebar, went into monk mode, started lifting, cut sugar out of my diet, did a cycle or two of Test-cyp and Tren, practiced talking to strangers. Now I'm 5'1 and 160 lbs and ripped, and I can look people in the eye and talk to them. I've started seeing women's eyes sparkle when they look at me, but I don't quite know how to turn attraction to lays. Any advice on good resources and tactics for sealing the deal?"

Then you'll have my respect.

... And Don't Listen to Me Like a 'Sperg, Either.

67 upvotes | July 20, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Hi, I'm PinkKitty1992, and I made this reddit account so I can tell you all my very important opinions on the red pill stuff. A lot of it makes sense, but I just don't agree that All Women Are Like That. My mommy stuck by my daddy through unemployment and cancer, and I'm not like that either 'cuz I'm not a vapid whore and I don't treat men bad or slut it up with every man I see even though I'm in college now and lots of boys like me (yay!), and I want to marry a man I respect someday and have some children but I don't wanna be chained to the stove and not have a job and have to ask permission to do anything and I don't see why the red pill has to be so full of angry guys being nasty!

...

Hi, my name is ThadThunderCock2378954732918, and I'm decently along on my redpill journey, but I have a question about to deal with disrespect. The other day I was talking about some politics stuff (not American, I'm Lebanese), and one of my plates said "That makes sense, but I don't quite agree", and made some other argument, which I didn't really pay attention to because I was thinking about how to respond to this obvious shit test. What would you guys say if one of your plates disagreed with you?

...

Y'all **spergs**.

Nothing you read here is to be taken literally. Except the parts that are. Which ones? You figure that out. I'm not here to give you a comprehensive, literal, and precise theory of everything. I'm here to say whacky stuff that shakes you up and opens your eyes. What you read here should start a thought process, not end it.

In every conversation, there two channels along which information flows... the **content**, and the **process**. The content is the literal meaning of the words we say. Simple, direct, easy to absorb for anyone who speaks English. The process is *the message conveyed by how I speak, and what I do while speaking*.

Process communication is the larger part of human language. While TRP attempts to open your eyes to process communication, by talking about it in the content channel, we cannot dispense with process communication even while doing so, because people do not work that way.

Even here, the literal content is not the message, because the end result is not dry information. It's what you do with what you now know. It's how you feel about what you heard. It's your new state of mind. There's no way to encode that in the content of words, because language doesn't do that. I can describe you, but I cannot write you. I can use the word "tree", I can point at a tree, but I cannot reach through the screen and forcibly twist your head so you see the tree and stop staring at my pointing finger.

And eventually, you're going to have to look at all the different trees and understand the concept of a forest.

Spergs cannot generalize. They cannot grasp implications. They cannot grasp nuance. They do not have a sense of proportion. They hear the content of a message, and take it literally, or reject it altogether. They do not grasp the intent behind the words. That's not going to help you here.

To be masculine in a world that has forgotten how is not just to *know* something. It is to think differently, act differently, see things differently than before.

So I cannot tell you. I have to show you. And you have to figure out how to be shown.

If you argue about whether literally all women are like that, you're being a sperg. If you treat everything as a shit test (even when I have literally just written to you "everything is a shit test"), then you are being a sperg. If you argue about whether TRP is full of "hatey stuff" that distracts from the message, you are being a sperg.

Instead, use your burgeoning social skills to read between the lines.

If you do not learn to use and understand process communication, not only will women not ever want to have sexytimes with you, you will also not be able to use the instructions written here for changing that.

Think about the presentation. Think about the process channel. Use your own brain. TRP does not free you from the responsibility to think.

Generalizations and truth.

48 upvotes | August 1, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

If you have a controversial or unpopular opinion, and you say or write it, sooner or later, someone is going to accuse you of "generalizing", as if this were somehow a refutation of what you have said.

It's pointless to argue with them. Debates are won, in the long term, by action, not words. But it helps us to understand why people would say such a thing.

Some people think generalizations are not "true", or, at least, not "true" enough. And yet everything we ever say is a generalization, whether it is that objects on earth fall at 9.8 m/s^2 , or that women are shorter than men, or that I weigh 210 pounds.

So what does it mean to be "true"? What does the word *truth* mean? To say "accuracy" or "representation" means nothing, these are just other words for truth. The question to ask is why we *care* about truth. Why do we argue about what is true? Why do we seek to find it out? When we ask this question, we would in danger of disappearing up our own ass... except that there is a simple straightforward answer.

We care about what is true because it enables us to predict what will happen. Knowing the law of gravity lets me predict the orbit of planets, knowing someone's address lets us predict where we will find them.

Simple enough, and so much for philosophy. **The word "truth" means "predictive power".** This is how we test truth, and why we care about it, so this is how we define it.

Whenever someone asks you if something is true, ask yourself what it empowers you to predict, and what that empowers you to do. You do not need to possess the absolute truth, the perfect model that would allow you to predict *everything*, to say something is "true". It is enough that something be true *enough* to help you.

Are *ALL* women like "that"?

Who can say? To perfectly describe all women would require more words than can be printed on every flat surface in the universe, in microscopic print. We're not here to perfectly describe women, or ourselves, or humans in general. We're here to describe them *well enough* to get done what we need and want to get done.

Red Pill "truths" are not absolutely true, because nothing we have is. They are *true enough to help us do what we need to*.

Related reading:

[Asimov's Axiom.](#)

[Wittgenstein's Ladder.](#)

Infatuation is not the only form of Oneitis.

656 upvotes | August 26, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Lately, I have had several questions from young men, all variations in the key of "*How do I {game/impress/win exchanges with/stick it to/seduce} {my ex-girlfriend/my high school crush/this girl who rejected me because I was beta/the one that got away}.*"

Then they insist that they don't have oneitis because they're banging other women. They're not in love with her. They're not infatuated.

But infatuation is not the only form of Oneitis.

Oneitis is nothing but the failure to regard a woman as replaceable, regardless of why you do so.

- Are you stuck on her because you loooooooooooooove her? *Oneitis.*
- Are you stuck on her because you have something to prove? *Oneitis.*
- Are you stuck on her because she's your ex and you still care what she thinks? *Oneitis.*
- Are you stuck on her because she's Jessica Alba, you actually have an opportunity to game her, and you want to brag to your friends that you banged Jessica Alba? *You guessed it... oneitis.*

A woman is a woman. A vagina is a vagina. Some are better than others, but no matter how good one is, there are others just as good, out there waiting to be found.

In today's ruthless sexual marketplace, you must learn to regard women as a commodity, like apples. Some are bruised and rotten, some are fresh, juicy and delicious, but any apple of good enough quality will do. Some people like the red, sweet ones, some people like the green, tart ones, but any apple of the proper variety will do.

If you are unwilling to walk away from a woman should she prove intractable, unavailable, or disappointing, you have oneitis *regardless of your reason for that unwillingness.*

- Do not try to impress your ex. *She's nothing to you now but another woman.*
- Do not try to catch the one that got away. *She's just another woman.*
- Do not chase that female celebrity any harder than you would a look-alike who is a waitress at IHOP. *She's just another woman, and with more shit tests and drama.*
- Do not cave and lose frame because she's super hot. *She's just another woman.*

No matter what reasons you have for wanting a woman, there is always another women with what you want. Chase, appreciate, but do not become stuck.

He who cannot cast away a treasure, at need, is in chains.

Frame

389 upvotes | August 26, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We talk a lot about "Frame Control", but many people misunderstand the term. I have noticed more and more people using the term generally, to mean something like "standing up for yourself", and more and more people asking about it on askTRP, because the overgeneralized use of the term has confused them as to its actual meaning.

Frame control isn't just conversational dominance. Frame control isn't just winning an argument. In fact, winning an argument without controlling the frame can be a very bad thing.

Frame is the process and context in which you interact with another person. It includes such things as the topic of discussion, the tone and manner of the speech, who is allowed to speak and when, and so.

Therefore, when we say "Frame Control", we do not simply mean standing up for yourself or not backing down. We mean *control over the process of the conversation*.

Example:

- Lose Frame, Lose Argument

Larry Summers: There may be some inherent difference in mathematical ability between male and female populations.

Horde of Angry Feminists: Misogynist!

Larry Summers: I'm sorry I'm sorry I'm sorry I'm sorry (resigns post).

- Lose Frame, Win Argument

MRA Larry Summers: There may be some inherent difference in mathematical ability between male and female populations.

Horde of Angry Feminists: Misogynist!

MRA Larry Summers: How dare you call me a misogynist? Here is my track of promoting female employees, donating to women's charities, promoting breast cancer research, etc, etc, etc.

Horde of Sheepish Feminists: Oops.

- Control Frame

TRP Larry Summers: There may be some inherent difference in mathematical ability between male and female populations.

Horde of Angry Feminists: Misogynist!

TRP Larry Summers: We're talking about mathematical ability, not your feels about whatever you think my feels are. Do you have anything useful to add to this the discussion of mathematical ability, or are you just going to squawk like a wet chicken?

You see, in the second example, MRA Larry Summers has won a battle, but lost the war, because he has *won the battle that his enemy picked for him to fight*. The point he was trying to make it forgotten, because the feminists successfully derailed the conversation into a discussion of Larry Summers' feelings and implied moral worth. *They have successful avoided the question of whether men and women differ in mathematical ability.*

TRP Larry Summers displays frame control. He refuses to be drawn into the discussion that the

feminists want to have. He is having the discussion *he* wants to have.

Without proper frame control, even a dominant conversationalist will lose out in the long run.

This is because he can be drawn into discussions he doesn't want to have, and distracted from his own goals in the interaction.

The most critical form of frame control, as we shown in the example, is dealing with the accusation shit test. To directly confront and attempt to refute an accusation, even if wild successful, is a defeat, because you have:

1. Allowed someone to steer the topic of conversation to something that has no good outcome for you.
2. Shown that the accusation bothers you, which weakens your image.

In any conversation, the controller of the frame is the one who acts, rather than reacts. Many shit tests are, at their core, an attempt to push you into a reactive mode to see if it can be done.

Some Principles of Good Frame Control:

- Focus on your goal in the conversation, and focus what you say on that goal.
- Do not simply react to whatever anyone else says. Consider what direction you want the conversation to take, first.
- Do not cooperate with an attempt to change the subject unless it serves your goals.
- Ignore, call out, or laugh at accusations rather than denying or defending against them.
- Reward cooperation with your frame with active listening and positive reinforcement. Frame control does not mean monopolizing the conversation.
- Punish attempts to break your frame by ignoring the speaker or calling out the behaviour.
- Always finish your sentences. Ignore interruptions as if they did not happen. Be loud if necessary.
- Reward those who tolerate your (deliberate or accidental) interruptions by quickly finishing and then explicitly calling on them to finish their thoughts.
- Do not attempt to control the frame merely to control the frame. Have a frame in mind, and be only as controlling as you need to be in order to establish that frame.
- Do not hesitate to leave a conversation if circumstances render the frame uncontrollable. You lose more face by being dominated than you do by retreating to fight another day.

Beating Infatuation (the most common form of Oneitis)

148 upvotes | August 28, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Infatuation, or what people call "being in love", may not be the only form of Oneitis, but it is the most common one, and in some ways, the most dangerous.

Oscar Wilde knew, after all, that "A man can be happy with any woman so long as he does not love her". And while women protest loud and long that they wish to be loved by their man, they surely do not mean infatuation when they say love, because the behaviour which infatuation inspires in a man often inspires little but contempt in a woman.

So, while many would say that "never do this" is too simple and extreme a policy, there's no doubt that it is wiser to control it, rather than the reverse. Emotions make good servants, but cruel and tyrannical masters.

But how to avoid infatuation? The key is to understand how it occurs.

Your subconscious cannot tell the difference between fantasy and reality. That's how oneitis starts. Imagine yourself with a woman, dream of it, fantasize about it, and the primitive bits of your brain think that it is so.

This starts the process. This kind of love is heroin... literally. Endorphins. Short for *endogenous morphine*. Released in response to her presence. At my best guess, it's evolved to stick you together for at least until the pregnancy is done, possibly until the kid can walk.

When you're in love, you're a junkie. When you have oneitis, when you're in love with a fantasy, you're a junkie who can't get a fix.

So control your imagination. Don't imagine yourself with one particular woman. Don't fantasize about one particular woman. Don't pick one woman and fix your plans on her. Always have a few prospects in mind, or none. If you catch yourself thinking about one woman all the time, go find another to clear your head. Ideally to fuck, but even to talk to will do.

Remember that **your emotions follow your imagination, and your brain cannot tell the difference between fantasy and reality**. This is why visualization techniques work. Control your imagination, and you control your emotions.

A special word about ex-girlfriends: Infatuation is harder to overcome when the bond was real. But the same principle applies. If you think about her, parts of your brain think she is still there. Find someone else to think about. Do not still around obsessing. Do not fantasize revenge. Do not think about how she sees you now. Do not figure out ways to make her regret it. It no longer matters to you what she thinks. She isn't even dead to you, because corpses exist. She is a puff of smoke fading in your rearview mirror, and you're busy looking through the windshield.

Control your imagination and you control your emotions.

Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need more soy lattes. Instead, the completely optional and rather frivolous*

"Buy Whisper More Steroids and Send Reddit to Chapter 11 Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address: 1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD

Strategy

201 upvotes | August 30, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

strat·e·gy

'strədəjē/

noun: strategy; *plural noun*: strategies

a plan of action or policy designed to achieve a major or overall aim.

A strategy is a method to achieve your goals. Presuming you are basically sane, you have goals that benefit you. Strategy is your plan for *benefiting yourself*.

Never confuse the means (Self-improvement, hard work, getting help from others, cheating) with the end (benefit). **You live a universe that only cares about results.** How you got there changes nothing, if the result is the same.

If you are strong because you spent 3 years lifting weights and taking steroids, instead of ten years lifting weights alone, do you think the universe cares? Will it impose justice by not allowing you to lift as much weight? Do you think the girls you want sex from care? Do you think anyone cares?

If you got rich by someone else's work, is your money worth less?

If you got blown because you learned game and faked confidence, did you enjoy the sex less than Chad, who was born with it?

We all know that those who take the path of least resistance are lazy. But some of you need to realize that those who take the path of *most resistance* are **stupid**.

- The lazy man takes the path of least resistance no matter where it leads.
- The stupid and gullible man takes the hard path because everyone tells him it is the right one, or the virtuous one.
- The strategist will succeed where both the lazy and the stupid fail.

The strategist is the man who takes the shortest, easiest path which leads to his goal. He does not waste his energy and time on unnecessary flourishes. He does not despise short cuts as a "cop-out". And **he does not call inefficient work "self-improvement"**.

He improves whatever capabilities are necessary for his goal, but he never loses sight of what that goal is. Much strategy involves necessary self-improvement, but honing your capabilities is a means, not an end. Ultimately, you want something. Know what that something is, know what you have to use, and find the best means to bring the two together.

This means cheat. The universe isn't fair. There are no rules. Use whatever you have.

If you are smart, but not charismatic, make money by entering a profession that not many people can train for.

If you are charismatic, but not smart, make money by using your influence on others.

Use the advantages you have to get the ones you don't.

Gifts can be exchanged for each other. Wealth can buy steroids. Friends and connections can help you get wealthy. Hooking a nerd up with a slut can get you smart, expert help. Intelligence can help you learn valuable skills.

You're going to *have* to improve yourself, a lot, to get what you want, if you're at all ambitious. But never mistake self-improvement for the goal, because then you will lose sight of the shortcuts, or, worse yet, come to despise them.

Only fools are proud of how hard they work. Wise men are proud of how effectively they work.

Be wise. Use strategy. Take the shortest path.

Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need more soy lattes. Instead, the completely optional "Buy Whisper More Steroids and Send Reddit to Chapter 11 Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address:
1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD*

Gronk

293 upvotes | September 8, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

"Hi askTRP, I'm having some trouble {sticking to my diet/motivating myself to lift/avoiding oneitis/motivating myself to approach/whatever}. {Here are my specific circumstances.} Any tricks or tips for overcoming my specific problem?"

*"UUuuggggh! Me **Gronk! Gronk!** is strong, like Siberian bear! **Gronk!** not have problem! Every morning, before lift weights, **Gronk!** stick fork in eye, to make harder. Because **Gronk!** have strong willpower! You need have strong willpower, like **Gronk!** You no be pussy man. You have willpower. That solve problem."*

*"Oh, and, just to remind.... **Gronk!** very strong!"*

Well, that's nice, Gronk. I'm glad your life is going well. *Now kindly shut the fuck up.*

Gronk! is a special sort of RedPill 'sperg that I see more and more of as TRP gets larger. He's read the sidebar. He's lurked for a long time, then asked pertinent questions. He's practiced the material in his life and started to get some success. But, like, most 'spergs, he overgeneralizes.

He's now treating TRP itself as a shit test. He has stopped seeing TRP as a place to learn about masculinity and success, and started seeing it as a masculinity contest. **Gronk!** *is now determined to prove he is the biggest swingin' dick in TRP, or at least a bigger one than whoever he is responding to.*

Gronk! is no longer speaking straighttalk (literal language about the subject under discussion, communicative language).

In fact, it's worse than that. **Gronk!** thinks he's speaking powertalk (language designed to manipulate the emotional state of others, goal oriented language), but he's not. He's speaking babytalk (language designed to manipulate one's own emotional state, masturbatory language).

Gronk! wins no real prize for AMOGing people on the internet. **Gronk!** may have "strong will" to resist eating doughnuts or skipping his workout, but he does not have "strong" enough "will" to resist the temptation to put his energy into getting cheap emotional highs that give him no long-term benefit.

Gronking feels good, but it makes you weaker. Kind of like doughnuts.

By endlessly singing the praises of "strong willpower" and a good "work ethic", which one either has or has not, **Gronk!** deprives himself and everyone around him of the opportunity to learn and systematically develop the right behaviour. **Gronk!**'s efforts to white-knuckle his way through life, and persuade everyone else to do so, deprive him and others of the opportunity to look on motivation as one more resource that can be built by understanding it, and using the right strategy.

Deciding to have more willpower is like deciding to be smarter, or to have more money. Like everything else, willpower (really motivation) is a finite resource that can be spent foolishly, spent wisely, developed, or squandered.

Gronk! builds an image of strength to project to others, pretending he was born with it, has an infinite amount of it, has always had it, and always will. **Gronk!** knows he must do this to women (women believe male strength is born, not made), but he has begun doing it to everyone, including

himself. By lying to himself, he cheats himself of chances to strategically improve his weaknesses. By boasting to other men instead of helping them, he cheats himself of the chance to make allies, and learn by teaching.

Don't be **Gronk!**

Think carefully about when to project an image of strength, and when to talk plainly. Don't boast or AMOG just to make yourself feel good with cheap admiration highs. Instead, focus on your long-term goals, and your emotional state will take care of itself.

Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need more soy lattes. Instead, the completely optional "Buy Whisper More Steroids and Send Reddit to Chapter 11 Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address:*
1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD

Respect and male social hierarchies.

154 upvotes | September 18, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We've spoken about Gronk!ing already. It's the act of trying to project dominance without regard to the situation you're in. Especially on TRP.

And [/u/humansockpuppet](#) has expanded on this, explaining how dominance is for achieving goals, not a goal in and of itself.

But we need to talk about this still more.

- **When you are with women, you must project dominance all the time.** Women only respond to dominance, never to persuasion or shared goals.
- **When you are with other men, projecting dominance is one of several tools.** Sometimes you need to take charge in order to get done what needs doing. And sometimes you need to shut up and shovel the coal.

Most importantly

- **There is no shame in deferring to a male authority when it makes sense to do so.**

This is the part many of us miss. **We must understand why this is so.**

In our feminized, feminist society, we have taken steps to abolish all social hierarchies, seeing them as *inherently oppressive*. To a feminist, power = oppression, always. This means that people only defer to each other out of fear. They defer to their managers at work for fear of being fired, they defer to police for fear of being arrested, they defer to laws for fear of being punished, they defer to those who use dominance strategies and intimidate them.

That is the only type of deference most people know. They defer if they are intimidated or defeated, and they feel shame.

But there is another kind, and that is deference out of respect. Respect for a person's accomplishments, for their skills, for their territory, for the benefits they have provided to us, or simply respect for the most efficient way to get shit done.

- **Deferring out of fear is shameful for a man.** And it should be.
- **Deferring out of respect is not.**

Here in TRP, we teach you how to fight back and win when someone tries to AMOG you. We teach you how to dominate others when it's time to do so (vital for getting sex). But the reason we get all these Gronk!s is that they are *men who have only ever deferred to or followed others out of fear*. That's all they know.

So, whenever someone else is leading the charge, or in the spotlight, or has the badge that says "Vanguard", they feel shame. They think that if they do not immediately challenge and beat this individual in a contest of wills, it is proof that he has a bigger penis, and they must hide their faces in shame.

Male social hierarchies are not based on intimidation. They are based on respect.

Men naturally congregate in groups to accomplish a goal. Whether that's hunting mammoth or selling

software. The leaders are not the best intimidators, but the ones who have invested the most time, invested the most effort, and contributed the most to group goals. They have earned respect. Some groups you are in, you will lead, because they are the ones you invested heavily in. Others, you will be a follower in, because you invested less time in those, and you just want to show up and participate. You can only focus on so many things.

EC members are not chosen for being the best men with the biggest swinging dicks. We choose them because they have contributed and earned respect. TRP becomes partially their territory because they helped build it.

This explains how a group of alpha males and aspiring alpha males, can get along. They earn each other's respect. Only this way can a team of men working together be built.

Without the twin abilities to earn respect, and to give the respect that others have earned, you cannot accomplish any goal that is too big for your own two hands. You can only build a team by giving respect when it is earned, and knowing how to earn it.

- **Do not submit to others out of fear.** If you lose your nerve, and do, feel ashamed, and use that shame to motivate you to do better.
- **If someone earns your respect, give it.** In the fullness of time, you will take what you learn from them, and use it to earn the respect of others.

Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need more soy lattes. Instead, the completely optional "Buy Whisper More Steroids and Send Reddit to Chapter 11 Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address:
1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD*

Change your actions, and your thoughts will follow.

309 upvotes | September 29, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

"Hi, askTRP, I pulled a threesome the other day, and couldn't get it up because I was drunk and had a case of nerves. Now I feel like a loser."

"Hi, askTRP, I pulled 300lbsx5 reps deadlift the other day, but gainz are coming slowly, and I feel feel small and weak."

"Hi, askTRP, I'm stuck at 15% bodyfat. I feel like a blob of lard."

"Hi, askTRP, my girlfriend wears a slave collar and calls me "master", but sometimes she fetches me the wrong kind of beer from the fridge, because she forgot what kind I like. Is it because I'm not alpha enough?"

The old seduction groups used to say "fake until you make it". Here we say to change your habits, and your mind will follow.

There will be a period of time, after you learn to act masculine, and get some success, where you will feel like a fraud and a loser in disguise. **This is because actions are quicker and easier to change than thoughts.** You will have new patterns of behaviour, but remember old ones. You will compare yourself to everyone Gronk!ing away on TRP. Your standards will rise faster than your progress. Your self-image will take time to catch up to the new you.

This is just what happens. Thoughts are habits ground in over years. Actions are what you are doing right now... they can change in an instant. Along the road between you and your goals, you will have moments of imposter syndrome.

Remember that there is no such thing as "who you are inside". You are defined only by what you do. If you do something awesome in the next two minutes, then in that moment, you did something awesome, and that is all that matters. And if you didn't do what you wanted, or get the result that you wanted, then that will no longer matter the moment you do it right.

The greatest advantage of being a man is the same as the greatest disadvantage: You have no inherent value, and you are worth only what you accomplish. This means you can acquire value at any time. If you're better than you were yesterday, you win. If tomorrow you are better than you were today, you win again.

Never waste time asking the question of how well you are doing. Mirrors are for people without a distant horizon to focus on. Only ask yourself what you want, and plan how you're going to get it.

Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need more soy lattes. Instead, the completely optional and rather frivolous "Buy Whisper More Steroids and Send Reddit to Chapter 11 Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address: 1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD*

Ask Whisper: "How do I get attention while speaking?"

151 upvotes | October 14, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Hey Whisper,

Can you provide me with some advice on speech/conversational dominance?

Sure can. Yell even louder, and punch anyone in the mouth if they try to talk over you.

... or perhaps "dominance" wasn't quite what you meant?

The first step to getting anything is to know exactly what it is you want:

I have trouble gaining attention when speaking, despite specifically making attempts to speak loud enough to grab attention.

Ah-hah. So you want to be able to **command the attention of others**. That's a good place to start.

Remember what we taught you about paying attention to women? You were taught to *use attention as a reward*, not give it out in the hopes of inspiring affection. But regardless of whether others do the former or the latter, we can see that **attention is a payment**. That why we call it PAYING attention.

Others give you attention because they know, or at least hope, that you will give them something of value in return. You are reading this right now because you think I might teach you something valuable, or because I have been valuable to you in the past, or because you think my writing is amusing, whatever. You read, or listen, or watch, because you think it's a good use of your time.

This is why **speaking loudly alone doesn't work**. No one wants to listen to an air horn. It's loud enough to force us to listen, but we quickly try to tune it out or stop the noise if we can. Because it does us no good.

Create value, or the perception of value, and attention will come.

What is "value" in the context of conversation? It is anything that rewards listeners for listening. There are too many possibilities to list, but here are a few examples. Charismatic people will use many of these at once.

- **Be funny and entertaining.**

People will listen to just about anything if it's creative, funny, tells a good story, or is otherwise pleasant to listen to.

- **Be insightful and interesting.**

Humans have been equipped by evolution with a powerful forebrain, which is basically a rationalizing and generalization engine. Its urge to spot patterns and find explanations is so powerful that we sometimes find them even when they aren't there. Few things are more gratifying to a human being than the experience of a bunch of random information suddenly falling into a pattern which explains other things. If you can provide eye-opening insights, people will not only patiently sit through, but actually *enjoy*, the wordiest of rants.

