

Girls just want to have fun

February 26, 2015 | 844 upvotes | by [Archwinger](#)

The Red Pill is a relatively new phenomenon, but the need for the Red Pill is as old (or older) than many of us. In 1983, I was a toddler. I'm older than a lot of you, younger than some. That year, Cyndi Lauper recorded the iconic song "Girls Just Want to Have Fun." The lyrics playfully talk about a girl coming home after being out all night (presumably getting fucked), guys calling for her at all hours, and her parents disapprove, but they don't understand, because girls just want to have fun. Some boys want to hide a beautiful girl away, but she wants to bask in the sun flaunting herself to the boys. When the working day is done, girls just want to have fun.

Fun fact – the original lyrics to this iconic hit from the 80s were written by a guy named Robert Hazard, and the song was originally about a player cad cruising about, crushing vag. He'd come home late at night, presumably after fucking girls, get scolded by his parents, and exclaim that the girls just want to have fun. That's all they want. Lauper found the original lyrics to this song to be misogynistic, so she rewrote them to the ones summarized in the first paragraph, intending them to be an anthem for young women. Oddly, they're even more misogynistic her way.

Housewives galore, my mother included, did aerobics classes in psychedelically colored leotards to this song, while reminiscing and gossiping about all the guys they fucked in the 60s and 70s during their hippie days in high school and college. And badmouthing their clean-cut, hardworking husbands who put on conservative dark suits and white dress shirts every day to go sit in an office and pray that the recession didn't cost them the jobs that were supporting their wives and kids and paying for their tenuous middle class lifestyle. Even as early as the 60s, hard-working, responsible men who provided for their families were boring. A laughingstock when women were alone together. A necessary evil.

This didn't stop women who'd fucked their way through college (after earlier women fought for their right to be there) from settling down and marrying a stable guy. Sure beats working. Work sucks, and girls just want to have fun.

Hazard knew what was up, or at least the character in his song did. The original message in those lyrics was meant for guys, not girls. Girls already knew they wanted to have fun. They'd been having fun for awhile. It was men in the 70s and 80s who needed to get a clue. The song didn't go, "Girls just want to fuck a guy with a middle class job." You couldn't say fuck on the radio.

The 70s and 80s were burdened with feminism. First-wave feminism was awesome. Women needed to be able to vote and own property and not be second-class citizens. Second-wave feminism was better than the shit we have today, but was considerably more retarded than first-wave feminism. Apparently, keeping house while the husband works wasn't the standard because it makes logical sense for the person who doesn't get pregnant to be the one relied upon for income. It was the standard due to systemic sexism. The world definitely had to do away with that. The line's a little blurry where second-wave feminism ends and third-wave feminism begins, but the third wave is essentially just planting a victory flag as far up the ass of society as possible, because they already won equality decades ago, so now it's time to normalize being a slut. Girls just want to have fun.

Mark my words, if we don't have a war or something else significant to shock the world in the interim, in another decade or two, one-sided poly marriages will be a somewhat common thing. Sexless men who are just happy to have a wife, marrying women who are free to go fuck whoever they want. Because trying to use marriage to own and control women is a patriarchal relic from the past. If men want to commit to women, that's fine, but they'd better check their privilege and not think that marrying someone means

they own that vagina. It's her vagina, to fuck whoever she wants. Not her husband's. He should be thrilled when she comes home ready to bear kids for him to help raise. That's why he married her. For a family, right? Be a real man. Marry a woman and support her family for her.

The old regime died decades ago. Women get free birth control through their insurance. They have jobs and support themselves, scholarships designated just for them, sexist programs designed to put more of them into various fields independent of qualifications, and other ways to make life a bit easier for them. If they don't have jobs or don't make enough with the jobs they have, they get free insurance and free money from the government. And if a woman slips up and gets pregnant, she can get an abortion at will, no questions asked. Or if she knows who the father is, she can have the kid if she wants it, and the government will take a portion of his paycheck and send it to her. That portion isn't based on her expenses. It's based on how much money he makes. So she can spend a little time keeping track of his promotions and raises and get that amount increased periodically. If he's ever a dime short, he goes to jail.

Women don't need hard-working, responsible guys who support them any more. They didn't need that in the 60s, they didn't need it in the 80s, they don't need it now. Girls just want to have fun.

Don't go crazy now. You still have to be hard-working and responsible. For you, not them. Your job is to support yourself awesomely and be a badass, because being a badass is fun. Hey, guys want to have fun, too. Sucking and having a shit life is not fun.

But for them, your job isn't to be hard-working and responsible. They want to have fun. They don't need you to support them or save them or love them or cherish them. The world's given them a safety net. You don't need to be their soft place to land. They have that already. They won it fair and square. Society failed the shit test and gave women the farm. And now women don't respect society any more. They piss all over society daily and still call it unfair and sexist, after all it's done for them. Now they're angling for two farms and a private island, and society will probably give it to them.

Your only purpose to women now is entertainment. Hard work? Responsibility? Support? Boring. Girls hate boring. Your job is to be fun. Girls want to have fun. If you're not fun and interesting, they'll fuck someone else. There are plenty of someone elses.

You young guys out there need to work harder than ever, for you. Get your awesome life in gear, for you, so when this bubble bursts, you're on top. But on your down time, ride this third wave of slutty feminism as far as it can take you. Look hot, smile, be fun, and abdicate all appearances of work, responsibility, or love. Entertain them. Perform like a monkey. Stick your dick in them. Laugh at them inside your head. Then go home and keep working on that awesome life you're building. It'll be our secret.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

[deleted] • 243 points • 26 February, 2015 09:14 PM

Great fucking post. It's funny, I recently heard this song on the radio and had the exact same realization: "Girls just want to have fun" is a complete and comprehensive thesis statement that the entire gender can get behind.

What do girls want? Fun. That's it. Nothing else. Big Daddy government ensures they will never spend a night on the streets or go hungry. So what's left for them to seek? Fun.

Another song that's an unbelievably accurate summation of current gender politics is Daft Punk's "Get Lucky."

"She's up all night to have fun. I'm up all night to get lucky."

Men go to clubs and parties for the purpose of getting laid. Their testosterone-fueled brains mandate that they spend their energy seeking sex. But women don't have the same hormonal balance, and their sex drives are nowhere near as intense as a man's.

So, like Daft Punk says:

When a girl goes to a party, she just wants to have fun. If a tall dark Alpha wants to fuck her, great! But if not, it's okay, because she's still having fun.

But when a man goes to a party, he just wants to get lucky. If he doesn't get lucky, he regrets going to the party, because he messed up his circadian rhythms and hormonal balance by staying up so late drinking what is technically poison. Smart men soon realize that it's more efficient and healthier to spend their energy improving themselves during the day than going out late at night, sacrificing sleep and energy, in order to get lucky.

She's up all night to have fun. He's up all night to get lucky.

Meanwhile, I'm in bed early to wake up early, hit the gym, eat breakfast, and continue building my awesome life.

Thanks for the post Archwinger, you're one of the best writers we've got.

LuvBeer • 83 points • 26 February, 2015 09:26 PM

Meanwhile, I'm in bed early to wake up early, hit the gym, eat breakfast, and continue building my awesome life.

Girls want to have fun. If you're not fun and interesting, they'll fuck someone else. There are plenty of someone elses.

Now that I'm in my late 30s, hangovers completely wipe out a full day. When my early 20s plates invite me out with them and their friends, I decline, because I'm boring in their context. I don't need to impress them: we're already fucking, and I can let their imaginations fill in the details about my wild life when I'm really in bed by 11.

[deleted] • 65 points • 26 February, 2015 09:55 PM

Dude I'm in my 20's and hangovers wipe out a full day or TWO or THREE for me. Maybe I'm just hypersensitive to it, but for me, going out is a losing game. I've always found improving myself and day gaming way more lucrative anyway.

CreateTheFuture • 159 points • 26 February, 2015 10:58 PM

Drink more water.

a-tapir • 83 points • 27 February, 2015 12:38 AM

Honestly this guy is correct. I drink quite a bit for a student taking a second degree, and the best hangover cure is to drink a fuck ton of water before going to sleep. I'm even drunk right now so I'm right don't argue

trplurker31 points 27 February, 2015 02:13 AM* **[recovered]**

Don't forget to also get some sugar and salt. I usually down a bottle of Gatorade or other sports drink along with a shit ton of water before I crash. Your body use's up a shit ton of salt and sugar metabolizing and purging alcohol from your blood stream.

aguy01 • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 07:04 PM

Yes. This. Either add sugar/salt or drink gatorade. Electrolytes get depleted by processing the alcohol and have a big effect on the tiredness during the hang over.

animestar93 • 37 points • 26 February, 2015 11:15 PM

^{This} guy knows how to drink properly.

suloco • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 11:59 AM

Exactly! I haven't had a hangover in over a year and I party a lot. I just don't drink that much (like I did before), use moderation and make every other drink a glass of water. Oh and weed. Definitely. A little weed and moderate alcohol can take you to a party mood and later lay you down for a nice 9 hour sleep. No problem.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 02:44 PM

The only hangover cure that works is not drinking. When you drink alcohol you are poisoning your liver and dehydrating yourself. If you want to do it fine, no judgement here, but there is no cure for the effects it has on your body.

suloco • 11 points • 27 February, 2015 03:15 PM

You need to define hangover better. To me (as to most of people, I believe) hangover means: feeling nauseated, tired, experiencing headaches and sick to your stomach. If you don't **feel** hungover, you don't have a hangover.

That said, the alcohol you drink still has negative effects your body needs to deal with. But drinking with moderation, a lot of movement (dance parties) and plenty of liquid is almost sure proof against (the experienced) hangover.

[deleted] 27 February, 2015 10:11 AM

[permanently deleted]

CreateTheFuture • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 11:36 PM

That's not a hangover; that's poisoning.

Kyfhomyoba • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 11:29 AM

And several days worth of vitamin B or B complex just prior to drinking.

[deleted] • 10 points • 27 February, 2015 11:18 AM

Don't get suckered into drinking too much. Tell the bartender you want a jack and coke without the jack and they will happily oblige while you save face.

AFPJ • 7 points • 27 February, 2015 09:10 AM*

The fuck? Early 30s here, I go out 1-2 times a month drinking ungodly amounts (I'm a big dude, 220Lbs of not fat) after pregaming with ~.5L of vodka to go to bed at 3AM and be up (probably still drunk) by 5:30 to run and get my ass back to training. Losing 2-3 days does not sound healthy, or okay. Alcohol annihilates your Folate, Calcium, A & B12 - take a high dose of those along with at least 3 quarts of Coconut Water when you get home after a night out.

Also, there's reliable evidence that taking NAC before alcohol consumption significantly reduces the downsides.

Learn about nutrition & your body. Never use vitamins or other shit as a substitute for a proper, healthy diet.

aguy01 • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 07:06 PM

go to bed at 3AM and be up (probably still drunk) by 5:30 to run and get my ass back to training.

For real you are probably better off just sleeping in. Drinking lowers testosterone, lack of sleep lowers testosterone, and training without properly recovering reduces testosterone.

AFPJ • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 07:35 PM*

Drinking and lack of sleep do indeed lower testosterone, you are correct. As for "properly recovering"...

