

Dave Chappelle: Marriage is Nothing but an Awful Contract You Shouldn't Sign

March 26, 2017 | 733 upvotes | by [Parvenu76](#)

I have been reluctant to post here, but I think this will be of interest to the community. How many of y'all watched the Netflix special Dave Chappelle comedy come back tour double event? I think the line he dropped about marriage was the most powerful moment of the entire series. I honestly don't know if this video will get taken down or this post deleted.

Dave Chappelle: Marriage is Nothing but an Awful Contract You Shouldn't Sign

<https://youtu.be/3ZYw6UnZuoE>

One of the defining characteristics of the red pill has been discussion of social theories that buck mainstream culture.

TRP's mission is to discuss men's identity, sexual strategy, and options in the context of our current global culture for the benefit of men.

Edit: IF YOU WERE ONE OF THE APPROXIMATELY 20,000 PEOPLE WHO SAW THIS VIDEO, CONTAINING A BRIEF CLIP FROM DAVE CHAPPELLE'S RECENT STAND-UP ACT AND SUBSEQUENT FREEZE FRAME / AUDIENCE ANALYSIS... I AM SORRY TO INFORM YOU THAT THIS VIDEO HAS BEEN REMOVED AND A COPYRIGHT STRIKE HAS BEEN PLACED ON MY YOUTUBE ACCOUNT

I was under the impression that the format I used where I showed a brief clip and then provided analysis/social commentary was legal and falls under the category of "fair use." I would appreciate if anyone in this community (especially if you saw the video so you know what you're talking about) could offer an opinion/guidance as to whether or not I should pursue a counter notification against the copyright holder.

Details:

Counter Notification Basics A counter notification is a legal request for YouTube to reinstate a video that has been removed for alleged copyright infringement. The process may only be pursued in instances where the upload was removed or disabled as a result of a mistake or misidentification of the material to be removed or disabled, such as fair use. It should not be pursued under any other circumstances.

If your video was removed but does not fit the criteria above, you may want to seek a retraction, or simply wait for your strike to expire.

Please note that when we forward the counter notice, it will include the full text of the counter notice, including any personal information you provide. The claimant may use this information to file a lawsuit against you in order to keep the content from being restored to YouTube. By submitting a counter notification, you consent to having your information revealed in this way. We will not forward the counter notification to any party other than the original claimant.

Counter notifications must be submitted by the video's original uploader or an agent authorized to act on their behalf, such as an attorney

Here's some information:

In the United States, fair use is determined by a judge, who analyzes how each of the four factors of fair use applies to a specific case.

1. The purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes

- Courts typically focus on whether the use is “transformative.” That is, whether it adds new expression or meaning to the original, or whether it merely copies from the original. Commercial uses are less likely to be considered fair, though it’s possible to monetize a video and still take advantage of the fair use defense.

2. The nature of the copyrighted work

- Using material from primarily factual works is more likely to be fair than using purely fictional works.

3. The amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole

- Borrowing small bits of material from an original work is more likely to be considered fair use than borrowing large portions. However, even a small taking may weigh against fair use in some situations if it constitutes the “heart” of the work.

4. The effect of the use upon the potential market for, or value of, the copyrighted work

- Uses that harm the copyright owner’s ability to profit from his or her original work are less likely to be fair uses. Courts have sometimes made an exception under this factor in cases involving parodies

I'M NOT LOOKING TO BUILD A "TRP LEGAL TEAM", JUST GIVE ME YOUR OPINIONS ON WHETHER OR NOT I SHOULD FIGHT THIS If you don't want to leave any public comment that could be misconstrued as legal advice or whatever, please send me a private message. *What do you think? Fair use? Or it was a good run and quit while I'm ahead?*

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

destraht • 452 points • 26 March, 2017 04:45 PM

He walked away from one lucrative \$50 million contract that would have stifled him and he lived his life on his own free terms while spending his already somewhat limitless money and then zipped into another \$50 million contract on his own free terms. The power to walk away...

CommanderCumlord • points • 26 March, 2017 07:08 PM **[recovered]**

As a kid I always thought he was crazy for doing that. Only now do I see the genius. And you know what he was smart! He made himself more attractive, people always wanted more Dave after that. Brilliant move and a great teachable moment.

grewapair • 230 points • 26 March, 2017 07:43 PM

He said he had about \$10M in the bank and he was at a restaurant and saw a guy worth \$100M. He realized the guy was eating the very same entree as he was. So if he kept doing what he didn't want to do, and got to \$100M, his life wouldn't really change.

So he just didn't show up for work the next day. "You know, it's like getting divorced in the '50s. People didn't go to divorce court. They looked at their wife like, 'Baby, I'm going to get a pack of cigarettes. I'll be right back.' And they just leave with the clothes on their back and make a go of it. There wasn't even internet back then. You could move 11 miles away and have a whole new life."

Source - David Letterman show, 2014

[deleted] • 66 points • 26 March, 2017 07:55 PM*

I always explain this to people on the difference between making 50k a year vs 200k. Both people likely work 9-5. The only real difference is the guy making 200k drives a little nicer car and might have a little bigger house. But do these two people really live that different of lives?

Edit: Maybe 200k was too much let's try 100k haha. Either way the idea is paychecks aside they commit the same number of hours. Meanwhile someone who can make 30k a year while not working at all to me would be very wealthy.

Infinity6 • 144 points • 26 March, 2017 08:23 PM

At 200k a year you can start looking at early retirement, investing to accumulate real wealth, multiple foreign vacations a year, etc.

dont-YOLO-ragequit • 29 points • 26 March, 2017 10:50 PM

200k a year man also has a better quality of life as soon as he punches out. His network of people makes it that he usually calls a few numbers to find professionals who will do everything they can(including bend their schedules) hoping to do better or bigger jobs for him or his contacts. He also doesn't mind seeing prodeessionals of every field before things becomes major,out of hand, or require time off. He also gets calls on huge deals since they know he can buy right now(also because luxury stuff depreciates fast so saving are huge).He buys the right stuff to unwind in the middle of the week if he has to. 50k man needs to run around on his own time to buy stuff on sale, call and find decent professionals who will squeeze their appointment somewhere if it's urgent or said professional will schedule it 2 to 4

weeks later. They also end up planning ahead to buy or rent what they need to unwind. It all becomes a matter of how you value your time to save the same 15% and what you do with it.

ICanSeeNow17 • 8 points • 27 March, 2017 05:22 PM

I went from making 80k to 120k+ Bonus+ Employee Stock Allotment+a Stock Vesting program. I worked between 80- 100 hours a week. I left that job and now work at a place still making decent money but not nearly as much with a much better work life balance. IMHO it's not as simple as the money doesn't make a difference. It does. But it really doesn't effect happiness or satisfaction.

Based on my experiences, happiness and satisfaction has come from deprogramming many of the things society programs into you. Chappelle's story is a great example of getting off the hamster wheel of needing more and more money for a fulfilling. On a larger scale TRP is about the same thing but not about money and about being a man.