- **Say useful things.**

If what you have to say solves a problem they have, they will be all ears. Just make sure you

remember that what people say their problem is counts for nothing. It's about what they actually want.

- **Have status.**

If you have status, power, and respect, not only do others hope to please you by paying attention, but what you think and plan to do effects their lives. This means it's important to them.

- **Use silence to make your words stand out.**

Remember that perception of value creates value. Make something scarce, and you make it more valuable. If you only speak when you have something to say, shut up when you have nothing to add, and use words sparingly, then people will quickly come to regard you as worth listening to. Speak because you have something to say, not just to be speaking.

- **Pass the microphone.**

Counterintuitively, indicating to others that it is their turn to speak, and supporting their points, can get you more attention. Not only does it give value which others may wish to repay, but indicating whose turn it is to speak, consistently, establishes you as the controller of the microphone and hence the leader of the conversation.

- **Speak with conviction when you speak.**

If you don't think what you have to say is important, no one else will either. Always speak clearly and with confidence, never mumble, and always finish your sentence rather than trailing off, even if someone interrupts you and gets the group's attention.

Remember that **attention is a thing of value**. If you simply try to snatch it, people will treat you like a thief. But if you reward it, people will give it to you to purchase that reward. And if you establish yourself as a figure of respect, people will pay it to you in tribute.

#Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need more soy lattes. Instead, the completely optional and rather frivolous "Buy Whisper More Steroids and Send Reddit to Chapter 11 Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address: 1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD*

Startin' Shit.

168 upvotes | October 24, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

[Something we don't talk enough about is fighting, both literal and metaphorical.

Like every other topic under the sun, the majority of us learned the wrong lessons about it from feminized, domesticated fathers, or the wrong lessons about it from single mothers in the complete absence of a father.

So most of you learned about when to fight either from a woman, or from someone who learned from a woman. Women understand as much about how and when to fight as cats understand about refining crude oil, because, as with most other things, women are unable to imagine the perspective and experience of anyone who isn't a woman.

"Just don't do it", women will say. "Just walk away", as if you always had that option.

Women see violence as a sort of natural disaster that comes along and wrecks everyone's shit, like a hurricane, and if only no one would do it, everything would just be much better. This is because they are unequipped to deal with it, and therefore do not wish to confront the fact that violence is the default state of all living things.

Any moment you do not have to fight is a privilege earned with wealth, technology, planning, allies, or other resources.

We know that "don't fight" is stupid woman-speak, issuing from the childish mind of someone who has the privilege of going through her entire life protected by default by violence and conflict. But we also know that overwhelmingly it is stupid, insecure, broke-ass, trashy losers who throw down the most.

So is avoiding conflict cowardly? Or is getting in fights and arguments a loss of frame, and hence weakness?

There's a stupidly simple principle to resolve this question. Fighting is expensive, but it can get us things. That's *why* fighting is the default state of all living things. We need to fight to get the things we need to survive, and to prevent others from the taking those things.

Every conflict has a cost, and a prize.

Fight for good prizes.

Don't fight for stupid prizes.

Every time you find yourself in a conflict, whether it's a dick-measuring contest with some reddit stranger, or someone trying to beat you senseless with a crowbar, **know what it is you are fighting to win**. A momentary feeling of vindication is not a good prize. Getting to walk away with all your body parts is an excellent prize, as is the respect of people in your social network, the ability to live free of fear, etc.

Always know what you are fighting for. Never fight for a stupid prize because you are proud and insecure. Never fail to fight for a good prize because you are afraid, or straitjacketed by feminized "niceness-as-morality". Whether it's a argument or a gunfight, a conflict is an obstacle between you and your goal, and whether you are startin' shit or just finishing it, the goal determines the effort.

Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need more soy lattes and scented body lotion. Instead, the "Buy Whisper More Steroids and Send Reddit to Chapter 11 Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address:
1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD*

Ask Whisper: The Fear and Shame Loop

100 upvotes | October 30, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Hey Whisper:

How do I overcome the fear of rejection and shame?

This question is very relevant to beginners. It's one thing to talk about bitch management, or how to pass a shit test, but there are a lot of young men out there who cannot make themselves put one foot in front of the other, physically walk up to a girl, open their mouth, and speak.

Now we can Gronk! away at men like this, call them scared little bitches or whatever, and maybe we even do some good with it, if we make them more scared of *not* approaching than they are of approaching. But there is a reason why this happens.

I call it the **Fear and Shame Loop**.

What young men fear, when they fear approaching women, is harsh rejection and humiliation. But why exactly do they fear this? Odds are this woman is a stranger whom they will never see again. Why does it matter what she thinks?

It doesn't. What these men fear is not the possible negative consequences. **They fear the shame and fear they will experience.** Being afraid *hurts*, in as real a sense as pain hurts.

When a frightened man approaches a girl, he isn't in danger of feeling like shit if things go badly. He *already* feels like shit, because the fear and shame he has developed. That's the danger he is afraid of, and it happens every time, whether he is rejected harshly, gently, or not at all. The more afraid he is, the worse the experience is, and the more afraid he is be next time. This is the loop... a self-reinforcing cycle of social anxiety.

There are many approaches to beating this spiral, everything from desensitization, to visualization, to training, to increased SMV, to drugs... and a full-blown case may require multiple methods.

But the most important first step is the realization that the enemy is not the girl, or the "danger" of rejection, or even his own poor social skills.... it is the shitty feeling he has while doing the approach.

Focus on the knowledge that the fear you are experiencing is not a warning of greater danger ahead. It is only a warning of itself. If you are experiencing it, and you can still hold yourself together and function, then that's the worst it has to offer. There is nothing more to be afraid of.

#Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need more soy lattes. Instead, the completely optional and rather frivolous "Buy Whisper More Steroids and Send Reddit to Chapter 11 Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address: 1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD*

If you don't sleep, you might as well not lift.

736 upvotes | November 1, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

*"Golly gee wilikers, Whisper, I work and work out until 11 pm, and then get up at 5 in the morning 6 days out of every 7, and then I eat a nutritious breakfast (cuz' I suuuuuuuure don't wanna be **unhealthy!**). But when I have a rare day off, and I go out to meet girls, I just feel tired and want to go home! Whatever could be wrong? Is it my attitude?"*

Look, I realize some of you bros never had fathers, but Jesus fuck, how dumb can you be?

If you do not sleep, you might as well not lift.

Lifting doesn't build muscle. Lifting *incentivizes* your body to build muscle. To actually build muscle, you need to eat and sleep. How the fuck are you going to build muscle if you don't give your body any rest to do it in?

Look down. Right now, sitting at your computer, playing with your phone, whatever, look the fuck down.

Do you have a fat belly, but the rest of you isn't? Then you don't sleep enough. And your testosterone is low, because you're using up all the same raw materials to make the excess cortisol that's making you fat. And your workouts aren't working because your testosterone is low and your cortisol is high and you don't get any recovery time anyway and your neurotransmitters are also all out of whack because your digestive system (yes, your digestive system, you scientific illiterate) is responsible for synthesizing most of them, and it's busy being fucked by all that cortisol.

And your dick doesn't work because your testosterone is low and your cortisol is high and your neurotransmitters are fucked up.

But you can't figure out why you are "tired and depressed".

Really. It doesn't get any simpler than this. If you are tired, sleep. Your body is speaking in the clearest possible language, and if you're still not listening, then it is not your body's fault.

Give your body what it asks for. You could have learned this from a children's cartoon.

If you are tired, do not fuck. Sleep.

#Whisper

This was a stupid article, and I shouldn't be putting my standard "Bitcoin-instead-of-more-Reddit-Gold" address (1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD) at the bottom of it. It's a stupid article because it states the blindingly fucking obvious, which is no great feat to point out. I shouldn't be rewarded for this. But none of you should need it, and apparently some of you did. For the rest of you, I apologize for this blatant insult to your fucking intelligence.

Insanity.

226 upvotes | December 7, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Did I ever tell you the definition of insanity?

Welcome, students. Today, we will take as our text one ThalesToAristotle, who gives us this gem of an example:

<https://archive.is/okbOT>

Now, everything you read on the web might be a lie, but there are certainly people like this, even if this one were fake.

And what, class, is he doing wrong?

No assertiveness!

Takes women too seriously!

He is listening to what women say, not watching what they do.

UNMASCULINE!

Shows weakness.

He probably doesn't even lift.

Yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, and yes. All good answers. But we're looking for something more fundamental, here. And it's not going to be hard to guess what I mean, since I just told you.

He is doing the same thing over and over again, and hoping for different results.

He has accepted a philosophy that he thinks is "correct", and if it doesn't work for him, he thinks he must be applying it wrong. And so he applies it harder. Feminism becomes like magic fairy dust... it solves every problem. If it didn't work, you just didn't use enough.

So does a man like this need the red pill? Surprisingly enough, no. No he does not.

All he really needs to do is *try different things*. If he were to simply do random shit, if he were to invent an imaginary character every day and talk to women as that character, he would eventually start to figure out what women like. That is, after all, how the red pill was invented. But he won't do that, because he is stuck on one strategy.

Why?

Well, obviously because he thinks it must work. But also because he regards opportunities as rare and precious. He does not have abundance mentality. So when an opportunity comes along, he is afraid to deviate from his strategy, because anything new risks "wasting" the opportunity.

And this is the answer to the question new students often ask: *"How can I have abundance mentality if I still don't have lots of sex, or pickup success?"*

The answer is that **the "abundance" in "abundance mentality" means abundance of opportunities, not abundance of successes**. Even ThalesToAristotle has abundance. There are women all around him. New women come along every day.

In order not to be insane (by trying the same thing over and over again), we must be able to regard opportunities as **disposable**, whether they be a woman who appears attracted to us, a job interview, an investment opportunity, something for sale, etc.

Opportunities are a river, not a pond. They flow past, but more will be along shortly. Try

different things. Even if you are winning at life, shake things up and learn something. Don't just follow every piece of TRP advice as a set of step-by-step instructions. Use it as a starting point, and try something new, change up your style. Burn opportunities just because you can. There will always be more women, more jobs, more business ideas, more chances, until the day you die.

The problem this poor sad man has is not that he is gargling the blue koolaid. It's that he's stuck.

Don't be him.

#Whisper

*If you liked this article, please **don't** buy me any more Reddit Gold. I have enough to last years, and Spez and Ellen Pao don't need your money. Instead, the "Buy Whisper More Steroids Fund" can be found at the following Bitcoin address: 1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD*

The Bitch Management Hierarchy study guide.

547 upvotes | January 4, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So some dumbass in [/r/asktrp](#) just got dumped after playing CaptainSaveAHO, and now Professor Whisper has to call school back into session, because some of y'all haven't done the basic reading.

This is HumanSockPuppet's Bitch Management Heirarchy.

It is not optional. It is required reading.

Understand the four ranks.

- *Level 0: One-Night Stand*
- *Level 1: Plate*
- *Level 2: Friends with Benefits.*
- *Level 3: Significant Other -or- Girlfriend.*

Understand the principles of promoting and demoting.

Understand that no sexual act ever leads to promotion. Sexual acts are simply required to keep a woman from getting demoted.

Understand that once a woman has been demoted, she can never be promoted again.

Understand that there is no rank 4. A woman cannot be worthy of marriage, because marriage has been turned into a deal that no human being could possibly be worthy of.

Now we need some additional supplemental material, because apparently, this isn't enough to stop some men from giving women things they haven't earned.

The ranks are distinguished by nature, not just degree, as follows:

- Rank 0 is the rank of sex.
- Rank 1 is the rank of repeated contact.
- Rank 2 is the rank of non-sexual social time.
- Rank 3 is the rank of emotional investment.

These are what a woman *gets* by being promoted to each rank.

- At rank 0, she gets to have sex with you.
- At rank 1, she gets to see you again.
- At rank 2, she gets to hang out with you, not just for the purpose of fucking.
- At rank 3, she gets to be invested in and cared about.

The Bitch Management Hierarchy also has maximum ranks.

There are women who are not worthy of the distinguishing feature of each rank, by virtue of their history. This is distinct from demotion, which is triggered by their behaviour *with you*... this is about their behaviour *ever*.

Women who are not worthy of sex (rank 0):

- Women who do not maintain their bodies in an attractive (to you) state.

- Women who do not protect themselves and their partners from sexual diseases.

Women who are not worthy of repeated contact (rank 1):

- Women who do not make any effort to ensure your sexual pleasure (selfish in bed).
- Women who are controlling or try to police your contact with other women.
- Women whom you didn't enjoy your first encounter with for any reason having to do with her.
- Women who withhold sex to try to get promoted.

Women who are not worthy of social time (rank 2):

- Single mothers.
- Women who are embarrassing to be seen with (no class, don't know how to act in public, dresses like a slob).
- Women who are not exclusive to you.

Women who are not worthy of emotional investment (rank 3):

- Women who have cheated, ever. Even with you.
- Women who are disobedient, or refuse sex.

This is not an exhaustive list.

WHY SO MANY RULES?

Because we're in remedial mode. Like the clueless waif who set me off on this rant, many of you *do not value yourselves, and do not value your time and investment*. You give it away too cheaply, to the first women who wets your penis or follows your lead.

If you do not value yourself no one else will. And understanding the Bitch Management Hierarchy is the first step on the road to recovery. The key principle is treat her sex as low-value, and your attention as high-value. If you are coming from a position of sexual scarcity, you must vigorously police yourself against the tendency to overvalue sex.

Hard and fast rules will help you do this.

#Whisper

I have a Bitcoin donation address: 1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD.

It's there because I resent reddit passing the hat after I speak, and then giving me a gold sticker and keeping the hat for themselves.

Donate, or don't, as you wish, but please do not gild.

If only a verbal "yes" means sexual consent, are all nonhuman animals rapists? Were all pre-language homonids rapists?

4 upvotes | January 5, 2016 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Ask Whisper: Parents

198 upvotes | January 7, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Hey Whisper, do you know of any good reads or materials on holding frame against parents. Especially against single parent (mother). I could handle normal shit tests but I do find myself a bit lost when having to deal with my mum.

Holding frame against some random clam is much easier than holding frame against your parents. They know you inside and out, there's no such thing as abundance mentality with them, and nexting them is a grave step indeed.

But it can be done. And it must be done. They remember you as a child, but at a certain point, you become a man, and you have your own life to live.

(Some of you are fortunate enough to have parents who are the solution, rather than the problem. For you, the following should be read to understand how the other half lives.)

- **Never have an argument.**

When you argue about what you *should* do, you are placing your actions upon the table, and dicing with them for the outcome. The very act of arguing concedes that which you do not wish to concede...the idea that their opinion matters to what you will do.

You are now an adult, and they will have some difficulty accepting that. Remind them of it by not opening up your reasoning for discussion.

- **Never give a reason.**

Your only reason should be "This is what I have decided to do." To give any other reason invites argument.

They can't argue "No, you haven't." If they argue "You shouldn't" (to try to tempt you into an argument), you can simply agree "Perhaps. But I will." If they say "I won't let you.", you simply point out that they cannot stop you. As you are doing whatever it is.

- **Never wait for them to stop talking.**

This is implicitly agreeing to have a discussion. If they say they will not let you leave, you tell them they cannot stop you... as you are walking out the door. Tell them what you will do, and *immediately do it*. Make them scamper after you if they want to talk.

- **Prefer telling them what you have done to telling them what you will do.**

They cannot argue with what has already happened.

- **Draw boundaries. Punish bad behaviour by withdrawing contact.**

If they raise their voices or speak disrespectfully to you, warn them once that if they do this, the conversation is over. If they continue, hang up the phone or walk away. *Remember that they need to talk to you, but you do not need to talk to them.*

- **Be financially independent of them.**
- **If you aren't, become so, as rapidly as possible.**
- **If you can't (yet), call their bluff preemptively.**

If you are afraid they will kick you out of the house, threaten to move out. If you are afraid they will stop paying for your tuition, threaten to drop out of college. Remember that cutting off your child is a dark and terrible thing to do, or have to do... it is much easier to threaten, or imply the threat of, than actually do.

They don't want to do it, not only because they love you, but because it a deeply humiliating thing for a parent to do. It implies a failure of the worst possible kind.

If you threaten them with it, then they cannot threaten you with it.

- **Restrict access to information.**

If they are the sort of parents you have to hold frame against, then they are on the lookout for weapons with which to undermine your will, your independence, your frame, your self-control, your confidence. Knowing what is going on with you, how you feel, what you want, provides them with opportunities. Tell them little or nothing.

- **Never lose your temper.**

If you become upset, you will be drawn into an argument. Calmly and firmly draw the line between acceptable and unacceptable and enforce it.

- **Don't defend. Counterattack.**

If they pull some bullshit, immediately focus on the bullshit they pulled. If they read your mail, it doesn't matter what they found out... what's now important is that they *read your fucking mail and that's crazy*. Doesn't matter that they found your steroids, what matters is that they went through your private stuff.

Put them on the defensive all the time.

- **Don't hide conflict.**

If they said your girlfriend dresses like a whore, let her know. Let her know the next time she and they are in the same room: "What do you think of this outfit, mom? Last time you said she was dressed like a whore. Still think so?"

Embarrass them with what they said. Show them that every piece of bullshit they pull, the whole extended family, and the whole world will know.

Problem parents use whatever hold they have over their adult children to do *unacceptable shit*. They use the privacy of family matters to create a world where the crazy seems commonplace. Let the world know.

Rot abhors sunlight.

- **Most of all, hold the fucking line.**

Never give an inch to keep the peace of avoid conflict. Peace without honour is not worth having.

Whisper

I have a Bitcoin donation address: 1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD.

It's there because I resent reddit passing the hat after I speak, and then giving me a gold sticker and keeping the hat for themselves.

Donate, or don't, as you wish, but please do not gild.

Seduction in One Picture.

245 upvotes | March 22, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Here is everything you need to know.

Watch her face. Don't just see the smile and giggles. See the coy turn after his second trick, the covered face. The foundations of sexuality are already laid down, years before they are expressed as sexuality.

Look at him. Look at the smile on his face that says it's all in good fun, even as he baits and switches her, over and over. Look at the assurance with which he moves.

Now looks at the skinny-ass beta in the background. Watch him try to bond with his companion over what he just saw, and completely screw it up. He isn't disapproving. He doesn't think our hero is a jerk. He wishes he could be our hero... but he does not have the courage, because he doesn't understand the meaning behind that little girl's smile.

It doesn't matter that he wears a silly costume and sells ice cream for a living. Because right there, in that moment, he is in control. He plays with her, not like one child plays with another, but like a cat plays with a ball of string.

And she instinctively loves it. She didn't learn this from culture. She didn't get conditioned by the Patriarchy™ to be this way. She's too young for that. What she does comes from what she is.

And as goes the little girl, so goes the woman.

Women don't love nice men. They love unpredictable men, challenging men, men who set the pace and keep them one step behind, forever reacting.

Watch this gif until you get it. Then go and practice.

Edit: [Here](#) is how it works on her in 20 years. Notice how the reactions are the same. The girl is the mother of the woman.

Edit2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=L2U3A4YDqF0>

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ygpw_8qeRFo <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5LIrmr9fii8>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=AnX7brUCFP4>

How much more of the same pattern do you need to see?

Edit3:

Now watch how a man reacts: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Jj6cdYVNuKA>

This is Rumor Control. Here are the facts.

5 upvotes | April 5, 2016 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Y'all know me.

I'm that guy who switches wildly back and forth between being diplomatic and saying crazy things. I've been diplomatic for a while, and as a consequence, some lying liars are getting away with telling lies about people far better than a jerk like me.

So I'm here to tell you the truth before riding off into the sunset. Ain't gonna be pretty.

This is the story of how the Gang of Five tried to stage a coup against Chairman Mao, and wound up in exile instead.

(All quotes paraphrased from memory, or secondhand)

The scene is Women's Cadre of The Red Brigade, the time ~ 1.5 years ago:

Wong Pao Er: If you look, really look, at the modern laws surrounding marriage, it's all stick and no carrot for men. {statistics, anecdotes, etc}. Surely attempting to get a man you love to sign this kind of contract is bourgeois counterrevolutionary behaviour. Perhaps a communist alternative would be for members of the proletariat to cohabit and act as a committed couple without signing capitalist papers that strip rights from the people.

Someone: But what if he leaves you? Without marriage, you have no protection against this.

Wong Pao Er: If a legal contract is the only thing that stops him abandoning you, the marriage is already dead.

Exchange gradually increasing in heat, Gang of Five bans Wong Pao Er for "being a lackey of the capitalist running dogs"

1.5 years of silence...

Escalating tension as the Men's and Women's cadres of the Red Brigade talk shit about each other, and are increasingly unwelcome on the other side of the line.

Gang of Five: Chairman Mao, could we be made mods in askThePeoplesDaily? We could help you take care of the place. It needs some work.

Chairman Mao: I have some doubts, but some of these plans seem good, let's give it a trial run.

Gang of Five immediately bans Wong Pao Er from askThePeoplesDaily.

Politburo: Holy shit, you banned one of the founders of the Chinese Communist Party ? You can't just go and do that.

Politburo unbans Wong Pao Er, unmods Gang of Five, bans Gang of Five.

Chairman Mao: Okay, both of you, this ends now. The Gang of Five is unbanned from askThePeoplesDaily. Wong Pao Er is unbanned from the Women's Cadre Discussion Group. We're all good communists, and we need to engage in vigorous debate over Marxist principles, not purge each other like greedy capitalists. Letting a hundred flowers blossom and a hundred schools of thought contend is the policy for promoting progress in the arts and the sciences and a flourishing socialist culture in our land.

Gang of Five: Chairman Mao is forcing us to be revisionist Trotskyites! We will retreat to the island

of Taiwan, where we can practice good Marxist-Leninist social doctrine!

Wong Pao Er: The tensions were always there, and this needed solving, but if you hadn't tried to throw your weight around in askThePeoplesDaily... none of this would have happened to you.

We now return you from communist China, and this amusing little tale of an attempted power grab gone wrong.

The moral of this story? You can decide that for yourself, but I might suggest that marginalized groups should avoid infighting. Because when communists fight, capitalists win.

Avoiding the Tradcon Trap

380 upvotes | April 8, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

You can't spin plates all your life.

Not because you literally can't (some of y'all smooooothe muthafuckas), but because sooner or later, you're not going to want to.

Most men, with the occasional rare exception, are at some point in their lives going to want something more from a girl than a sexy body to ejaculate into.

That's where the shit gets dangerous. Because while y'all know enough not to LTR the town bicycle, there's another kind of woman out there who we need to talk about. Because while everyone knows crazy hoes will ruin your shit, there are other ways for your life to suck.

I'm talking about **traditionalist conservative** ("tradcon") women.

On the surface, this kind of woman looks like a good deal. She certainly talks a lot about doing the things that men want an LTR to do... keeping a low N count, being faithful and loyal to her man, acting submissive, treating his needs as important, etc.

Listen to her long enough, and some of y'all weak muthafuckas will tear up, decide she's a unicorn, and promote her to LTR right away. Some of them are good at talking that shit.

Not a good plan.

Why not?

Isn't an old-timey marriage, with a sweet, affectionate wife, a cozy home, and maybe some children something that many men want? It's not all fantasies about being a rockstar and nailing groupies. Hell, we get some guys in askTRP who can't get even get it up with on an ONS, because that's just not their thing.

Yes, many men want this, but that doesn't mean that is what is actually on offer.

You see, what the tradcon woman wants is *the deal women had 100 years ago*, or at least, the parts that are good for her. So she tells you, "marry me, and I will be a good wife to you".

If this were true, great. **But she wants you to take her word for it.**

This ignores the single greatest and most fundamental piece of redpill writing ever. (There's also a study guide.)

If you haven't read and understood the Bitch Management Hierarchy already, please leave class and go report to the Tutoring Center for remedial class.

The rest of you know that the basic point is that **trust is earned, not demanded**. The reason that a woman must *earn* her way up the Bitch Management Hierarchy is that you only find out what she is really like by **observing her behaviour over time**.

Anyone can say anything, only actions tell the truth.

The tradcon woman who says "Marry/commit to me before sex" is attempting to buy her way to the top of the Hierarchy with nothing more than a promise. And anyone can say anything.

We refer to this phenomenon as **Ladder Jumping**.

Only two things can make a woman worthy of any trust at all:

1. She knows that breaking that trust will result in immediate, dire, and unavoidable punishment.
2. She has been observed, over a long period of time, to value her investment in the person extending that trust.

Why did this work 100 years ago? Because wedding vows were enforced. A woman knew that breaking her promise would result in ostracism, social death, and poverty. Case 1.

But case 1 is dead now. Society *will not enforce wedding vows*. Instead, it reward her for breaking them with cash and prizes. Your money, your house, your kids, attention, love, sympathy, etc.

So we move to case number 2. The Bitch Management Hierarchy. We **make women earn that trust**. And this is the deal that the tradcon woman attempts to decline. Her doctrine tells her to avoid sex before commitment with you, to avoid risking her N-count. But where does this risk go?

The risk is shifted to you. Instead of her having to be "all-in", and betting that she can inspire you to want commitment, you assume the risk by committing to her before having any idea how she will handle that trust. How does that deal sound to you? You want that deal?

Ya wanna throw everything you've learned out the window because some bitch pinkie-swears she's a unicorn? Didn't think so. If she's a unicorn, she can prove it just like everyone else, and not need to cut to the front of the line.

If she says she's "saving it for marriage", or "only has sex in a relationship", *laugh it off, treat it as ASD, and escalate the same way.*

Women are women, no matter what values they give lip service to.

Ignore what women say, watch what they do.

#Whisper

I have a Bitcoin donation address: 1DChc2Azt3zGHbZcwBwPG42jL9B8SuktdD.

It's there because I resent reddit passing the hat after I speak, and then giving me a gold sticker and keeping the hat for themselves.

Donate, or don't, as you wish, but please do not gild.

Passion

65 upvotes | April 11, 2016 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

- Men want women with a low (ideally zero) partner count.
- Men want women to leap into bed with them as soon as possible.