If you are mentally, emotionally or on another non-physical level, stressed you likely have high Cortisol. Training without proper (muscular) recovery or training with high Cortisol due to other reasons is detrimental, however if you don't feel "stressed"/"annoyed" (the feeling of Cortisol) and your muscles are recovered, you are primed for training.

Going into the gym drunk on 3 hours of sleep when your muscles were already almost fully recovered the night before doesn't magically put tears in your muscle fibers or drain your glycogen (the conditions for overwhelming release of Cortisol to the point where it has an overall negative impact on Testosterone from a resistance training session).

Mind you, there's a world of difference between the casual aestheticfag gym rat and someone who's been training for almost a decade. If I don't go to the gym or otherwise physically exert myself, my entire day feels wrong & fucked up.

rpserote • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 06:30 PM

Also, there's reliable evidence that taking NAC before alcohol consumption significantly reduces the downsides.

NAC is awesome. There's evidence that people with nervous tics (nail biting, scab picking) do those activities less while regularly taking NAC, in addition to its liver benefits.

skiff151 • 1 point • 4 March, 2015 11:48 AM

NAC

Hey buddy! As an avid drinker, what is this? I've been googling and I'm assuming you mean:
<http://www.webmd.com/vitamins-supplements/ingredientmono-1018-n-acetyl%20cysteine.aspx?activeingredientid=1018&activeingredientname=n-acetyl%20cysteine> ?

What's the skinny on this? Does it actually work?

beginner_ • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 09:56 AM

Travel sickness pills help against all types of sickness. ;)

theproudbanana • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 05:35 PM

Most people have a hard time drinking X drink, IE my friend cant drink wine. Maybe you should try to drink the one that you gives less hangover, for me its whisky

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 05:16 AM

Switch to dangerous drugs instead?

aguy01 • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 07:02 PM

You have some nutritional problems if that's happening bro.

Veles11 • 1 point • 18 May, 2015 12:04 AM

On the nights I go out I always leave a bottle of water on my bed, when I get home drunk as fuck I drink the whole thing. Does wonders to help hangovers.

[deleted] • 18 points • 27 February, 2015 01:15 AM

Yep. "Boring old man! You never do anything fun!" Yep. That's me. But I'll see you later tonight when I bend your drunk little ass over the sofa. THEN I'll be doing something fun.

ThroughDarkness • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 11:46 PM

How do you get these plates if you're in bed by 11? Is it through online dating/Tinder?

xPURE_AcIDx • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 07:53 AM

Haha except if you're in a professional degree its more like study late, study in the morning, study in the afternoon. Get ripped in the summer while making bank.

bluedrygrass • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 05:02 PM

Their testosterone-fueled brains mandate that they spend their energy seeking sex. But women don't have the same hormonal balance, and their sex drives are nowhere near as intense as a man's.

Amazing that this shit is in the top comment.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 05:11 PM

Why? Do you disagree? Not trolling, curious. I'd be really interested to hear an argument that the female libido is anywhere near as powerful as the male libido.

[deleted] • 239 points • 26 February, 2015 08:21 PM

Taylor Swift provides the modern day slut anthem

Saw you there and I thought oh my god... Look at that face, you look like my next mistake

[deleted] • 68 points • 26 February, 2015 11:51 PM

girl are allowed to make "mistakes", its part of life, growing up and having fun!!
she can learn from her mistakes when shes 40!

[deleted] • 158 points • 27 February, 2015 01:39 AM

I wasn't born last night

I know these hoes ain't right

But you was blowing up her phone last night

But she ain't have her ringer nor her ring on last night, oh

Nigga, that's that nerve

Why give a bitch your heart

When she rather have a purse?

Why give a bitch your inch

When she rather have nine?

You know how the game goes

She be mine by half time, I'm the shit, oh

Nigga, that's that nerve

You all about her, and she all about hers

People say rap is just gibberish and nonsense. I don't. I love it, these rappers are on the red pill and most people don't even know it. They aren't just talking out of their ass they speaking from experience, they are speaking a philosophy.

[deleted] • 37 points • 27 February, 2015 02:38 AM

this should be redpill anthem

love the nerve part... everyone gets so defensive when exposing females

Anderfail • 11 points • 27 February, 2015 03:52 PM

The only redpill music left is rap, metal, and outlaw country (not modern country). These are the only genres where it is accepted to be very masculine.

rpscrote • 9 points • 27 February, 2015 06:32 PM

half of metal subgenres are pussified though, even if they still make good music. The other half of metal is definitely "fuck you" which is awesome

Anderfail • 4 points • 27 February, 2015 07:11 PM

The SJW kind of metal is obvious though because it doesn't contain the pure aggression that standard metal does. They try to incorporate shit like vegetarianism and other bullshit, but it doesn't work at all and makes them come across as posers. That kind of aggression and rage cannot be faked.

HalfysReddit • 1 point • 2 March, 2015 07:00 PM

I remember pissing off an old housemate of mine one time when I was playing "Alcohol and Ass" by Hellyeah. Apparently since the lines are similar to "alcohol and ass" it promotes rape culture or

something along those lines.

prodigy2throw • 29 points • 27 February, 2015 04:52 AM

I swear this song was my summer anthem. Best part was when these girls were singing along with the song. AWALT

aguy01 • 6 points • 27 February, 2015 06:56 PM

I grew up on Bluepill alternative shit in the 90s. Now all I listen to is rap.

[deleted] • 11 points • 27 February, 2015 07:07 PM

Notice how all the 60s soul songs were based on love. James brown's "a man loves a women" was about his love for her. Notice when the 3rd wave of feminism came in the 90s and music started to change, songs like "bitches ain't nothing but ho's and tricks" "don't love these ho's" because the women started to fuck every guy that makes their pussy tingle with no restraint, then want to settle down with betas when they lose their youthful vigor.

seiken287 • 12 points • 27 February, 2015 04:37 AM

Used to never listen to r&b/hip hop/rap growing up. Now it's really the only kind of lyrics+music I can tolerate.

the99percent1 • 12 points • 27 February, 2015 09:21 AM

Big Sean, I don't fuck with you.

[deleted] • 7 points • 27 February, 2015 02:10 PM

That song gets stuck in my head so easily

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 02:29 AM

Source on the song for those in mobile?

[deleted] • 10 points • 27 February, 2015 02:31 AM

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Ot8-_ZvV2o

occupythekitchen • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 06:23 PM

god this chick i was hanging with would play this song on repeat it burned me out of it

prodigy2throw • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 04:55 AM

Also check out Ty Dolla Sign. He actually wrote the song. The guy spits more unintentional Red Pill than anyone. Looks like a 40 year old perv but has the confidence of Iron Man

Kingspot • 11 points • 27 February, 2015 07:40 PM

"Lord Knows"

Last week I fucked 5 bitches don't remember one name

She wanna know more, I want one thing

Had her drinking and smoking on the tour bus

Last year I remember they ignored us

She used to fuck with A\$AP

Too \$hort said he knew the bitch from way back

These groupie hoes ain't got no morals

Where that pussy goes only lord knows

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 05:11 AM

Yep. "Loyal" should be the anthem. Tells it is.

[deleted] • 4 points • 27 February, 2015 05:20 AM

personally I like this one better <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2W459tYJJT8>

its surreal how these songs are so similar to the redpill philosophy.

Sickman-D • -1 points • 27 February, 2015 12:39 PM

Check out Abi Cruz's Skeletons in my closet. RedPill

GASTON_TONNERRECOQ45 points 26 February, 2015 11:35 PM* [recovered]

"I go on too many dates, but I can't make them stay."

rztzz • 7 points • 27 February, 2015 05:17 PM

I was trying to explain to my girlfriend that Taylor Swift shoots herself in the foot by dating guys out of her league like the One Direction front-man. My Girlfriend obviously disagreed and felt she was led astray by men, and Taylor was entitled to have fun.

Lets see how the "fun" works out for her in the long run.

GIGANTIC_NIGGER_DICK • 1 point • 26 March, 2015 02:04 AM

Some red flags from your girl too I think

spicy_fries • 12 points • 26 February, 2015 10:51 PM

[VIDEO]Taylor Swift "I Knew You Were Trouble" Domestic Violence Edition

[deleted] 26 February, 2015 08:52 PM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 20 points • 26 February, 2015 09:07 PM*

All of her songs are like that ASALT:

And to the fella over there with the hella good hair... Won't you come on over baby we could shake, shake

LoveOfThreeLemons • 11 points • 26 February, 2015 11:40 PM

You look like bad news/I gotta have you

[deleted] • 26 points • 26 February, 2015 09:06 PM

It doesn't matter, because even if it is, the masses are blind to the initial intentions, aka lost in translation.

[deleted] • -15 points • 26 February, 2015 09:07 PM

I know, totally like in the early 90s when that NWA song came out. I'm still raping policemen these

days.

[deleted] • 17 points • 26 February, 2015 09:14 PM

Wait, are you trying to tell me NWA was satirical? I have trouble believing that, OG niggas were real as fuck. Sarcasm is for whinny bitches.

[deleted] • -15 points • 26 February, 2015 09:16 PM

Wait, are you trying to tell me that people don't take everything at face value? I have trouble believing that.

dropit_reborn • 22 points • 26 February, 2015 09:04 PM

Perhaps, but I guarantee the median listener is *not* smirking at satire, but placing herself in the position of the character described in the song.

[deleted] • 16 points • 26 February, 2015 09:06 PM

Yah but that's only 1 person though, so not really a big deal.

DaThrowaway808 • -17 points • 26 February, 2015 09:09 PM

I'd White Knight Taylor Swift proudly.

Shade_Raven • 8 points • 27 February, 2015 12:01 AM

Rich Slut has fucked half of hollowood.

DaThrowaway808 • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 05:37 PM

I am proud of her as she builds her empire and harem. She swims in the tears of her victims as she counts her money.

[deleted] • 130 points • 26 February, 2015 08:29 PM

That last paragraph is the key.

Stop being mad and upset. If these women want to be whores then let them, it's their body and they are indeed free to do whatever they want.

Just don't fall into the trap of taking them seriously as partners. Appease them. Placate them. Be the little sociopath they want, feed them their pretty little lies they crave. Let them go clubbing and do whatever the fuck they wsnt.

Treat them like children and do not hold them responsible for anything. And then when you meet someone better or find a woman worth dating, drop her snd move on.

She won't care because she's got a million other guys she's been fucking and you get someone who will cherish and respect your hsrdr work and effort. Win win.

Godtiermasturbator • 51 points • 26 February, 2015 10:15 PM

Well, you *might* get to date/marry a woman who cherishes and respects you. Don't expect it, because AWALT. Let it be icing on the cake if it happens, otherwise be happy with the awesome life you've built for yourself.

[deleted] • 18 points • 27 February, 2015 01:05 AM

Nope, those women are still out there. I've noticed the more masculine and real i am the more date able women become. Once you break through the brainwashing they become really genuine and respectful.

-Awake- • 30 points • 27 February, 2015 02:47 AM

They don't love you my friend, they love the game. If you forget that then you're fucked

[deleted] • 27 points • 27 February, 2015 03:05 AM

All men should know it's both.