If you work at a craft and truly dedicate yourself to it money will come. People pay for quality. The same way making a commitment to being a better man attracts women to you.

dont-YOLO-ragequit • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 06:18 PM

100 hours a week is insane, I topped out at 86 blue collar hours a week for 1 year in order to make rank while avoiding a 1 year sabbatical at an other job, all I did was work and sleep and try to keep my house in order before I passed out about everywhere except the bed.

I did end up losing weight even if I didn't need at all to lose some and made good money to start some ETFs.

I can only imagine 100 hours a week in the middle of winter funk... No way I would survive. Much respect.

Back to the subject, I think the first post meant the difference between 150k a year and 300 k a year where the mortgage for the possible dream house can be paid in under 10 years and the Quality of life goals don't take months to plan and years to achieve.

This is where a solid plan and investments can lead freedom from endless hours at work.

I also agree that while lots of top posts like to circlejerk about how women can play double standards to their advantage, TRD at heart focuses on avoiding these basic traps and building a successful life that can withstand the misconceptions that are shoved in our head through family, hollywood and the political correctness on the internet.

ICanSeeNow17 • 2 points • 28 March, 2017 12:10 AM

ouch! 86 blue collar hours is hell! Respect to you for doing that for a year.

So i'm still relatively new to TRP but my interpretation so far has been that while much of the advice on here does have to do with women, they really seem to only be a benefit of the work that you do in the quest to become your own man and/or the best version of yourself that you can be. Granted, a large part of that work does revolve around unlearning the things about women society has taught, It seems as though there is much more(fitness,mental health, etc.) That is part of the advice on

this forum.

MuhTriggersGuise • 6 points • 27 March, 2017 03:28 AM

Yeah the lifestyle wouldn't change (if the person earning 200k a year was smart at least), just the speed and which they reach independent wealth.

I spend way way way less than I earn, because I like being able to walk away from anything, and you don't get to do that if you don't have a nest egg or your own money out there earning enough returns for you to live on.

[deleted] • 6 points • 27 March, 2017 05:38 AM

In the span of 8 years I went from \$70K to \$200+ by changing jobs and location. It has meant sacrifice on my part, but if I hadn't made the change I would not be looking at a comfortable retirement at the end of 2018.

I work in an industry that can be very dangerous (oil & gas), and do 12 hour shifts on a 72 hour cycle, with at least 500 hours of overtime per year.

I expect the end result to be debt free and enough coming in to put me in control of what I want to do, instead of being a slave to everyone else.

wanderer779 • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 01:21 PM

what do you do? I've done a bit of this myself.

how is the market for jobs right now?

UrsusG • 58 points • 26 March, 2017 09:13 PM

Depends.

If the 200k guy spends all his money and lives paycheck to paycheck, then he's no different than the 50k guy.

magikmausi • 30 points • 27 March, 2017 07:27 AM

I lived in India half my life. There is a very clear class system here. If you're a postman, for instance, you're likely making about 1/10th of what my middle-class father makes.

The postman would call me "Sir" and wouldn't hang out where I hang out - he just can't afford it.

When I first went to the US to stay with my brother before heading off to college, he took me to the local bar. My brother makes about \$120k+, which is a lot of money in suburban Atlanta. At the bar, he met a guy, they chatted up.

When he finished, he told me that this guy was his postman.

That was the biggest surprise for me about the US. That there was no real "class system" here (there is, but it's nowhere like the rest of the world). A bus driver, a plumber, a postman can eat and drink with an PhD or a banker.

Yankee_Fever • 20 points • 26 March, 2017 11:45 PM

People that make 200k do not work 9-5 the same way a secretary does

MarvelousWhale • 14 points • 27 March, 2017 03:54 AM

I work in mortgages and see dozens of examples like this daily.

Fact: the guy making more is not living any different until you reach 400k, that's when good money management will make you live like Scarface, their lives are automated. We as a mortgage company do not even speak to these people directly when they're buying homes, they have assistants they pay to do this work for them.

There is a third tier, the multimillionaires, these people are on a level incomprehensible to us, jetsetting businessmen forging industries internationally, they can afford the world but they are the most stressed out people I have ever spoken with, they're the first to complain about a five hundred dollar fee, tier 1 and 2 never complain but these guys bitch and moan like they're living paycheck to paycheck. Always getting divorced. It comes full circle no matter how much you make.

Slut_Slayer9000 • 7 points • 27 March, 2017 10:29 PM

On the flip side my dad makes around 450k a year and lives almost pay check to paycheck because he's the ultimate beta and decided to be captain save a ho to young hottie (15 years younger) whom has 3 young kids (all under 15 currently) from one guy and then decided to impregnate her with 2 more after getting married. All while living in gigantic home in the burbs for a good school, and pays for 2 60+k car payments for him and said ho. Who will eventually dump him, and rake him some serious money on top of her new tits she already got. Don't be my dad if you make that kind of change, I know I'm not. 450k surprisingly isn't a lot of money when its spread out over 7 people living above their income level. It pisses me off to no end because he literally could set himself up for life of not having to work instead supports all of these people.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 03:59 AM

Finally someone who understands. Like I understand you can buy more things with 150k more a year but at the end of the day you still work M - F for a living. You might get a few more vacations and financial stability but lives are hardly different. These are the people in thinking about. Getting to the Fuck you money level.

[deleted] • 26 points • 26 March, 2017 10:04 PM

I used to make \$50k and now make \$100k. Totally different. I feel more financially secure.

bteh • 20 points • 27 March, 2017 02:28 AM

Yeah, went from 13.50 an hour to 38.50 overnight by switching to a new career field and moving.

Day to day life, not EXTREMELY different, but definitely noticeably. Free time was the big change, Much less of it, but during my limited amount, I can do whatever I want with no real consequences, even if the things I do are stupid.

[deleted] • 10 points • 27 March, 2017 04:32 AM

50k to 100k is a huge difference. 100k to 200k much less so. Sure, I can sock away more at 200k, but day to day difference really isn't much.

At 50k, you are trying to get by. At 100k+ you are getting by just fine as long as you aren't paying off an ex wife. The getting by part doesn't change much until you hit wealth, which has more to do with savings than income.

wanderer779 • 5 points • 27 March, 2017 01:29 PM

For most people who are at 100k and thinking about getting to 200k, it is a complicated question. It's not like you are going to save an extra 100k. First of all you are going to be taxed probably an extra 30-40k. Then you have to figure in a little lifestyle inflation. And usually you will have to work more in a higher stress position.

If you could just keep the same hours and job and put 100k in tax deferred accounts it would be a no-brainer. I'd probably still usually try to get ahead, but it's not as good as it seems.

antiharmonic • 8 points • 27 March, 2017 03:02 AM

I used to make \$50k and now make \$100k. I feel the same.

Moneyley • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 04:15 PM

at \$54k last year headed towards \$76k this year... not much difference because you keep getting taxed higher on the way up. The system is so fucking hard (rigged) but I think there is a lot of hope once I reach \$200k or either reach \$150k with 50k in assets. I dont need to live lavishly but I think its important to hit a net worth that cushions enough so you're comfortable enough to take more risks.