We know both of these things to be true because we see them every day. And when we see both, we are confused. Surely men make no sense at all! Aren't these two things contradictory?

And our whole society is caught in a war between two cultures.

The tradcon side, which is slowly losing, says

- "Men, you must give up the desire for a woman to sexually surrender quickly... instead, you must invest time and resources in her, make her promises you cannot easily break, before she will give you what you desire."
- "Women, you must restrain your desires and be calculating. It is your job to test a man's commitment to you and make him jump through many hoops (ideally on fire) before he gets access to your precious lady parts."

The liberal side, which is slowly winning, says

- "Men, you must give up your desire not to marry the town bicycle. You must learn to cherish women who were ploughed bny the entire football team at the same drunken party, and that was just the begining. Women own their own sexuality... they also own your reaction to what they just did; make sure it's the approved one."
- "Women, do whatever you want. We'll make sure the men are docile and obedient."

The tiny, unnoticed redpill side rolls its eyes, and says:

- You cannot tell men to "give up" this or that desire. Desire is not a choice. Desire cannot be negotiated. If men want both these things, then the girl who achieves the most of both will have the most desireable men.
- And here's a [long complicated explanation](#) of why these things can coexist, which lots of people will read and not understand.

So the liberal and tradcon answers are just plain wrong.

And the red pill answer has [too much boring math](#).

Time to simplify.

Why do men want low-count women? **Why** do men want sexually eager women?

Passion. Men want women who are passionate about them.

A woman who is passionate about a man does not consult her girlfriends about what an "acceptable" amount of time to "make him wait" is. A woman who is passionate about a man does not bargain the promise of her body for a wedding, like some jaded whore negotiating a "session". A woman who is

passionate about a man will find a way to reach his bed. She will fly across the country, crawl under barbed wire, climb in through his second story window, do everything he desires, and wait patiently inside his closet if his wife comes home early from work.

Women do not withhold sex from men they are passionate about. A woman is not passionate about a man if she withholds sex from him. Unless she is seriously physically ill, or *on fire at that very moment*, she is ready when he is.

Similarly, a woman who has tasted a hundred men over her thirty years of life is not going to be enthralled by the hundred and first. Not only is the experience far from new or unique, he is unlikely to be the best or most attractive man she has had, since she was younger, more beautiful, and more innocent before, and could command the attention of a better variety of man.

Women are generally the most passionate about their first partner, and gradually less so with each new one. This is not their first rodeo.

Now we understand how these two male desires are NOT contradictory. They are actually the SAME desire... the desire to be both loved, and lusted after, passionately, utterly, and completely.

When a woman has a high partner count, a man asks himself "None of them kept her... why should I?".

When a woman delays, withholds, and asks for promises or time, a man says "She is cool-headed enough about me to negotiate. To enforce a policy. She regards sex with me as *a price to pay* for what she wants... not a joy she urgently desires."

In fact, if a woman delays sex to avoid risk to her partner count, because a low count makes her more attractive, *just who* is this low count making her more attractive to?

It makes her more attractive to other men. It does nothing for him. He of course expects to increase her count by one, because he wishes to be that one. If she hedges, then she is saying to him "I don't want to risk being less sexy, or less commitment-worthy, to *the next guy*."

She is already looking past him and the relationship hasn't even started yet. She is not "all in" with him, and he knows that.

Why would he be committed to her, when she is not committed to him?

But what is a woman to do about all this? How can she be passionate, and unrestrained, with men, without destroying her value from an accumulation of failures?

This, I will discuss in Part Two.

The Final Exam

69 upvotes | April 25, 2016 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Last time I spoke about the apparent contradiction between men pressing for sex (and not wanting to be put off), and men wanting partners with low n-counts. And how these are actually two manifestations of the same male desire for a passionate, involved partner.

So, it may not be hypocrisy, but it still leaves today's young woman with a problem. **She cannot simply treat men like slot machines where you pull the sex handle until you win the relationship jackpot...** because with each pull, her odds get worse. Entering into a series of sexual relationship, and simply hoping each one will be "the one that works out" is foolish.

Every time a woman goes to bed with a man, she takes a risk, and makes an investment. Getting to lifelong, happy relationship, with the best possible man, is about managing this risk, and maximizing returns on her investment.

So, answering the question, "What is there?" leads to "What shall we do about it?"

The Final Exam.

"The moment after I first bedded a girl, that is when I would meet her for the first time."

The man who once told me this knew what he was talking about... he had loved a lot of women, some for a single night, some for years, one until breast cancer finally took her in the twilight of both their lives.

It took me a while to understand what he was talking about, but I eventually did. When a young woman meets a man, she naturally asks herself *"Is he serious about me, or does he simply desire my body?"* What she often doesn't realize is that such is the power of the male sex drive that *often he doesn't know, himself.*

Simply put, many men, in the first stages of getting to know a woman, are wearing **"lust goggles"**. Couple this with the fact that male emotions are dimmed down to the point that **many men are unaware of their emotional state** from moment to moment, and you get a man who simply **doesn't know what he wants yet**. He may say he wants a relationship. He may even believe it. He may try hard for weeks or months. But the true test is **how much emotional attachment remains when the "horny goggles" are off**.

When sexual desire is out of the equation, whatever remains is emotional attachment.

So:

- The first "moment after" is like getting your grade back on the final exam.
- You are just now seeing the results of what you did up to this point.
- He, too, is just now seeing the results.
- If he's edging towards the door, or edging you towards the door, you failed.
- If he's spooning and nuzzling, it's more likely you passed.

Nothing is finalized until those "horny goggles" come off, and promises or facebook statuses don't change this. Men do not leave you because they "didn't pinkie swear". Men leave you if they are unhappy with who you are, or what the deal is.

So, given that the goal is *the best possible relationship, with the best possible man*, lasting

indefinitely if possible, then there are a few obvious implications of this metaphor.

1. Don't take tests if you don't care about the class.

Never have sex with a man if you are not passionate about him, and specifically him. If you want an orgasm, get a vibrator. If you want attention, get a dog. If you are lonely, go hang out with friends. If you want to feel pretty, get a makeover. If you're not sure you're into him, and you want to test it and see, then you're not into him, and you should stop wasting his time. Any relationship that you do not enter into out of urgent desire for that specific man is a bad risk.

2. Don't take tests if you don't know the material and haven't studied.

If "how to be a keeper" is an abstract idea to you, if you don't really know what it means to "be feminine", if you find yourself *arguing with men* instead of *charming them*, then you are not relationship-ready, and you need to be in monk mode, working on that, before you gamble on your relationship readiness.

3. Don't take tests unless you are prepared to take responsibility for the results.

If you are focusing on "searching for a commitment-minded man", "finding a trustworthy man", or "making sure he's not a player", then you are shifting responsibility. Getting to sex is men's responsibility, but getting to relationship is yours. There's a reason why we think a college student who complains that "the test was too hard" is a lazy, irresponsible lout.

4. Don't take any class that you are not good enough to pass.

Condemning men as "players" is shifting responsibility, but also be aware that any woman can have sex with a man that is out of her league for relationships. If you know your girl game isn't good enough to reel him in, let him swim past.... even though you know you could get him in bed. Some players are too good for you. Don't like that? Become better.

5. Be prepared to take the test when it's scheduled, or drop the class.

The purpose of a test is to assess your ability. If you tell the professor you need extra time to study, or you will fail, you are telling him you deserve to fail. If things are getting hot and heavy, and you have to put on the brakes and say "not yet, I need you to commit to me more", then he knows you're thinking you can't pass the test. You are telling him right up front your girl game isn't good enough, and that he won't *want* to stay without a binding promise in the mix.

6. Choose your university carefully.

Nightclub University gives tests on the first day of class. Maybe if your girl game is really tight, you can pass, but that's risky. Thirsty Beta University gives easy tests after a long class, but who the hell wants a degree from TBU? Fundamentalist Bible College doesn't give very hard tests at all, in fact, sometimes it gives you a passing grade *before* the test, but it only admits fundamentalists, and commits you to a career in the church. The Homewrecker School of Married Men lets you delay tests, but only a handful of women have ever successfully graduated, and they are not very popular.

Some good schools include Social Circle State, which gives slightly more study time and degree programs are pre-vetted for prestige and career impact. And the Workplace Crown College uses a unique model of allowing students to observe classes for some time before declaring the intent to take them. Clever students will think of other examples.

Key Takeaway points:

- Turning sex into a relationship is your responsibility, not his.
- Relationships are only truly tested after sex has begun.
- Putting men off when they think it's about time damages your prospects. (You are visibly not passionate about him.)
- Prefer nexting men over delaying them. You are either all-in, or you're out.
- Balance risks and rewards.
- The venue you meet in a man in has a lot of impact. Choose wisely.

Goldilocks and the Three Metabolic Pumps. (Trigger Warning: Science!)

248 upvotes | April 26, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

It's time we had another conversation about how not to be fat, pulling together all the previous information for the new guys.

There are three separate mechanisms that add fat to your body, both in the form of new fat cells (de novo lipogenesis), and adding fat to existing adipose tissue.

Think of them as *three pumps which generate fat*. Each one is fueled by a different material. We'll summarize each one, and link to more detailed discussion.

The first pump is the **Fructose Pump**. It runs on a specific sugar called fructose, which is present in sucrose (your standard white table sugar), high fructose corn syrup (obviously), fruit (in smaller amounts), and anything sweetened with either of these (including natural fruit juice).

This pump is the **most powerful**, and it has **no shut-off point**. Furthermore, **the more it runs, the more powerful it becomes**.

This where landwhales come from. You can learn, in detail, how it works, here:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dBnniua6-oM>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ceFyF9px20Y>

The second pump is the **Starch Pump**. It runs on glucose, another kind of sugar, found in grains (bread, pasta), potatoes, and pretty much anything starchy.

It is **moderately powerful**, and it drives body fat up, but reaches a point of diminishing returns.

This is where "a couple of extra pounds" comes from. You can read about it here:

https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/353buo/eating_101_fork_use_for_dummies/

The third pump is the **Weak Pump**, also known as the thermodynamic pump. It runs on pretty much anything that has any calories and raw materials at all.

It is **weak**, and it has a **low shut-off point**, because it is a **deliberate body process** whose goal is to keep you above a certain fat percentage, for your health. However, sometimes we wish to slow this pump, too, because the idea of a "healthy reserve" that you have in a society surrounded by food, is different than that of a body evolved under conditions where you might not catch a wildebeast this week.

This is your "calories in - calories out" mechanism. It actually uses the starch pump to work, by synthesizing glucose to feed into it. Yes, your body will synthesize glucose itself if you don't eat enough. Your body needs glucose. Just not an infinite amount of it.

It makes the difference between "athletic" and "super cut bodybuilder".

So, what to do about all this?

Know which pump is causing your problem. For example, if you are drinking lots of soda or fruit juice, and you are 25% fat, don't bother counting calories, because that's messing with the Weak Pump, when your problem is the Fructose Pump.

Shut pumps down in order. Not all at once. If you try to shut them down all at once, you will white-

knuckle it for a while, then fail. Your body knows how to make you hungry.

Don't mess with the Weak Pump until you're ready. You don't need to calorie restrict to get to 15% bodyfat, or even 12. Go hard keto first.

Be careful with the Weak Pump. No, you won't starve yourself to death. Nobody's that dumb. But if you calorie restrict too much, you are taking away what your body needs to feed those carefully built muscles (you ARE lifting, aren't you?), and you will do yourself more harm than good. Do not run large deficits.

Cheat days should feed lower pumps in preference to higher ones.

Rule #6a

606 upvotes | May 5, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Most of you are familiar with early proto-red pill material from the pre-TRP manosphere. If you aren't, you should be. Go read. Without Rollo Tomassi, the Book of Pook, and so on, we would not be here today. Don't just skim the sidebar. Read it, follow the links, read, lather rinse repeat.

Today, we will be revisiting one of the basics: **Iron Rule of Tomassi #6.**

Women are incapable of loving men in a way that a man idealizes is possible, in a way he thinks she should be capable of.

Read it, because the devil is in the details:

She's not incapable of love in the way she defines it, she's incapable of love as you would have it. She doesn't lack the capacity for connection and emotional investment, she lacks the capacity for the connection you think would ideally suit you.

Now it's time to refine it from the benefit of our additional five years of understanding:

Iron Rule #6a: If women cannot love you the way you want to be loved, then you want the wrong kind of love.

That's right, it's your fault, not theirs. Women are creatures of emotion and instinct, and what they do precedes from who they are. If you expect women to love you in a way they cannot, you are trying to teach a canary to talk, or a parrot to sing.

How do women love?

There are two kinds of love: **Respectful Love**, and **Protective Love**.

Protective love is the love of a superior for an inferior. It is not repelled by weakness or vulnerability. It does not serve, submit, or give up power. It controls, dominates, and protects. It will sacrifice safety and comfort for the benefit of its object, but never dignity. It concerns itself with the welfare of its object, but not with the object's whims or commands.

The **Flow of Protective Love** is:

Man -> Woman -> Child

Respectful love is the love of an inferior for a superior. It is inspired by strength and self-assurance, and destroyed by weakness or vulnerability. It serves, submits, and gives up power, but does not control, dominate, or protect. It will sacrifice dignity for its object. It concerns itself with the whims or demands, but never the welfare, of its object.

The **Flow of Respectful Love** is:

Child -> Woman -> Man

Men who want Protective Love from women are broken men. They are idealizing their mothers' love towards them, noticing that it is identical to the love they feel for women, and deciding that's what love is. But such men will never be loved at all until they learn of the existence of Respectful Love, and figure out how to inspire it.

Your woman will never count up the sacrifices you make for her, tally them, mark them, and respond with gratitude, for the same reason that a child will never spontaneously notice the sacrifices of a parent. Monitoring your state, and putting herself in your shoes, would be a Protective act. Parents who have grateful children are not the ones who have made great sacrifices for their children, but the ones who have *taught* their children to honor and respect them, and show that gratitude.

This is why you must learn to rule your woman, or she will rule you. Because if you love her, she must love you also, else you are her slave. And if you do not rule over her, if you are not superior to her, she will see you as a child in the body of a man, and any affection she ever holds for you will also be blended with contempt.

Women are capable of love. They are capable of self-sacrifice. They are capable of devotion. But to receive it, you must abandon ideals from your mother. You must put away childish things. You must stop expecting women to sympathize with you or be concerned for your safety or welfare. Instead, you must decide for yourself what your needs are, and demand them as a condition of your protection and care.

50% is a Failing Grade.

362 upvotes | May 10, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

One of the common themes that detractors use to concern troll TRP is the issue of marriage.

"Don't you want to get maaaaaaaaaaaaarried someday?"

"How are you going to have baaaaaaaaaaaaabiez?"

"A unicorn will never settle for anything less than a ring!"

"You can't fuck sluts all your life!"

"You are shallow!"

"MY marriage is teh awesums!"

"Man up!"

To which we can only say, no, we're not, there are no unicorns, just watch us, so what, we're happy for you, and a tool is not a man. Respectively.

We hear a whole lot of things about how marriage is good for women (and therefore quality ones will insist on it!), how marriage is good for "your" kids (and you want what's best for "your" kids, right?), how marriage is good for society (man up and save it, you slacker!), how marriage is good for humanity, etc, etc, etc, blah, blah, blah.

Of course, what you won't hear is anything about how marriage is good for **you**. Not because they wouldn't love to tell you. If they had a slum dunk case, they'd deliver it. If they had so much as a talking point, they'd repeat. But they don't.

There are a lot of people out there who urgently want you to accept marriage as an inevitable stage of life, whether it's because they want you to support the female sexual imperative, or to validate *their* poor life choices, or to support their religious beliefs, or save society for their children, or whatever.

These people aren't bad salesmen. The reason their pitch sucks is that their product sucks. They have to sell you something that's useless to you.

So what do they do? They try to shame you into it.

- They tell you it's the red pill on hard mode (implying "what kind of pansy plays on easy mode?").
- They tell you all the risks and drawbacks don't materialize for someone who is "alpha enough" (implying that if you care about any of that, you're just not "alpha enough").
- They tell you that without kids, you lose the evolution game (oh, goodness, I don't want to be *loser*! Wait, what's the prize, again?).

They tell you that if you don't do this, you're not good enough.

But there's something they'd like you to forget about:

50%

And that, my friends, is the elephant in the room. We call it an elephant, because **I don't have to tell you what 50% means. You already know.** No one's gonna ask "50% of what?" "50% do what?" All

I do is say "50%", and you know exactly what I am talking about.

50% means it's not you. 50% means it has nothing to do with you, or how "alpha you are". 50% means the system is broken.

50% is a failing grade. 50% means that somewhere, somehow, something has gone terribly wrong. And these concern trolls would have you believe that only thing has gone wrong, and that's men not being alpha enough.

Well, Mick Jagger got divorced.

Michael Jordan got divorced.

Evander Holyfield got divorced.

"Sugar" Shane Mosley's divorce rapist *got his championship belts*.

How do you fancy your chances now, Mr. Red Pill Guy? How alpha do you think you are? How many more corpses do you need to see?

So, does it make sense to discuss marriage? Sure. **The discussion of marriage is "red pill damage control strategy"**. After all, if you already screwed up, you don't just lie down and die. Some guys make it work. Some guys get lucky.

But don't let anyone concern troll you into screwing up.

If someone tells you to do something, they better tell you how it helps you. Because "*what's a matter? You skkkkeeeer?*" stopped working on you when you hit puberty.

Who killed Marriage 1.0? (Trigger warning: dry theory)

269 upvotes | June 12, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

WARNING: THIS POST IS PURE THEORY AND CONTAINS NO ACTIONABLE ADVICE OTHER THAN "Don't get married, dumbass". Read only if you are curious.

So, you already know you need to avoid getting married in any modern western society, no matter how good the woman is. And you know why. If you don't, you have some reading to do. But, having established all that, and knowing what to do, and why, some questions still remain.

Most importantly, **how did we get this way?** Who broke marriage?

It wasn't feminists. It wasn't feminism. In fact, *far from being the cause of the destruction of marriage-based society, feminism may very well be an effect of that collapse.*

After all, you don't think that after hundreds upon thousands of generations of women being women, we suddenly got blue-haired hippos with cat glasses *spontaneously and for no reason at all*, do you? Suddenly decided to start hating men?

No. The fundamental change that broke marriage is something else. And when there is a sudden, sweeping, permanent, and global change in human society, there's only possible culprit... because only one human process runs in one direction only, never fails or falters, and spreads everywhere given time.

Some of you are already nodding your heads. It's **technology. Science.** Good old clever-monkey know-how.

Why? There are several pieces.

- **Western Lifelong Bilaterally Monogamous Marriage 1.0** (which is what we are focusing on here) **is sexual communism**. Both parties sacrifice their optimal strategy in return for a safety net, and a stable society.
 - *Men must sacrifice their urge to mate with every available female* who is a 5.1 or greater, but they are guaranteed to be allowed to mate with one woman who isn't much lower than them on the desirability scale.
 - *Women must sacrifice the chance to fuck Chad, be supported by Brad, and keep Thad in the dark about the whole business, but they get lifelong commitment, guaranteed.*
 - Unlike economic communism, *sexual communism is not inherently bad and unworkable*. This is because the enterprise and initiative that economic communism sacrifices is a public good that flows to everyone, but the sexual success that sexual communism sacrifices is a private good which only benefits Chad, and Alice (AFBB).
 - However, like economic communism, *sexual communism can only survive when it's the only game in town*. Communism only works when everyone is a good communist.
 - In any economic communist system, the majority of those who produce more value than they receive in an equal share will opt out if given the chance, and keep that value for themselves. This slowly destroys the system unless the top is unable to escape.
 - In a sexually communist system, a similar dynamic will happen with Chad and Alice. *The highly competitive players will always tend to move to the game that most rewards winning*. Winners don't like low ceilings, and communism imposes a low ceiling in order

to create a high floor.

- The Tradcons were right about "destroying marriage". **Marriage can only survive when it is enforced as an institution by society, never as one of a list of options.** Gay marriage destroys marriage. Promiscuity destroys marriage. Single motherhood destroys marriage. Fornication destroys marriage. Because *everything that isn't marriage destroys marriage*.

But society *did* enforce marriage as an institution. It was held up as the sole outlet for sexual release. Anything else was frowned upon and ostracized when it wasn't outright punishable by law. Even if you did it, you had to hide it.

But the world has moved on... we are all villains now.

Why? The second piece:

- **Economics controls the age at which people become independent adults.**

- There are several "adulthoods" that happen at different ages: The age of *sexual maturity*, the age of *legal sexual consent*, the age of *legal adulthood*, the age of *economic independence*, and the age of *economic surplus*... by which I mean the age at which one can afford a home and children.
- The first age, *sexual maturity*, is firmly fixed by biological processes we have no control over. It is 12-13. It is when sexual desire emerges in a clear, unambiguous, and irrepressible way.
- The second two ages, *legal consent*, and *legal majority* are consciously set by people, either with laws or social mores where laws are absent. They are often set as a response to the other ages, consciously or unconsciously. They are less important for this discussion.
- The age of *economic independence* is the age at which the average working adult, with typical skills, and no rare talents, can support themselves financially.
- The age of *economic surplus* is the age at which that same adult can afford to have a home, and support dependents.
- *The age of sexual maturity is when most people start wanting sex. But the age of economic surplus is when people can afford to get married.*

And the third:

- **Technology produces information economies.**

- An information and service economy requires longer to train for than an industrial economy, which requires longer than an agrarian economy, which requires longer than hunting and gathering.
- *The more sophisticated the skillset required for economic productivity, the longer the delay before a new adult can be economically productive.*
- **Technology stretches the gap between sexual maturity and marriage.**

And the fourth, and final piece:

- **The sexual urge can only be delayed briefly, never denied.**

- Once the average person hits sexual maturity, the clock is ticking. The further from that

point in time you look, the greater percentage of them will have had sexual intercourse.

- If marriage can occur at 15-16, most people can wait. This can happen when you live in a small farming village, land is close to free, and your neighbors get together to help you build your house.
- If marriage occurs at 26-30, almost no one can wait. Virgin brides become a thing of the past.
- *A thing becomes socially acceptable when a lot of people do it.* If a lot of people are having sex outside marriage, then **sex outside marriage becomes socially acceptable.**

So now we put it together:

- Western Lifelong Bilaterally Monogamous Marriage 1.0 can only survive if non-marital sex is socially unacceptable.
- People can't afford to get married early in a modern technological economy.
- If people can't get married early, non-marital sex will become socially acceptable, because hormones don't give a shit about the real estate market.
- When this happens, marriage begins to crumble, very, very slowly, but very, very inevitably, as alternatives become more widespread.

Conclusion: **Marriage 1.0 was doomed by technological advancement, long before feminism came along.**

The only thing feminism did to Marriage 1.0 was perform an unholy ritual to turn its corpse into Marriage 2.0, a vile zombie nightmare that shambles about looking like its former self, but only existing to devour those it once loved.

The question of "Could marriage be truly resurrected?" will be left for a later article.

Urbanism, Ruralism, and Dunbar's Number

641 upvotes | November 9, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Take a good look at [this picture](#). (Be careful, though. Erections that last longer than four hours can be damaging.)

But I am not here to gloat, and TRP is not here for "saving society", even if it actually proves possible after all. (I'm still a little skeptical. SJW tears are tasty, though.) TRP is here to empower the *individual*, and nothing empowers like understanding.

So examine the picture closely. Come on, look again. See anything enlightening?

Yeah, the title gives it away. This picture explains what liberals and conservatives really are.

Liberalism is **urbanism**. Conservatism is **ruralism**.

Political views are a direct function of population density.

Both groups see the other as fundamentally insane because their different surroundings lead to completely different notions of what society *is*. The difference, in this context, between "rural" and "urban" is that a living situation becomes "urban" when the number of people they must directly get along with in their daily lives exceeds approximately 148.

This special ~148 is called **Dunbar's Number**. It's an approximate limit to the number of people the normal human brain can sustain individual psychological models of, for the purpose for maintaining a functioning social relationship.

When that functioning social relationship is maintained, elaborate and formalized rules for social are not necessary. Each relationship can be negotiated on an individual basis using communication both subtle and overt. Overarching rules are unnecessary, and no one uses them, because they lack precision. One size fits nobody.

But when there are too many different individuals around for every single person to have a mental model, not only of that person, but of how they relate to the others, then something breaks.

Relationships can no longer be negotiated, interactions can no longer be personal. Suddenly, people start needing rules, and rules means authorities to make them, and praetorians to enforce them.

I'm sure intelligent readers can see plenty of other ramifications at this point.

Thus, *ruralists have relationships, not rules* and *urbanists have rules, not relationships*. The implications for sexual strategy are numerous, but the most important is this:

Slutty behaviour is an inevitable result of urbanism. Giving free rein to hypergamous instincts and AF/BB strategy allows a woman to satisfy sexual instincts and maximize resource gifts from males, but its drawback (from the female point of view) is that it destroys relationships (both with men, and with the social network in general). In an urban, and urbanist, environment, a woman can replace damaged relationships with new ones, as there are plenty of strangers around, and people are social networks tend to be wide, but shallow (many, but weak, bonds).

Ruralist environments, by contrast, restrain hypergamy. Women in these environments are dependent on the social network not only for status, but for survival, and social networks tend to be sparse, but deep (few, but strong, bonds). This means damaging relationships with hypergamy is unsustainable, because *those damaged relationships are more valuable, and cannot be easily replaced*.

So what's good for men?

It depends what you want. Unchecked hypergamy is good for you if you are looking for sex with as many different women as possible with as low as possible an investment of time, effort, and money... but it sucks if you want an LTR. If hypergamy is kept strictly in check, then there are more good candidates for LTRs, but a critical shortage of sluts.

This matters because *opportunity rules everything*. No matter how tight your same-night-lay game is, you're going to strike out with the Amish. No matter how alpha-male you are in your relationship, hoes gonna ho. To get what you want, learn the skills you need, but also *place yourself where those things happen*.