She loves me because I know how to play the game.

makesomewyrms • 6 points • 27 February, 2015 10:08 AM

they love how you make them feel. That's it.

e50000 • 37 points • 27 February, 2015 01:14 AM

Or you've just graduated to a higher tier that are better at lying and hiding it.

[deleted] • 29 points • 27 February, 2015 01:27 AM

There have been several studies into why sociopaths exist because if they were a genetic deterrent they should've been removed from the gene pool.

but it takes a special society, an overly tolerant, completely insecure and narcissistic society to breed sociopaths. We happen to live in such a society.

So when I say you're surrounded by people who are all better liars then you I'm not on some littlefinger shit. I'm genuinely trying to warn you about what you're dealing with.

DarthRoach • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 11:27 AM

Sociopaths? Genetic deterrent? Being a sociopath is actually a massive advantage in many cases, so long as it comes with above average intelligence.

JakeRay • 10 points • 27 February, 2015 12:22 PM

Isn't that **exactly** what the guy you replied to said?

_PM_ME_YOUR_CAT_3 points 27 February, 2015 03:04 PM **[recovered]**

Sociopaths are generally incompetent when it comes to social situations. You're thinking of highly functioning psychopaths. There's a big difference between the two.

It would be an insult to be called a sociopath.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 05:16 PM

There is always a struggle to maintain a balance between individual and group/society needs. People who for whatever reason tend to be above average in terms of individualistic behavior and below average in behavior that benefits others start meeting the criteria for a psychopath. It isn't a binary thing, more of a spectrum. People that are between 0 to 1 standard deviations above average in selfishness/individualism still function in society and probably do rather well for themselves. 1-2 and now you're looking at people who start to meet the clinical definition for narcissistic or psychopathic personality disorder. Those less intelligent or who had poor role models will probably wind up in jail. Smarter ones who realize

what they are, know they have to keep up the appearance of playing by the rules in order to maximize the benefits they receive from interaction with others. These are your apex predators, sitting on top of most corporate, government and criminal hierarchies. At 2 and above, you're likely dealing with people that regardless of intelligence or upbringing are acting with such disregard for others that they are going to have major problems functioning in normal society. These people are probably in prison, mental institutions or homeless.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 05:58 PM

Exactly.

Thus my follow up of living in a society that breeds sociopathic qualities like late night snacks to gremlins.

sweetleef • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 08:46 PM

Quit your job, give away all your money and possessions, then go home and start swaggering around about how much of a "masculine" tough guy you are. Pay close attention to how much she loves you then.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 09:54 PM

Being masculine includes financial stability and the ability to provide and protect

Getting emotional and offended and transcending into the world of absurdum helps no one

A419a • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 07:49 PM

Just look younger and maybe go some place where younger doesn't mean jail. Also look outside of the US and other 'well off' countries. It isn't a guarantee but you significantly up your chances, if that is what you are looking for.

Patranus20 points 27 February, 2015 01:41 AM [recovered]

Just don't fall into the trap of taking them seriously as partners.

The key here is to additionally don't talk them seriously as partners later when they decide to 'settle down'.

They should not be rewarded for their behavior and allow them to 'settle down' after running around like a child until they are 30.

[deleted] • 20 points • 27 February, 2015 02:19 AM

My friend it's too late for that. There is now two generations of brainwashed men who think single moms and thirty something career women are worthy partners.

Guys who WANT to be house dads

Patranus10 points 27 February, 2015 02:32 AM [recovered]

You make a mistake. A thirty something career woman looking to settle down is on a completely different playing field than that 30 something single mom.

The 30 something career woman put in the same work as the 30 something career male. They usually went through the trials and tribulations as the men and usually actually didn't slut it up and then look for the 30 something man to settle down with. They were too busy which is a plus.

The aversion is toward the 30 something single mom or freeloader who passed up the 20 something men in they heyday who were working towards having a stable life. They should not be rewarded to staying in neutral and not pushing them selves or for slutting it up.

InflatableRaft • 35 points • 27 February, 2015 03:52 AM

Trust me, career women are slutting it up too. AWALT

[deleted] • 12 points • 27 February, 2015 02:35 AM

I need to know if you're being sarcastic before I respond

Patranus-3 points 27 February, 2015 02:48 AM [recovered]

I am simply trying to point out that many 30 something career woman are actually in line for traditional relationships that are not in line with the 30 something single mom.

They both come from 2 different frames.

[deleted] • 12 points • 27 February, 2015 03:28 AM

The guys building a career can't go out once a month and get laid at the bar just by showing up.

You going to believe a career woman didn't go out a couple of times a year to get her plumbing plumbed. She probably had 40 one night stands and is unsuitable for marriage.

[deleted] • 8 points • 27 February, 2015 03:04 AM

Single moms are the worst but this does not make career women any better.
they're the top two on the lost of undateable women.

PandaMania3 • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 04:26 AM

You forgotten that they won't settle for less. If they are successful, tell me why would they want a Beta provider when They can provide for themselves?

aguy01 • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 07:15 PM

...No. Career women are career women because they are slutty. They either aren't satisfied by one guy, or they don't know how to maintain healthy relationships. Any woman not married by 30 is a terrible choice for marriage.

A419a • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 07:52 PM

Worthy? Men are taught they are a world better than someone much younger. I get a funny feeling listening to the guys who say they want someone with a ton of experience. *Yuck*

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 09:55 PM

Woof. What kind of man would want a woman's experiences to guide him.

I can't even fathom

[deleted] • 1 point • 4 March, 2015 12:42 PM

She won't care because she's got a million other guys she's been fucking

I never really understood this RedPill concept. Why is it that TRP thinks all girls must be fucking. Most of the people my age (19) are all self-proclaimed virgins, including girls, and I have no reason to believe otherwise.

30303030303030 • 48 points • 26 February, 2015 10:08 PM

True.

This is why the loud, socially active overconfident "jerks" fuck all of them when their smv is at the highest. It's better to offend a woman than to bore her.

bsutansalt • 31 points • 26 February, 2015 11:14 PM

It's better to offend a woman than to bore her.

Not only that, but if you can recover from offending her then you've given her a huge emotional spike which is exciting, ergo attractive. See also: push-pull.

Overkillengine • 7 points • 27 February, 2015 12:28 AM

Like a roller-coaster, you can't have highs without the lows.

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 February, 2015 05:33 AM

It's better to offend her than compliment her.

[deleted] • 15 points • 27 February, 2015 01:12 AM*

Equally pertinent in this era of fat-shaming and obesity is weird AI's rendition "Girls just wanna have lunch", which also features an epic synth-fart solo.

mordanus • 33 points • 26 February, 2015 10:04 PM

Speaking about songs from that time... Madonna put out the song "Material girl". I remember when that song was on the radio and how all the girls loved it and all the guys just tried their best to ignore that it existed. The lyrics are very telling and very red pill.

<http://www.metrolyrics.com/material-girl-lyrics-madonna.html>

If you don't have money you aren't attractive. My favorite part is

They can beg and they can plead But they can't see the light (that's right) 'Cause the boy with the cold hard cash Is always Mister Right"

tallwheel • 12 points • 27 February, 2015 04:05 AM

That would be the '80s beta bucks song. The alpha fucks song would be Gloria Estefan's "Bad Boy".

Bad, bad, bad, bad boy, you make me feel so good

Always get so restless, nothing but trouble Leaving me feeling breathless, nothing but trouble

It's pretty much all spelled out there. Bad boys give the tingles. It's staring everyone straight in the face... or at least in the ears. It was on the radio being broadcasted to us constantly. How did people not get the message?

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 08:28 PM

Because for every RP anthem there were also crooning love beta songs. It went along with the nerd-get-

the-girl fantasies force fed to us in the 80s. It was a giant battleground that I know I did not have the eyes to see, but in retrospect, it was a bloody war.

Never Gonna Give You Up, Say Say Say, Head Over Heels versus Girls, Girls, Girls, Cherry Pie, Billie Jean.

But to answer your question, people like me didn't get the message back then because of single motherhood and political correctness. We can't blame (or praise) the media for influencing us, because it is only a reflection of attitudes at the time. (In a similar vein, I don't worry that violent video games create violent kids.)

JP_Whoregan • 55 points • 26 February, 2015 08:31 PM

Fun fact – the original lyrics to this iconic hit from the 80s were written by a guy named Robert Hazard, and the song was originally about a player cad cruising about, crushing vag. He'd come home late at night, presumably after fucking girls, get scolded by his parents, and exclaim that the girls just want to have fun. That's all they want. Lauper found the original lyrics to this song to be misogynistic, so she rewrote them to the ones summarized in the first paragraph, intending them to be an anthem for young women. Oddly, they're even more misogynistic her way.

As a kid who grew up in the 80's, playing with GI Joe, TMNT, and hearing this song on the radio constantly, that's a pretty cool-to-know TIL. Feminism was wrecking my childhood and I never even knew it.

Archwinger[S] • 18 points • 26 February, 2015 09:06 PM

The original version is craptions better than Lauper's, too. Not just the small lyric modifications. The arrangement itself.

[deleted] • 9 points • 26 February, 2015 11:06 PM

Did anyone ever record the original version as a song?

Archwinger[S] • 11 points • 26 February, 2015 11:07 PM

You can find it on YouTube, I think.

[deleted] • 14 points • 27 February, 2015 02:29 AM

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5aLNwOxPsgjg>

nillotampoco • 8 points • 27 February, 2015 05:28 AM

I'll say, both versions suck.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 10:57 AM

I was thinking the same thing, but I do like Robbie's better. It sounds more organic at least, after listening to this Lauper's sounds like it was shrink wrapped and shoved up a campy robot's ass.

ilikeurbootyimnotgay • 10 points • 27 February, 2015 01:48 PM

I'm just waiting for male sex toys to become indistinguishable from real women.

The driving force of success for a lot of men is women. What will women do when the men don't want to work anymore?

capts shady • 17 points • 26 February, 2015 09:32 PM

I remember those days, I was in H.S. It was totally an girl's anthem back then, along with "Like a Virgin" (I know I've banged everyone in town, but with you, it's LIKE I'm a virgin) and "Material Girl" (If they don't give me proper credit, I just walk away) by Madonna.

[deleted] 26 February, 2015 10:25 PM

[permanently deleted]

FLFTW16 • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 07:14 AM

Reservoir Dogs opening scene

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 03:57 PM

It's ironic that this character is played by Quentin Tarentino, someone who was rejected by most women during his time.

bluedrygrass • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 05:14 PM

Because he's one of the most disgusting larvaes of a man.

real-boethius • 19 points • 27 February, 2015 02:29 AM

First-wave feminism was awesome. Women needed to be able to vote and own property and not be second-class citizens.

I suggest you read up a bit about early feminism. They were pushing for women to get custody of children plus child support from day 1 (it is in Mary Wollstonecraft's book from the eighteenth century). They were the driving force behind the disaster that was prohibition. Many of them (eg Emmeline Pankhurst) supported the white feather brigades (social enforcement of men having to enlist in the armed forces). Pankhurst also promoted the vote for upper class but not lower class (propertyless) women to help the ruling class retain their hold on power.

And what have women done with their votes? They have awarded themselves money, mostly taken from men at the point of a gun. Nowadays the government takes vast sums of money from men in the form of taxes, "child support", alimony and gives it to women.