ICanSeeNow17 • 3 points • 27 March, 2017 05:24 PM

If you save up and invest the magic number is ~\$250k in invested assets for when investment income starts to make a noticeable difference.

Moneyley • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 05:33 PM

Thanks breh, gonna keep closing my sales and using my commissions wisely

ICanSeeNow17 • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 05:51 PM

That's the thing to do. A lot of people go out and buy things(car, tv, bigger house). IMHO unless i'm buying something that's going to make me more money, or give me an experience i'll never forget, why spend the money?

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 March, 2017 02:34 AM

studies show happiness grows noticeably with increase in salary up to about \$75,000/yr and after that increases in happiness are less noticeable as salary increases.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 02:47 AM

Yeah the key is time. Make enough to not have to work and your on a whole new level of wealth.

ihelpwithredcapsule • 13 points • 26 March, 2017 09:34 PM

Not the same comparison. While some may agree that whether your income is 200k or 50k, your lifestyle is unaffected, the difference between the 2 is extreme. 200k is high class, and those that make 200k *generally* know how to spend their makings on what they really need/want rather than pointless shit that offers no value but "seemed like a good idea at the time". 50k guys are absolutely able to live a decent life if they can properly manage their money, but I doubt many who make 50k really understand the idea of proper spending, time management etc. therefore not

having the lifestyle that 50k could potentially earn you. *There are obviously exceptions to those generalizations* Dave's idea is similar but the scale is different, the difference between 50k and 200k lifestyles is much much greater than the difference between 100 million net worth and 10 million (again, MOST of the time). This is due to the fact that with 10 million, already the highest quality (well almost but close enough) products are affordable, so with 100 million it's the same life basically.

ShakaLeonidas • 20 points • 27 March, 2017 04:05 AM

Nah i disagree. I actually made a boat load of money (international contracting) and then lost everything. Got back on my feet and realized that time was the only thing i couldnt get back. I couldn't get back that decade of sleepless nights and long work days, planning and preparing. Missed time with freinds and family and surpassing momentary gratification for the long haul. Stress by the boat load. I had some nice things. Most of which are gone. I had some nice women. ALL of them are gone. Ironically started living a better quality of life when i made less and had more time and personal freedom. The hottest women ive been with have been laid with out all the flashyness. I also know now that money and material shit comes and goes in the blink of an eye. You have to find happiness in all aspects of life. More money really does equal more problems but being broke ain't no fun for anyone. I digress. My millionaire freinds and family eat the same Pizza hut as everybody else. Drive to the store in a 200k car but still pay the same price for gas as everyone else. Fly first class just to land at the same time as everybody else. If your talking moments of luxury, yes things are different. But only on the surface If your talking respect from peers... there is less because everyone smiles with one hand out and another behind their back. The Instagram pictures looked awesome though.

ihelpwithredcapsule • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 04:23 AM

This is kind of what I've been getting at, there are those that make less money and are fine with it because they understand their values and know making more wouldnt make them happier (you are like this from what I understand, this is the minority). Then the majority of those who make 50k (the ones who can't spend properly at all) struggle to get anything done, live paycheck to paycheck, and wish for more money because they see money as happiness (not sure if i can blame them since you always desire what you can't have, but at the same time they have this problem because of their own refusal to make more).

Nonstopas • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 10:33 AM

The thing about time waste, im studying at University, and im doing part time work, roughly 40 hours a week for 8 pounds/hr. Everytime i do a longer shift im thinking of how im wasting my time and that i will never be 19 again and won't have the same free time. Other part of me thinks that not much 19 yo. earn money during their first year of Uni/collage etc. So which one is it? Is it waste of time or is it investment into the future?

ShakaLeonidas • 2 points • 28 March, 2017 01:09 PM

Everything has a pro and a Con. Run a cost benefit analysis of your situation. Are you fincaially struggling? i mean missing meals/food, no gas/petrol, no tuition money type hardships? If not i would scale back on working alot while in college, If it is not absolutely necessary. You will have the next 50 years to work.

I dont think college years are the best yeasrs of your life but it has some unique experiences. Also after high school and college, The over all physical beauty and

tolerability of most females takes a cliff dive. 16-20 is the Hottest most women will ever be. Neoteny is real and you will see how it plays into attraction as you age. These girls will get older. Some will workout, some will have surgical enhancements, some will work on seduction and sex appeal, becoming cultured conversationalist etc but shear " hop fresh out the bed in the morning fuckability" it decreases with their age. "The longer the avacado is on the market, the more its been squeezed and mashed and shuffled about. You can still make guacamole wit it but it could have been better with fresher avacados."

Simply take time to pursue what you want to do while your obligations are low and you have your health (hopefully).

Money is a tool. It simply buys someone elses productivty, that's it.

InscrutablePUA • 16 points • 26 March, 2017 08:38 PM

I always explain this to people on the difference between making 50k a year vs 200k. Both people likely work 9-5.

The guy making 200k is likely working 60+ hours a week unless it's passive income of some sort

whoglyogglydoo • 27 points • 26 March, 2017 09:11 PM

This is so ignorant and why there's so much class envy. No, the person making \$200k a year does NOT work just 9-5. They're generally on call 24 hours. Some days they come home from the 9-5 part only to crack open the laptop and continue working. We work with people on the other side of the globe, so there are 3AM meetings at times.

The ignorance in your statement makes me livid. It's evidence of how lower classes see upper classes. Anyone can choose to work 90+ hrs a week to make \$200k. If you just want to make \$50k, then work 9-5 and don't bitch about gradually growing poorer.

Dremlar • 16 points • 26 March, 2017 09:19 PM

Depends on the field. Some of my friends make that much money (one considerably more) and they work 9-5 bar crunch time if they planned poorly. If you work in a high skilled field and are good at what you do you can make a lot of money with regular hours.

That being said, I know many at my level which is still good money who put in 60+ hour weeks.

Apostrophe • 5 points • 27 March, 2017 06:04 AM

Peterson touches on this topic in this talk : <https://youtu.be/8ABa4RdNPxU?t=2368>
(The whole video is good)

fodosho • 27 points • 27 March, 2017 12:26 AM

If you are working 90+ hours to make 200k you are a fucking idiot.

rosariorossao • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 11:22 AM

Tell that to most surgeons man

justshitposterthings • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 12:59 PM

Pretty sure most surgeons are making 400k+

rosariorossao • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 02:15 PM

Not really dude. Mid-late career surgeons who subspecialized definitely are, but plenty aren't. You definitely don't make that money in residency and even your first couple years as an attending you're starting at around 250-270k, which after taxes is less than 200k.

MustNotFfff • 7 points • 27 March, 2017 12:15 AM

So much this. A lot of people who are coasting in life like to bitch about how much someone else is overpaid for just 'sending emails, talking, writing code'. What they don't realize is that someone might be on call pretty much all the time. That is a tradeoff that not everyone would be willing to make.

magikmausi • 3 points • 27 March, 2017 07:30 AM

A cousin's husband works at Amazon. Gets paid a lot of money but I've seen the guy get up at 2AM in the night to work because there is some catastrophic issue with some server that needs to be resolved

OneU • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 09:31 AM

He just needs to move to Microsoft, Amazon sucks for that very reason you stated.

asktrpthrow123 • 1 point • 28 March, 2017 06:07 PM

Had a job offer with decent money from Amazon a year or so ago. Declined it for this reason. They said I had to be on call and could be called in at any time.