Yes, Virginia, you ***do*** have to be an asshole.

461 upvotes | September 20, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

First they called you all delusional for thinking such boorish behaviour might work.

Then they swore that these "tricks" would never, ever, ever work on *them*, because *they* weren't "party sluts".

Now the bleating has taken on a tone of:

Is[n't] there a way for men to look out for their own interests without being so savage/harsh/brutal to women?

... to which you, being sane, introspective, analytical sorts of young men, are tempted to respond with something like:

It's not savage[,] it's simply looking out for your own interests. A guy who has standards like this is unfortunately seen as some sort of devil. Anything that is pro-male or doesn't put the woman first is considered heinous in today's society.

Stop that.

You're supposed to agree and amplify. But you don't, because, deep down, you're not an asshole, and **you don't want to be an asshole.**

Well, **crush that dream.**

You have to be willing to do, and be, evil. Why?

Because this:

Anything that is pro-male or doesn't put the woman first is considered heinous *in today's society*.

... is dead wrong.

It is not "today's society" that regards male self-preservation as heinous. This isn't a plot cooked up by leftists, or feminists, or communist infiltrators seeking to sap and impurify our precious bodily fluids.

It is hardwired into the human genome. Human beings, both male and female, are hardwired to be more sympathetic to girls. Tribes that didn't protect their women via male self-sacrifice died out.

This is not only built into everyone out there calling you an asshole, it is also built into *you*. And it requires extensive brainwashing, internal or external, to overcome. That's what we do here.

Unless you are comfortable not only being *called* the bad guy, but actually *being* him, you will never be able to put your own interests before those of some chick you met three days who doesn't give a shit about you unless she wants your dick, attention, or money. That's how people are. That's how *you* are.

So, the *real* answer, the factual answer, the analytical answer, to this new question:

Is[n't] there a way for men to look out for their own interests without being so savage/harsh/brutal to women?

... is simply

"No."

Because "harsh/savage/brutal to women" simply *means* "men looking out for their own interests". Not only to feminists. Not only to our society. Not only to women. But to everyone.

The answer to give when asked can, of course, be selected from:

- Meh, don't care. Gettin' laid.
- Yep, am an asshole. Was raised by wolves.
- Don't recall asking your opinion.
- We prefer the term "Ethically Challenged".
- Gaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaay!

... or any other response that indicates you don't give a shit.

You're not good enough, you're not smart enough, and people don't like you.

1274 upvotes | September 29, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I punched a girl right in the mouth once.

Long story short, she was convinced she was the greatest martial-arts trained badass that any of us poor scrubs had ever seen, and she quite insisted on starting a sparring match with me. Wouldn't take no for an answer. Okay, whatever.

First gentle lob I threw, easy, relaxed, telegraphed to hell... pow, canvas.

I was surprised as hell. Expected her to parry it easily.

And there she sat holding her face in her hands, looking for all the world as if she was waiting for everyone to flutter around her and fan her fevered brow. When none of this was forthcoming (after a very awkwardly long time indeed), she rose to her feet and mumbled something about ...

(and I shit you not, she said this)

... how she had been down trying to control her temper after being hit *because she'd didn't want to lose control and hurt anyone.*

She so desperately wanted to be like the cool ninja chicks she saw in movies and comic books that she was unwilling and unable to acknowledge the gap between *what she was* and *what she wanted to be*. So instead of training hard for years and years and years, she half-assed it for a little while, then started working at convincing everyone, herself included, that she was already there.

...

Okay, now finish up your little laugh about how silly and childish women are, because now we have to talk about how some of you assholes do the same damn thing.

You think your game is good enough. It isn't.

You think you're fit enough from calisthenics. Your "general fitness" is an excuse for being weak.

You think you don't have to train MMA or Thai boxing or karate, because you "don't wanna end up like Muhammed Ali", as if anyone would let your slow ass get into the ring with Joe Frazier. You just don't wanna get hit, because you are a pussy.

Anytime you are afraid of doing something, your treacherous ego will always find a way to tell you are either already good at it, or that you don't need to be good at it.

You will never become the person you want to be until you admit you are not him, and are more afraid of staying that way than you are of the work you're going to have to do.

People keep asking "When will I become confident, and not have to fake it?" Answer is, never. Not if you know what's good for you.

When you can deadlift 300 lbs, compare yourself to the people who deadlift 400, and focus on them until you feel like shit. When you can do 400, compare yourself to the people who lift 500, until you feel like shit again. When you hit 850, compare yourself to Eddie fucking Hall.

Greatness is driven by the fear of mediocrity. The moment you think you are good enough, you will never be any better.

There is no light at the end of the tunnel. There is no magical nirvana that you will break through into, where nothing will ever be hard again. There are only standards, and effort, and improvement, or complacency, weakness, and self-delusion.

Your choice. But don't make excuses for how you are too afraid of being hit in the face.

Pussy is a Commodity.

829 upvotes | October 15, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So, now that our own Uncle Vasilya has troubled to explain to the class how not to be a disgusting loser despite having loads of money and power (go read), the next step is to understand how people get that way.

It certainly looks like a puzzler, when you think about. A premium class whore costs about \$500 an hour. Two at once cost \$1000. Double that, hell, multiply it tenfold, and anyone who's a major player in Hollywood can afford *as much of that action as he wants*.

So, even if you're ugly, even if you have no game, even if you look like Jabba the fucking Hutt, you still have two smoking hot pros at once, anytime you want, who will do whatever you want, right away, and fuck right the hell off afterwards.

That sounds like a pretty good deal even to those of you who can pull at will, doesn't it?

So why, oh why, do men with that much money still act like thirsty losers?

Why?

Mindset. Neediness. **Ego**.

Make no mistake, most or all of these girls (and probably boys as well) weren't raped in the strictest sense of the word. They held their noses and sucked Weinstein's greasy cock because they knew the money shot was made of Hollywood stardom, and pretty much anyone you see in film or television or hear on the radio is a degenerate whore, or they wouldn't be there in the first place.

But they didn't *want* to suck that cock. So why wouldn't this asshole at least pay someone whose job it was? Who would suck it harder and suck it better and suck it with a lot more enthusiasm out of sheer professionalism if nothing else?

Mindset. Neediness. **Ego**.

Harvey Weinstein crept on starlets rather than paying whores, because *if he paid a whore, he would have had to admit to himself that his cock was being sucked for money instead of the thrill of it*.

That's right, little Ol' Harv didn't do all this to get sex with hot chicks... he did it to feel like a winner. Deep down, he knows he is an obese undisciplined slob, since he owns a mirror and isn't stupid.

Harvey Weinstein ultimately thought of pussy as a yardstick that measured his worth. If he could get enough pussy, he must be a winner at life, right? Because that's what life is all about, right? Trying to climb back into the same sort of hole you crawled out of?

No.

Pussy isn't a yardstick. Pussy isn't a milestone. Pussy isn't an achievement.

Pussy is a commodity. Like potatoes. If you're hungry, you want a potato. If you're horny, you want pussy. You get as much as you want, of the *kind* you want, with the variety you want, then you fucking stop until the itch comes back.

The meaning of life will never be found inside a vagina. Self-respect will never be found inside a vagina. A sense of purpose and identity will never be found inside a vagina. Happiness will never be found inside a vagina. The only things you will find there are temporary pleasure, and temporary

release from your sexual appetites.

Which means that if you don't want to end up like our little friend Harv, you can't get your self-image from how often vapid twentysomethings (whose major interests in life include cute shoes) spread their legs for you. Harvey's plan didn't work, because he just kept having to do it. No matter how many greedy, vapid little teenage sluts licked his sweaty balls then went home to take six showers and cry themselves to sleep, he had to keep doing it, because it didn't help for long.

So what's your mission? What is it that gives meaning to your life? It can be pretty much anything you think is important.

But if you say "popping bottles and fucking models", then have a long hard think. Because pussy is a commodity, like potatoes. Not the measuring stick of greatness, or the source of happiness. Anyone can get women's approval, because women are a herd of sheep. It didn't help Harvey feel better, and it won't help you.

And he is not the only man brought low by overvaluing pussy.

Remember Tiger Woods groveling to some bitch when models were lining up to fuck him? Then getting on TV and apologizing for being the victim of domestic abuse? Remember Shane Mosley's ex wife taking his title belts in court? Bitch can't punch her way out of a paper bag, and she's got four championship belts. Paul McCartney had to write a check for fifty million dollar to some bitch with one leg. How many hot teenagers would have crawled across broken glass for a shot at fucking Paul McCartney for free?

Pussy is something you get sometimes because you like pussy. Pussy is not an achievement.

Go do something you can be proud of.

Kayfabe

869 upvotes | October 21, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I'm not done talking about Harvey Weinstein. (The man is just such a goldmine of perfect examples.)

We've talked about what he did wrong. (Mistook situational leverage for SMV.)

And we've talked why what drove him to do it. (Used pussy to stroke his ego, instead of just his johnson.)

But now we come to the question of **why everyone in Hollywood sheltered him, then suddenly turned on him**, when they knew all along what he was doing.

To understand the answer, we have to understand a couple of facts, and *think about them all at the same time, in relation to each other*.

- The vast majority of those women were *not* raped. That wasn't rape. They chose to suck his cock, even if they went home and took six showers and then knelt on the bathroom floor alternately puking and crying.
- The ones who he grabbed who *didn't* give in still shut up about it.
- All the women who are now accusing him of rape and harassment, are all doing so at the same time. A few did, then the others followed in a cascade.
- Pretty much everyone in Hollywood knew what was going on.
- Hollywood is in the illusion business. To make money, they need people to believe, or suspend disbelief in, certain illusions.
- Beginning on 31 Aug 2014, and over the next few weeks, in an event that would be jokingly labelled "the Fappening", an unknown person or persons leaked naked selfies of a bunch of celebrity actresses.
- The response to this was widespread outrage, ostensibly over their privacy.
- Celebrity actresses frequently get naked on camera on purpose, and this boosts boxoffice draw.
- In professional wrestling, the term "kayfabe" refers to the portrayal of staged events within the industry as "real" or "true", specifically the portrayal of competition, rivalries, and relationships between participants as being genuine and not of a staged or predetermined nature of any kind. Kayfabe has also evolved to become a code word of sorts for maintaining this "reality" within the direct or indirect presence of the general public.

Now we know everything we need to know.

Kayfabe is how Hollywood makes its money. Kayfabe is why no one said anything about Harv for decades, and kayfabe is why they are calling him a rapist now. Kayfabe is why Hollywood was angry about the "Fappening", and kayfabe is why Hollywood actresses get naked on camera at a specific point in their careers, never too early. Kayfabe is why Hollywood stars talk endlessly about how wonderful and amazing and talented the people they just worked with are, and kayfabe is why they got together at big televised ceremonies and give each other trophies for making dull original movies that you went and saw because you were bored and forgot the plot of within the next two days.

So what is Hollywood's kayfabe, exactly?

Hollywood's kayfabe is the collectively-sustained illusion that Hollywood stars are prettier, more exciting, more interesting, larger-than-life people who are special. If you believe this, you will pay more money to see and hear them, and to see and hear about them.

What is the reality that the kayfabe hides?

Hollywood stars are just a bunch of theatre nerds who have been selected for above-average looks and whoever gave ol' Harv the best handjob.

The only special people in Hollywood are the very expert professional makeup and lighting and sound and production folks who are very, very good at taking your average 7.5 - 9 and making her look ethereally beautiful on camera.

The woman in the second two pictures doesn't exist. She is the highlight reel from a makeover shoot by the best illusionists in the world. She is every bit as fake as if she had been constructed entirely from computer graphics. In the future, she might be. Kayfabe.

Hollywood wants you to believe in her.

The "Fappening" was an outrage not because involuntary porn, but because it revealed that celebrity-actresses don't really look any better than the hot secretary at the local car dealership. And that the girls themselves aren't special, either... just another bunch of dumb sexting instagram hoes. Kayfabe.

Harvey was protected before for precisely the same reason he is being thrown under a bus now... to sustain the illusion that these girls were selected for their extraordinary beauty and talent, as opposed to at random (or by casting couch) from a vast pool of relatively ordinary beauty and talent. Kayfabe.

Hollywood talks about how wonderful each other are, and give each other awards for doing their jobs, to make you believe that they are wonderful, and that their jobs are important and meaningful. Kayfabe.

So is kayfabe limited to Hollywood?

Of course not... other groups have their own kayfabe which helps them succeed.

Ever hear a physician criticize another physician in public? You won't. Some idiot could amputate the wrong leg and others of his guild will rush to defend him.

Why? Because closing ranks prevents public contradictions to the perception that physicians are the most highly trained and competent of professionals and deserve to be the only ones called doctor (as if PhDs didn't exist), as opposed to a mixed bag of ordinary dudes doing jobs that require recognizing the same things over and over again, and doing the same things over and over again.

The navy's SEAL teams have *amazing* kayfabe. They have practically everyone believing they are invincible-warrior-ninja-philosopher-batman, as opposed to high-selected light infantry who have had a lot more money spent on training them.

Why?

Well, how else do you get to cash in when you EAS? How else do you charge premium rates for "management consulting", as if killing muj had anything in common with manufacturing pipe fittings. How else do take one single idea that's obvious to anyone that isn't an idiot, pad it like a procrastinating undergrad into an entire book, and make the bestseller list?

So what happens with groups that don't have a kayfabe? That don't control their image?

Have a look at software engineers.

Unlike physicians, or actors, they have no group loyalty, and will ruthlessly criticize the slightest

shortcoming in their fellow professionals' work, right in front of the public, calling them idiots and incompetents and whatever else comes to mind. Go read some Linus Torvalds posts to see what I mean.

Now, the vast majority of experienced ones are actually very good, having been ruthlessly subjected to this gladiatorial pit for the entirety of their careers. However, the public regards them as a bunch of high-paid manchildren who just seem to keep generating bugs (and never noticing when they swipe a credit card, send an email message, punch up satnav, or turn the lights on, and shit just works).

Because they have selected ruthless quality control over kayfabe, their public reputation is lower than their real world competence. For groups with good kayfabe, the reverse is true.

Lessons

- It is often good to exercise kayfabe, but never beneficial to be fooled by it. Be very careful what you take from anything deliberately presented for your consumption.
- If a group is held in high reputation, instead of automatically admiring them, ask yourself if kayfabe might be active. See if you can discern what it is.
- People are more often thrown under a bus for breaking kayfabe than for doing something wrong. Learn to spot that guy, and how not to be him.

Further thought

- Consider how the concept of kayfabe applies both to Donald Trump, and to the politicians who organize resistance against him.
- Consider how the concept of kayfabe applies to the collective behaviour of women. And of men.

Treating the Red Pill as a new way of being a follower.

165 upvotes | November 2, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So [/u/gaylubeoil](#) has called out some pundit I never heard of as a *kuchi bushi*.

Don't care, never heard of the dude, but this is a real phenomenon. The Red Pill has a set of common beliefs and values, and where you have that, *you will always have people trying to preach the values as a way to appear to be living them*.

Early Christians, for example, decided that "salvation through faith" rather than "salvation through merit" was the goal, and invented elaborate justifications for it, because actually practicing virtue is hard, but yammering on and on about Jesus is super easy.

Their key issue here is **teaching as a substitute for doing**.

Some men read what other, better men have written, and think that writing the same way will make them better men, or make others think they are better men (which is one and the same to a beta male, since beta males concern themselves with appearances).

They have that backwards.

Saying things doesn't make you a better man. Being a better man causes you to have something to say.

It is easy to spot men who are trying to "become alpha" by talking, because they simply recapitulate what others have said. They have no *experience of masculinity* to draw fresh insights from. Their writing is unoriginal.

Genuine masculine experiences can be had by:

- Having goals and working to achieve them.
- Seeking control of your environment, rather than allowing it to control you.
- Taking responsibility for your circumstances, and for the distance between them and your desires.
- Gaining knowledge, skill, and wisdom by leaving your comfort zone to seek out new experiences.

When you write from these, your writing will have value, substance, and fresh insights that will inspire others to do the same.

If you write from a desire to write, and to be seen as having written, it's obvious. Every day our mod team deletes reams of trash filled with nothing but empty "moto" bullshit. It usually features the words "brothers", or "gentlemen" a lot.

It's holding you back. Do not focus your ambitions on being the biggest anonymous swinging dick on the internet.

Fix. Your. Life.

Approaching Men: the Art of the Bad Excuse.

142 upvotes | November 2, 2017 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Someone asked me in PM for advice on how to attract, not just "men", but particular men she desires, once she's seen them.

This leads us to an area where many modern single girls are particular weak: the approach.

Obviously, approaching a man allows you to make something happen. But many women's immediate reaction to the very idea is "*I do not want to approach men.*" There are a number of reasons for this, some good, some bad, which tend to boil down to this list:

- I don't want to look so starved for male attention that I *have to* chase men.
- I don't want to look like a slut.
- Men don't like to be approached. They want to do it... right?
- I don't want a man who isn't bold enough to make the first move.
- My ego requires that men do all the work.
- It's men's natural role to approach, not mine.
- Approaching is scary.
- Uh... I don't know how.

Most, if not all of these are based on single misconception.

Approaching or making advances doesn't just mean making a male-style overt pass.

It means any way of starting an interaction that can lead to something.

When a man approaches a woman, the effective way to do that demonstrates masculine virtues: courage, decisiveness, assertiveness, leadership skills, and so forth.

When a woman hears: "*You can approach men, go ahead! It's fine! Men like it!*", she often thinks of that particular process and either cringes in horror at the thought of acting like that, or naively forges ahead, and chats up dudes as if she were one... at which point they eye her as one would a crazy person or a rabid dog, and start edging away.

There are feminine ways to begin an interaction.

The first tier of this is *signalling willingness to be approached*. This is mostly done with eye contact, and many women already understand it.

Make eye contact deliberately. Hold for a few seconds. Smile. Break eye contact by dropping the eyes *down*, not looking away. Repeat. Turn toward him, displaying open body posture. Laugh at lot. Play with your hair.

... this isn't hard stuff. Most every girl knows how to do this.

The rarer skill, which we'll focus on here, is being able to *actually open the conversation*. There are several elements here:

- You must fabricate an excuse to talk to him.
- This excuse must *be* an excuse, and not your overt reason.
- This excuse must not be too good... in fact, it should be pretty bad.
- You must continue to fabricate bad excuses to give flirtation time to happen.

The point here is that you are using indirect speech.

He must be aware of your real intent, and he must think that it is about **him in particular**, not that any man will do, or that you want attention.

If you use an overt reason ("I find you attractive") rather than an excuse ("Can you help me with this homework problem?"), then you have broken the delicate surface tension between "*Looks like she's really into me*", and "*This is weird, why is she acting weird? Is she crazy?*". Then you look desperate, or like a slut, or neurotic, or whatever explanation he comes up with for your bizarre behaviour.

However, if your excuse is *too good*, then he either believes it, or is unsure whether or not it is an excuse. Both are bad. If he believes it, he will focus on the ostensible "purpose" of the interaction, miss any attempts at flirtation you make, and probably leave when the fake task is accomplished. If, for example, he really believes that you just need help with that one homework problem, he'll either focus on math, and leave when you seem to get it, or he'll decline (because he's not your unpaid tutor, and has things to do).

Where most women err here is *excuse too subtle*. They are often afraid of being too blatant or obvious, and not always aware that *men do not speak to each other in subtleties*.

There is **no such thing as an excuse that's too bad**, so long as it is an excuse and not an actual direct statement that you want to continue talking to him because you find him attractive. Remember that he's supposed to see through it, and that's its fine if others see through it as well. This can't be stressed enough. Men often miss what you think of as glaringly obvious, because men do not typically talk to each other that way. If it feels about right, it's too subtle. If it feels embarrassingly obvious, it's probably about right.

Once the conversation begins, and your bad excuses allow it to continue, flirtation has time to happen. If logistics intervene, a bad excuse can be made to resume contact in the future.

Good news: no one gives a shit about you.

1027 upvotes | November 7, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Sometimes a very simple observation can make all the difference.

It wasn't complicated for some dude to observe that gym embarrassment is stupid, because no one is watching you, but that post rocketed up because it's true, and it's important.

So important that we need to talk more about it.

Many of you, many of *everyone*, are being held back from doing what you want to do by fear of what other people will think.

Hammer this through your tiny brains:

- If you do something that might invite ridicule or hatred, probably no one is watching.
- If they are watching, they probably don't care.
- If they do care, they probably won't say or do anything.
- If they do say or do something, it probably won't stick if you don't act ashamed or apologetic.
- If it does stick, it will only stick until the next shiny object distracts them.

Humans are fantastically unobservant, and fantastically uncaring, because everyone is absorbed in their own lives. The universe is a flood of information, 99.999999999999999999...% of it is irrelevant to us, and our brains must filter it ruthlessly for us to function at all. Every stupid thing you do, every time you fail, everyone moment that you remember and cringe... no one else remembers it. They just don't care enough.

Don't believe me? Think of a friend, fellow student, or co-worker who you see almost every day. What colour shirt was he wearing yesterday?

Yeah, you have no idea.

Still don't believe me? Go to work or school with *your* shirt on inside-out, with the seams showing. Watch how long it is before someone notices, if anyone ever does. If someone does point it out, look down, shrug, and go "Meh. Oops.", and go right back to what you were doing. Note how fast business as usual resumes.

No one cares if you screw up, not unless you have enemies who are waiting for you to screw up (and you're not Donald Trump or [/u/redpillschool](#), so you don't).

Get this through your head: **Publicity is hard**. It is almost impossible to get people to care, even when you are putting forth your best efforts to publicize and make them care. The constant scrutiny you are afraid of doesn't exist.

No one is watching.

No one is watching.

No one is watching.

Go do what you were afraid to do.

Ignore the Peanut Gallery

49 upvotes | November 15, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So some Indian dude wrote a Field Report about how he failed hard in all sorts of ways, and why. That's a good thing. FRs are not for talking about how badass you are, they are for learning, and failure teaches more than success. I won't link him here, critique his technique, target selection, whatever. Basic shit you should already know.

What's important is what he said at the end:

| | Anything I missed? Thoughts and rational advice are appreciated.

Don't.

Do.

That.

A man who asks for advice from *just anyone* is saying that some rando's opinion is more valuable than his. He is telling the world he believes himself so lost and at sea that just anyone can put plans into his head. He wears his lack of confidence on his sleeve.

And while there may not be any chicks to impress on TRP, that shit is habit forming.

Asking and taking advice is a mark of respect, and strong men do not hand out respect like Halloween candy. They give it sparingly to those who inspire it.

Randos will always give you advice, whether you ask it or not. But the guys in the cheap seats have not earned the right to be listened to, unless what they just yelled out was spectacular enough in its own right to merit your attention.

This goes double for criticism. It's easy to tell the difference between someone who's got a point that's valuable for helping you improve, and someone who's feeling short-dicked because you have the lectern right now.

Every damn time you open your mouth in public, there's going to be unsolicited advice, and haters. (If there aren't, then everyone is ignoring you because what you said was stupid.) There is absolutely no reason to let some Juicebox Hero command even a microsecond of your attention.

Save it for the people who can convince you they matter.

The 237 Commandments of the Alpha Sperg

111 upvotes | January 6, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

1. The Alpha Sperg shall, at all times, be Alpha. Alpha Alpha Alpha Alpha.
2. The Alpha Sperg shall not treat his Asperger's syndrome as a disability, or attempt to unlearn its habits.
3. The Alpha Sperg shall construct simple rules for being Alpha, in the form of a big, long, numbered list.
4. The Alpha Sperg shall show this list to anyone who asks, and everyone who doesn't, because bitches love lists.
5. The Alpha Sperg shall fill his list with Alpha traits, which everyone may emulate in order to become Alpha.
6. The Alpha Sperg shall not give his list a thesis, topic, or coherent centrel point, other than how to be Alpha.
7. The Alpha Sperg shall shun learning game, interaction with girls, and writing field reports in favour of cultivating his inner Alpha.
8. The Alpha Sperg shall tie an onion to his belt at all times, because this is very Alpha. Also, use lotion. Lotion is Alpha.
9. The Alpha Sperg shall publish his list of Alpha traits and actions for all to see, that they, too, might become Alpha by following a list of someone else's instructions.
10. The Alpha Sperg shall make his list as long as possible, to pack in all the very specific tips about what to do, which he has worked out by sitting around thinking about it, such as how to knot a tie, what the most Alpha way to mix a martini, and where in NYC most Alphas make dinner reservations. Eskimos need to know this shit.
11. The Alpha Sperg shall continue adding points to his list until he runs out of things he can think of. At no time should a list stop simply because it has made its point, exhausted the topic, or reached a natural conclusion... especially because all of these things would imply having a thesis, and that's not Alpha.
12. The Alpha Sperg's list shall encompass all the Alpha tips he can think of, every single one (especially lotion), then stop sudden

The Pedestal

135 upvotes | January 31, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I once knew a certain Benedicta whose presence filled the air with the ideal and whose eyes spread abroad the desire of grandeur, of beauty, of glory, and of all that makes man believe in immortality. But this miraculous maiden was too beautiful for long life, so she died soon after I knew her first, and it was I myself who entombed her, upon a day when spring swung her censer even in the burial-ground. It was I myself who entombed her, fast closed in a coffin of perfumed wood, as uncorruptible as the coffers of India.

And, as my eyes rested upon the spot where my treasure lay hidden, I became suddenly aware of a little being who singularly resembled the dead; and who, stamping the newly-turned earth with a curious and hysterical violence, burst into laughter, and said: *"It is I, the true Benedicta! It is I, the notorious drab! As the punishment of your folly and blindness you shall love me as I truly am."*

But I, furious, replied: *"No!"* The better to emphasize my refusal I struck the ground so violently with my foot that my leg was thrust up to the knee in the recent grave, and I, like a wolf in a trap, was caught perhaps for ever in the Grave of the Ideal.

- Charles Baudelaire

Can't love an illusion, bro.

Still, since you're stuck there anyway, there's no reason why a quick one should be out of the question.