MentORPHEUS • 56 points • 27 February, 2015 03:52 AM

I'm going to weigh in on the minority position of agreeing that first wave feminism was necessary.

I have an antique player piano, and some of the 100+ year rolls include lyrics about women wanting the right to vote, then wanting to be able to *smoke*... at the time, this was positively *scandalous*. Other rolls from this era include lyrics about the darkies working in the cotton fields. It is *not* a time I hearken to with nostalgia, or think returning to this time would improve womens' OR mens' lot in life.

Many seem to be judging the suffragettes by today's comfortable standards, and coming to ridiculous conclusions. Married women were like galley slaves, running the household without modern appliances, even electric light in many cases. Unmarried women were worse off; social *and* economic pariahs. All women were considered the property of some man, and they had no say or standing in politics, the public arena, or their own destiny. I would not want to live in such a society as a man, and the problems of modern feminism can be confronted and vanquished by intelligent men without the thought of returning to such a system.

The civil rights movement of the 60s saw some additional necessary advancements. Another thing I notice about my piano rolls, love songs from the early 1900s till 1960 often mentioned a preacher or marriage. That stopped

after the birth control pill was introduced.

I think Feminism went off the rails with the most radical of the Womens' Lib era of the mid 70s. This marks when feminism lost the focus on equality, and went off in the weeds with the bra-burning, don't need a man rejection of femininity itself. Place the blame where it belongs, and it becomes apparent that the solution to neo-feminism's problems isn't as radical as removing the right of women to vote.

As for Cyndi Lauper, that song was popular during my high school years. I've always dismissed it as silly, but with a red pill perspective, it does make sense as an anthem of an era when women can do foolish things in the pursuit of fun and never suffer harsh consequences.

UgUgImDyingYouIdiot • 4 points • 27 February, 2015 04:39 PM

Those songs, just like the songs of today, were a form of social engineering, putting the ideas in your head with catchy melodies that you repeat over and over. I have a history book written by "progressive" darling HG Wells and it's from the same first wave era, absolutely chock full of the same type of shit. He actually claims in that book that the founding principle of the USA was that women were not citizens. All that kind of shit does is engrain a convenient narrative for the current political class to use to get their goals furthered. It's a big agenda.

Newdist2 • 12 points • 27 February, 2015 05:56 PM

Married women were like galley slaves, running the household without modern appliances, even electric light in many cases.

And their husbands were working 14 hour days six days a week in the coal mines. Life sucked back before technology.

Eskibro47 • 7 points • 27 February, 2015 08:08 AM

A moderate opinion on this board that didn't get downvoted: I'm impressed.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 05:38 AM

Deserve a lot more upvotes than you're going to get.

Hennez • 17 points • 26 February, 2015 08:40 PM

That's exactly how it is. **Girls wanna have fun and guys want to be loved.** Fun guys get to fuck them and the other to fuck themselves. Nice but boring guys do realize this but don't know what to do in order to fuck them, well it would be better to say that they **do know** how to get the girls (the fun guy's attitude they think offends the honor of their princesses) but don't want to accept it.

EDIT: better explaining.

RPSigmaStigma • 6 points • 26 February, 2015 11:15 PM

Yep. It's gamma males hamstering about how they think things *should* be, refusing to accept how they are. It's a narcissistic self-congratulating cycle. The funny thing is, these gammas vacillate between pedestalizing women (falsely, under the auspices of "respecting" them), and secretly hating women for not "appreciating" their (insincere) attempts to be "not like all the other assholes".

RAGING_ERECTION • 10 points • 27 February, 2015 11:43 AM **[recovered]**

in another decade or two, one-sided poly marriages will be a somewhat common thing. Sexless men who are just happy to have a wife, marrying women who are free to go fuck whoever they want.

I've said it on here before and I'll say it again: The female imperative and current western society will not stop until their AF/BB sexual strategy is **legally enforced**.

I'm talking legally enforced cuckoldry with no male parental rights whatsoever. The 80% of betas are nothing more than disposable worker drones to pay for and raise the seed of some top 1% alpha, if not you end up in jail. Hell, we're half way there already.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 February, 2015 09:09 AM

In France a man has to pay for his wife's kid, even if it's not his kid.

FLFTW16 • 12 points • 27 February, 2015 05:17 AM

Firstly, excellent post. Your writing is clear and concise. I like your style and this kind of high quality post is the reason why I come to TRP. Your analysis of Robert Hazard's song encapsulates how feminists spin a harsh reality into a moral anthem for their own ideological shock troops.

I do have one major issue to bring up. You wrote:

First-wave feminism was awesome. Women needed to be able to vote and own property and not be second-class citizens. Second-wave feminism was better than the shit we have today, but was considerably more retarded than first-wave feminism. ... **in another decade or two, one-sided poly marriages will be a somewhat common thing.** (emphasis mine)

More men should challenge their beliefs about liberal democracy and universal suffrage. It's mind boggling that you wrote such a cogent summary of the downward spiral of Western civilization and the very thing that started us down that spiral earns a grade of "awesome."

No. Women were *not* second class citizens. Civilization is a **male invention**. It is built, maintained, and defended by males. When (always *when*, never *if*) shit hits the fan it is millions of men that pay the price to put things back together.

In the United States when white men decided to end slavery and salvage the Union it was men that were slaughtered by the hundreds of thousands to make it happen. The United States is a male project. When Europe was engulfed in the Great War, and then threatened again 20 years later, it was millions of men that were slaughtered to prevent world conquest by the Nazis. Every tribal village, principality, country, Kingdom, and Empire is a male project.

The idea that women should vote when they never have and never will defend the entity in which they are controlling is laughable. That, in effect, makes them first class citizens, above men. They have the privilege of controlling resources without the burden of defending them.

Furthermore, men should question the wisdom of allowing the poorest and dumbest masses to control the machinations of the State. Since women have had the vote it has been a steady march toward replacing men with big daddy gov. The very thing that men built, maintain, and defend with blood is now robbing us to replace us through the hocus-pocus of the enshrined vote. We sense that something is amiss, that we are headed for a crash of some sort, but the worse it gets the more we look for Hope & Change™.

Women unconsciously want to be conquered and ravaged by their betters. A good case study is the country of Sweden. Once in the top 3 for standard of living in the entire world, the ideology of feminism gained a tight grip and they raced full speed *left* off the cliff. Currently Sweden is being colonized by outsiders. Muslims, and sub-Saharan Africans. Once a safe and prosperous place, it is quickly turning into the rape capital of the entire world. It is estimated that in 20 to 30 years Sweden will have the standard of living of a third world country. They are going backward in time. Swedish feminists shit tested their men and the men failed. So they are inviting in men

from Africa by the boatload. Needless to say those Africans don't buy into feminism, and they are raping and pillaging the Swedish women and social services respectively. **Women can't be trusted to lead civilization.** It's not their thing. When push comes to shove they would rather get raped than be called racist.

I agree with the overall message of this post. Have your fun. Spin plates. Fuck sluts. But wake up on the political side of life, eh? Democracy is a sham and universal suffrage is a time bomb. Civilization has always been a male venture and when women have too much say, they take all the goodies for themselves. We see this in countless examples of marriages where the woman is in charge and cuckolds the man. The same can be said on the country and empire level.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 09:05 PM

With luxury came freedom. With Americans freed from the tyranny of survival, they craved equality next. True, there will forever be a cycle of luxury, freedom, downfall, advancement, and luxury again, but should freedom be restricted because of it? It's a moral problem, to me. Is it moral to maintain civilization if it oppresses? Is it moral to give freedom if it brings down civilization? Think of *V for Vendetta* and the like. Sure, the movie is propaganda for revolution where it may not be needed, but giving moral agency to "organization" is murky.

I would agree with you 100% that freedom makes us inefficient and possibly even poor, but the tyranny of philosophy makes it hard to say that the current situation is objectively poor. If you spin plates and enjoy the decline, such chaos can be seen as good, in a self-serving, semi-nihilistic way.

kevkos • 4 points • 27 February, 2015 05:13 PM

Spot on, and nothing that a good dose of anarchy won't fix. I'm not being facetious- government itself is the problem. Humans are autonomous by nature, and having a centralized system of domination and control simply does not work, and leads to the exact problems we are discussing here.

Government is just human beings.

They are supposedly superior to us, allowed to use violence against us, legally to support a corrupt system? These are mere politicians I might add, some of the greediest types of people on earth.

Democracy certainly is a sham, but voting, male or female, is beyond pointless, and is in fact as the late George Carlin said, "bullshit". You choosing your slave masters is not freedom.

Kyfhomyoba • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 06:37 PM

AnCap here. I'm just waiting to see what will happen when the SNAP/EBT don't work, and the welfare payments won't buy shit 'cause the Chinese/Russians will only take gold.

MentORPHEUS • -1 points • 27 February, 2015 06:27 AM

I'm surprised at how many limitations on voting are proposed in this discussion. Women shouldn't have a vote; Poor shouldn't have a vote; Noncombatants shouldn't have a vote. Parts of this thread are sounding like Too Much Rand, or Too Much Heinlein.

FLFTW16 • 6 points • 27 February, 2015 06:31 AM

I'd love to see your actual objections to the ideas presented rather than just a complaint that the ideas themselves were expressed.

MentORPHEUS • 6 points • 27 February, 2015 07:19 AM

Gladly. Women should have the right to vote; I don't want to live in an *actual* patriarchy. Wealth should not be a requirement to vote; no thanks to Oligarchy. Military service shouldn't be a

requirement to vote; a military-centric government will likely end badly, it does NOT filter for good/bad voters, and the 1/XXX,XXX,XXX stake it gives each voter so qualified is not a superior motivation to vote wisely than the incentives that exist in our form of democracy now.

As Churchill said, Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the others.

FLFTW16 • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 07:49 AM

Women should have the right to vote; I don't want to live in an actual patriarchy.

Women having power in society leads to the destruction of society, just as women having the power in marriage leads to the destruction of marriage.

Unfortunately you completely ignored my Sweden example. If a society exists in isolation it can impose any rules it wishes and walk blithely into the future. When Japan was isolated they could afford to fight with swords and shun modern technology. Eventually the party ends when people realize, *shit*, we aren't isolated, we are in competition with other groups. Sweden followed the feminist ideology to its logical conclusion and the result is genocide of the native population. Alarming quickly they are being replaced by African Muslims and they are enjoying the fruits of this, the exalted position of world rape capital and a plummeting standard of living.

There is a reason patriarchy exists today, it is the only system that creates stability. Matriarchies are *always* conquered. When gynocentrism rules the system will fall apart or underperform until someone stronger comes along to challenge for resources/territory.

Oppression isn't what you think it is. You know most South Africans preferred life under apartheid compared to after the ANC took over power? They don't teach that in school. Or that there are more slaves in Africa **today** than were ever taken by Europeans in the Atlantic slave trade? It turns out that when white men are in power they ensure a society with decency, even to the point of civil war in the case of the USA. When left to their own devices Africans are just cool with slavery.

You say "wealth should not be a requirement to vote" but I say that those who have the gold make the rules regardless of whether people are voting or not! Your idealism is, in fact, naive.