Ain't nobody got time to ruin precious sleep to make money for someone else. Work 40 hours now, I clock out within 15 mins the same time and go work on my own project after work.

OneU • 5 points • 27 March, 2017 09:31 AM

I make 200k and work 9 to 5, no laptop at home. There are literally thousands of us.

RUSTY_LEMONADE • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 03:05 AM

Maybe off topic but this reminded me of a time when I saw a car full of goth kids in a Honda Civic. They looked so out of place in a car that isn't a hearse.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 03:24 AM

But do these two people really live that different of lives?

Uhh...abso-fucking-lutely?

Are you serious dude?

Location seems to be a huge factor in your ridiculous comment.

[deleted] • 0 points • 27 March, 2017 01:35 AM

I don't get what you're trying to say here. Sure they work the same hours for different sums of money.

Please clarify. I'm not debating I want to understand though.

Luce_Bree • points • 26 March, 2017 07:49 PM [recovered]

And ironically, walking away was the absolute BEST thing he could have done for his career. Years later his shows sell out instantly, and he still has the respect and admiration of millions of people around the globe. Funny, that.

[deleted] • 25 points • 26 March, 2017 08:01 PM

Well he walked away due to principles and the fact they probably wanted to take his show in a direction he didn't like. Absence makes the heart grow fonder is kind of what happened. People were so anxious to see him come back.

destraht • 40 points • 26 March, 2017 08:05 PM

They probably would have made the show canned and corny. In an interview he said that some people on the show were trying extremely hard to get him to dress up as a woman. He didn't want to do it and they told him that "all the [black] greats" did it. They really wanted him to cross dress and I think that it rubbed him the wrong way and he realized that he could end up being forced to do things like that.

Ocupheus • points • 26 March, 2017 09:35 PM [recovered]

I remember when he said this. Hollywood does this to send a message and Dave was not having it.

destraht • 20 points • 26 March, 2017 10:08 PM

Also they really like fucking with black people. Look what they have done to the women with the nanny state worse part of feminism and locking the shit out of the men. Then some black kid sees his hero pretending to be a woman. I'm sure that tweaks virgin males in some weird ways.

Yankee_Fever • 12 points • 26 March, 2017 11:50 PM

This is exactly why he was saying that everybody THINKS they can relate with black people because they're a snowflake, but they really can't

Yankee_Fever • 5 points • 26 March, 2017 11:50 PM

This is exactly why he was saying that everybody THINKS they can relate with black people because they're a snowflake, but they really can't

dudet23 • 0 points • 27 March, 2017 11:33 PM

Bullshit. Its everyone. Blacks are just more sensitive about everything.

[deleted] • 8 points • 27 March, 2017 04:27 AM

I can't remember what I saw or if it was several different sources, but I have heard of people complaining about making black men dress up as women at some point in each man's respective career. There is some sinister shit behind it, apparently. I don't like it, either. I don't think men should be dressing up like women 99.999% of the time in comedy.

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 March, 2017 10:07 PM

<https://youtu.be/MtPtr8aMtXs>

[deleted] • 0 points • 26 March, 2017 10:05 PM

That episode without him showed where they were heading. And that episode had a few amazing

sketches, but the rest were mediocre at best.

empatheticapathetic • 15 points • 26 March, 2017 08:15 PM

Sure. But his actual quality is dead. He is back for the money and his absence has allowed him to return to the tune of \$60m but he hasn't tried at all with these specials. He openly said when I watched him last year he couldn't give a fuck and is back just to get paid.

Canedude08 • 11 points • 26 March, 2017 11:26 PM

Chappelle wasn't ever going to be "Chappelle Show" good again, or "Killing Them Softly" good. That said, his new stuff is damn good. Comics age, and most elite ones are retired from standup by 40. Chappelle is still out there doing it.

[deleted] • 8 points • 27 March, 2017 02:26 AM

most elite ones are retired from standup by 40

What? Carlin? Louie? Bill Burr? Patrice died at 42 and hadn't even entered his prime yet. And Chappelle went away for 10 years and just recently came back.

Canedude08 • 13 points • 27 March, 2017 02:48 AM

Emphasis on MOST. Carlin was the only ELITE guy on your list that was still kicking past forty. Frankly, old man Carlin was, in my opinion, significantly better than young Carlin. As he aged he grew even more cynical, and his age became part of the comedy. Patrice was damn good, no one called him Richard Pryor, Eddie Murphy, Chris Rock, Jerry Seinfeld, etc good. Those are elite comics. Patrice is a guy who has a loyal fanbase(I'm part of that), but he was never truly able to take that talent, and get it out to the masses. Some of that was because his message was far too tough for a widespread audience, but a lot of other guys have managed to take tough stuff and make it palatable to large audiences(Pryor was a guy who was great at that).

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 02:52 AM

Yeah that's all pretty valid.

Canedude08 • 4 points • 27 March, 2017 02:56 AM

Comedy, like rock is a young man's game. Yes, you have groups like the Stones and the like that can perform at a high level forever, but even then, they start to look like old people that can't let go. Even Kevin Hart has a shelf-life, and I think that he will eventually be a full-time movie star in the next five or so years. To be great at standup, you have to find a way to maintain the common touch, and that's tough to do when you are filthy rich. Hence why Eddie Murphy walked away following the Raw tour. That's why that as Pryor started doing more and more movies, his comedy became more and more watered down. Seinfeld, once his show took off, walked away.

[deleted] • 5 points • 27 March, 2017 02:59 AM

Kevin Hart

His last special was god awful and I was legitimately angry to waste my time and money. He fucking phoned it in so he could continue to "be everywhere" "hustle" "build his brand" meanwhile his standup was complete dogshit.

Canedude08 • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 04:07 AM

Eddie Murphy at least respected his fanbase enough to where he retired when he realized that his standups weren't going to be nearly as good as what he had done before. Hart on the other hand, is selling out stadiums, never mind the fact that by doing so, his comedy isn't going to have nearly the edge it once had.

Merwebb • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 05:52 AM

Yeah it was a huge let down

SlothOnRoids • 8 points • 26 March, 2017 10:07 PM

Fuck you talking about? Dave Chapelle is still a phenomenal comedian.

empatheticapathetic • 5 points • 26 March, 2017 10:20 PM

Personally I'm disappointed with his quality from his recent return.

Yankee_Fever • 8 points • 26 March, 2017 11:51 PM

He's in a different stage in his life now. He's not a 30 year old kid on the come up

empatheticapathetic • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 08:25 AM

Doesn't mean anything. That may influence his subject matter but his quality level is something that's his responsibility. Louis ck only got better and more mature through age, and then eventually regressed his subject matter recently.