- Whisper

Jordan Peterson is not your friend.

0 upvotes | February 4, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Every once in a while, some new tradcon cock enters the public eye, and all the recovering betas here cannot forebear relapsing into their old ways and wrapping their lips around it for a good hard suck.

If tradcon shit was the Red Pill, why does the Red Pill exist? Why was this wonderful, perfect tradcon world of justice, health, strength, freedom, and the right way of doing shit so soundly and thoroughly defeated by feminism in a couple of decades?

Why? Because tradcon values are none of these things, they are shit, they always were shit, and it's very easy for slaves to replace one master with another. Tradcons do not give a shit about your welfare. They are just fighting with feminism over who gets to hold your leash.

When feminism first came along, why the men buy into it?

Because they thought it would free them. They thought that the chains would be struck from their own natural and healthy sexual appetites if only women were "liberated" to be sluts. Why would they have gone for that, if they were already free and happy.

No, tradcons may hate feminism and cultural Marxism, but **The enemy of your enemy is not your friend. He is your enemy's enemy, nothing less and nothing more.**

The *reason* tradcons hate these things is not because they want you to be free, but because those chains get in the way of the ones *they* want you to wear. Chains like marriage to some ho. Chains like absolutist morality, as sold with the superstitions of a bunch of bronze-age sheep herders, and who gives a fuck whether you are getting anything in exchange for all this righteousness.

They don't give a fuck about you. They just want you pulling their ideological wagon instead of someone else's. Tradcons and feminists can fight their little war over whose plan to exploit you for women's sake is "better", and you don't have to be involved. Because if you actually take the Red Pill, instead of just longing for a low-T, shrill, pencilnecked right-wing intellectual to suck up to, then this what you already know:

- You belong to you.
- You exist for you.
- Anyone who wants something from you had better offer you something in exchange, instead of trying to convince you it's your duty.
- Because every moral system is just some shit somebody sat down and came up with.
- And if you buy into it when it hurts you, you're a fucking tool.
- If you are still looking for someone to worship, you're still in beta-male suck-up mode.
- Yes, that includes Jesus. If he loves you so much, why does he never pick up the phone and call?
- Yes, that also includes me and other redpill dudes. We'll eat your lunch out of the fridge and steal your girl. We're just not bullshitting you, not because we love you, but because we hate bullshit.

You belong to you. You exist for you.

Never let anyone subvert your primary directive with bullshit.

On unplugging all the way: You need to chew before swallowing.

511 upvotes | February 8, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

It's easy to push people's buttons.

Post a hyperbolic rant about how someone's favorite sports team sucks, and you will easily be able to separate the **people who watch sportsball for fun**:

"Dude, the Podunk Penguins are a decent sportsball team, I happen to like sportsball, and they're fun to watch. What ARE you raving about?"

from the **people who look to sportsball to provide them with a sense of identity**:

"Fuck you, you limp-wristed fuck! The Penguins are WAY better at sportsball than you will ever be, loser! You're just jealous because THEY are successful sportsball players and YOU work in a mayonnaise factory! Eat shit and die!"

Separate them like this, and you know who is unplugged, and who isn't. Consider it as a sort of litmus test.

The process of unplugging from the "matrix" of someone else's ideas and plans for you can sometimes be interrupted by another type of blue pill. The sort that presents you with a nice matrix instead of a scary dystopian one.

It's easy to stop there.

There are, as one rather well unplugged reader put it, a great many young men here who are *"temporarily on a strike, waiting for some authority figure (be it [Jordan Peterson], Ben Shapiro, Milo [Yiannopoulos], or some bigshot YouTube skeptic a-la Sargon of Akkad) to intellectually 'checkmate' the SJWs and the globalists into capitulation"*

They are waiting for a messiah to save society.

And while these public figures certainly make us all smile when they take the radical left down a peg, **that isn't what we built TRP for**. That socket in your head, the one labeled "insert messiah here", or "insert plans here"... that's what made you vulnerable to the Disney Blue Pill, or the Chivalry Blue Pill, or the Feminist Blue Pill in the first place. Someone exploited your desire for a ready-made set of instructions for life. Your dream of a society where everything was mapped out, and you didn't have to wander in the wilderness on your own, looking for what suited you in life.

Unplugging is hard, because it means you are alone.

But when you have sockets in your head for people to plug you into something, whether it be Social Justice, or the Right Wing Save Society Movement, then you are forever at the mercy of any sufficiently persuasive person with an agenda that isn't yours.

TRP was created to weld that socket shut, so that any advice that entered your head had to do so through a more filtered orifice. When you put food in your mouth, you don't just swallow it. You chew first.

There was always the danger that he who seeks to unplug people from messiahs becomes regarded as one himself, whether we wanted to be or not. Sometimes, you point at things, and people just stare at your finger. That is inherent in the process, because unplugging can be hinted at, but never given as a

list of instructions.

How could it? The whole idea is about not following lists of instructions. Feminist bullshit, Disney movies, sperg-like lists of " how to be AlphaTM ", and tradcon plans to save society by recruiting you with the promise of one free UnicornTM (*Caution: do not subject horn to strong lateral pressure as glue may fail*) ... these are all blue pills.

The red pill is *you*. You regarding every thing you see as raw data to be analyzed. Every article or video or column of advice as a hypothesis to consider and weigh. Every strategic technique as a suggestion to test and see if it works for you.

And if some manipulative jerk can make you rage by telling you your favorite sportsball team sucks, then check your brain for someone else's fingerprints.

Cancer

580 upvotes | February 16, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

What distinguishes a bad habit from a harmless one?

AskTRP constantly wants to know if it should swear off masturbation, video games, television, weed, whatever. We hear endless arguments about whether this or that is "bad" or "okay".

This is the reasoning of a child. The dose determines the poison. Everything has a "too much", even oxygen and water. The question is how much. When is a habit simply a habit, and when is it cancer?

cancer (kǎn 'sər) ►

n. Any of various malignant neoplasms characterized by the proliferation of anaplastic cells that tend to invade surrounding tissue and metastasize to new body sites.

n. The pathological condition characterized by such growths.

What this means in layman's terms is that a cell is cancerous if, when its growth is blocked by another cell, it *eats into* that cell instead of stopping.

This is how you know when anything you are doing is becoming a problem. Does it fill the time, attention, and resources you allot to it, or does it eat into other areas of your life?

Is masturbation reducing your motivation to go out and meet girls? Is weed keeping you idle on the couch? Do the video games stop when you're tired, or do they keep you awake into the predawn hours? Are you reading TRP and then going out and trying what you learned, or has the reading eaten the practice?

This is stupidly simple. Don't ask if it's bad, because enough is never bad, and too much always is. Ask if what it is *doing* is bad. Is it eating something else it's not supposed to eat? Cancer.

Assuming men are stupid.

88 upvotes | February 18, 2018 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

While the goal of girl game is ultimately to get better treatment from men, the practice of it must consist of something more than *naively grabbing for what you want in the most obvious fashion possible*.

As [/u/durtyknees](#) so aptly put it:

I've always found it ironic that women who aim for "high quality" men underestimate the **mental** capacity of such men, as if **outstanding intellect**, **exceptional empathy**, and **excellent social skills** are somehow not traits found in "high quality" men

--- I mean, this is the impression I get from reading posts in RP communities, and I always scratch my head about it.

To expand on this idea, it makes little sense to date a man who joined the Army and made it through Ranger School and then ask RPW about how best to break this man's will with an ultimatum.

Or to date a man who carefully practiced seduction, how to read women, and how to make himself attractive to them, then ask RPW about how to play little games to make him jealous... because you saw that in a movie once.

Or to date a man who got himself a law degree, passed the bar exam, learned through experience how to play a jury like a fiddle, then ask RPW how to put off his sexual advances while feigning passion.

If you do not want a stupid, weak-willed, or oblivious man, do not employ tactics that require these qualities in a man.

This is why high-quality girl game does not consist of adversarial tactics. Not because these tactics never work, but because the kind of man you can defeat in a game of chicken is not the sort of man you want to spend the rest of your life with. "The Rules" may be an excellent manual for managing your beta orbiters, but that's all it is.

Since a woman's goal is to remain with the man she practicing game on, any means of getting her way that makes her man unhappy with the result, will damage the relationship even if it works. Girl game does not contain the same level of option to "next" men, so it must seek a win-win situation.

An excellent rule of thumb for this is **if explaining your tactic to him as you perform it would make it not work... it's not a good idea to try it at all.**

The Talk is Socially Retarded, Don't Do It.

157 upvotes | February 21, 2018 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Imagine yourself on a date with a man. It's going fairly well so far... he's confident, handsome, smart, and he has a sort of dry humor that makes you laugh. Then, about halfway through, he drops the banter, gives you a serious look, and says:

"We need to talk. You're a nice girl, and I like you, but my goal for tonight is to have sex. So we need to talk about whether you're ready for sex, and about what kind of sexual acts you're ready for. Because I deserve sex, and if you're not a sex-minded kind of girl, then I need to not be wasting my time here."

About now, most of you probably feel like you need to go and take a shower just from reading that.

That's okay, I feel like that from writing it.

Certainly in this scenario, sex would *not* be happening, that night or any other.

Why? Well, because it's creepy, but let's be more specific:

- He attempted to negotiate desire, which is involuntary and cannot be negotiated.
- He showed poor, indeed borderline autistic, social skills by not knowing this.
- He acted entitled and demanded what it was his job to inspire.
- He treated you as a means to his own goals, rather than a person.

The "Commitment Talk" is the female version of this social blunder, and men react to it with just as much distaste, for the same reasons.

- Negotiating Desire

Remember that commitment is not a man promising to stay, calling you his SO in public, letting you move into his house, or even marrying you. All of these are expressions of commitment.

Commitment itself is his desire to keep you in his life. This is not a conscious act. **A man can neither deliberately give you commitment, nor deliberately withhold it.** You simply inspire it, or fail to.

- Poor Social Skills

These are even more repellent in a woman than in a man, since gracefully dealing with thorny social issues where conflict may arise is a feminine art. A man wants to be with a woman who smooths over potential arguments, rather than creating them.

- Entitled

Since you either inspire commitment or fail to, getting to commitment is your job, not his. If you attempt to dump this responsibility on him, he is certainly going to wonder what else you will just demand that you should have earned.

- Treating him as a means to an end.

This hardly requires explanation. He already knows what you want. If you simply demand it from him because you want it, then he will know you think that he was put on this planet to fulfill your desires.

The art of girl game is the art of getting what you want without conflict or ultimatums, by making him want to give it to you. Do not attempt to shortcut this process.

"The Talk" is Socially Retarded, Do Not Tolerate It.

664 upvotes | February 21, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So how many of you would drop this on a woman halfway through a date:

"We need to talk. You're a nice girl, and I like you, but my goal for tonight is to have sex. So we need to talk about whether you're ready for sex, and about what kind of sexual acts you're ready for. Because I deserve sex, and if you're not a sex-minded kind of girl, then I need to not be wasting my time here."

?

If any one of you raised your hands, then go to the back of the fucking class, and the some gentlemen from the Federal Witless Protection Program will stop by a little later with your helmet and a juicebox.

One of the first principles of TRP is that **desire is not voluntary, and cannot be negotiated**. And if you've been here more than a few minutes, you know better than to try.

So why would you let a girl get away with doing the same thing? The "Commitment Talk" is nothing but the female version of this clueless screed, an attempt to negotiate or just simply *demand* her way up the [Bitch Management Hierarchy](#). Tolerate that, and you're the one who's the bitch. Hope you like strap-ons.

If a girl ever hits you with "the talk", her permanent maximum rank is "plate", because **your** desire isn't voluntary either, and it cannot be negotiated, either. You do not ever want to be in a relationship with a girl who doesn't get that.

When your game is tight, girls will have sex with you and never be conscious of having made a decision to do so... "it just kind of happened". In promoting a girl to LTR, you must not settle for anything less... you hang out with more and more *because you want to spend time with her*, you visit her when she's sick *because you want her to feel better*, you take her along on that road trip *because you want her there*.

A girl who can't make that happen without stopping the flow to make sperglie demands of you isn't worthy. If she cannot infuse you with the *positive desire* to promote her, she isn't worthy. She has to earn her way up just like anyone else, no matter what she says about herself.

And remember that there is no level 4.

Full fucking stop.

No fucking exceptions.

Do NOT go there.

No matter how much you want to see her smile.

That institution is DEAD.

Submissive Behaviour as Strategy

175 upvotes | February 28, 2018 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Any woman with a triple digit IQ who devotes an hour or so to scanning the main redpill subreddit will quickly realize a few things:

- TRP deliberately cultivates a harsh and critical tone towards women in general.
- TRP deliberately teaches dealing with women in a ruthless and self-interested fashion.
- These are not the result of a raw outpouring of uncontrolled anger, but instead a deliberate instructional choice by TRP's leading voices.

While the men of TRP have no need for women to understand the "why" of this (TRP tactics work regardless), it is very for valuable *for women* to understand why this is so... it yields insight into their own best strategy.

The basic method of TRP is founded on the realization that mating between men and women is governed by the balance between two corresponding instincts:

- Women instinctively submit to, defer to, and obey men.
- Men instinctively protect and care for women.
- Each of these instincts, when expressed proportionally, tends to provoke the corresponding response in the other.

When these two instincts are both strongly expressed, a win-win interaction inevitably takes place... the woman is not brutalized or casually discarded despite her complete vulnerability, because the man's own instinct to protect and care for her restrains him, and the man is not exploited and vampirically sucked dry, because of the woman's instinct to defer to him and place his desires ahead of her own.

However, these instincts are not always expressed in balance. A woman who is submissive to a man who feels no urge to take care of her, or a man who is protective of a woman who does not submit to him, will end up being harmed.

When we understand this, we can see the reasoning behind the "tone" of TRP. It is a deliberate tactic for training men to suppress their protective instinct, necessitated by an environment full of women who are not submissive.

It is from here that we can realize a profound tactical implication for women who understand this. **If the teachers of TRP must work as hard as they do to suppress male protectiveness even of women who are not submissive, how hard can it be for a woman who IS to activate that same instinct?**

This, in a nutshell, is why RPW teaches submissive behaviour. It has nothing to do with tradition. It is not a religious law, or a moral obligation. It is simply *the best move* for dealing with any man who isn't severely damaged (how to identify those is a subject for another day). This is why "drawing boundaries" with your man, or "negotiating" with him "from a position of strength" may *sound* safe, but is a very bad idea. It is the decision to engage in conflict with the sex that is built for conflict, while in that very act sacrificing an incredibly potent advocate who *lives inside his own head*, past all his defenses.

The basis of any strong RPW strategy for navigating the risks of the sexual marketplace involves cultivating the ability to evoke this instinct in men.

This does not simply begin and end with deference or obedience, but rather consists of a whole host of behaviours calculated to draw the protective instinct out. It is, however, the *willingness* to behave in a submissive fashion to begin with that allows a woman to access, learn, and experiment with such strategies.

The Great Trad Con, and How Not to Get Conned.

253 upvotes | March 2, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

By this time, the only men who don't realize that marriage has mutated into something ugly are the truly stupid, or the delusionally hopeful. Since we are not Captain Save-A-Bro, either, we're not interested in preaching on streetcorners, trying to save idiots from themselves.

But there is a segment of the more clueful who are still making a serious mistake: They agree that Marriage 2.0 is a trap, but **they want Marriage 1.0 back.**

I don't know if it's too many Jordan Petersen videos, or just a yearning for unicorns that they know they won't find, but still believe once existed, but these guys want the 1950s back, despite having not been alive then, and only having ever read about that era through its own propaganda, or that of its fat, purple-haired detractors.

There's a temptation to think that, *if only* we could defeat the *evvvvvvvvvvvvvvvvviiiiiiiil* feminism, that ruined everything, we could roll the clock back to an era where everything was easy, you could pluck a unicorn off the unicorn tree, and find happiness (at least sexual happiness) without having to think, struggle, build value, or reinvent yourself.

Well, no.

(Oh, here Whisper goes again, having a go at the tradcons yet again. What did they ever do to him? What the hell is his problem with the whole business, anyway?)

It's time we answered that question once and for all.

There's two simple reasons:

1. You can't bring Marriage 1.0 back.

Neither you, nor the secular tradcons, nor the Jesus freaks, nor all of you together, can resurrect this dead institution. Oh, you could defeat *feminism*. Feminism isn't scary. Hell, all you have to do for that is *wait*, and watch feminism defeat itself. But *feminism didn't kill Marriage 1.0* in the first place. The information economy did.

2. Marriage 1.0 sucked for men, anyway.

Now, we can talk about how and why it sucked, and we will in a minute. *But we don't need to know **how** it sucked to know **that** it sucked.* All we need to know is that men agreed to destroy it for the (mostly false) promise of a little hairy free-love snatch.

Men saw it, it was available to them, they were intimately aware of what it offered, they watched their parents do it, and *they chose column b*. They didn't want it.

End of debate. But we can talk about why they made this choice, and why, for the same reasons, what modern tradcons are offering you is a shit sandwich on really good bread.

1. Tradcon women are not submissive to you. They are submissive to the rules.

Now, during the era of Marriage 0.1, this wasn't really a significant difference, because the rule was "Do what your husband tells you", and if one of your wives was disobedient, you just went and cut yourself a willow switch, and fixed the problem. And there was much rejoicing.

But Marriage 1.0 wasn't like that. The rules didn't say "Obey your husband" anymore. They

said "Husband must do A, B, and C. Wife must do X, Y, and Z, and must obey husband... *unleeeeeessssss* he neglects her or his order isn't godly and righteous."

And who, exactly, decides if he has been neglectful, or his instructions are bad? Why, *she does*, of course!

That tradcon girl ain't gonna obey *you*, Mr. Alpha Male Badass Person. Even if you do put a ring on it. She's going to obey some guy in a big "I talk to Jesus" hat, who doesn't really care what your priorities are because his idea of a relationship is five minutes alone with that hot altar boy. She's only going to obey you *if and when she feels like it*.

And obedience when you feel like it isn't obedience at all... it's bdsm-flavoured doing-whatever-the-fuck-you-want.

And what consequences can you impose if she does shit you don't like? Funny you should ask....

2. A Captain who cannot fire a bad First Mate without losing his crew and half his ship is no Captain at all.

Now, no-fault divorce didn't exist yet in Marriage 1.0, so she could actually be punished for breaking hat-guy's rules. She cheated on you, she got nothing, because hat-guy told her not to cheat. But what about shit *you* want? Well, that Marriage 0.1 willow switch is right out, because hat-guy told you not to. So's dread game, because that's infidelity, which hat-guy doesn't like. And if you decide you need to fire your first mate, because she won't obey the captain, then she gets all the crew and at least half the ship.

Get the picture? You ain't the Captain, bro. Hat-guy is the Captain. The First Mate is *you*.

3. You are expected to surrender a large part of your sexual imperative for... what, exactly?

You're genetically programmed to seek out variety. Can't do that anymore, because it's against hat-guy's rules. Supposedly what you get in exchange is love, support, reliable sex, etc. Except hat-guy doesn't mandate those. Perhaps there's some lip service to a wife's "duties", but how are they enforced? What if she'll only have sex with you once every two weeks? Every month? No, you haven't escaped the necessity for running game. You're still in the sexual marketplace. Except now she has a monopoly.

And that's *after* marriage. Before it, well, don't you *dare* expect to test-drive a car before you buy it. Hat-guy doesn't like that, and he's the Captain.

4. Gotta pay to play. And pay. And pay. And pay.

Do you really need this explained? Picture the first girl you had sex with. Remember what she was like. Remember what the sex was like. Wanna bankroll her for life, so you can have that when she feels like it?

Now you get the picture. Marriage 1.0 is better than Marriage 2.0 in the same way that a kick in the crotch is better than being stabbed. Marriage Anything.0 is for losers who can't get laid without it, and men so enslaved by their own oxytocin and protective instincts that they would take huge risks with no reward other than seeing her smile.

Don't do it.

Learn game.

And if you want to let her have an LTR, make her earn it, and make sure you can kick her to the curb with zero cost the moment she stops making it worth your while.

Because you're not allowed to give your wife a thrashing anymore. Your only power is the power to walk away. Never surrender it to anyone.

Families and Children

230 upvotes | March 5, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Just as most of the Red Pill's understanding of the sexual marketplace can be derived from the simple principle that **"Sperm is cheap and eggs are expensive"**, most anything you need to know about childhood, and the raising of children can be derived from the simple principle that **"Humans are incredibly smart, and being smart is incredibly expensive"**.

Now, you may not think humans are all that smart if you peruse the Huffington Post, or the average YouTube comments section, but all that really means is that the average human isn't all that smart compared to a smart human, the sort whose writing tends to grab our attention. No, the mere act of watching a YouTube video and commenting on it at all requires an incredible degree of intelligence as compared to most other species on the planet.

Now, we can also see that this intelligence is incredibly costly from a biological standpoint. We lack almost all of the advantages that other organisms possess: strength, stamina, agility, endurance, speed, claws, wings, fur, and so on. We put all the resources those things would have cost into building a giant information processor... and then use it to build tools that not only substitute for what we lack, but far surpass the natural versions they substitute for.

Due to our magnificent brains, we can survive where no other animal can, and do what no other animal can. Only one other organism in the history of the known universe has been brainier. (And humans who still have some of their genes are among the smartest of the modern human race.)

But how does our need for maximum brainpower shape us as evolved animals? The important thing to understand is that *everything* has been sacrificed to build those big brains.

Human babies need to be born with huge heads. But, while you can evolve a vagina to stretch a hell of a lot, ultimately it must pass through the pelvic girdle, which is a ring of bone. And sure, you can widen the female pelvic girdle some, but that ends up being the reason women can't run very well, so you can only take that so far.

Ultimately, an infant's head can only be so big before he must be delivered. Can't spend more time in the oven. This means that from the viewpoint of the average animal species, human infants are born prematurely. A newborn horse can stand up within about 30 minutes of birth, and can run in under two hours. Human infants can't crawl for months. And are physically helpless to some degree for many, many years after that, while all the hard work goes into building and training that giant brain.

So how does humanity evolve in response to that? Simple. **Half of the entire race is optimized for child-rearing and very little else.** It has to be that way. Human children are so uniquely helpless and needy that they must have close to 24/7 care, month after month, year after year. As an obvious consequence, **the half who are totally optimized for child-rearing require constant support themselves from those who aren't.** Evolution has exploited the opportunity represented by sexual dimorphism to specialize the human species.

If children are totally dependent on women, and women are totally dependent on men, then for the species to survive, women cannot be on their own. A female mountain lion can mate with a male and never see him again, because she can bear her kittens on her own, hunt on her own, feed them on her own, and teach them to hunt on her own. A female human cannot... **she needs the continued presence of a male.**

Which brings us at last to the Family.

The Family is a **series of social structure designs which transfer support and resources from men to women, and from women to children**. Because humans can directly transfer information between themselves using culture and language, the Family does *not* need to have a single, instinctively programmed structure. It can be redesigned on the fly by culture. This has happened several times.

- **Family 0.0.1:** This predates written records, so no one really knows for sure. Did hominid bands have the concept of a father? Did all males take care of all females, and all females of all children? We don't really have a clear idea. We only know that human society was structured into small hunter-gatherer bands of about 100+ people.
- **Family 0.1:** Introduced with Marriage 0.1. A family is a man, his children, and their mothers.
- **Family 1.0:** Introduced with Marriage 1.0. A family is a man, one woman, and their children. (This gets messy if a man impregnates more than one woman, or a woman is impregnated by more than one man).
- **Family 2.0:** Introduced with Marriage 2.0. A family is a woman, her children, and whatever man she is currently having sex with. <----- *YOU ARE HERE*
- **Family 3.0:** Introduced with the utter dissolution of marriage. A family is a woman and her children. They are supported by state-mandated transfer of resources from men in general... a sort of "man-tax" in lieu of fatherhood. Whether this tax explicitly targets men, or just higher income-earners, doesn't really matter. <----- *THIS IS COMING*

"Excuse me, Professor Whisper, that's very interesting and all, but what does this mean for ME? How do I go about having children in the Land of Marriage 2.0?"

You can't. Notice how the possessives change:

- Marriage 0.1 ---> HIS children.
- Marriage 1.0 ---> THEIR children.
- Marriage 2.0 ----> HER children.

You cannot have children.

You can sire children. You can possibly raise children. But you cannot have them. Because they are not YOUR children. They are HER children. And your level of involvement in their lives will be exactly what she decides, and no more.

So, if you wish to *sire and raise* (not *have*) children, here's what you are up against.

You are entering a voluntary but irreversible state of permanent oneitis, because while women are interchangeable, children are not. You will always have oneitis for those kids. And *she* controls those kids. Which means you are committed to keeping Briffault's Law from biting you until the last one becomes an adult.

"Hey, Professor! Haven't you already said that Marriage 2.0 is a benefit solely to women? If that's true, doesn't it make a good bribe to offer in exchange for permanent access to my kids? I've been hanging out on RPW and they told me marriage was important for child rearing!"

No, and go to the back of the class, and don't hang out on RPW.

Remember we are dealing with Briffault's Law here, not reciprocity. Reciprocity is giving something in exchange for what you have already received. *Men* do reciprocity. Briffault's Law is what women do instead... giving something in the hope of future benefit. *Nothing you have given her in the past buys you anything, because she already has it.*

If you marry a woman, you have permanently committed to supporting her, and she still gets that if she blows up the marriage.

If you sire children on a woman, you have permanently committed to giving her resources for them, and she still gets that if she withdraws your privilege of access.

Neither of these will stave off Briffault's Law in any way, shape, or form.

So, if you have the dream of siring and raising children, you have two choices:

- Find one single woman on which you wish to stake everything you have or will have, gambling on your ability to keep her in check permanently, come whatever may, without any ability to leave or run dread game. Don't even think about marrying her. That just makes the job harder.
- Exchange your dream for a less silly dream.
- Expatriate to Saudi Arabia perhaps.