Western society will not simply chug along when the role of men is entirely outsourced to big daddy government social programs for sluts and single mommies. It will result in men entirely dropping out and the system collapsing under its own weight, a low birthrate followed by waves of immigrants that give zero fucks for Western values. Look at Sweden. They **are** the canary in the coal mine.

saibot83 • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 01:56 PM

You are completely spot on. I live in Sweden and shit's fucked up, getting worse by the second. The future will be extremely interesting. And scary. :-(

kevkos • -1 points • 27 February, 2015 05:15 PM

Women don't destroy the idea of marriage. The idea has already been destroyed, it no longer is applicable to today's society. Marriage is just another sham foisted on society.

[deleted] • 18 points • 26 February, 2015 10:07 PM*

I see the possibility of another outcome, one where marriage disappears.

As women obtain more and more protected jobs and income, male resource provisioning will play an ever

smaller role in mate choice. Many men will understand, as they always have, that the key to getting women is to simply develop the correct persona, money be damned. Given how hard it will be for them to make money, as women squeeze them out of the workplace, persona will be all they care about. These will become women's go to fun time options, but not marriage material. What could they bring to a marriage that the woman doesn't already get?

Most of the other men will also get squeezed out of any meaningful employment but fail to develop the correct persona. These are not fun men. But, they bring no resources into the marriage equation either--by this point we'll have to have state mandated child care. Women can freeze their eggs and inseminate them whenever they want and bare children all on their timeline without a man or "closing windows of opportunity." They won't need a stay at home parent, the state will provide care and resources. These men will never get married.

A few true over achieving men will rise to the top and have great jobs and great lives, but with marriage become the abnormality these same men will have grown up understanding that marriage just isn't what you do. Would women want to marry them? Absolutely, but these men won't make a commitment to one when they really can have them all, and again marriage is not the norm.

Also, the wall will disappear. When child birth can be chosen at any time and mate selection is no longer an issue, these two factors, and their traditionally imposed biological limitations, will disappear. There will be no wall. There will simply be a number of choices for women for as long as they live.

fittitthroway • 4 points • 27 February, 2015 05:28 AM

Wait until increased automation comes. Then the real fun begins. Millions of vehicle based jobs are already on the cliff once Google, Mercedes, Toyota etc start producing automated smart cars. Google already has tens of thousands of miles of tests done with autonomous cars. Then you have automated check outs, retail etc in the pipeline. As the chinese curse goes, we're in for interesting times.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 02:27 PM

Automation is put in place when it is cheaper than labor. Dropping expenses for the company means lower prices for the products. Lower prices for the products means higher standard of living. So if every high tech job gets automated that wouldnt be a big issue: even guys working entry level at mcdonalds could afford a middle class lifestyle at that point.

QQ_L2P • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 07:54 PM

You mean the people who *were* working at McDonalds, they were just automated out of a job.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 11:56 PM

Ok then, whatever job hasn't been automated yet.

And if all jobs have been automated, welcome to heaven! Do whatever you want.

QQ_L2P • 1 point • 28 February, 2015 12:07 AM

For the average person, complete automation would be a far worse prospect. It would require a fundamental shift from capitalism. Something those who had profited from automation would be unwilling to let go without a fight.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 February, 2015 01:19 AM

It would require a fundamental shift from capitalism

Actually it is the logical endpoint of capitalism. In a free market, entrepreneurs in competition with other entrepreneurs work to provide the highest quality goods and

services at the most competitive (low) prices. In doing so, whenever a new machine is developed that can provide more benefit relative to cost than human labor, that new machine will be used. As new innovations make more and more machines cheap and effective, more and more industries become automated. At some point engineering and other "research and development" types of jobs become automated, you now have self-designing/self-improving machines, and you have hit technological singularity. The last companies in existence are just a handful of people who maintain and repair the highest-tier machines (which at that point are capable of designing and building better versions of different machines). The economy still exists, prices still exist, however machines do all trading, producing, marketing, etc. and humans make money simply by receiving profits made by the machines they own.

Something those who had profited from automation would be unwilling to let go without a fight.

The only real way to "fight" a new innovation from replacing you is using the government to make that new innovation either illegal or heavily restricted, and that would be a fundamentally anti-capitalist action. That would be horse-drawn cart manufacturers successfully making cars illegal.

QQ_L2P • 1 point • 28 February, 2015 03:24 AM

That's great in theory, but it doesn't address the practicalities of it with the current economic model. The average person isn't going to own any of those machines, lol. It'll be the people who had the capital to invest in them in the first place, which definitely won't be the average person.

So now what happens? You can no longer trade your time for money, but there's a functional economy? What are people doing to earn the money put into the economy? Sell snake-oil?

The practicalities of such an existence means that humans are either doing nothing and get some sort of "living allowance", or money disappears completely and we start moving to some sort of hyper socialism where resources are shared out equally, we invent the technology to recombine the elements at will and we end up in Star Trek, or we all have a big ol' resource war and kill each other off till that doesn't matter any more.

The only real way to "fight" a new innovation from replacing you is using the government to make that new innovation either illegal or heavily restricted, and that would be a fundamentally anti-capitalist action. That would be horse-drawn cart manufacturers successfully making cars illegal.

You seem to have misunderstood what I was saying. *The people who have profited from automation will not give up their monetary gains without a fight. They aren't going to just start handing out money to the guy working a 9-5 job out of the goodness of their own heart.*

[deleted] • 1 point • 1 March, 2015 03:02 AM

The average person isn't going to own any of those machines It'll be the people who had the capital to invest in them in the first place

What do you mean? As machines start building other machines, (and later on automatically improving designs) the startup costs get smaller and smaller. Just like any other product, as you are able to make it more and more efficiently you can sell it for cheaper and cheaper to outcompete other businesses. When its at the point that very few jobs still aren't automated, buying a machine would cost very little, and anybody who loaned the small bit of money necessary to somebody who didn't have one would be virtually guaranteed to get his money back.

What the are people doing to earn the money put into the economy?

Providing value, what you always would do. But this small handful of people who are machineless would be easily aided with charity (considering the vast majority of families would have had bought up many machines over generations)

They aren't going to just start handing out money to the guy working a 9-5 job out of the goodness of their own heart

The people who manufactured horse-drawn carts eventually moved on after cars were the dominant transportation. They went into different industries and lived out their lives normally. They didn't need donations.

If you're talking about "late game" when machines are at the point where they are making better versions of themselves, buying a machine that could earn you a basic living would require a loan from a friend of essentially chump change. I don't think you fully appreciate the kind of changes true self-improving machines bring.

finalfantasybrownies • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 12:15 AM

The time the egg is fertilized doesn't effect the DNA in the egg that makes women age like milk. That would take some DNA engineering of the distant future.

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 01:04 AM*

Not sure what you mean. If you're referring to the wall disappearing: it's because without having to use their rapidly diminishing youth to secure a provider to start a family their age doesn't matter. Husbands won't factor into women's timeline for childbirth, science will and it will greatly extend the time frame (the fact that the eggs might be less healthy likely won't be any more important to women then than it is now). We *might* see a trend towards younger mothers when husbands are no longer factored in. And, since women understand they won't be obtaining husbands, their youth becomes less important. Yes, they'll still have to lower the level of alpha they expect to attract as they age, but that will also be a slow process given how few options those lesser and non-alpha men looking for sex will have when they can no longer secure the BB role.

Very likely you'll see an informal harem type dynamic with most people having multiple partners (wmoen in general having more partners then all but the very top men) none of whom cohabitate. The higher up the scale you are the higher your core number of primary, then secondary then tertiary, etc. partners and the greater your frequency of ONS as well. Lower down the scale you get fewer number of primary and maybe one or two secondary partners. Mid range will have people mainly progressing through a series of serial monogamy relationships with the occasional overlap. On the lower half of the scale you'll have greater and greater times between relationships until you enter the lowest reaches of the scale where your options will be similar to what is currently available to people at that place on the scale

now.

santino314 • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 02:05 AM

as women squeeze them out of the workplace

This will only be possible if they impose hard quotas by law. No sane employer would hire mostly women for (physically and intellectually) demanding jobs.

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 February, 2015 02:08 AM

You're right. Because we clearly aren't moving in the direction of codifying laws that prefer women over men.

SgtBrutalisk • 22 points • 26 February, 2015 08:32 PM

This post aligns with a post I had published under the same title on RoK. Basically, become a jester who entertains women or opt out of dating scene altogether. Women simply don't need men as providers anymore.

[deleted] • 21 points • 26 February, 2015 10:44 PM

I don't like or would ever adopt the "jester" mentality

I want to have a good time, so I do fun things for my own sake. Sometimes I want a beautiful woman there to be the garnish on my good time, or to have sex with after I'm done exploring/hiking/etc. They're more than glad to tag along with my action packed schedule than sit home bored. They get turned on watching me partake and by me forcing them out of their comfort zone. They will gladly fuck someone who makes their life fun and interesting.

Fun, Interest & Mystery = High SMV. If you reek of high SMV they will do their best to raise their own. In their mind, they raise their own by fucking High SMV men. Be that High SMV man, not a Jester. End of Story.

FallenHighSchoolJock • 10 points • 27 February, 2015 09:36 AM

Hey, I just met you, (9/10 male model who I haven't shared two words with) And this is crazy, (no it's not) But here's my number, So call me, maybe!

And all the other boys, (Sub 8 beta orbiters) Try to chase me, (stroke my ego) But here's my number, So call me, maybe!

Hypergammy is *everywhere*.

TheFriendWithin • 17 points • 26 February, 2015 09:07 PM

Society is a genuine tragedy. Humanity is capable of so much but its being squandered.

It would be ignorant and naive to blame women, it is not exclusively their fault, but they are the catalyst for societys destruction.

I only hope that some of the men from this forum have survived when its time to rebuild civilization.

[deleted] • 9 points • 27 February, 2015 05:28 AM

Lol. The majority of this forum is doing their best to ensure it goes down in flames.

Bibosas • 21 points • 26 February, 2015 11:18 PM

Source: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hmgF9OUWdQs>

Here we go! I present you: *Tylor Swift – Style*

Midnight Come and pick me up. No headlights.

Interpretation: There's really late and nobody's supposed to see us, but be careful I don't wanna look like a slut. I have to care about my reputation of a good girl.

A long drive. Could end in burning flames or paradise.

Interpretation: I don't know if I'm gonna fuck him. This is a long drive, because there's no drama like usually. Are you still alpha? We will see. I will shit test out of you.

Fade into view. It's been a while since I have even heard from you. (Heard from you.)

Interpretation: And here we go! Let's create some drama! Shit test!

I should just tell you to leave 'cause... I know exactly where it leads, but...

Interpretation: Shit test. But maybe you are still alpha, I'm gonna give you a chance...

I watch us go 'round and 'round each time

Interpretation: You treating me like a plate and I don't deserve this. I'm so special. And you don't even see this! (More drama!) (Look at the movement of her finger. Is that remind you something? Little plate :-)) Hilarious!

You got that James Dean daydream look in your eyes

Interpretation: You look like a bad boy alpha with a possibility of making a lot of money in the future.

And I got that red lip classic thing that you like.

Interpretation: Look! Look! I would be a good wife! I not a slut! I'm so special! Just give me a chance.