Cant_Tell_Me_Nothin • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 12:52 PM

I don't think episode 1 was that good. I loved episode 2 though. He had me laughing for the most part, but most important it was his storytelling that had me hooked. It was very good writing and storytelling.

twatbutter • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 05:36 PM

Completely agree-- he's definitely weaker in his recent return. He just doesn't have that natural flow that he did with his original skits.

magikmausi • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 07:32 AM

More importantly: he has the respect of his peers.

In creative industries, especially those with traditions about 'authenticity' like comedy, that matters a LOT.

Watch how comedians talk about Jerry Seinfeld. Besides the success of his show, they all have a LOT of respect for him because he quit when the show was at its peak and walked away from a lot of money

deville05 • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 02:05 AM

There isn't an overabundance of him in the media.. So you wanna seek him out. Like music before the internet.. You really wanted to buy music and listen to a band, exchange tapes, figure out how to do all that... Now rverything is at your finger tips and you don't want it

[deleted] • 22 points • 26 March, 2017 08:56 PM*

Didnt realize his situation but there is a name for this:

Fuck you money

Cant beat it with a stick (so I hear, I still have work to do. Stay tuned bitches)

[deleted] • 18 points • 26 March, 2017 09:09 PM

Fuck you money

For many men there is also the

fuck you lifestyle

Figuring to what it takes to live, and live well, on much less. Once the excess expenses of a resource sucking mate are removed, it is easier than most men think.

[deleted] • 4 points • 26 March, 2017 09:17 PM*

I'm gonna give that some thought. Not that I disagree but I wonder if we are using different words to say same damn thing.

[deleted] • 6 points • 26 March, 2017 09:32 PM*

Probably the same thing. Here's an example:

Assume, a guy has been living good with income over 120K. Pays mortgage on McMansion, 2 nice cars, all the nice stuff. He's saving too, but at the end of the month, the 10K a month income is all spent or spoken for. He has a place to live and a nice car to drive. Gets food and clothes. He's buying wife clothes and food and a nice car/SUV for her and all the expenses she creates. The reality is he is getting the benefit of a very small percentage of his income.

He walks away. Gives 1/2 his income to her till the kids are grown, and even gets the shaft with some short term alimony.

Now he lives cheap. Nice, small, low cost apartment. Trades in the BMW for a Honda. If he works it right, he can actually end up with more money left over at the end of each month.

So yes, he doesn't have a huge stash of "fuck you money", but he does have at least few hundred dollars that only he can get at. With that he has his "fuck you lifestyle" by virtue of being willing to walk away, and live on less, and enjoy the freedom.

With that mentality, any time a man leaves the house, he does not have to come back. Freedom.

In another post, I made the comment that I never got outside without my wallet and my keys...

EDIT: Maybe it could also be called a "fuck you mentality"

Edit #2: That is what I did at the end of my first marriage. I walked out the door with only my keys and my wallet, and never came back. I did have a small stash of cash, that was pitiful, instead of plentiful.

[deleted] • 9 points • 26 March, 2017 09:41 PM

yup, ive seen it here and in real life....women are parasites and giving 50% ONCE can be a fair price to pay. A man can rebuild.

on another note old man:

I had one boomerang back recently.

reason for return?

she told me she didn't have enough asshole in her life.

hahhaaha...cant make this shit up if u try

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 March, 2017 09:47 PM

she told me she didn't have enough asshole in her life.

I think you're an asshole too. But I try not to play favorites.

[deleted] • 9 points • 26 March, 2017 09:59 PM

better to provoke responses and be a cocky, polarizing dick than some boring nice guy that nobody recalls two weeks after his death

Rhybon • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 04:50 AM

Blackdragon wrote an article back in 2015 about this, stating that getting divorced actually was financially cheaper than remaining married.

<http://www.blackdragonblog.com/2015/12/10/being-married-is-very-expensive/>

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 01:32 PM

Blackdragon is one of many that have come to the same, or similar conclusions. Nothing new about anything I said, nor do I take any credit.

[deleted] • 17 points • 26 March, 2017 07:14 PM

In the 48 Laws Of Power on making yourself elusive.

magikmausi • 6 points • 27 March, 2017 07:23 AM

To his credit, he is mad talented.

In the last special, it was nice watching him accept that. He constantly refers to himself - "But I'm Dave Chapelle, so I can get away with that shit"

[deleted] • 3 points • 26 March, 2017 08:00 PM

Abundance mentality at its finest.

empatheticapathetic • 4 points • 26 March, 2017 08:17 PM

It's abundance mentality sure but he basically retired himself over his principles. It's hardly abundance at that point.

LuckyLuke23 • 1 point • 28 March, 2017 06:08 AM

if you like dave you should check out his inside the actors studio. it's really good and gives more insight into this

roeddit • points • 26 March, 2017 05:17 PM **[recovered]**

Comedians (especially racial minorities) are the only ones who can deliver red pill knowledge to the mainstream without being ostracized.

<https://illimitablemen.com/red-pill-comedy/>

ozaku7 • 30 points • 26 March, 2017 06:15 PM

It's because comedy is an extreme form of a sprinkle of truth that shouldn't be taken too seriously, typically. With red pill it's the fullblown truth. He blasts the audience with red pills and none of them actually swallow it. They just let it dangle in their mouth and spit it out laughing.

[deleted] • 13 points • 26 March, 2017 09:33 PM

He blasts the audience with ... and none of them actually swallow it. They just let it dangle in their mouth and spit it out laughing.

Makes his audience sound entirely female.

Ocupheus • points • 26 March, 2017 09:38 PM [recovered]

That's because everyone thinks they're joking.

Gorech1ld • 17 points • 27 March, 2017 06:18 AM

I disagree. It's more like, they know deep down, the joke is the truth. Just look at how much Bill Burr kills it with his jokes and it's all unadulterated red pill stuff. Comedians just tend to deliver it in a comical way that makes everyone laugh at the absurdity of it.

[deleted] • 7 points • 27 March, 2017 01:52 AM

Muthafuckas couldn't be more serious..

Cant_Tell_Me_Nothing • 5 points • 27 March, 2017 01:05 PM

Being black also helps. Although it might be offset by the simple fact that he is a man. Black community used to be less politically correct. Unfortunately the new crop of black college kids have adopted SJW ideologies.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 01:43 PM

I think it's two-fold. Some actually realize it to be true, but laugh, reject, and act as if it isn't because they're following societal rules. Similar to 48 laws' think as you like, but act as others or whatever it was. They know it's the truth, but it's taboo to just run around shouting red pill stuff. It's just rules of the game.

Others truly think it's absurd. These would be those still in the blue pill. I know before trp, when I would hear jokes like Chappelle's or Burr's, I'd laugh because I thought it was ridiculous. "Women aren't really like that, he's just joking." I truly thought what they were saying was absurd and that's where I found the comedy in it.

Luce_Bree • points • 26 March, 2017 07:52 PM [recovered]

Chris Rock also railed against marriage, and look what happened.