Sorry, class, there's no magic technique here. If you want to do this, you simply have to abandon favourable ground, and get in a rock throwing contest while standing at the bottom of a well.

Remember that this is how a lot of the early PUA guys got punked out in the end. Remember how many high-status "chad" types got shafted the same way.

Won't tell you not to do this, but you pays your money, and you takes your chances. Or you wise up and get a dog.

LTR: The Bare Minimum You Need to Know

1081 upvotes | March 9, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I've avoided teaching about this, because learning to spin plates is more important. But now the subject has come up, and people are talking about it.

Here are the Basics. Not a comprehensive guide, not even a primer. Simply the absolute minimum you need, to avoid shooting yourself in the foot.

What is an LTR?

If we read the single most important piece of Redpill literature ever, [/u/humansockpuppet's Bitch Management Hierarchy](#), we learn that there are four level of sexual intimacy with a woman.

- *Level 0*: One-Night Stand
- *Level 1*: Plate
- *Level 2*: Friends with Benefits.
- *Level 3*: LTR/Significant Other/Girlfriend

The Guide itself touches on the distinctions, but focuses on when and why to promote. Of a clear explanation of what the difference is, we turn to the [Cliff's Notes](#), which makes it clear that:

- Rank 0 is the rank of sex.
- Rank 1 is the rank of repeated contact.
- Rank 2 is the rank of non-sexual social time.
- Rank 3 is the rank of emotional investment.

So, an LTR is a sexual partner you have voluntarily allowed yourself to become emotionally attached to.

That's it.

That's all.

It doesn't mean monogamy, necessarily. (Don't give that away unless you want to, and never for free.)

It doesn't mean promises made to her, or publicly announced status, or cohabitation, or investment of material resources (all of these are also gifts if you choose to give them).

It just means you emotionally invest in her.

This has additional benefits, and carries additional risks.

What are the benefits?

Men may be the gatekeepers of emotional connection, but this does not mean they derive no joy from it. Just as women, who are the gatekeepers of sex, still crave and enjoy sex, men can and do feel real affection for the right sort of woman, and will actively want to do so.

Most of you, this already makes sense to. If it doesn't, and you are still asking "why?", then this urge

is weak or non-existent in you. Stop reading and go spin plates.

What is the major risk?

When we *invest* money in a business enterprise, we risk losing that money. When we emotionally invest in a woman, we risk losing that investment.

If the idea of losing this girl doesn't bother you to some degree, then you have an FWB, not an LTR. Thus, you lose the *total outcome independence* that you would have with a plate.

The effects of this are easy to imagine.

How do I capture the benefits while minimizing the risks?

Simple.

First, *invest wisely*. The Bitch Management Hierarchy deals very comprehensively with how to do this.

Second, *actively manage your investment*.

This means **abandoning your strategy of indifference for a strategy of control**.

You no longer get to not care if she stays or goes. You no longer get to say that "*she's not yours, it's just your turn*". These are tactics of indifference. If you are invested, you are axiomatically not indifferent. Investment and indifference are opposites of each other.

You must actively **control your woman** to prevent things from going pear-shaped. It's not just your turn. She *is* yours, and you damn well better be able to enforce that.

This principle is why Chad gets turned into a bitch by his LTR, and divorceraped by his wife. "Naturals" have only indifference game, and no control game.

"But Whiiiiiiisssssper, it's heeeeeeeeeeeeeer job to secure commitment! I'm just supposed to be attractive, and any effort to keep her is BETA! YOU are talking like a BETA right now! The Vanguard are getting WEAK! (I'm terrified of being a beta. Someone please hold me.)"

Yes, it is her job to secure commitment, and keep it. **But since when can a woman do a job without a man to tell her what to do?**

She does the work to keep the LTR. *You* control her so she does the right work.

Your control of your woman rests upon three pillars:

- **Attraction**

You must, at all times, keep her believing that you are *it*. That you are the best thing she could possibly get, and if she doesn't hold onto you, it's all downhill for the rest of her life. She must mate-guard *herself* whenever she is capable. This means that unless she is being strong-armed, you shouldn't have to step in.

- **Obedience**

You must instill her in the expectation that her job is to do what you say, when you say it, because you say it. She must explicitly and consciously accept her role as the subordinate in the relationship. This is easy to do if you start early. (Read some porn written by women, they

touch themselves to this stuff.) Be sure not to let obedience stop at the bedroom door, use the habits she gets into there to give her instructions in her daily life. Use compliance tests frequently. Explicitly punish her for minor misbehaviours.

- **Non-Entitlement**

You must make sure she regards anything you give her as a gift given on a whim, not a normal aspect of your relationship that she is now entitled to. Gifts (generally small and inexpensive as a rule) should happen when you feel like it, not on Christmas, her birthday, Valentine's day, etc. Never respond to "I love you" with "I love you, too". Give her attention and pets as a reward for good behaviour, not as a pattern or habit. If she ever approaches you in a fashion that comes off as demanding, never give her what she wants.

She should always be working to keep you, and to keep you happy.

You should always be giving her clear and unambiguous guidance on what is expected of her.

If I'm not outcome independent, what do I do if it goes bad and my control strategy doesn't work?

He who cannot cast away a treasure at need is in chains.

While you must be invested, you must also be willing to write off a bad investment and cut your losses. Major misbehaviours (cheating, deception, ultimatums, deliberate disrespect, etc) must always result in a hard next. There is no "saving the relationship". If a relationship ever needs "saving" rather than a minor course correction, it's already a write-off.

It is important to keep your game strong, so you can get back into it as soon as possible after you write off a bad one.

I like relationships better than spinning plates. How do I get one?

You don't.

If a woman who practices reciprocity is a unicorn (because unicorns don't fucking exist), then a feminine, submissive woman who is willing to work is a "snow leopard", an animal that exists, but is so rare that if you see one, odds are it will already be captured and in someone else's zoo.

Don't hunt snow leopards. It's a waste of your time. Simply be prepared to recognize one if you see it, and know what to do with one when you recognize it.

Just as girls have no control over whether you are sex-worthy, you have no control over whether the girls you meet are relationship-worthy.

Plan accordingly.

Still Wanna Get Married?

1443 upvotes | March 29, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

From elsewhere on reddit:

Not at all. My wife took our baby when she dyed her hair blue and fell in with a crowd of regs feminists that work with her at Starbucks. She moved back in with her mom, stopped working, and hit me up for child support. They set my CS at the highest earnings I've ever made in my life - a single month during my time owning a janitorial business - , pre tax, 40%. So, that one single month (I had got a contract to clean up a demolished building that paid \$4000), I made \$6000. Luckily, in Texas, there's a cap at a little over \$1000 a month. Problem is, I make \$600 every two weeks.

I didn't cheat. I didn't flake. I was supportive, loving, and if I might say so, a good husband. She cheated on me while pregnant with our child, took off while I was at work, no notice, and filed a restraining order which I later found out all lawyers MUST advise their clients of, because it means a MUCH higher rate of achieving custody. That shows up on my background check.

I'm genuinely going to kill myself soon, because I have about two months of savings left with which I can pay my CS, and after that, for each payment missed, it's a court date, with a 180 day jail sentence. Why did all of this happen? So she could find herself. Because she's a strong independent waman who don't need no man. <--- that sentence would have never, ever come out of me before she left.

That's not the half of it, either. I won't bore you with details, but just a few highlights are:

Legal Aid place said their free help for poor people was "more for women".

The state provides free attorneys for women but not men in custody and CS cases.

95% of all custody cases are awarded to women in my state.

This one's the worst of them all, to me: After all of this, I am, in most of society's eyes, a deadbeat dad.

No, this one's the worst: They arbitrated CS from out of state for my wife, so she didn't even have to show up to the court date, but they won't do that for custody. I still haven't even seen my daughter. I learned her name (went from a classic "Julia" to "Aaliahya"..) when the policewoman served me CS papers and treated me like I was trash.

My wife, unemployed, living with mom, gets nothing but help and positivity and support. I'm a monster.

So, that's the story of how I die, apparently.

EDIT: wwell fuck I'm sitting here crying for the first time in.. I don't know.. I can't begin to tell you guys all how much this means to me. I've been living with this huge knot in my chest for close to 2 years and haven't told a soul because I was sure they'd call me weak or not a man or whatever I thought. Just thank you.

Thank you thank you thank you, all of you, so much. I promise this to each and every one of you guys: I will document this all. I will make a video detailing all of this, and I'll try to get in contact with some of the people which some of you guys have told me would be interested in the story. I'll plea my case in court before I commit to anything, and like one guy said, maybe jail isn't that bad.

Still wanna get married?

Still wanna bet "your life and everything in it" on the turn of a card in order to win "she gets a ring and a princess party, and you keep the relationship you have now"?

How many more corpses do you need to see?

Indifference and Control: Why You Don't Wanna Be Chad

743 upvotes | April 20, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

"Chad Thundercock", the metaphor for the man who never had to study game to be attractive, is often spoken of as a "natural", but he's not. There are no "naturals". We all emerged from a vagina naked and crying like a bitch, covered in goo and with no game whatsoever.

No, what Chad has isn't an instinctive understanding of game. Nor is it such manliness that he needs none, for again, there is no such thing. What Chad has is confidence, and abundance, and a host of other circumstances that lead to what define Chad: **Chad is a man whose life up to this point has made him relaxed and indifferent.**

Chad doesn't have clever techniques for making Katie attracted to him. Chad just doesn't give a shit, because if she isn't into him, he'll give Brittany a call. Or Karen. Chad doesn't have nerves of steel. He simply doesn't get approach anxiety, because not only is getting rejected no big deal to him, whether he is attractive isn't a big deal to him either. Women are like firewood to Chad... if you want some, it's lying around everywhere... just pick it up.

Indifference is the key element of most of the game we teach here on TRP, and Chad serves as a good exemplar of it. But **indifference game** is not the only type of game, this is where Chad gets in trouble, because **indifference game is the only kind of game Chad has.**

This is why you hear all the constant stories of super-alpha exemplar celebrity men being chewed up and spat out in divorce court. Pure indifference game is increasingly ineffective in relationships, and indifference is the only card Chad has to play.

Chad doesn't actually know what makes Katie tick, and has no idea how to get what he wants out of her. All he has going for him is the ability to easily next her for Brittany or Karen or Samantha or Kimiko. At first, this makes Katie run about desperately trying to figure out how to please him, which looks a lot of like he can get her to do what he wants. But he can't. *She* is doing it, because of his natural dread game, and the moment he enters a relationship, or otherwise makes a visible emotional investment in her, that power begins to fade.

Chad has no control game.

In fact, Chad doesn't even know he should be in control. Why would he know that? Women have always just *given him what he wanted* before. The whole concept of dominance, or even leverage, in a relationship is foreign to him, and he probably thinks it sounds slightly creepy. He thinks that women are generally biddable and easy to get along with, because cats always seem easy to get along with when you're holding a can of tuna.

Relationship game is control game. Because men are naturally protective of women, and women are not naturally protective of men, relationships are long-term viable to precisely degree that the man is in charge.

In initial contact with a woman, controlling behaviours appear weak, thirsty, needy, and creepy as fuck, and indifference behaviours appear relaxed, confident, and powerful. But as emotional investment visibly increases on both sides, indifference gradually begins to appear avoidant, unassertive, unconfident, passive-aggressive, and, you guessed it, creepy as fuck.

A certain point, you simply have to make your expectations clear to a woman, or she will believe you are afraid to. At a certain point, you have to be possessive, or she will believe you are afraid to. At a

certain point, you have to punish rather than ignore bad behaviour, or she will believe you are afraid to.

At a certain point, the best indifference game in the world will simply cause her to jump ship. This is why knowing that there is a time to invest, expect, and demand is the first step to being able to have an LTR.

We will address *how* to play the control game in further articles. But, first, you must understand that to every thing, there is a season, and that includes breaking the rules of indifference game to play control game instead.

Tears

1034 upvotes | May 27, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Last week Funsized showed up at my door crying.

Apparently, her aunt, who she was quite close to, even lived with for a year, had unexpectedly died. An accident of some kind.

As she proceeded to soak my shirt, I thought about how this is one of the most difficult trials for men who have not had the "red pill". Tears used as a weapon are bad enough for them, but genuine tears can be worse still. **Men instinctively know that we are to women as women are to children**, and so they feel responsible to do *something*, but they don't know what.

I knew what to do, of course.

I didn't say anything. I simply held onto her, let her cry, and didn't show any emotion myself (which was easy, because I felt none). After a little while, I gently pried her off me, got up, walked to my closet, and changed my shirt, then resumed my former position. "It was wet.", I said with a half smile.

"But what if I cry again?"

"Then I will eventually run out of shirts."

She began to giggle uncontrollably.

Men who are not in the know will try to cheer women up. This accomplishes nothing; it only focuses them on their grief and makes them more upset. It makes them insecure because it shows your weakness and neediness... you *need* to make her smile right away. You *need* to fix things. You regard her emotional upsets as a dark and terrible catastrophe you must "fix", rather than just the child being a child again.

Girls derive emotional comfort from masculine presence and masculine stability, not from flailing attempts to fix things.

Shut up. Be visibly calm. Be visibly patient. Act like it's no big deal.

Girls' emotions are far stronger and more volatile than yours (as anyone who has ever screwed up a post-cycle knows). They are scared of them. What they need from you is for you to be stable and not get sucked into the madness.

After a little while, she asked my permission to fly back to Texas for the funeral, which I gave, and if I could accompany her, which I refused.

"Standard travel rules apply."

"Yes, sir."

And that was that.

Control game is the game you play when you can no longer hide your emotional investment, and pretending to would simply appear as weakness.

The first rule of control game is that you must be visibly stable and in control of yourself. That which

moves her, must not move you.

Your Devotion is Worthless

907 upvotes | May 29, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Most men who fail with women, fail because they apply the "[Golden Rule](#)".

They treat women how they would wish to be treated, and, when they desire love, they act in a way that would inspire love in *them*. But men and women are different, and they want different things.

How you wish to be treated, women hate. And how women wish to be treated, you would hate.

The easiest way to understand how this is so, is to understand *why* this is so.

Many of you are in university right now, and some of you are nerds and will graduate with degrees in Computer Science, while others are losers and will graduate with degrees in Literature. Five years after that, you will have very different experiences.

The Literature graduates will be desperately looking for a job, any job, and worrying about the rent.

The CS graduates will be ducking phone calls and emails from Amardeep Nagpal, who wishes to advise them of much very fine opportunity to move to San Francisco and spend sixty hours a week coding javascript for some shitty startup's website for fifty bucks an hour. He also wants them to have a blessed day.

Now, the Lit guys would be thrilled to have a job come looking for them, and aren't going to understand that *software engineers loathe Amardeep for the same reason that women despise attention from most men*. It makes no difference to the engineers that Amardeep is very impressed with them, they get that every damn day. They are swimming in a sea of attention from the Amardeep Nagpals and Pritesh Krishnamurtis of this world. They hate them because San Francisco is a shit city, working sixty hours a week is a shit life, and fifty bucks an hour is a shit wage.

Men who court women by telling them how devoted they are making this same mistake... **men's devotion is worthless**, because girls have been swimming in a sea of constant male attention, love, and devotion since they were old enough to recognize emotions in other people. Offering them your love and devotion is like offering them plenty of air to breathe. They can get it anywhere. What they want isn't men who care, but men who are awesome.

- Do not offer women your devotion. Your devotion is worthless.
- Do not show them how deeply you care about your their feelings. *Everyone* cares about their feelings. Human beings are genetically hardwired to care about their feelings.
- Do not tell them about how awesome you will treat them. Everyone is nice to them. Human beings are genetically hardwired to be nice to them.
- Show them how awesome you *are*.

Men want to be treated awesome by someone okay. Girls want to be treated okay by someone awesome.

Plucked from AskTRP

44 upvotes | June 8, 2018 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I forget her actual number but I know it can be counted with just one hand. We're technically not exclusive, but *I've dropped my other plates just out of lack of desire for them now*, and she has made it abundantly clear that that I'm the only guy she's seeing. The sex happened pretty quickly but like I said, we have history and it just naturally turned into that.

This is what can be done with strong game.

Go Out and Test It.

400 upvotes | June 10, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Beware of **Scienceism**.

Okay, Whisper, what the fuck is "Scienceism"?

Scienceism is the cult surrounding scientific data, and the institutions and practitioners of science.

Are you trying to say that SCIENCE is a CULT?

Of course not. Science is one of the best things humanity ever invented. But it is a very small and simple thing. It consists only of...

This.

That's it, maybe with a few principles of experiment design thrown in for good measure.

So what are you calling a cult?

Scienceism. The practice of:

- Confusing scientific data with science itself.
- Quasi-patriotic displays of enthusiasm for this body of data as a manner of ritually establishing group identity.
- Revering professional practitioners of science as privileged arbiters of truth.
- Uncritical acceptance of the beliefs of scientists as established fact, without first making any demand for an understandable explanation, or a visible demonstration.
- Contempt for ad-hoc use of the scientific method by non-professionals, most often with accompanying accusations of insufficient experimental rigor or subject expertise.

Around now, you may be starting to think, "Hey, I've seen a lot of Scienceism in the world lately, especially in the news." Yeah.

- "97% of Climateologists say Global Warming is Here, it's Real, and it's a Threat to Us All."
- "Steven Hawking Says the Development of Strong AI Could Destroy Civilization."
- "New Medical Study Reveals Coffee is Better For You Than We Thought."
- "Nobel Prize Winning Economist Paul Krugman Says Trade Deficits Are Not the Enemy."

In each case, the scientist, researcher, or "expert" is being treated as a priest, who transmits revealed truth, rather than a teacher, who is supposed to explain why this is so, or an engineer, whose machine had better fucking work, or we are all going to laugh him off the stage.

The Scienceist may, in any case, be the scientist himself who demands unquestioning acceptance of his utterances, the reporter who only reads abstracts, or your aging hippie aunt who mails you links to articles in the Huffington Post about how going vegan will save the planet from... well... something. In any case, a Scienceist can be distinguished by the way he puffs up like a wet hen and clucks when you remain skeptical and ask to see the evidence for yourself.

Scienceists regard doing actual science in much the same way that medieval Catholics regarded bible study... laudable in principle, but in practice heretical for anyone but a priest operating under the most controlled and ritualized of conditions.

You can be pretty sure you are talking to a Scienceist if they:

- Cite a study to you without explaining in plain language how it worked, or what it is supposed to show.
- Call you a "Denier" of something rather than "Mistaken about this particular issue."
(Remember that science is not a personal identity.)
- Ask you what your relevant expertise is for disbelieving something, as if you needed permission to be a skeptic.
- Use the word "science" a lot in lieu of an actual argument, formed from a connected series of statements which explain a proposition.
- Avoid explaining the basis for their opinion by alleging that you lack the relevant expertise to understand it.
- Make general responses to the *tone* of things they disagree with (often using the word "anti-intellectual" a lot), rather than pointing out any specific false premise or error in reasoning .

Which brings us to our point.

Be a scientist, not a Scienceist.

Every major writer in TRP has told you time and time again to go out and practice this stuff, rather than simply reading about it. And this has been because it is important for you to be skilled, rather than merely know.

But it is also because it is important for you to **know from your own experience, rather than believe from faith in someone else's.**

Of course you're not a PhD. *Of course* you lack the resources to run a double-blind controlled study with a high sample size, or the mathematical knowledge to perform an ANOVA (both ways, please!) on the results. But **it is better to be the most imperfect, ad hoc, untrained, and informal of SCIENTISTS than it is to be the most devout and fanatical of SCIENCEISTS.**

For every writer here worth reading, everything we state with great confidence (because we have tested it our satisfaction) is meant to be a hypothesis to you. Which you not only may, but must, test to *your* satisfaction.

Otherwise, you don't know.

A Field Guide to Retarded Bullshit

66 upvotes | July 4, 2018 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Theres so much of information out there, so many gurus telling you to do 'X' so 'Y' will definitely happen. So many websites teaching you the behaviour of a High Value Woman... there is this one thing almost all the Gurus teach. "By not caring for the relationship, you hold the most power"... "Do not care, be busy, be high value" mantra is blatantly taught by all the big names (Brian Nox, even Sherry Argov... in their bestselling books.

Well, congratulations, lady, you just answered your own question.

In. Their. Bestselling. Books.

When you go to Brian Nox's website, [here](#) is the first thing you see. Scroll down a bit and you get to read this:

Some men are silly to say the least. They don't treat women with the respect they deserve in relationships, at work and even in their family lives. Sure, not all men are like this, but you might have noticed life is not always easy, as a woman.

I'm on a personal mission to change that. Being a man I get why men do what they do. Consider me your "insider" who is not afraid to share the truth about men and their 'interesting' behaviors. I share important strategies with women that will help them get what they deserve, in their love life, in their career, wherever they need it.

Yeah, right. Mr. Brian Nox, your personal white knight, is going to *treat you with the respect you deserve*, by giving you inside information on how *men are silly* and what you should do to get *everything you deserve* from them.

Just click here to buy his book.

I swear, if I ever get sick enough of working for a living to be willing to sacrifice my self-respect, I will take a fifty milligram dose of ondansetron hydrochloride, and start penning "*Coughing Up The Red Pill: How I Rejected Misogyny and Discovered Women are Wonderful*", full of every platitude I can think of about how women are perfect, how anything they do wrong is men's fault, how they deserve a Nobel Prize and a Congressional Medal of Honor just for breathing, and how it is morally imperative that every man they encounter should devote his entire existence to satisfying their every whim, but never dare to speak in their presence unless given permission.

Then I will buy a small Caribbean island, have a palace built on it, and never do any work again, unless flinging the ice from my martini glass off the balcony counts as "watering the lawn".

Because hordes of women will buy enough copies to kill a small forest, then read the first three chapters and collapse on the sofa in a drugged-out stupor of ego-gratification, oblivious to the babble of daytime television or the fact that their bag of potato chips has spilled into their unwashed hair.

In case my real point isn't totally fucking obvious, **anyone who makes money giving women relationship advice is really being paid to tell women what they want to hear.**

It must be quite tough to be a woman sometimes (and here I am no longer being sarcastic), because

women are constantly surrounded by a perfect storm of misinformation, blowing from overprotective busybodies, and dudes who will say anything if they think they'll get laid.

Let's face it: **If good relationship advice for women affirmed what they already wanted to hear, they wouldn't need any. They'd already know it.**

All growth, by definition, happens outside your comfort zone. This is common sense. If you want better results than you have ever had, you are going to have to learn things you have never known, think things you have never thought, and try things you have never done.

If advice tastes good on your tongue, spit it out. It's full of sugar and it will make you fat.

Anyone can make long lists of what they they deserve, and seek out people they can pay to agree with them. But if you think you deserve something, and the world isn't offering it to you, then it has a different opinion of what you deserve.

And you can work hard to change yourself, or you can pay people to tell you the world is mistaken. Guess which one of these will get you what you want?

The Cult of "Self-Esteem"

65 upvotes | July 7, 2018 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

A while back, some revolutionary thinker in the field of psychology noticed that *some people think that they are pretty cool, and others don't*. This astonishing revelation was heralded by trumpet fanfare and a new fad sweeping the psychological community (which should tell you something about the average intellectual calibre of that profession).

Today, while the professionals have largely moved on to other, even stupider, things, this concept has lingered on in the popular concept of what psychology is, largely because it is easy to grasp, easy to explain things with, and impossible to predict anything with and thereby be proven wrong. This allows otherwise useless people to feed themselves by writing articles for Cosmo, and people who know nothing about anything to sound smarter than they are during casual conversation.

And where you encounter the words "self-esteem", you almost invariably encounter the word "women".

In fact, aliens reading random samples of earth's modern printed material could be forgiven for mistakenly thinking that "women's self-esteem" was our most precious resource, which we use to catalyze working nuclear fusion reactors, or distill to cure cancer, or something.

In fact, a lot of humans, who live on earth and should know better, seem to believe this as well. It always makes me smile when I am accused by some outraged feminist or tradcon, of "trying to lower women's self-esteem", often with the codicil "so they will be easy prey for men". (*At which point she glances backwards to find a soft spot, faints dramatically, smelling salts are fetched, and a good time is had by all.*)

Technically, of course, they are absolutely right. What they, and pretty much anyone else, have never thought about, however, is a simple question: **What makes everyone so sure that having the highest possible self-esteem is good for you?**

No one ever explained that to you, did they? They just took it as their starting point. *Obviously* a high self-esteem is good, and a higher self-esteem is better, so here's how you go about convincing yourself that you are best thing evaaar.

Well, yes, this *is* obvious, and like about 50% of obvious things, it's also dead wrong.

If you look at successful and happy people, you'll find they all have high self-esteem. That's why people are tempted to conclude that high self-esteem makes you successful and happy. This, of course, is backwards. Being happy and successful gives you high self-esteem, and it doesn't work the other way at all.

When you start to think about it this way, it becomes clear. This girl obviously thinks she's beautiful, because she has access to a mirror, and her eyes work. But if this ... whatever that is... believes the same thing, will she be happy?

She will persistently wonder why nothing ever seems to work out like she expects.

In practice, self-esteem is not like wealth (more is better), but like insulin: Too little will hurt you, but so will too much.

We live in a society and era where the male ego is systematically starved (and then called "fragile" when it exhibits signs of that starvation), while the female ego is fed, and fed, and then force-fed

some more with a tube down its throat as if we were trying to produce *foie gras*. This means that, while both too much *or* too little self-worth is bad for both men and women, **the most common self-esteem problem that women face is "having too much of it"**.

This leads women to chronic disappointment, envy of others, and most importantly, to making really bad moves in their efforts to get and keep the best relationship they can.

In my next article here, we'll discuss how to detect low and high self-esteem problems.

You Don't Need a Wife, Just a Blowjob.

513 upvotes | July 17, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

[/u/conflagratorX](#) asks:

I am wondering why there is so much contempt for {tradcon pundit}. The only difference between {tradcon pundit} and TRP is that {tradcon pundit} thinks current civilization can revert back to traditional values while TRP prefer to enjoy the decline. Not everyone is cynical and nihilistic enough to enjoy the decline while almost every men can benefit from other TRP concepts. Why making so much fuss about guy whose core concepts align with TRP?