And when we go crashing down We come back every time

Interpretation: Everytime when I create drama and shit test him, he always is giving me good alpha responses.

'Cause we never go out of style.

Interpretation: You so alpha I'm going to tell all my friends about you. They gonna be so envy! She's so proud of herself.

We never go out of style

Interpretation: Hamster marathon! (Wait for the wall, my dear. :))

You got that long hair slicked back, white t-shirt.

Interpretation: You got all the attributes of an alpha bad boy.

And I got that good girl faith And tight little skirt.

Interpretation: And for you I can play a good wife. You gonna see! Nobody gonna notice anything. I'm gonna add value to your life by being your wife. And at night I'm gonna be only your slut. I'm gonna forget about thunder dick Chad and Big dick Brandon, and pure half hour of laying pipe Ricardo. I love you. I only care about you. They don't matter.

And when we go crashing down We come back every time We never go out of style

Interpretation: I'm gonna hamster as long as I can to pursue you, my alpha. Beta bux Rick gonna wait for me no matter what.

So it goes

Interpretation: So it begins.

He can't keep his wild eyes on the road.

Interpretation: He's work me over. I'm getting horny.

Ooh, yeah.

Interpretation: Yeah I'm 100% sure I'm wet.

Takes me home

Interpretation: Look how proud she is :-)

Lights are off He's taking of his coat.

Interpretation: There's a mood. Everything's in place. Fuck! There's nothing get drama for. He's ready to fuck me.

I say I heard Oh, that you've been out and about with some other girl Some other girl

Interpretation: Fake anger. Here we go again, an other shit test. You thought you gonna fuck me so easily? You gonna have to work me little bit more. Show me more how alpha you are!

He says: What you heard is true

But I can't stop thinking About you and I

Interpretation: Look at his fucking guys frame, I just love this guy. He's brilliant. I'm 100 % sure she didn't come up with this herself. This is too goddamn brilliant.

I said I've been there, too, a few times.

Interpretation: Great answer, you are a master of shit tests. You can fuck me. Also I'm a slut too. You don't care and you never gonna shame me for it. You so alpha!

We never go! (chorus: out of style) We never go! (chorus: out of style)

Interpretation: Hamster is burning! I will never hit the wall. I'm so special!

Take me home!

Interpretation: Ok, you can fuck me!

Just take me home!

Interpretation: I'm ready, I can't wait. Just fuck me!

Yeah

Interpretation: Is that "yeah" is enough with this new "yes means yes" policy? :)

Just take me home

Interpretation: Come on, fuck me already! I'm so wet!

'Cause we never go out of style. we never go out of style

Interpretation: Don't worry, alpha, my hamster gonna explain everything to me. My hamster gonna find some value in me whoring :)

Taylor Swift's songs are a vault for a RP information. Every her song.

Source: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hmgF9OUWdQs>

rockerfeller_1696 • 9 points • 27 February, 2015 12:39 AM

It would be nice if there was a "Red Pill Rap Genius" for deciphering lyrics like these for our less-enlightened bretheren

Newdist2 • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 07:04 PM

Midnight Come and pick me up. No headlights.

Translation: Don't wake up my parents.

Taylor Swift is encouraging your underage daughters to be whores like herself.

GuideGhost2 points 27 February, 2015 08:08 AM [recovered]

OMG. I love you. Taylor Swift is one of my guilty pleasures and this song is one of my favorites on her new album. I was thinking about doing a RP analysis myself. Brilliant work.

[deleted] 27 February, 2015 04:56 PM

[permanently deleted]

rztzz • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 10:47 PM

I noted similar things in that songs, and most of the songs on her album, but interpreted the lyrics a bit differently than you.

This is a FWB, alpha fucks situation. Therefore she must comment on his physical appearance. It's also a situation where his SMV is likely a little bit higher than hers, this could have been about the One Direction guy, and therefore he fades in and out with her but she's texting with other guys too so it hurts less. She makes this song to feign control and glorify her existence essentially as a plate.

NeoreactionSafe • 16 points • 26 February, 2015 08:49 PM*

Always remember that in this age you can "go your own way" and probably should most of the time.

Sad to think we are reduced as men to the level of "entertainment" objects, but there is a lot of truth in this.

The Whore of Babylon wears the Jewels:

http://img3.wikia.nocookie.net/__cb20130425154153/villains/images/5/51/Whore_of_Babylon.jpg

The opposite is "Barefoot and Pregnant":

<http://i256.photobucket.com/albums/hh198/cherries-in-the-snow/pinups/housework12.jpg>

...which do you prefer?

alfred_e_nooman • 8 points • 27 February, 2015 08:18 AM

An additional note to point out was that although the OP says that the first and second wave feminism might have been a good thing, an often omitted fact was that women before that time were completely content with their relationship arrangements. They were not concerned with voting or any of the other political activities that they saw were boring, complicated and better left to the devices of men.

While she felt comfortable being subordinate to her husband, at least she had power over other lesser human beings to do her bidding in the form of slaves. First wave feminism is arose as a response to the abolition of slavery which happened around the same period (1865 onwards) because white women found it incredibly offensive that a black man whom they consider subhuman had more rights to property and freedom than herself.

Feminism was hardly a movement for equal rights for women but was more of a movement to try to grab what power was taken away from them. Slaves were taken away from them and they demanded compensation for the right to manipulate the government in the form of voting. Now, they've stumbled on an untapped source of power in the form of government provisions and the force of law to effectively create new slaves in the form of alimony and child support. Not only can they re-enslave black men again, but all men and all taxpayers. It's so incredibly insidious and now people have grown to accept it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 5 November, 2021 02:59 AM

You are truly deranged. Less than 11% of SOUTHERNERS owned slaves and few, if any, other Americans

did, so where you get your ideas from is beyond me. Nearly 50% of marriages end within the first 5 years and the vast majority of those INCLUDE NO CHILDREN, so where the child support/alimony slavery comes in, I don't know.

vakerr • 3 points • 28 February, 2015 07:05 AM

if we don't have a war or something else significant to shock the world in the interim, in another decade or two, one-sided poly marriages will be a somewhat common thing. Sexless men who are just happy to have a wife, marrying women who are free to go fuck whoever they want. Because trying to use marriage to own and control women is a patriarchal relic from the past.

No matriarchy ever survived long term in history. If the west continues on this path it'll be overrun by people who don't subscribe to the feminist/progressive nonsense.

Bocaj6487 • 7 points • 26 February, 2015 10:25 PM

There is no good wave of feminism. From the courtly love movement to women's suffrage and beyond, the female imperative has been bad for humanity. Consult the wisdom of our forefathers

fittitthroway • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 05:32 AM

Goes all the way back to Rome empire and more. It's insane.

TomilloDanup • 5 points • 26 February, 2015 09:02 PM

This is so cool to read. It's like "back to basics".

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 February, 2015 08:21 AM

My question is, how can we combat feminism? I've known it's bullshit for a while, recently started reading TRP. I'm in college and there's lots of feminists here, even one of my professors has us read feminist articles and makes us write journals on our opinions of them. If we don't agree with her, we fail. So I just play her game and spout the bullshit nonsense she wants for the grade.

What is the way for men to counter this? It's depressing to see so many brainwashed men just accepting feminism for whatever demand they have next. What do we do? On a day-to-day basis, dealing with these people is becoming frustrating. I don't think the media would have ANY interest in men's rights, unfortunately. I think we're going to hit rock bottom as a gender. Hell, we're already close to it. The tables have almost completely turned.

Archwinger[S] • 4 points • 27 February, 2015 10:52 AM*

You don't combat feminism or try to change the world.

The rules changed on us. The Red Pill is about learning the new rules and accepting them - how things really work, not the politically correct version, not how we wish things were or how they ought to be, not what girls tell you. How things really work. And we say it out loud even if the truth is offensive. Even if everyone else will deny it and call us crazy and misogynistic.

Then, we explore ways of being successful, sexually and otherwise, under the new regime. We're not out to change anything, more to succeed despite how things are.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 11:36 AM

Why not try to change things to be more fair for everyone? Just stating the truth isn't enough. If you know something is wrong, it's important to voice things that need to be changed.

fitnesstested • 3 points • 28 February, 2015 02:12 AM

Some do. They are called Men's Rights Activists.

Others would rather be like Fuck it and watch the world burn.

One of my favorite pieces about the subject.

"Without feminism a lot of you never would have learned game in the first place, you'd be too busy with a nice family.

But you're a 7 and that nice 7 who would have made a fine bride for you in 1870 fucked the Left Wing of the hockey team in college where a Federally subsidized loan paid for her to get a sociology degree, which allows her to look down on any man who works with his hands and now the thought of marrying her disgusts you.

It is what it is. You can't fight the terrain.

So what do you do?

You either keep trying to find a bride from a shrinking pool of prospects, and fight for your share of civilization. or You say fuck it, master the game, fuck the sluts and ruin other guy's potential wives, and kick your feet up poolside as the world burns. Choose your path. Can anyone really blame you if you choose the latter? I can't. I may even join you. The world stopped caring first. Fuck it."

<https://web.archive.org/web/20131212081141/http://laidnyc.wordpress.com/2013/12/04/no-really-what-does-a-feminist-look-like/>

popthatpill • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 08:01 PM

Why not try to change things to be more fair for everyone?

Because you won't succeed, and so it's a waste of time.

Mac2TheFuture • 5 points • 27 February, 2015 08:39 AM

And women would call this claim discriminating, sexist, and misogynist *despite* it being absolutely true. The fact that TRP offends people is a good thing, because that means it's probably true. The difference between being 'insulted' and 'offended' is that being offended means denying truth to avoid enlightenment for blissfully ignorant minds.

kingofpoplives • 24 points • 26 February, 2015 08:57 PM

First-wave feminism was awesome. Women needed to be able to vote and own property and not be second-class citizens.

False.

It should be obvious that the problems created by second and third wave feminism were only made possible by the success of the first wave.

I'm sorry bud, but you can't have it both ways.

You can't claim feminism was good, but then it went bad.

It was always bad. It always wanted to subvert the patriarchy, and through that, destroy civilization itself.

You have to understand that leftism is a ratchet. First they ask for one thing, it sounds innocuous enough, so you give it to them. Then they ask for another, and another. They keep pushing for more and more and never give an inch in the other direction. Once they gain critical mass and take power, they really start putting the screws to the

opposition (read: SJWs). This is how we find ourselves in our present predicament.

arrayay • 12 points • 27 February, 2015 12:08 AM

Glad I'm not the only one who caught that.

If you don't see the issue with this statement, go back and reread "The Manipulated Man" in the sidebar material. Men have always had it worse than women, we are the disposable gender.

A419a • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 07:57 PM

The ones who disagree just never looked down. And they never intend to. Yells about glass ceiling while refusing to recognize the much larger glass cellar.

guy_from_the_thing • 22 points • 26 February, 2015 09:08 PM

Do you think we'd be better off if they were not allowed to vote?

I never thought I'd actually consider it. The more RP my worldview has become, the less crazy it actually sounds. Although saying anything like that in public will get you skewered.

scamper_22 • 20 points • 26 February, 2015 11:13 PM **[recovered]**

Well it actually is a good question.