I have a feeling there is great unrest in the Chappelle household, lol.

sonickid101 • 20 points • 27 March, 2017 03:16 AM*

Eddie Murphy railed against marriage too <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ts4sEBb2K3s> I want half eddie. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SniOXFhwIZ8>

Vlauer • 3 points • 4 April, 2017 09:39 AM

The "what have you done for me lately" bit is classic

Conceited-Monkey • 14 points • 26 March, 2017 06:29 PM

Chappelle is a pretty funny guy and his Netflix specials are great entertainment. Even if he is married, his point that aside from religious or romantic considerations, modern marriage is an insane idea is completely valid.

David949 • 44 points • 26 March, 2017 05:44 PM

Best line of the show is when he meet the juice. Nicole brown is flirting with him and Dave says. "Bitch are you trying to get us both killed"

[deleted] • 112 points • 26 March, 2017 05:32 PM

I tell you this shit is nothing more than a population control scam, encourage faggots and trannies to follow their dreams, inflate egos so husbands and wives can't tolerate each other, indoctrinate casual sex is okay for all to destroy satisfaction of monogamy and instill the feeling of missing out to young guys so they will run after sex while giving leverage to less logical sex on courts so they can destroy males' life on their whim. After you destroyed males' will for marriage, show how hard it is to be a single mom, make abortion and contraception cheap. Population will control itself in years in developed countries. Undeveloped countries will continue to fuck like rabbits but who cares when you can wipe them out periodically with wars while actually making money out of their misery? Fucking future looks hopeless.

RedPillFreedom • 11 points • 26 March, 2017 07:13 PM

Is your end goal a family(with Approved girl) or fuck bitches vasectomy route or will you go for the middle ground like Ronaldo(kids from surrogate).

destraht • 25 points • 26 March, 2017 05:49 PM

India is interesting. A billion people and its becoming totally fucked beyond previous measurements. My take is that the global elites don't give a fuck and just want to scoop up a billion people into the shittiest dystopian biometric cashless system. They will be made to suffer for as long as necessary until they sign up and the system finds a way to function with the corruption so that when the system limps out of this in many years then it will be a done deal. Then, the next billion get brought into it...

Part 1

Part 2

Part 3

India has just like China carefully and jealously constructed a narrative about their country as being enlightened and spiritual. So hippy chicks, "ya India is great" (but has a REAL 'rape culture'), etc.

[deleted] • 11 points • 27 March, 2017 07:28 AM

rape culture

Yes, you are so right. I am Indian and I can vouch to what you are saying. The Rape culture is integrated in our school syllabus. In 1st grade we have Rape101 where we learn that it is our birth right as men to rape. In second grade we have Rape102, we learn that all white people are like saints and respect women so much and we do not have to be like them.

Minomol • 5 points • 27 March, 2017 08:46 AM

While India has been doing great in terms of removing the rape problem, you have to at least agree that there is, or until very recently has been one. In the more rural areas. Of course the term "rape culture" is overblown, but India definitely has a rape problem.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 11:26 AM

but India definitely has a rape problem.

So does US, Sweden, UK, etc. The propaganda here is to tell the world that Indian men are rapists. These idiots who pretend to care so much about India's rape problem don't know has no idea about rape problems of their own country.

PS: I am not talking about the fake rape allegations which is also a trend amongst attention seekers in India nowadays .

ShadowPeopleAreReal • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 01:53 PM

Damn i didnt realize it had gone this far. Whats next?!?!

[deleted] 27 March, 2017 01:54 PM

[permanently deleted]

destraht • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 06:06 PM

You went to school. The articles discuss how the many people beneath you barely exist in your mind.

I once met an Indian in Europe who told me that many Indians were upset and that he was upset with the movie Slumdog Millionaire because it depicted to many people that India was only a poor country. I was shocked because when I was living with my Sikh friend in California he had the Indian channel and every night he would watch a single Indian movie about some extremely rich families and one variation after another of pre-marriage issues. So there is the very typical Indian mind, only caring about the perception of the tribe. If the larger world wanted to see another piece of shit canned Bollywood movie about marriage then it would have happened already. Then one very cool movie breaks out because it is about something interesting and the struggles of life (not just ultra rich life) and it is met with resentment.

[deleted] 27 March, 2017 10:31 AM

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 March, 2017 11:29 AM

Of course that is Sarcasm! India is a secular nation and Indian schools don't have religious studies.

thebluepool • 1 point • 5 July, 2017 09:17 AM

Well besides Catholic convent schools that is.

judethedude • 3 points • 26 March, 2017 08:29 PM

Woah I had no idea about the currency ban. I'll read up on it and see what my foreign exchange friends think. That's actually insanity though, and there aren't any ready replacements (ie bitcoin).

destraht • 8 points • 26 March, 2017 08:39 PM

From what I understand in India there are a hundred million people (if not more) who are too literally stupid or uneducated or both to even understand the concepts. The elites would know better than to pull this shit on some other random billion people on the planet so suddenly and although the masses are suffering and taking their Hindi plight as fate the administrators and populace are likely too

corrupt to implement this plan (its already failing but we'll have to see if it fails to the point of collapse). This was a stupid as hell idea and probably the best thing that could happen for humanity is for a biometric cashless hell hole to outright fail to the point that not even the computers work.

deville05 • 12 points • 27 March, 2017 02:13 AM

Umm if you are American.. Look into how your financial crisis happened in 2007 (inside job) and how it affected the world and then tell me how stupid you aren't.

destraht • 8 points • 27 March, 2017 02:21 AM

Similar shit was playing out over continents. The entire world is simply all doing the same funny money thing with the Rothschild families dominating the European, American and Japanese systems. Your misinformed if you think that Japan and China weren't playing with infinite bubble money. Have you seen Chinese real estate? Its simply the largest house that dictates the precise moment when it collapses. If a smaller country pulls a plug then guess what? Nothing, just that little country goes to shit. When the US pulls the plug then they bring it down on demand. Same shit and ALL of the banks are tied into the same exact BIS system and are running on the same exact mathematical model pioneered in England (when the Rothschild family took it over). There are a shrinking number of countries not integrated into the BIS system and from 2000 onward that small list shrank considerably (all of the countries attacked, destroyed and converted were on a different banking system). None of this makes India not populated by incredible numbers of superstitious ignorant fucks.

Strum_Gewehr • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 05:24 PM

India was doing quite well at that time.

Strum_Gewehr • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 05:22 PM

You are simply screaming wolf.

[deleted] • 9 points • 27 March, 2017 01:53 AM

What does this have to do with Chapelle and his viewpoints in that vid? You went Alex Jones on us.

[deleted] • 4 points • 26 March, 2017 06:57 PM

I think it's more of seeing an opportunity to make money off people who are victimized/oppressed etc and giving them what they want. Gay/trans people have alot of purchasing power and there's plenty of money to be made whether it's gender reassignment surgery or buying an entire new wardrobe.

scarletspider3 • 2 points • 26 March, 2017 11:15 PM

I think the governments motive in facilitating the feminists in destroying marriage is really about oppression. If men don't have stable family support structures it'll make it really hard for the lower classes to rise up in the ranks.