I've been asked this fair amount... "What the hell do you have against Tradcons, Whisper? Why not stop the decline instead of just learning to prosper within it?"

Since we've already had enough ragebait and shit tests to smoke out the cucks among us, we'll just talk about the answers.

1. Their utopia is not your utopia.
2. They lost the fight, why would you think they'll win the rematch?
3. Tradconism was destroyed by a non-reversible process.
4. They're not offering to save society for you. They're demanding you save it for their kids.

So, to lump it all together, **they want you in a fight you can't win, against a foe you can't defeat, for a prize you don't want, in a future you will never live to see.**

I'll give them credit for a nice sales pitch, though.

Their utopia is not your utopia.

The reason that tradcon societies are so economically successful in general is that they hitch the wagon of productivity to the strongest horse there is... the male sex drive. Civilization itself was, after all, built by dudes trying to get laid. If men have to be financially successful to get laid, they have to work hard and be productive. That's great for society, and great for women... but for you? Are you really that sure you want the price of pussy raised?

How thirsty would you have to be to consider marrying a woman you hadn't fucked yet? (Especially in a society that expected monogamy of you.)

Remember that Baby Boomer men *enthusiastically helped to dismantle the tradcon way of life*. If marriage was so great for them, why did they kick over the traces for the vague promise of some hairy free-love snatch?

Which brings us to...

They lost the fight, why would you think they'll win the rematch?

Tradconism pays lip-service respect to men, rather than insulting them, but remember that it, too, is in service to the female imperative. Instead of helping men to overcome and control their protective instinct towards women, it plays to that instinct, and raises men who are slaves to it.

This is why feminism ate tradcon's lunch. Feminism is nothing, after all, but a massive exploitation of the male protective instinct. Chivalry-type polkamans will always be weak to girl-type polkamans. Especially when their victory condition is unattainable because...

Tradconism was destroyed by a non-reversible process.

Nuff said.

They're not offering to save society for you. They're demanding you save it for their kids.

Anytime someone comes to you with a plan for society, there is always a price to pay. If they don't tell you upfront *who will pay*, and *how much it will cost*, then the answers are *you*, and *a whole hell of a lot*, respectively.

Are tradcons going to smooth the way for you by abolishing alimony and no-fault divorce, banning abortion or legalizing paternal severance, getting young women to marry at 16 before going to college? Are they going to restore fatherhood as a position of respect and veneration? Are they going to take ANY action to eliminate any of the risks and drawbacks of marriage and raising children?

No, they want *YOU* to do that work starting the crusade yourself. They want you to dive on the grenade so that the next generation of *their* kids can reap the benefits created by the survivors.

They can't fix western civilization in time to make a difference in *your* life. *You* are going to live the rest of your life in Upside Down Clown World.

What they want is for you to stop trying to make the best of it and start taking a bullet for the same western civilization that abandoned you.

What they promise will happen might sound wonderful to you, if you are thirsty enough to trade your glorious freedom to game sluts for a lifetime of guaranteed starfish sex and nagging... but the tradcon "return to traditional values" is no more a real prospect for improving your existence than the "pie in the sky when die" offered by Christians, or communist's glorious utopia of the proletariat.

That's why I'm not telling you a plan, and not recruiting you for a movement. I do not have a glorious vision of hope to sell you. I am not asking for your trust. If I met you in person, I would eat your lunch and steal your girl. I am telling you that you are on your own. **The only person with your best interests at heart is you.**

Don't get suckered.

Distrust that Particular Flavour

832 upvotes | August 15, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I'm here today to talk about the blue pills.

Note the plural.

It's easy enough now to understand what many people call "THE" blue pill, especially since others have done all the hard work for you. Just read the sidebar. What's harder to come by is an understanding of just how those others came to say those things, and how that might apply to other things.

Grasping the truth about women and sex is one thing. Grasping the truth about grasping the truth is quite another.

But does anyone out there think that women are the only thing in life you've been lied to about? There are many, many Blue Pills in life, and nobody's going to make a discussion group for each and every one. So without the ability to do what others did, the ability to *spot blue pills yourself* instead of merely understanding someone who points them out to you, you're going to remain vulnerable to a lot of nonsense of all sorts.

Now, it's easy enough to see a lie when you already know the truth. And it's easy enough to discern lies when you can test a proposition for yourself. But that doesn't cover all of reality. How can you avoid being bluepillled when you don't have the resources to test, or access to the data, and can only hear what others tell you about it?

When you can't find out the truth, you need to *learn to spot the lie by its own characteristics*. That won't tell you what the truth is, of course, but it will tell you when to be skeptical, and suspicious. Lies have distinguishing features.

Blue pills have an aftertaste. Learn to distrust that particular flavour.

A selection from Whisper's ~~bullshit~~ blue pill detection tools:

- **Lies are told by those who want them believed.** *Be suspicious if the person telling you a thing profits from you believing that thing, or learned it from someone who profits from you believing that thing.*
- **Truth can be observed many times from the universe, but lies spread from their authors.** *Be suspicious if every person who tells you an idea uses the same words. Odds are they all heard it from each other.*
- **Lies are told to get you to do something.** *Be suspicious if the man telling you something to believe also has something he wants you to do because of that.*
- **People are defensive about lies.** *Be suspicious if proponents of a narrative get mad that you don't believe them.*
- **Liars hate the burden of evidence, and want to shift it.** *Be suspicious of any speaker who demands justification for your skepticism.*
- **Liars don't like competition.** *Be suspicious of anyone who tries to silence other narratives, instead of ignoring or criticizing them.*
- **Profitable things justify investment.** *If someone is spending a lot of money to spread a story,*

be suspicious. They expect to profit from that investment.'

- **People tend to believe what they want the truth to be, but the universe is perverse.** *Be suspicious if a story contains no bad news. Since when did the universe become friendly to our desires?*
- **Liars love language.** *Those who have no evidence can't show you anything... they have only words. Be suspicious of anyone who tries to change the words you use... they are trying to influence how you think. (Thanks, [/u/Heathcliff--](#))*
- **Liars rely on reverence.** *If you're afraid to have your story questioned, you attach it to the coattails of that which it is socially unacceptable to question. This might be JESUS (as opposed to just the moral traditions of our culture) in some communities and SCIENCE! (as opposed to just plain old science) in others. Remember that liars want to stop the argument, not settle it.*
- **Liars make compound assertions.** *Be suspicious of someone who doesn't want to let you pick and choose what to believe from his story. Anyone can start with an obviously true statement, but truth is not contagious. It doesn't infect the rest of this narrative.*

You can sample any story, from religion to late-night television commercials, from these characteristic tastes, and for others like them. But even more important is the process of tasting again to find them in *what you already believe*. The lies you never notice are the ones that hurt you the most. Learn to recognize the distinguishing smells of a lie in the things you know to be lies. Then look for them elsewhere.

Remember that skepticism is free.

The Second Fundamental Skill

433 upvotes | August 31, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

There are two fundamental skills that one must have in order to thrive. The first, *distinguishing truth from falsehood*, we have already talked about some:

https://old.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/97f0kh/distrust_that_particular_flavour/

https://old.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/8pz9m3/go_out_and_test_it/

... and will talk about more in the future. The second is the *skill of learning new skills*.

Skills are the path to pretty much anything you want which is at all possible. When you know *what to learn* (by distinguishing truth from falsehood), and you know *how to learn*, you always have a way to work towards your goals.

Learning important things is hard, because if learning a thing is easy, everyone already knows how to do it, so it's not that important. *We distinguish ourselves from others by learning hard skills*. And when we say "hard skills", we mean "hard to learn", because any skill becomes easier to perform the better one learns to perform it.

So how does learning work?

- There are three distinct types of learning: **Education**, **Practice**, and **Training**.
- They don't substitute for each other; learning requires all three.
- Although they do overlap some, they are stages, and they need to happen in order.
- Learning a skill can be one big Education-Practice-Training sequence, but it usually also has lots of little ones inside it.

Now, everyone here knows that:

- **EDUCATION** is the process of transferring knowledge from an external source into you. (The source can be a book, another person, a video, just going out and looking at something directly, performing science experiments, whatever.) Knowledge of a subject is not performance of a skill, but no one can perform a skill unless they first know what they are supposed to be doing.

So what are practice and training, and how are they different?

- **PRACTICE** is the act of attempting to perform a skill, observing the results of the attempt, and correcting the performance according to the observation. This *try-observe-correct-try* cycle is called a **feedback loop**. It is the presence of this feedback loop which distinguishes practice from education. Generally the faster this loop can be run, the more cycles you can complete, and the more effective your practice time will be at improving your skill.
- **TRAINING** is the process of inducing a stress to stimulate an adaptive response. (If this doesn't sound familiar to you, then do you even lift, bro?) When a skill can be performed correctly and reliably in *practice*, a stress is introduced into that performance to induce an adaptation to that stress. (If you can perform a squat correctly with an empty bar, add some weight to it. If you can reliably hit 10 out of 10 shots from prone at 300 yards, do it against a 60 second time limit.)

The difference between practice and training is that practice uses a *feedback loop* to *teach an action*, while training uses an *induced stress* to *modify the performance* of an already-practiced action.

So, when we want to learn properly, we:

- First **educate** ourselves so we know what a performance of the action should look like.
- Then we **practice** the action, focusing on using *feedback* (the quicker the better) to make the action *correct*, not on the difficulty or challenge of the practice task.
- Last, when we can do the action reliably and correctly, we **train** by adding some stress to that performance in order to be able to do it under those conditions: faster, heavier, under less favorable conditions, while balancing a ball on your nose, whatever. Just remember that adapting to one stress adapts you to that stress, not necessarily others.
- This is the cycle. We run big cycles of this, and smaller cycles inside that. But practice must be informed by education, and training must be enabled by practice.

So what happens to people who don't do this?

- Your kid brother who tried to "learn MMA" by putting on some boxing gloves and duking it out in the backyard with his friends was *training without practice or education*. He got faster and smoother at doing the wrong thing, perhaps, but can't really fight.
- If he hung a heavy bag and hit that a bunch first, before he progressed to brawling, then he was *practicing without education*, and things were much the same.
- The guy who thinks he can fight because he watches a whole bunch of professional MMA matches and knows what all the moves are is *educated without being practiced or trained*, and can't punch his way out of a wet paper bag.
- That strip mall karate school guy who can do elaborate forms but can't fight is *educated and practiced, but not trained*. He has not introduced stress into his learning process, so his skill performance falls apart under stress.
- That wannabe tough guy who starts fighting smoker matches when has only been boxing for four months is *training without enough practice*. He knows what a good punch looks like, what good footwork looks like, but it all falls apart in the ring, because he hasn't practiced it enough, and the level of stress he is inducing is too high, too fast.

So how do we learn?

- Pursue the steps in order.
- Any time you are learning, know which one you are doing: educating yourself, practicing, or training.
- Focus on what is needed for the step you are doing:
 - When educating yourself, focus on gaining a mental understanding of the proper way to do things. *It doesn't matter that you can't do it yet.*
 - When practicing, focus on creating a tight feedback loop so you can correct your technique. The quicker and better your feedback, the more effective your practice will be. *Do not induce stress by trying to make things more "realistic" or by "practicing a harder thing". You are trying to be correct, not fast, smooth, or awesome.*
 - When training, focus on adapting what you already know to a new level of pressure. *Do not try new shit you haven't practiced first.*

- Don't make the "coward error" of educating forever to avoid practice, or practicing forever to avoid training. You will never learn.
- Don't make the "showoff error" of jumping right to practice without education, or training right away without practice. You will think you look awesome, but you will continue to suck.
- When you change what you are doing, jump back to a previous stage. Never try to learn something new under stress if you can avoid it.

Think about what you are doing, and you will get better faster.

Instant Gratification

620 upvotes | September 4, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I'm eating a burger as I write this.

It's a pretty good burger... 50/50 wagyu and elk, duck bacon, mozzarella cheese, some kinda spicy barbeque sauce but not nasty and sugary like southern style, more southwestern. Bun's a tasteless disappointment of gluten-free "bread", but that's hardly anyone's fault other than my own digestive system.

Nicest thing about it is that someone brought it to my door. I just clicked some things on the internet and someone brought me food, and I can concentrate on writing weird stuff for you deranged monkey boys instead of driving my ass downtown or even talking on the phone with some minimum-wage retard who doesn't speak American.

So why the fuck am I writing an article about my lunch? Have I finally lost the plot? Am I about to start taking restaurant selfies and posting them on instabook or facegram?

Nah.

I'm talking about food (and more importantly, food delivery), because last time I talked to ya'll, about something a little more fundamental, a sizeable number of people choose to "agree" with me by recapitulating the Yorkshiremen Sketch, like this:

| A large problem with today's society is we're a bunch of wanters. Everything is so instant...messaging, food, online shopping.

...

| Instant gratification is the death of character, and self respect.

...

| Indeed. You become addicted to gratification.

This shit is eternal. Every time society starts working right, or simply hasn't stopped working yet, technology advances. And every time technology advances, old farts decide that young people have it "too easy", and either it's going to ruin them, or it already has. I'm sure that at some moment in prehistory, Angrinak thought that Tholo was ruining his character by hunting aurochs with these fancy new Clovis points.

So I'm here, having polished off my instant-gratification-and-duck-bacon burger, to rant at you why, yes, there IS something wrong with young dudes right now (as if we would be here if there weren't), but, no Dr. Van Winkle, your diagnosis is not correct.

The average timid, depressed millennial who limps into TRP looking to fix his life has not been broken by the presence of instant gratification, but by the absence of non-instant gratification.

Saaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaay whut? Whisper, you just said the same thing twice!

No, I didn't.

It doesn't matter that I can make someone bring me lunch right away so I can write. What matters is

that I have things to work on that are neither so easy that I can succeed instantly, nor so hard that I cannot ever conquer them. Real goals that require long term work give life what most people call "meaning", although it can be better described as a sense of achievement.

It doesn't matter whether the average millennial can summon lunch with one click, or images of naked nymphs with another. He's not depressed, hopeless and ineffectual because everything is too easy. If everything were too easy, he would be getting a lot more things... easily.

No, his problem is that *he doesn't believe in his ability to succeed at difficult tasks eventually*. If his initial effort doesn't lead to success, he doesn't give up to avoid hard work... he gives up in the belief that hard work would yield him nothing. He's not being lured away from real girls by images of naked sluts... he's using the images of naked sluts to anesthetize his feelings of hopelessness of ever succeeding with the real girls.

How did we get this way?

Well, to grossly oversimplify, around about the mid-1970s, a bunch of middle-aged harpies with PhDs in Education (from the French "Edu", meaning "like psychology", and "cation", meaning "but with even more bullshit"), decided that there was a thing called "self-esteem", that "self-esteem" was really important for children to have, that constant praise and celebration of everything about them would bolster children's "self-esteem", and that failure would damage or destroy it. So they adjusted public school practices, and "expert" advice to young parents, accordingly.

Well, it turns out that scienceism isn't just dumb... it's dangerous. Consider the work of this negligent mass-murderer, for example.

And so, like so many of the projects of scienceists and ivory-tower intellectuals, the action they took achieved the exact opposite of the intended effect. Each succeeding generation of young children, constantly praised, and sheltered from any difficult task which might lead to failure, did *not* develop a high self-esteem. They hated their participation trophies, they knew their accomplishments amounted to nothing, and yet they were terrified to try anything difficult, because all of their young lives, they had been **graded on avoiding failure**.

Self-reliance (a very different thing from self esteem) **in adulthood comes from the repeated experience in childhood of trying a difficult thing, and succeeding through sustained effort.**

Without this experience early on, the later adult will be very afraid to try new things, believing failure to be both inevitable and permanent. This continues the pattern of deprivation of challenge, and lack of self-reliance.

Thus, the problem we see is not one of general excess and abundance, but of specific scarcity and starvation in the very midst of that excess.

Ditch the Resume

65 upvotes | September 18, 2018 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

One of the most common mistakes both men and women make when trying to attract the opposite sex is *projection*.

Men who don't understand women will woo them with displays of devotion and declarations of passion (and come off appearing pathetic rather than attractive), because they think what *men* want is simply what *people* want.

And women who do not understand men will attempt to increase their allure by making a show of confidence they don't feel, and "playing hard to get" with a show of challenging aloofness, because they think what *women* want is simply what *people* want.

When women have significant academic or career accomplishments, they tend to fall into a particular example of this trap... *assuming that men care, or should care, what they have accomplished*. This can take the form of "*resume courtship*" (attempting to appeal to men by showing or speaking of accomplishments or capabilities), attempting to attract a man's attention by competing with him (a real turnoff), or even *actually becoming angry* that men do not value her small business, her executive title, or her PhD.

This is a form of projection. While **women use a man's accomplishments to evaluate his character, but men do not...** they have other ways to do that which they prefer.

Why?

Simple. Because *men like young women*. A 21 year old cannot meaningfully be evaluated by asking "Does she have a PhD in philosophy?", because no 21 year old does. A man who wishes to court her must find other ways of evaluating if she is intelligent enough to understand the world around her, a good conversationalist, and possessed of a sense of curiosity. He cannot simply ask "has she built a business from the ground up?" because she won't have done that, either... he must find other ways to evaluate if she resourceful, self-disciplined, and capable of sticking to a goal.

So, you might think that if you have a PhD, and your husband has a PhD, your PhD matters to him... but it doesn't. It didn't make him pick you. What made him pick you was the traits that enabled you to get it, coupled with the fact that he ran into you in that environment because you were there in the first place... that's how you met.

To understand this, it helps to hear a tale I was once told by a sports reporter. Apparently, the athletes' village at each olympic games is the site of a great deal of promiscuity. (Anyone surprised? Didn't think so.) But apparently the dynamic shifts as the games wear on, and more and more events are completed. As event results come in, female athletes begin to display a marked preference for male *medalists*. (Anyone surprised? Didn't think so.) But the instructive part is that the males do *not* display a corresponding preference. Female olympic athletes are highly desirable because they are pretty, healthy, energetic, and vital... but *it doesn't make a damn bit of difference whether they won or not*. The losers are still all of these things, and the men still seek them out.

The takeaway looks like this:

- Men don't care about your victories, only the traits you used to get them.
- Men don't use your victories to measure your traits or character.

- Never expect a man to love you for your accomplishments, you will be disappointed.
- Never build a resume for the sake of attracting a man. Only do it if you want it for some other reason.
- Never assume you are unable to attract a high-status man because you lack the accomplishments of other women in his life. All you need is the combination of traits he desires.

How Many Women?

85 upvotes | October 1, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Kitten is still struggling to come to terms with having to share my attention with FunSize, not to mention the occasional plate. FunSize, of course, is experienced at this, and has no issues, but Kitten feels threatened by her very presence, and won't talk to her for long enough to bond and stop seeing her as a threat.

Since Kitten is actually Dr. Kitten, PhD, she likes to intellectualize things that upset her, thinking about them in abstract terms rather than as they relate to her personally. This gives her emotional distance so she can cope. So the other day (I actually started writing this sometime back, so it was a while ago now), she hits me with this question:

"How does polygamy [by which she means polygyny] fit into evo psych? How did monogamy [by which she means monogyny] form?"

Fleshing out the gist of my answer into a complete description for TRP:

Polygyny is a mating strategy optimized for replacing combat losses, because one man can easily keep multiple women pregnant. It's used by warlike societies, or those with high male-specific mortality rates.

Monogyny is a mating strategy optimized for appeasing low-tier males, because it guarantees them a mate. It's used by peaceful societies which depend on beta male labour and cooperation for their prosperity.

Polygyny's effect upon the Sexual Marketplace is to increase the availability of apex males.

This benefits:

[Read the rest on trp.red...](#)

Whisper's Comprehensive Guide to the Shit Test

200 upvotes | October 12, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

What is a shit test?

Female attractiveness is clearly obvious to even the most casual of observers. Beauty, femininity, and approachability, the three pillars of female SMV, are all on display in any girl you can see, hear, and speak with.

Male attractiveness, being basically a rubric for "how useful would this guy be during a riot or zombie apocalypse?", is less evident from casual interaction. While muscularity can be seen, wits, nerve, resourcefulness, persistence, and other behavioural qualities cannot.

Men can passively observe attractiveness, but girls must actively probe for it.

Enter the **shit test**, wherein a girl gives a man a hard time ("some shit") to see how well he copes with it. This takes a number of different forms, and can be at pretty much any level of intensity, but if a girl suddenly does something that **seems intended to bother you, and is totally unprovoked**, you can be pretty sure you're being shit-tested.

This is generally an indicator of interest (IOI). If a girl cares how attractive you are, it's usually because she is considering mating with you, consciously or not. Successfully pass a shit test, and she will feel more attracted to you. Fail it, and she'll feel less.

[Read the full guide](#) at **TRP.red**.

Hypergamy is Monogamy

262 upvotes | December 9, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Dr. Kitten, PhD, is a useful girl to have around. Studying mainstream western psychology may have taught her all the wrong answers, but it did give her a certain facility with asking the right questions, and understanding the answers without too much difficulty.

The other day she laid this one on me:

“If there’s just a few men who all the women are attracted to, and the rest just get ignored...”

(Jealous as she is of FunSize, FanGirl, and whatever plates she might find out about, she has to admit she’d rather share my attention than have any of the various guys who have proposed to her all to herself.)

“... then is that true of women as well? Are there apex women who all the men want instead of anyone else? And what are they like? How do they get there?”

The answer, of course, is “No.”

Hypergamy is the reason, and it’s much talked about, but rarely understood. Most people think it just means “women are cheaters with an inherent tendency to trade up”.

If you think that, you missed the whole point. **Hypergamy actually happens because women are monogamous, and men aren’t.**

Here’s how it works:

([Full article on trp.red](#))

The Zeroth Law of Power

222 upvotes | January 28, 2019 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Ultimately, the Red Pill is about winning. Certainly, it was invented to be nothing but a pool of observations and speculations about what really is, but the reason we care about this shit is so we can get what we want.

Knowledge is important because knowledge is power.

And we can read the 48 Laws of Power for some valuable suggestions on how to attain and wield power. But what about knowledge about power? Surely that is the most powerful of all. What are the underlying principles upon which power is based, and with which it can be analyzed and understood?

Examine this possibility:

The Zeroth Law of Power: In any interaction, power is held in inverse proportion to need. He who needs the least from an interaction has the most power within it.

When we try thinking this way, we can see arguments, negotiations, and power struggles in a whole new light.

[Full text on trp.red](#)

You NEED to Stick Your Head in this Bucket. RIGHT NOW.

145 upvotes | February 15, 2019 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Sooner or later, someone is going to walk up to you with a bucket, and somewhat breathlessly explain how you urgently need to stick your head in it.

It might have any number of different labels on it. “Jesus”, perhaps. Or “philosophy”. Or “psychotherapy”, “socialism”, “functional programming”, or “steroids”, or “veganism” or “nofap” or “The Red Pill”, or “LSD”, or “mysticism”.

They’ll explain how inside the bucket is a wonderful enlightening experience that will change your view of the universe... and having already stuck their own heads there, they certainly seem to believe it. But is that a slightly glazed look in their eyes?

If we look at this problem in a naive, simplified-math-game-theory way, it’s insoluble. Before you stick your head in the bucket, you don’t know what’s inside. And afterwards, if indeed you do, you don’t know if you have truly gained meaningful enlightenment, or simply been practiced upon.

But the world, fortunately for us, isn’t actually that simple. It’s full of *other people*...

[Full text on the parent site.](#)

Always Be Sure to Tie a Live Duck to Your Right Ankle.

96 upvotes | March 29, 2019 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Whhhhhhhhaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaat?

Exactly.

That's the experience of reading some of these questions. I'll be skimming along, yes, okay, dead bedroom, trying to do better, been reading RPW for a few weeks/months, boyfriend is like this, she is like that, yeah, yeah, looks familiar... and then, suddenly:

I've been trying to improve. Every day I tie a live duck to my right ankle, just like the red pill advises. It's hard, but I'm getting used to the quacking now. He doesn't seem to like it, though.

... or something only slightly less ridiculous.

What?

The red pill advises *whatnow*?

When did I write this? When did any EC write this, here or on TRP? Who wrote this? How on earth did you come to think this was any part of red pill advice?

As if we didn't already know.

Some of y'all been going to university, and listening to the freshman in the back of the class, who's straight out high school, instead of to the professor's lecture.

Example:

Our relationship has worked up to this point because I worked the RedPill and part of this included hiding my fetishes with him so I would appear to be a quality woman.

This poor girl somehow got confused, listened to the newcomers in the cheap seats, thought it was redpilled advice because it was a comment on RPW, and thought that:

- Quality women don't have fetishes (What?)
- Quality women lie to their spouses. (Seriously?)
- Lying and hiding information from a man helps him to be a good and effective leader. (No. Just... no.)
- You can white-knuckle your way through life suppressing your own needs (I'll pass, thanks.)

RPW is no different than every other place in the human sphere... it's fulla people who love to hear themselves talk. Some of those advice comments are coming from people who just showed up here yesterday, and have never had a successful relationship in their lives. It's kinda dumb for them to be pontificating, but the mod team's not gonna ban them all, because that's like trying to hold back a glacier, and, hey, they need to learn, too.

So be careful who you listen to.

We invented the EC tag system to make this easier on you. There are some people you know you can

rely on, with big, easy to read stamps on them for your convenience. The mods have vetted them for a long time, to make sure they know what they are talking about, and continue to watch them to make sure quality stays high. (Yes, tags have been yanked in the past, for bad advice, or losing the trust of the community).

Others, you might wanna ask yourself if what you just heard is really in line with the way we try to build healthy relationships.

And if you're trying some principle that just isn't working out for you no matter how hard you try, try asking yourself if that's really something we actually teach... or you just picked up that impression from somewhere.