As the Middle East is teaching some people right now, democracy means nothing if you don't change the mind set of the people. If all democracy means is me Sunni, you Shia, me vote Sunni, you vote Shia. Life not good. We go war... well that democracy is pretty meaningless. Or in the case of some people... me want money, government give me money, I get money.

It's the same with voting. Women got the right to vote BEFORE having to do anything or change their mindset. As the obvious contradiction arose. When women got the right to vote, they really had no responsibilities outside of well... having children and staying home. Politically, they couldn't be drafted into war and sent to die. Culturally, they were not expected to support themselves.

Democracy is a pretty decent form of government, but it also needs democratic citizens, democratic culture, strong judiciary... to be effective.

But whatever, politics has always been pretty screwed up. If it's not women controlling politics, its bankers, corporations, government unions, military... whatever.

Most of this would not even be a problem if men actually saw was happening and grew a spine... well we now have the RP, but I mean where has it been for the past 60 years. Not in terms of stopping politics, but just in terms of teaching men. Where was every father telling their son, don't get married or teaching them this RP stuff?

Even here at times, we have men telling other men to screw over other men or laughing at BP guys. Well congrats, that's not very productive now is it.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 03:50 AM

I think one of the best things we can do to start fixing the problem is having senators send appointed by state legislatures, not elected. I think politicians that don't have to campaign will be more effective.

Newdist2 • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 06:56 PM

To the extent that democracy works at all, it works with a single cohesive population has a common interest, but legitimate disagreements about how to advance their common interest.

However, all too often you have competing groups voting to extract resources from each other. Ben Franklin's old adage of the wolves and the sheep voting on what to have for dinner.

zyk0s • 17 points • 26 February, 2015 11:06 PM

Do you think we'd be better off if they were not allowed to vote?

If you think about it for a bit, this is the wrong question to ask. OP's proposition was that "women *needed* to be able to vote". We don't know what would have happened if they didn't get the vote and all else stayed the same, how our technological progress, trends and fashions would have shaped politics then. It's foolish to speculate, even more so to qualify as "better" or "worse".

No, the real question was, was there really a *need*? No, it was a luxury, only afforded because it was a time of relative peace and prosperity. If there had been a famine going around, how many women do you think would have joined the suffragettes, and how many would have shut their pretty mouth and tried to secure a husband so they could be assured provision? Contrast this with the French Revolution, that was brought about because times were hard for the common folk. Allowing the people to vote was a need because the French society was about to collapse. Women's suffrage came about because wealthy and well educated women got bored, and like a petulant child, asked "what about me? It's not fair", not realizing how coddled they were.

zephyrprime • 27 points • 26 February, 2015 09:45 PM*

I definitely think so. We would be better off if women were not allowed to vote. Women always vote in wealth redistribution and welfare for themselves. 10 out of 11 welfare recipients are women and their children. Basically, women vote in laws that put men into tax servitude. For some of them, that money will be going to women that wouldn't give them the time of day and for children they will never be able to have. Sure, there aren't a whole lot of guys like this...YET. Unfortunately, this is the direction society is moving in.

bsutansalt • 22 points • 26 February, 2015 11:26 PM

10 out of 11 welfare recipients are women and their children.

I figured it was bad, but not that bad. Is there a source for this figure?

RedMorpheus • 8 points • 27 February, 2015 12:41 PM

Stanford study, source: Female-Headed Households and the Welfare System

TL;DR; Women with children are the overwhelming majority among the beneficiaries of the main "means tested" income maintenance programs, such as AFDC, food stamps, and Medicaid..

[deleted] • 9 points • 27 February, 2015 03:16 AM

And the most ironic thing is that all of those career-minded progressive feminist women that are postponing childbirth are subsidizing through taxes the unemployed and low-income women having many children. Ultimately, feminism is demographically unsustainable and feminists will over the long run breed themselves out of existence, since the traditionalists/RP cultures always have superior demographics.

You just can't beat the natural order.

bsutansalt • 14 points • 26 February, 2015 11:20 PM

IMO, nobody should be allowed to vote if they're on the dole and/or don't have skin in the game as people are selfish fucks. It should surprise no one that women voted more more more for themselves the moment they got the vote.

Furthermore, back then women consumed resources rather than produced them, in large part because of the limited jobs available to them for a couple generations. Men on the other hand were the opposite in the grand scheme of things. Complicating matters is how same-group preference works: women have it and men do not, plus men actually prefer women over their fellow men. Toss it all into a pot and stir and you get why women have gotten just about everything they ever asked for and why the historic expansion of govt spending is in lock step with women's suffrage.

an0n4btc • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 04:35 AM*

IMO, nobody should be allowed to vote if they're on the dole and/or don't have skin in the game as people are selfish fucks.

I disagree. While they don't have skin in the game on the tax side of things; they are still affected by government policies.

Changes in corporate/business law, for example, can add or subtract available job numbers and thus affect chances of those, on government benefits being denied the right to vote, the opportunity of gaining employment (men being more likely than women IMO to do as such).

There will always be those that choose to skim from the labors of others; but to say all that take (or have taken) any benefits provided to them is a gross generalisation that would be detrimental to your society.

The detriment is realised in losses incurred from the number of people, that went on from those programs, to become tax payers and, by proxy, pay back the funds they consumed so that others may benefit in kind.

kingofpoplives • 16 points • 26 February, 2015 09:20 PM

Do you think we'd be better off if they were not allowed to vote?

Oh god, yes. Things have only gotten worse since they extended the franchise beyond land owning males.

Women just can't be in charge of society. They don't think far enough into the future and allow emotions to corrupt their decision making. This is just the truth of their nature.

Although saying anything like that in public will get you skewered.

Ain't that the truth.

Tom_The_Human • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 02:48 AM

Do you think we'd be better off if they were not allowed to vote?

Tbh, I think most people shouldn't be allowed to vote, as I don't want my life decided by millions of idiots. I think that only the ~80th percentile and higher should be allowed to vote.

BrunoOh • 8 points • 26 February, 2015 10:01 PM

I'd rather have voting rights based on how much tax you pay. That way male leeches are excluded as well, and it won't be a gender specific law. Democracy works better when voters have a stake in the

game.

RPenetrate • 14 points • 26 February, 2015 11:04 PM

I'm not sure if your comment is intended to be ironic, but that's not Democracy. What you're describing is a kind of Plutocracy.

guy_from_the_thing • 9 points • 26 February, 2015 10:17 PM

that's tricky. I prefer a combination of being a net tax contributor, plus some kind of exam you have to pass to vote. Topics should include civics, math (compound interest function a must), logic, reading comprehension.

if it's based on the amount you pay, the rich would have a disproportionate influence, even though they'd vote to lower their own taxes, they'd still end up paying more and having more influence. I know they already have a disproportionate influence as of now anyway lol.

mjociv • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 01:42 AM

Net tax contributor would either screw a lot of people unintentionally or no one would ever take a government contract/work for the government, awful hard to pay more than you got when all or most of your income is tax dollars. This includes policemen, firemen, EMTs, teachers, some correctional officers, court employees (DA office, judges, etc.), people in the military, you get the idea. Students who take out government backed loans (the vast majority) are all net takers until they're paid off. The only people who would really benefit are the people with disproportionately high influence already.

Archwinger[S] • 11 points • 26 February, 2015 09:14 PM

I wonder about that. Female voters outnumber male voters. The gender gap was 10 percent in women's favor in 1996.

Going to the polling place during peak (after work) hours is a hassle. If you don't work or work a part time or flexible schedule (more women than men), you can show up at alternate times, early polling locations, etc.

Plus, a lot of the men that vote do what their wives do. They're busy working all day and haven't researched the issues or the candidates. So the woman tells her husband who to vote for.

Pandering to female voters is essential nowadays.

mr_willz • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 09:55 PM

Define 'better off', I mean it's an interesting thought but in my mind that is completely irrelevant to whether they should be allowed to vote. Then you have to ask yourself, who should be allowed to vote? There are a lot of dumb idiot men out there too.

mr_willz • 5 points • 26 February, 2015 09:04 PM

I'm sorry bud, but you can't have it both ways.

You can't claim feminism was good, but then it went bad.

Incorrect, balance is a thing.

[deleted] 26 February, 2015 09:29 PM*

[permanently deleted]

tallwheel • 6 points • 27 February, 2015 03:56 AM*

Women have all the rights and none of the responsibilities.

It was that way with the first wave too, though. Women wanted the vote, but only as long as they still didn't have to sign up for selective service.

mr_willz • -2 points • 26 February, 2015 09:57 PM

So? What do you want to do? You have to accept that is the way it is, you should think higher of yourself than ever becoming a slave because of votes, but even you know you're exaggerating.

This is not a fight against women.

[deleted] 26 February, 2015 10:07 PM*

[permanently deleted]

mr_willz • -1 points • 26 February, 2015 10:27 PM

Answer my question, so what do you want to do?

I repeat this is not a fight against women, against feminism. Remember this sub is not about educating women, it is about educating men.

/u/brunoOh touches on it with a better approach.

kingofpoplives • 13 points • 26 February, 2015 09:09 PM

Yea... except not when it comes to granting voting rights to half the population.

Can you please tell me sir, in which direction women voted with their newly acquired voting rights?

Spoiler: for more and more feminist shit.

mr_willz • -1 points • 26 February, 2015 09:48 PM

I'm not sure what you're trying to say, whether you believe their votes were correct or not is irrelevant to whether women should have the right to vote or not.

kingofpoplives • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 01:15 AM

whether you believe their votes were correct or not is irrelevant

False.

It is supremely relevant.

Good governance is more important than equality. If you put equality first, you just get a shit country to be equal in.

As we have seen, equality makes for a great marketing slogan, but in practice, turns everything to shit.

Godtiermasturbator • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 10:13 PM

Bravo. As they say on one of my favorite sites, "fukkin saved".

Shankar_ • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 03:47 AM

Sooo true and beautifully written

FrameWalker • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 05:49 AM

You young guys out there need to work harder than ever, for you. Get your awesome life in gear, for you, so when this bubble bursts, you're on top. But on your down time, ride this third wave of slutty feminism as far as it can take you. Look hot, smile, be fun, and abdicate all appearances of work, responsibility, or love. Entertain them. Perform like a monkey. Stick your dick in them. Laugh at them inside your head. Then go home and keep working on that awesome life you're building. It'll be our secret.

Thanks for the inspiration arch. It's crazy how many little tells they give you about being a slut, using you for sex, seeing other men on the side. I was so blind before. I'll play nice and enjoy the sex, but it'll be a long time before one will lock me down.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 11:21 AM

A lot of excellent points made here however I disagree as far as where feminism is going. I believe we are at the peak currently. Their own gender is starting to turn on them and well from my own stand point I have a hard time seeing society stomaching much more anyway.

TomHicks • 2 points • 28 February, 2015 03:03 AM

First-wave feminism was awesome. Women needed to be able to vote and own property and not be second-class citizens.

ehhhhhh they started the white feather movement. Bunch of fucking cunts

Vietnom • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 12:48 AM

I think a lot of what you're saying is pretty crazy, but the paragraph about one-sided poly marriages caught my eye.