Quantization • 0 points • 27 March, 2017 10:30 AM

Faggots and trannies? Damn dude, kill yourself.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 10:47 AM

A whole another level of cuckery, white knightng for men.

Quantization • 3 points • 27 March, 2017 11:31 AM

Being a good person is white knighting to you? White knighting is when you defend someone regardless of whether or not they are wrong. For example if a girl slapped a guy for no reason and I defender her, that is white knighting. You saying faggot and tranny is just you being a fucking cunt. I say again, kill yourself.

Phaeer6 points 27 March, 2017 01:09 PM* [recovered]

You remind me of jihadists who wants to kill anyone who draw cartoons of Mohammed. It's a fucking word. Get over yourself.

Quantization • 0 points • 27 March, 2017 02:37 PM

The fuck? So he's allowed to say faggot but now I'm a terrorist for telling him to kill himself. Alright bud.

Phaeer7 points 27 March, 2017 02:52 PM* [recovered]

He is allowed to say whatever the fuck he feels like as long as he is not encouraging violence. Just like jihadists, you are too retarded to see the difference.

Quantization • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 03:05 PM

Ooo so now you're creating the rules here. Okay well in MY opinion, he can say whatever the fuck he likes and I can say whatever the fuck I like. Now piss off lmao.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 12:34 PM

Pure, distilled white knight, nothing more. Good Guy™

Quantization • 0 points • 27 March, 2017 02:38 PM

Yep, and you're a homophobic and transphobic piece of shit! :)

[deleted] • 4 points • 27 March, 2017 02:54 PM

Although I don't fear them and just don't like them, I accept those words as a compliment, thanks.

Quantization • 0 points • 27 March, 2017 03:05 PM

Which is why you're a disgusting "human" who would genuinely be better off dead.

[deleted] • 3 points • 27 March, 2017 03:13 PM

I would gladly sacrifice myself if it would cure all the faggy stuff.

994212 • 11 points • 26 March, 2017 10:41 PM

Heard somewhere that marriage used to be a security for men to secure their assets by leaving inheritance for their specimens. Love was not in the mix .

epixs • 50 points • 26 March, 2017 05:06 PM

I watched both of his new specials since I'm a huge standup comedy fan, he even mentioned how Bill Cosby's rape victims had "8 hours of sleep in them" and how they were all "allegations" . He talks so much about how

marriage is a bad contract, like you said. Like they say, you can say so much truth if you can make the people laugh. His jokes on feminists were point on to and female logic.

muggedbyidealism • 30 points • 26 March, 2017 06:43 PM

When he said "allegations," his tongue was firmly in cheek. "8 hours of sleep," was his way of making a joke during an uncomfortable topic. Did you miss him agreeing with the statement "women suffer," (while pointing out it is not the same as systemic racism against black people)?

UrsusG • 31 points • 26 March, 2017 05:20 PM

Dave Chappelle: Marriage is Nothing but an Awful Contract You Shouldn't Sign

He's been married since 2001 and has 3 kids, so that vid is just a performance.

His anti-marriage stance is about as credible as Rollo's (though I really enjoy Rollo's writing).

ColdIceZero • 106 points • 26 March, 2017 05:31 PM

That's an ad hominem logical fallacy that has nothing to do with the merits of the claim but instead focuses entirely on the characteristics of the person saying it. The statement "smoking is bad for your health" is still valid, even if the person making the statement is a smoker.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 01:14 PM

He didn't use a noun as an insult towards Rollo or Chappelle so I wouldn't call it ad hominem. I would say its closer to a No True Scotsman logical fallacy. But as you said, Chappelle can be married and his anti-marriage stance is still credible.

UrsusG • 7 points • 26 March, 2017 05:46 PM*

focuses entirely on the characteristics of the person saying it

Because OP was glowing about "powerful moments" and "bucking mainstream culture."

The merits of the claim stand on their own: do not marry

The merits of Dave Chappelle stand on their own: he's a good comedian.

But when married Dave talks about how you shouldn't get married, my paradigms shift without a clutch.

Also, it's perfectly natural to prefer advice from people who practice what they preach, don't you agree?

ColdIceZero • 40 points • 26 March, 2017 06:17 PM*

I think it's a trick of the mind to feel more comfortable with the consistency, but it has almost nothing to do with the truth of the claim being made.

Let's switch it around. If a guy told you that going to the gym is good for you, but he doesn't go to the gym himself, does that mean going to the gym isn't good for you? It is inconsistent that the guy would make the claim yet not follow through with his own advice; but that situation then necessitates the question, "why isn't he going to the gym?"

Either he doesn't go to the gym because he's lying about how beneficial the gym is, or there's some additional factors involved in his personal life that influence his ability or choice to go to the gym. If those personal factors have nothing to do with you, then the claim "going to the gym is good for you" is still valid, even if the person saying it doesn't go to the gym.

So sure, it requires less mental exercise to follow the consistency of people who practice what they preach; but the lack of practice doesn't inherently negate the truth of a declared statement.

Also, on the flip side, "trust me because I do it too" is not necessarily support for a claim's truthfulness either. If a murderer tells you that killing people isn't a crime, are you to believe him merely because his statement is consistent with his practice?

This is why a person's characteristics should be irrelevant when analyzing whether a statement is true or false. Ad Hominem and Appeal to Authority are both logical fallacies for a reason.

If Trump, Hillary, and Bernie Sanders all said that the sun rises in the east, but your instinct is to distrust the statement when said by some or trust it when said by others, then you have an underdeveloped skill in critical thinking.

Tallsmarhandsome • 5 points • 27 March, 2017 01:56 AM*

Thank you for patiently explaining this. I still get angry that kids in my college philosophy class 15 years ago didnt understand modus ponens and modus tolens, how did they get into the same private school as me!!!

[deleted] • 8 points • 27 March, 2017 02:55 AM

how did they get into the same private school as me!!!

haha EXACTLY! I mean you're tall, smart, *and* handsome!

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 March, 2017 09:11 PM

You are torturing the definition of ad hominem. Agree with your point, tho.

MattyAnon • 51 points • 26 March, 2017 05:24 PM

I'd say being married gives him first hand experience of the results of marriage.

Most men know that it's a shit deal, but they have misguided faith in themselves and the girl they are with (delusion plus oneitis). "She'd never do that to me, she's a great girl who isn't like that".

Do Not Marry

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 March, 2017 09:06 PM

Anti marriage doesn't always bean pro divorce rape

ozaku7 • 1 point • 26 March, 2017 06:14 PM

Anyone would be stupid to refuse an offer that benefits them. Again, anyone would be stupid to sign a contract that fucks them hard and dry.

MattyAnon • 12 points • 26 March, 2017 07:03 PM

So we're agreed: men are romantic and stupid and women are opportunists.

CallMeHaseo • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 06:30 PM

Yet we live in a society where so many men do it anyway ☐

UrsusG • 0 points • 26 March, 2017 05:40 PM

I'd say being married gives him first hand experience of the results of marriage.

Perhaps, but he's definitely not some paragon red piller "bucking mainstream culture" like OP said.