And for god's sake, don't hide your kinks from your husband. (Eyeroll.)

How Do I Use This Thing?

64 upvotes | April 23, 2019 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/918>

The Why of Feminism

187 upvotes | May 18, 2019 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/926>

Chad, Dylan, and the Myth of "the Bad Man"

29 upvotes | July 24, 2019 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I recently read a neat little send-up of how some men use feminism or the appearance of sensitivity and allegiance to women's concerns as a sexual strategy, using a character "Dylan" as a concrete stereotype. While it was cleverly written, and certainly describes a thing, there was something slightly... off... about it.

Damseling.

"Oh, woe is women's lot! All these different evil men are always trying different evil strategies to get them into bed! How could they despoil these helpless creatures who have no will or judgment of their own? How dare they pursue their own objectives in life, rather than making sure women get what they want instead? How dare they coerce women into deviant sex acts by making noises with their mouths?"

Now, some women who object to Chad and Dylan may need a fainting couch and some ammonia salts, while others may just be a bit disapproving, but they would both be making the same mistake. What mistake? Sorting men into "good" and "bad" men, and believing that their lives will be made happy by seeking out the former and shunning the latter.

Women, however, are not endowed with any special powers of moral perception, nor with any sort of divine ability to sort the evil men from the good ones. And even were they equipped to do so, there are plenty of good men who make terrible relationship partners.

In order to be successful in love, a women must understand the difference between the concepts of "good" and "good for me", and realize that only one is in play in relationships.

Any man you date will appear bad or good to you depending on how closely the way he treats you aligns with your goals for the relationship. But since the way he treats you will always align with his own relationship goals, **a man will appear bad or good to you depending upon how closely his relationship goals align with yours.**

If you are left-leaning college girl who wants to party, have fun, get a lot of attention, and have a lot of orgasms, then Dylan will be a godsend. If you are a Christian-with-capital-C girl who wants to be in a committed relationship before she graduates, get married right afterwards, then stay at home raising four children while her husband supports her, then Dylan will appear to be the devil himself.

And that girl's ideal mate (let's call him Alan) will appear to another girl to be a raging asshole because he wants to take away her career, turn her into a brood mare, trap her at home with a herd of brats, and prevent her from wearing skirts that show her (gasp!) ankles.

The most saintly man in the world might be a terrible partner for you if you're into rough kinky sex and he absolutely refuses to choke a bitch. A complete cad to others might be a wonderful husband if he wants the same things out of life you do, and you are Bonnie to his Clyde.

The same thing is true for men. The same sentence might sound to two different men like "I love you so much that I want to bear your heirs and care for them with all my love" ... or "I love you so much that I want to create a screaming, expensive homunculus, and prioritize it above you in all things for the rest of your life".

Depending on whether or not he wants kids.

Shared goals are one of the three elements of a successful relationship (along with mutual attraction and shared values), and so, to be successful in relationships, **you need to know what your real relationship goals are, and to be able to figure out what those of the men you date are.**

This is less simple than it sounds, because people lie all the time, both to themselves and others, about what they want, and what will make them happy. You can't just take his word for it, or even your own.

But the task is made possible at all when you realize that goal alignment is not the same as morality, and that the second is not necessary or even sufficient for the first. **Analyzing someone's morality is idle coffee-shop chatter; analyzing his goals tells you if he is right for you.**

Don't fall for "natural".

208 upvotes | September 10, 2019 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So someone asked how, if femininity was hard to achieve for some women, could it really be "natural".

Nothing we do in our lives is "natural". Natural is hunting and gathering. Natural is sleeping under a tree. Natural is being constantly pregnant between the ages of 11 and 35. Natural is dying in your thirties of rotten teeth. In short, natural, the way modern people use the word, is what happens if you don't do something to oppose entropy.

So do not mistake natural for good, healthy, or desirable.

You are not trying to live as you would in the natural state of humanity... you are trying to do far, far better than that. Doing far, far, better than that is why humans invented civilization and technology in the first place. We are trying to improve our lives over the state of "natural".

When you shave your legs, you are not just imitating a young, healthy, high-estrogen girl's pale, fine, and less-visible leg hair... you are exaggerating it. When I lift heavy barbells, I am not simply imitating the effects of high natural testosterone, I am greatly exceeding them. A house built of timber and drywall isn't a substitute for a shade tree on the African savannah, or a cave... it is a vast improvement upon it. Willow bark is natural. Ibuprofen is not. Guess which one works better?

The history of human civilization is nothing but the story of how humans tried to improve upon nature... and usually succeeded. This required effort. This required humans to leave their comfort zone, and do things they had not tried before. This required the willingness to plan, try, fail, plan again, and try again.

If you don't want to cultivate those things, then the notion that everything worth doing should be "natural" will seem very tempting. But this is just wishful thinking. If improvement were easy, it would not be considered improvement, because everyone would already have done it.

You're going to have to work.

Giant Heads

138 upvotes | November 17, 2019 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1058>

How to GET RICH OVERNIGHT with this one simple trick (Employers hate it!)

214 upvotes | January 22, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1081>

How to NOT argue with feminists.

265 upvotes | February 10, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1088>

How to be a Skeptical Bastard

174 upvotes | April 14, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1153>

Situational Metagame

83 upvotes | June 4, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1221>

Muscle Men, Intellectuals, and the Perpetual Student

219 upvotes | July 9, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1252>

Persuasion and the Modular Mind

28 upvotes | August 8, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1269>

No Means No Means ... What?

38 upvotes | August 12, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1274>

So what if you've had a lot of partners?

169 upvotes | October 2, 2020 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

(This started out as a comment, and grew.)

Okay, so first of all, this is not a tradcon space. Their answer to "I slept with a lot of men" is "begone harlot!", which isn't very useful, because "you shouldn't have done that" isn't advice, it's just moralizing.

Okay, the bad news is that because of what you did, you absolutely are less desirable as a wife. Take a deep breath, look in the mirror, and accept that, because getting mad or sad about it does no good. You are not a jar of peanut butter, you can't get *unscrewed*.

Also useless is blaming men for caring about such things. Men weren't put on this earth to serve you. They get to like what they like and they don't have to answer to you for whether it's "justified" or not. The important place to start with is to understand *why* men care about your sexual past.

This may be difficult because **men themselves usually do not know why they care about your sexual past**. They don't understand their own feelings in this area, and so they cannot explain them. They only know that it "bothers them". So they make up excuses like the ridiculous "stretched out" myth, as if girl parts could somehow wear out, and did so faster with more partners. Or they say that women who have lots of partners can't pair bond, when it's actually the reverse (women who can't pair bond have lots of partners).

They're not *trying* to lie to you. They just don't *know* why they are turned off by the idea of committing to a woman who's been with lots of other men... and they are trying to explain it themselves.

But it *can* be understood. The key word here is "committing". If you look at porn targeted towards men (not the written-word stuff targeted at women), then you notice that the women in it are just about as slutty as it's possible to be, and it doesn't turn the male audience off at all (otherwise they wouldn't be depicted that way).

Men don't care about the sexual past of their casual sex partners, but they care deeply about the sexual past of their romantic partners. This is because they know, even if they can't articulate it, that a woman is at her most sexually available and adventurous with the man she loves the most.

What actually bothers men is the idea of being with someone, of committing to someone, for whom he wasn't the top choice. A man can be patient with a girl who is a virgin... so what if she made him wait for a week, or a month, or whatever? After all, she made everyone else wait for eternity. She's still being at her most sexually available with him in particular.

But once a girl has, for example, a one-night stand, then that indicates something about what it takes to inspire her sexual enthusiasm, and if she she tries to put the brakes on with future partners, this tells them exactly where they stand in the scheme of things. This is why men find the news that his wife had a previous one night stand to be humiliating... she desired that other man more than she desired him.

And it's no good to say "I made a mistake" or "I changed my standards" because all that means is "other men were able to tempt me to do unwise things, but I have more self-control with you".

So, that's the problem with sleeping with a man you just met... because forever afterwards, that's the

standard. That's the benchmark. Anything more reserved than that means "I'm just not that into you". And you will never persuade a man otherwise by talking at him.

So, with all this being understood, what can you do?

There are three approaches:

1. Lie. This may seem immoral, but we don't do moralizing here. Lies can, theoretically, fix the problem. But there are some drawbacks. You can't ever be totally open and honest in your relationship... you have to live that lie for as long as your relationship lasts. Also, if you ever get caught, a lie compounds the injury, and you should not expect the relationship to survive.
2. Continue to take sexual risks, but with a purpose. This involves being as sexually available to the men you're dating now as you ever were in the past, although now you are at least *looking* for a relationship. Obviously, this tends to expand your sexual history even further, but at least if you manage to get something going, you didn't withhold from him *more* than you did with others.
3. Radical self-improvement. Increase your value on the sexual marketplace so much that you are not the same sexual partner at all, and it's obvious that you can command more effort and investment. This is not as simple as just learning to play the piano, or being slightly nicer to men. It has to be a profound and immediately obvious improvement to the point where a man would not be made ashamed. Think on the order of quitting your drug habit, losing fifty pounds, maybe getting a nose job, and basically reinventing yourself. If you could be in a room with a former sexual partner and your husband, and the FIRST guy feels like a loser, because he had a much worse version of you, that's the magnitude we are talking about.

What do all of these solutions have in common? Well, they all hurt. They all have drawbacks.

But this is the real world, and it wasn't put here to be fulfill your fantasies. This is simply damage control.

It may be tempting to think that you can re-invent yourself as a virgin and simply raise your standards. We've seen plenty of women try to do this, and some of them even find partners. But what they do not find is *enthusiastic partners who had other choices*. Men who wife up an slut are men who don't have options, and there will be reasons why they don't have those options.

So if you want the best partner that is available to you, you're going to have to have a concrete strategy for dealing with what you did, and how that affects their feelings, instead of just complaints about the consequences of your actions. That means more risk, and more compromises... but we can always play the cards we have to the best of our abilities.

TRP has an End Game

316 upvotes | October 22, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1355>

(Endgame) The Lost Boys

68 upvotes | November 3, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1363>

The TRP Endgame: Financial Freedom

92 upvotes | November 16, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1375>

What, some of you clowns are actually MAD about OnlyFans?

339 upvotes | December 15, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Are you seriously that retarded?

When are going to stop being butthurt about every girl on the planet not being your ideal Stepford sex slave, and start thinking about them as a commodity that follows the rules of economics?

A small but significant percentage of the latest generation of basic self-absorbed bimbos *just dropped the bottom out of the pussy market.*

Three times.

First because the price of a girl getting naked for ya is now fixed at about the going rate of a cup of fancy coffee.

Second because so many of the simps who used to give out free attention are now at home jerking off to cheap custom porn, which drives the price of male attention up.

Third because now ordinary girls, instead of just drug addicts whose daddies beat them, are now joining the sex work economy. Which normalizes prostitution. And when that becomes legalized in the same that weed did, the real price of pussy will forever be public knowledge, and it won't be much.

Look, if TRP was the Tradcon Central Committee of the Revive EthnoNationalist Socialism Movement, and you were a good little Christian Patriarch in Training, looking for your pure-as-the-driven-snow Aryan forever wife, to have starfish sex with you once a month with the lights off and raise your 3.5 children in exchange for half your shit, then, yeah, OnlyFans would lower your pool of options.

But you're not. You're a degenerate pervert who's here to learn to keep your pimp hand strong and be a better degenerate pervert, from older, wiser, and more degenerate perverts like me. And you don't care if society fucks off down a hole and drowns itself, because it wasn't your decision to send it there, and you have neither the power nor the obligation to save it.

Don't you get it yet? You may be living in Upside Down Clown World, and the people running the circus may hate you, but you're still at an advantage because *you're the only guy in the room who isn't dressed like a clown.*

Did you not ever wonder why the old world failed? Why the tradcons got their asses kicked by feminism? Because Top Side Up Pussy Cartel World sucked, too, just in a completely different way. Think about how fucking *thirsty* the baby boomer men must have been, to kick over their entire society just for the promise of little unshaven free-love poontang? (Which they largely never got.)

I don't have to think about it. I was *there*. I *saw*.

Yes, it's true that girlfriend material is scarcer. Yes, it's true that in my high school, you couldn't have thrown a sock in a classroom without hitting three thin, pretty, white or asian girls who were relatively polite and didn't even use cuss words.

But getting them in bed was a lot of work. Nowadays you can have all the variety you want, quick and easy and cheap, and if you want a girlfriend, it doesn't actually matter as much as you think that supplies are dwindling... because your competition is dwindling even faster.

I honestly don't know what I'm going to tell the girls at RPW. Because if they are still looking for a

relationship and not already in one, *they are so completely and totally fucked*. Imagine trying to keep your N-count low when every swingin' dick out there expects a test drive before he even thinks about buying, to say nothing of the joy riders who are only pretending to be in the market at all.

But you... you are going to be fine. Feminism has given you far more power over women than patriarchy ever would have. So stop slut-shaming. Sluts are good for you. They suck your dick, and then other women have to suck your dick to be able to compete. Just ignore or laugh at them if they want your commitment and love.

Go get 'em, boys.

Problems that are beyond the scope of RPW.

98 upvotes | January 8, 2021 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

If you're reading this post months or years after it was written, it's probably because you have been linked here by someone who thinks that you need in-person help with your relationship, possibly by a professional.

(This post was written at the request of the mod team to be a resource for situations where RPW cannot necessarily help.)

While RPW, as a group with values, tries to avoid the typical pattern of "leave him, gurl, You Deserve Better™!" advice that women tend to get on the internet (regardless of the situation), certain relationship problems *are* actually severe, and cannot be addressed by some internet advice.

This is not simply a matter of "we're not qualified professionals"... indeed some of us may be. But the major qualification to do intervention in a profoundly unhealthy relationship is *physical presence and ongoing involvement*... neither of which we are able to provide you.

This isn't the "when you should leave" list. It's the "we can't help you" list. You might leave even a serious relationship for many more reasons than this. But these are specifically things where internet advice is inappropriate.

Here are some situations which might be severe enough that you should seek in-person help, or consider ending the relationship, even if it is an ongoing long-term one with a lot invested in it:

.1. *Physical abuse.*

While the stereotype of unilateral evil-man-beats-innocent-angelic-woman is not the typical abuse situation, *any* type of relationship violence is a severe problem, whether it's him striking you, you striking him, both of hitting each other, or anyone hitting the kids. This level of relationship conflict is not something we can defuse with internet advice. You should seek expert help, and consider ending the relationship if that does not work... patterns of this level of conflict can be difficult to break. Seek help in person.

(Note: this doesn't apply to kinky sex. If one of you is hitting the other, not out of anger, but because you both get off on it, that might be considered "violence", but it isn't *conflict*. Just be careful not to get too enthusiastic and put someone in the Emergency Room.)

.2. *Severe emotional abuse or conflict*

The real damage in abusive relationships often results from living in fear or a constant state of vigilance, rather than simply injuries. This same effect can be created with words. Like physical violence, this can go either way, or in both directions at once, but is not something anyone can simply "live with"... it can cause severe mental and even physical health problems. Seek help in person.

.3. *Severe addiction*

While our culture is slowly coming around to the idea that addiction is a health problem, rather than a moral or criminal one, addict behaviour can be very destructive, and the consequences of living close to an addict can be severe. While the choice to stay or leave is ultimately an individual one, we can't provide advice for that choice here, because it's simply too hard to get insight into the situation over the internet. Seek help in person.

.4. *Prolonged physical separation*

While this one may seem harsh, as it isn't really anyone's "fault", relationships *are* close personal contact, and prolonged separation is not something they can necessarily survive. The decision to end a relationship because someone cannot be available enough to make it work is a painful one, but sometimes it is necessary to do so, so that both people can be free to find another that *can* fulfilled their needs. Discuss this with your partner, and seek advice from friends and family who have known you a long time.

(When this is initially posted, I will leave the comments open so that readers can suggest amendments. The intent here is to have a permanent list of "this problem is beyond the scope of RPW situations" that we can link people to, instead of randomly saying "leave him, gurl, You Deserve BetterTM!")

The Most Important Thing

237 upvotes | January 24, 2021 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1424>

This Article Will Infuriate You

151 upvotes | February 5, 2021 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1442>

How not to be fat.

126 upvotes | March 12, 2021 | /r/RedPillWomen | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Everyone knows that being fat is unattractive.

Lately there have been a fair amount of attempts to shame men into being attracted to fat women, but since most men don't find shame to be enticing, this hasn't been effective at all and is unlikely to be in the future. And while some women carry fat better than others, for every woman, there is a level of body fat at which she becomes unattractive.

There is also a great deal of argument as to whether being fat is unhealthy or not, but since people will move heaven and earth to avoid being ugly, when they won't lift a finger to avoid dying twenty years sooner, this really doesn't matter much.

Suffice to say that you don't want to be fat.

And yet, despite the fact that women desire desperately not to be fat, and try very hard not to be, still many, many women are... in fact many more than there were in previous generations. Which makes it overwhelmingly likely that some of you reading this are fat. And that still more, perhaps even most, are fatter than you would like to be.

Now, our culture, society, and indeed medical profession has very simple instructions for not being fat: Eat less, move more. They will tell you that your body is a receptacle for something called a "calorie", and that if you eat more of these "calories" than you burn while moving around, they are going to be stored as fat. And that thus fat loss, or fat gain, is a simple matter of arithmetic.

Now, anyone whose brain has not been surgically replaced with a cauliflower can tell that this is wrong, even if they are not a macho arrogant jerk like me, and therefore are not willing to argue with the food industry, the government, the medical profession, and a whole bunch of know-it-alls quoting from what they learned in the University of It Stands to Reason, or possibly the Post-Graduate School of I Read in a Book Somewhere.

Why? Because huge numbers of people are fat now, and fifty years ago, they weren't. "Calories" didn't come into existence fifty years ago. Neither did gluttony and sloth. Unless you want to try explaining how we, for no apparent reason, birthed several successive generations who were lazier and greedier than every generation before, this simply doesn't add up.

Neither does it add up with your own experience. You know who you are. You've counted "calories". And it kinda-sorta worked. For a while. But it was really hard. And unsustainable. And you quit. Then you blamed yourself, instead of the idea, because surely if you had only stuck to it, it would have worked.

Except a program that 99% of people cannot stick to needs to take the blame for its own failures. We cannot make people fit again by simply demanding a better class of human being, with more "willpower". "Just have more willpower" isn't any easier than "just don't be fat". That's silly.

Additionally, your great-grandmother did not count "calories", because she didn't know what a "calorie" was. And she didn't do "zumba", either. Because even I don't know what that is, and please don't tell me.

So we are going to start from the basic idea that **you can be slim and proportionate your whole life without ever knowing what a "calorie" is, much less counting one.**

And we are going to talk about what researchers (NOT physicians, physicians are a bunch of coconuts) know about how the body stores and uses fat.

So what IS fat, anyway? Well, **fat is bunch of organic stuff that your body can burn for fuel, and can store in some of your cells so you don't die when you have nothing to eat.**

And right there is the answer. But you don't see it yet, because getting the answer isn't the hard part... it's asking the right question. Often the answer to our problems are right there, but we can't see them because we don't understand the problem yet.

So fat is FOR keeping you alive when you don't have anything to eat. Duh. If your body had chlorophyll, or solar panels, or plugged into a wall, and thus had a constant inflow of energy, you wouldn't need the capacity to *store* it at all. Your hair dryer doesn't have a battery in it, but your laptop does. That's because your hair dryer is designed to work in an environment where energy is always available, and your laptop is designed to function without an outside source of energy for at least some period of time.

So now we know that your body is designed to store fat. That's supposed to happen. And your body is also designed to burn fat. That's supposed to happen, too. And that between these two processes, you're not supposed to get so skinny you can't sustain your body temperature, and you die of cold, or so fat you can't run or climb, and you die of sabertooth tigers. You're supposed to gain a little fat, and lose a little, over and over again.

Now, your body, despite what the "calorie" people will tell you, is not a box. It doesn't just have things in it because you put them there. In order to store fat, an active biochemical set of events has to happen to turn things into fat and put them in fat (adipose) cells. In order to burn fat, another set has to happen to order to unpack the fat and send it to muscle cells.

Your body doesn't get fat just because some things are lying around, and it doesn't get thin just because you're low on fuel. It gets fat, or thin, *on purpose*. There are control mechanisms, and things that trigger them.

So if your body is storing too much, and unpacking too little, so that you gradually expand like a balloon, than its because there is a switch (metaphorically speaking) that is stuck in one position.

Well, researchers know what this switch is, and now you will, too, because that's what we need to know.

The "switch" is two hormones: insulin, and glucagon.

Insulin stimulates cells to take up glucose from the bloodstream. Some need it to have this happen at all, some don't, but the important thing here is that adipose (fatty) cells turn this glucose (sugar) into triglycerides (fat), and store it. Beta cells in the pancreas release insulin when blood sugar is high.

Glucagon stimulates adipose cells to unpack triglycerides (fat), and release it into the blood. Other cells can burn this directly, and the liver can also convert it into glucose (sugar). Alpha cells in the pancreas release glucagon when blood sugar is low.

The important thing to understand here is that you can't have both these hormones high at once. So when your blood sugar is above a certain level, insulin stays high, and *you can't burn fat, no matter how much you have, because you can't get it out of your cells.*

That's the stuck switch.

If your blood sugar is too high, your insulin stays high, and you can't burn fat, you can only store it.

This is what happens when you calorie-restrict. You're eating small meals, but since you keep eating, your blood sugar stays high enough to prevent the release of glucagon in any significant amount. So if you have less energy coming in, but you can't unpack stored energy, you *have* to burn less, because it's physically impossible to burn energy you haven't got.

You've got loads of fat in your butt, but you're short of fuel, because *you can't get it from your butt into your blood*. You're *hungry*, and your metabolism slows to a glacial speed, because you're short of fuel.

This is why calorie-restricting diets fail. They're inefficient, because your metabolism is tanked, and they're impossible to stick to, because your brain thinks you're starving. Your brain can only see your blood, not your butt.

So what to do?

Do what this system was evolved for. Your body fat isn't evolved to sustain you when you eat a salad and a small bun. It's for when you *have no food*. If, instead of six small meals that don't add up to a lot of calories, you eat *nothing*, then your insulin will go low, all that fat can be unpacked from your butt, and you won't be hungry anymore, because why on earth would your body unpack less than it wants, now that you can unpack something?

In other words, you stop eating tiny meals, and you fast, instead.

When we understand this, we understand why grandma wasn't fat, and you are. It's not because you have less self-control than she did. It's not because she ate *more* than you do. It's because of *what* she ate and *when*.

She ate fat, protein, moderate amounts of starch, and almost no sugar. You eat very little fat, and a whole lot of starch, processed food, and sugar. Guess which one keeps your insulin higher longer?

If you want to be less fat, eat more fat.

She ate at mealtimes, and never in between. She didn't have plastic-wrapped convenience food. She didn't have a microwave oven. If she wanted to eat something, she had to cook it. She and her family ate at mealtimes, and not in between.

You... snack. Throughout the day. So when does insulin have a chance to drop?

If you want to stop looking like a cow, stop grazing like one.

Eating real food at defined mealtimes was enough to keep the people of 1960 thin. But if you're already fat, you have to reverse that switch harder. It's called "intermittent fasting", although it really should be called "intermittent eating", because the idea is to impose long delays between meals.

When you run out of sugar, you will unpack the fat.

Sounds like starving yourself, doesn't it? But it isn't. Because "starving" is when you're running out of fuel, not when you're merrily burning it. You're not starving, you're fasting. It sounds scary, but that's only if you believe that you're just going to keep getting hungrier and hungrier when you don't eat. That's not true. You get hungry, and then you enter *ketosis* (the state where your body unpacks and burns fat), and you're not hungry any more.

All of those stories about medieval people spending days in "fasting and prayer" suddenly make a lot more sense. You don't actually need to shove bread into your face every two hours in order to survive. This works. There's a whole subreddit devoted to it, and you can check it out, it's full of success stories, and you can learn what eating and fasting schedules work for people.

This method works because it's sustainable. Instead of fighting your body, you're doing what your body was designed to do... store fuel, and then use it. With a little practice, you can even decide how fat you want to be. Some level of subcutaneous fat is good for you, and you can get to decide how much looks good on you.

There's a lot more science in this rabbit hole; we could talk about how "sugar" (the white stuff on your table) is poison, but "sugar" (the glucose in your blood) is the energy of life; we could talk about how fruit juice and smoothies are terrible, terrible things, we could talk about how eating anything is a nutrition label is most likely a bad idea; about how butt fat is healthy and belly fat is terrible; about where diabetes really comes from and why "life-saving" insulin injections are really expensive now; about why healthcare is so expensive now and how socialism is not the answer and will only make things far, far worse.

But the important thing to understand is:

- Calories don't matter. Insulin matters.
- It isn't how much you eat, it's what and when.

Serotonin, Dopamine, and Covid-19

170 upvotes | May 15, 2021 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1556>

Many of you don't know what "Frame" is

280 upvotes | July 6, 2021 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1654>

Why They Hate You

211 upvotes | July 24, 2021 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1693>

NARS: The Real Epidemic

124 upvotes | September 14, 2021 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

<https://www.trp.red/p/whisper/1897>

I owe you nothing, and I don't have to fix anything for you.

14 upvotes | January 17, 2022 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

We've heard a lot lately about how men, collectively, can "fix" dating, or society, and correct whatever is going on that is inconveniencing women.

We've also heard a fair amount about how women don't owe men sex, or anything else, and wouldn't owe men anything even if our lives depended on it.

We've also heard a lot about how men shouldn't be in charge of society any more.

And we've also heard it said that responsibility comes from having power.

When I put all these things together, I come to the following conclusion:

I owe women nothing. Not even if their lives depend on it. I don't have to fix anything for women, save them from anything, or lift a finger to make sure they are okay.

I wouldn't be obliged to put a woman out if she were on fire.

So it doesn't matter what I can do to help women. Because what matters is "What's in it for me?"

Think different?

Persuade me.