My dad is friends with a family that matches that description. The woman is a powerful, semi-attractive professor at a major U.S. university. She has a husband, an older man, who is a rich lawyer, and pays for their megamansion. She also has a younger man who is her lover. They don't quite declare it publicly, but it's incredibly obvious. The three of them all "pitch in" to raise the child. The woman sort of tried to pull my dad into the mix and he was like "no thanks."

SportingCP21 • 3 points • 27 February, 2015 01:57 AM

Come on now these arrangements are very rare. I don't see this becoming a thing. Theres about 1% of the US population that practice polyamory. That dude is obviously a beta cuckold for allowing his wife to bitch him like that.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 05:42 AM

He's got money too? Certainly enough to hire someone to make people start falling on knives 20 times?

SportingCP21 • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 12:58 AM

One sided poly relationships? The fuck are you serious, polyamory is about 1% of the American population why the fuck do you think it will be the majority in years to come?

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 February, 2015 05:40 AM

I feel like women argue two things. "leave me alone!" and "you're not a man!"

I have such a head rush from the cognitive dissonance. I'm a man, im not a jerk. But if you want a jerk, i can

help. However, once you get said jerk, don't go around complaining that he never lets you see your friends or go out, or do anything fun. don't bitch and whine about the fact that you feel like he owns you. Cuz you know what? At the end of the day, he does own you. As sexist and evil as that sounds. It will always be true.

alpha_n3rd • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 10:50 PM

Girls just want to have lunch

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 05:32 AM

like it or not every line in a song has been carefully crafted for subliminal messages. you have reminded me that there are many songs that i want to pull apart in red pill postings. upvoted

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 06:48 PM

If he's ever a dime short, he goes to jail.

I live in Brazil and here the law system is fucked up, inefficient and slow, but if there's one thing that's very effective and sends you to jail faster than you can say "Red Pill" is failing to pay alimony/child support.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 February, 2015 11:06 AM

And what's most fun? To be having sex and looking at a good looking guy of course. So we can come to the conclusion that men's good looks (good genes) are the most important thing for women right now. How can I improve my physical attractiveness? Plastic surgery? Platform shoes?

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 February, 2015 02:56 PM

I really liked your post. Pretty spot on. I think that women are very emotionally driven and want to experience a range of those emotions.

It makes them feel like a women and is also a fun experience for them. A man who can engage a women on an emotional level will do way better than a man who engages on a logical rational level.

It's not that women are irrational or not logical. You can find logic in their actions. It's just not in line with blue pill teachings. It's just that women are more emotionally driven.

Men are more logically driven.

We all have both just tend to lean on one more than another. Men who are more in control over their emotions and know how to manipulate or have healthy grip on their emotions have a huge advantage in the world of women.

Because a lot of women are not so grounded in their emotions. It's a very random process for them. They want to experience a range of them. Otherwise it gets boring. Something needs to change.

That's why women can be a pain in the ass for men. We like consistency and they like change. Men like to be set on what they want, like order or structure.

Women don't know what they want.

This is why you can't take them all that seriously. Why you have to watch their actions more than what they say. Why being a wild out of control jerk is more attractive to a women than a guy who is stable and serious about everything.

The men who are best with women are able to master their emotions, not take life so seriously and yet be able to accomplish goals too. Are able to fulfill their desires.

These men are aggressive in pursuing all of their desires yet are also able to handle adversity when things are not

going their way. They do this by being able to enjoy all situations.

To not take life all seriously. It's a middle ground. It's not easy to find if your not naturally there. Men either fall somewhere totally in the emotional side where they are more like women (all over the place) or they are more consistent in their behavior.

Both can be attractive to women depending on what they are looking for but it's still not a secret men have to aggressive in their pursuit for women and also not take it all that seriously.

Men who take it seriously end up frustrated. They don't "get it". They aren't having fun. Women become something to get instead of already having them.

Which is where women behave when it comes to men. They already have choices so they aren't serious about it. Men who are hungry or needy for women are serious. Men who don't need women are able to play with them. They get it. Women just want to have fun.

whataboutudummy • 1 point • 1 March, 2015 12:33 AM

Such an awesome post. Kudos!

First off, I always trust someone more if they know music music, and although I always loved the Lauper version a great deal (so much so that I encountered the Handler original, which is quite unknown nowadays, simply by some random google query regarding the lauper song) and that's how I found the Robert Handler version which was cool, but it had a weird production, weird audio quality.

Second, you really managed to evoke the feelings that *ought*

adiktif • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 01:25 AM

you seem to be sure about so much, yet i see no source or prove of what anything you say is actually true.(except maybe for a song that find ok) study the psychology behind how women think and men think. Take a second look at human history, come back with sources- then we'll talk. you sound paranoid and look like you've got some grudges against women(maybe they cheated on you).

Archwinger[S] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 12:52 PM

I surveyed 1,000 women this past year. Every one of them admitted to this. I haven't posted the paper yet. It's still undergoing peer review. The scientific world is having a hard time locating anybody that's truly my peer due to how awesome I am.

PurpleDan • -6 points • 26 February, 2015 09:47 PM

I agree with some of the red pill.

But I don't understand the hate. Isn't it supposed to help you better yourself and not take women's shit? What does critiquing a song and calling it a slut anthem even have to do with red pill?

I'm not trying to argue, I just don't understand hate. Can someone explain?

[deleted] • 14 points • 26 February, 2015 10:05 PM*

It's not hate, it's outrage that is socially unacceptable to express publicly because women get a free pass to define the vocabulary used in the conversation. "Rape culture", "misogyny", and "sexism", for example, are totally contrived by women or by men that have bought into or become entrapped in what has become a feminized culture of double standards that totally confounds most men.

I'll go one step ("generation") further than what Archfinger has said, and say that more men will realize how screwed they are if they get married or knock someone up, and the birthrate will plummet.

bsutansalt • 5 points • 26 February, 2015 11:05 PM

It's not hate, it's outrage that is socially unacceptable to express publicly because women get a free pass to define the vocabulary used in the conversation.

♂ Well said. Anything critical of women, however reasonable, gets internalized by the mainstream as if it's some kind of hating of women. It's not.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 01:30 AM

At work I was accused of misogyny and "shamed" for only dating much younger women (in a hospital where all of my supervisors are women) and I STFU and ended the conversation because I could have lost my job for being honest.

It was kind of funny because the few men I work with each eventually asked me in private "How the hell do *you* get such younger women?" (I haven't dated anyone at work in a while, but apparently I have a rep.)

PurpleDan • -3 points • 26 February, 2015 10:20 PM

That isn't what RedPill is about. It's about leveling the playing field and taking away women advantage in mate selection.

Shit on women all you want, but by dwelling on the negativity of anything your only asking for negativity in your life.

Red Pill has so much useful stuff, but I have to unsubscribe because I don't hate women, nor do I feel the need to expend energy on the idea of "Feminism ruined society." You're just giving those bitches validation for feminism, and there's way more to life than just sex and dating.

KenuR • 3 points • 26 February, 2015 10:55 PM

There's indeed a lot of MRA and feminism-related stuff posted here that I don't really care about. Maybe you have to be an American to understand it.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 01:23 AM

What country are you from that you don't understand it? (I want to move there.)

[deleted] • 7 points • 26 February, 2015 10:48 PM

Oh no. Don't go. We'll miss you. Please stay ; (

PurpleDan • -3 points • 26 February, 2015 10:49 PM

Oh, how they never grow up.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 11:30 PM

We need u to help us grow up. Maybe u can be our mom like Wendy was to the Lost Boys in "Peter Pan?"

Archwinger[S] • 3 points • 26 February, 2015 10:49 PM

Shit! Please don't unsubscribe from this internet forum. There will only be 99,014 of us left!

[deleted] • 4 points • 26 February, 2015 11:03 PM

now only 90k left to scare off...

Maybe then it'll be half as good as it was 6 months ago.

tallwheel • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 04:00 AM

Relevant username. You're still purple pill. Not ready to go red yet.

PurpleDan • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 06:01 PM

Ya,

I'm not swallowing any of your pills, the way of the superior man.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 February, 2015 10:55 PM

u know there are more options than just unsubscribing

u can ignore the posts or debate them, but there is no need to act like a woman

Moldy_Gecko • 2 points • 26 February, 2015 11:16 PM

If it has so much useful stuff, why unsub? I don't agree with all the women hating. Yes, feminism is ruining society, but I don't hate them for that... it's their gender imperative. Men would do the same shit if the tables were flipped... although I think we'd stop at a certain point.

I have had nothing but great relationships with women. Even my ex-wife who was definitely AWALT, put out every night, sometimes twice and would do whatever I wanted. Thus, even though she divorced after I paid for her college, took 2/3 the bank account (no alimony/child support) and ended up sleeping with my best friend during our separation, I don't hate her.

All these hate posts are from the people that just swallowed the pill and don't understand AWALT. Sift through them, I do. I just search for the posts that teach. For example, if it says rant, no need to read it. If it says Red Pill Example or Meta, likely a good read. Blue Pill Example could be good as well to ensure you don't mimic those behaviors. All the kids ranting is just a side effect of swallowing the pill.

Archwinger[S] • 14 points • 26 February, 2015 10:10 PM

Wait...

We're supposed to be improving stuff? I only come here to shit on women. Everywhere else censors that crap.

RPSigmaStigma • 4 points • 26 February, 2015 11:04 PM

You obviously didn't read the whole thing. I'm usually pretty critical of the anger posts myself, but I didn't get a single notion about this post being angry or hateful.

Archwinger[S] • 4 points • 26 February, 2015 11:27 PM

I'll ramp up the misogyny next time. Sorry that I failed everyone.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 04:12 PM

Awesome post. The Millenials have an interesting future before them. With the death of the family structure, I wonder what other out-dated institutions will die with it.

kevkos • 1 point • 27 February, 2015 05:05 PM

Hopefully religion & government.

colucci • -5 points • 26 February, 2015 10:58 PM

The Red Pill is a relatively new phenomenon,

Stopped reading right there. It's not.

Archwinger[S] • 7 points • 26 February, 2015 11:30 PM

Good catch. Thanks for spending some of your valuable time writing a comment anyway. Let me know how I can improve my posts in the future so I keep your interest. Cool guys like you are what keep me thinking about things to type.

Newdist2 • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 03:25 AM

Women needed to be able to vote and own property and not be second-class citizens.

Disagree with the vote part.

johnnight • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 03:37 PM

Aaron Clarey on this topic some time ago:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2CbOVcf3W7s>

An incredibly successful (and good looking) 23 year old man is having trouble with girls his age...Hint - the problem is in the phrase "girls your age." They like fun guys, not reliable guys. And it's harder than hell for somebody to act like someone he's not.

bluedrygrass • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 05:00 PM

I often thought of that song, after having discovered the red pill kind of view.

It was evident to me what "fun" really meant. Yes, that song is really a good summary about women's drive. Girls, just want to have fun: mindless, irresponsible, chaotic living.

The little story about the original author of the lyrics and his different point of view is really funny, put in context.

iSnORtcHuNkz69 • 0 points • 27 February, 2015 06:05 PM

Great post. I've had these same thoughts run through my head but you explain it in such a graceful way

[deleted] • -1 points • 27 February, 2015 12:36 AM

Inspiring post, thank you for an insightful read.