He's a funny, observant guy making big money talking shit on stage, while not exactly practicing what he preaches.

MattyAnon • 22 points • 26 March, 2017 07:02 PM

Would be more plausible if he got a divorce.

But a married man complaining about marriage is much funnier than a single man complaining about marriage. If I went on stage and said "marriage is a terrible idea, that's why I never did it", would anyone laugh?

BluepillProfessor • 9 points • 26 March, 2017 05:39 PM

anti-marriage stance is about as credible as Rollo's

Rollo is not anti marriage. He is anti getting married in the current culture.

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 02:56 AM

So he got married *before* culture and women went insane?

BluepillProfessor • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 09:24 PM

This insanity is pretty new. It started just in the 1980's with the onslaught of 3rd wave feminism.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 09:34 PM

So Rollo has been married since when?

Bear-With-Bit • 1 point • 28 March, 2017 08:35 AM

His daughter is late teens I think.

waking-life • 3 points • 27 March, 2017 12:30 AM

Rumours currently swirling that he is separated and/or divorced.

Or maybe they are having trouble.

Who better to know you shouldn't get married than a married man?

Quantization • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 10:31 AM

He admits he is married, go watch the full clip you idiot.

RPthrowaway_007 • points • 26 March, 2017 08:48 PM **[recovered]**

Chappelle is alpha as fuck

waking-life • 22 points • 27 March, 2017 12:29 AM

He really isn't and says as much during his specials. He seems stoic, though. Shit happens, run with it.

MuhTriggersGuise • 9 points • 27 March, 2017 03:36 AM

He literally called himself a feminist during his special.

[deleted] • 4 points • 27 March, 2017 03:55 AM

yeah i disagree. chappelle is not alpha, but he isn't beta. the strong points he seems to display are only racial advantages (he has your typical black guy level of freedom of speech. he can say what he wants and criticize

what he wants more than almost any white guy would)

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 March, 2017 07:59 PM

His special where he mentioned that was awesome. Always loved Dave Chappell and was uncertain if he still had "it", but he showed me that he still does. Definitely recommend everyone listen to it.

[deleted] • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 05:50 PM

Marriage is a one sided deal today, laws has to be changed in order to make marriage appealing to men again, there is no wonder why divorce rates has increased so much over the years, with women filing divorce more than 70% of the cases.

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/06/23/144-years-of-marriage-and-divorce-in-the-united-states-in-one-chart/>

Parvenu76 • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 07:01 PM

I just edited this post to include the latest development of the copyright strike

akremkeder • 2 points • 27 March, 2017 11:23 PM

Dave chappelle will be making \$60 million for his netflix special. here
<http://www.businessinsider.com/dave-chappelle-salary-netflix-comedy-specials-deal-2016-11>

reddit_sucks3 • 3 points • 27 March, 2017 04:48 PM

Damn homie is jacked compared to the skinny crackhead / stoner I remember in the 90's.

victor_knight • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 12:37 AM

Men who don't marry tend to get weeded out of the gene pool... but it's still a good idea not to marry, all things considered. Maybe that's how the powers that be want it.

lonewolf-chicago • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 06:46 AM

I watched it both of his specials and of course I was again impressed as hell with Dave Chappelle.

It's the first time we talked about that type of stuff to my recollection and the first time he's ever talked about his family and his wife.

I highly recommend it

bench250 • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 07:46 AM

I watched both of them last night, classic!

FBlagentPosingAsKid • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 09:18 AM

Says the normie who has been with a woman

SgtBrutalisk • 1 point • 29 March, 2017 09:17 PM

You need to start moving away from Youtube and onto smaller platforms where your rights as a content creator and remixer are fully protected. Youtube and Google don't give two shits about you and will gladly sell you out at first chance.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 March, 2017 09:18 PM

From what I read when Chapelle quit his show, it sounds to me like he had some kind of meltdown or nervous

breakdown.

MalkavianJ • 1 point • 31 March, 2017 06:23 PM

You will not win this fight against YouTube, not for this content.

This is an extremely popular and hot bit of his NEW (keyword) Netflix Special. Netflix's business model relies upon revenue from recurring subscriptions, and doubtlessly they are hoping by shelling out \$60M for 3 EXCLUSIVE (another keyword) specials from Chapelle they can get more subscribers, so doubtlessly:

1. They have social media personnel employed solely to comb YouTube and similar sites for this (and other copyrighted material) special
2. They (Netflix) filed this 'injunction' against you (my words, not source).

I wouldn't fight it. It's totally copyrighted and not for your use in any way, shape or form.

Parvenu76 • 2 points • 8 April, 2017 02:26 AM

Agree. Not going to Fight it. I did quite a bit of homework on fair use. There were several things I could have done better, which *could* have tipped the scale towards legal fair use. Thanks for the input

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 March, 2017 05:07 PM

I don't think it's irrelevant to TRP - but it's a slow day anyway :D

Dave Chapelle is a funny one isn't he, seems like his "outrageous comedy" and Blackness make him hard to criticise and take down like they would anyone else...but I'm English and so not very knowledgeable about him.

beatsdropheavy • 4 points • 27 March, 2017 12:31 AM

dave chapelle is the shit. check out the dave chapelle show if you get a chance, his skits are gold. i still think its some of the best comedy ive ever seen and its been 10 years since the show ended

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 06:41 AM

Yeah he seems witty.

I think he's done a Joe Rogan podcast, I'll check it out if I'm right.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 March, 2017 09:43 PM

He got married. Isn't he contradicting himself?

Canedude08 • 5 points • 26 March, 2017 11:30 PM

Tom Leykis got married FOUR TIMES. Sometimes, guys have to learn the hard way, but they want others to learn from their mistakes.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 March, 2017 11:37 PM

Never heard of him. Appreciate your comment nonetheless.

Phaeer • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 12:33 PM

I'm confused about the whole situation. He talks numerous times about fucking other women but he has been married for over 10 years. Is he fucking on the side and his wife has accepted that or is he just talking shit?

Gman777 • 0 points • 26 March, 2017 08:34 PM

Seems like unlike you, Dave's wife understands humor.

schizoBrother-1 points 27 March, 2017 09:26 AM [recovered]

d-d-don't get married goy

b-b-but strive for lots of meaningless sex like a stupid chick

Fuck off with Dave's JOKE bad advice. tbh though the chicks you guys deal with are almost all indoctrinated, directionless whores so yeah don't marry those.

Find a nice trad wife and have some white kids.

sestre • -1 points • 26 March, 2017 11:33 PM

propose to a woman of my own free will

Damn it, she trapped me! What an evil vixen!

MattyAnon • 3 points • 27 March, 2017 01:20 AM

Nah, she's just maximising her financial returns with a state-run long con.

lonewolf-chicago • 1 point • 27 March, 2017 06:45 AM

When all of society your parents your family your friends and television and movies tell you that getting married is the correct thing to do it's not your own free will choosing it is years and years of influence and propaganda.

Jbpuma01 • -2 points • 26 March, 2017 07:45 PM

Is the one thing i might get out of marriage a license to beat her and cheat on her while keeping her pregnant?