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A while ago I was asked a question after I stated “feminism corrupts the relationship between a mother and her son.”

The question directed to me was: **What is the cause of fathers treating their children in the same way?** (he worded his question poorly, but basically, if you’re blaming feminism for why some mothers behave like cunts to their boys then how do you explain some fathers being cunts to their boys?) he is somewhat presenting a false dichotomy with his question, but I suspect that is due to a lack of understanding or an inability to articulate well on his part, rather than an attempt to be devious.

**This was my response to him:**

Despite your disposition to view my opinion through filters of suspicion, this is nothing more than about analysing reality, if a father treats his child badly then there is a good chance that he is Dark Triad, and this makes a lot of sense seeing as women are commonly most sexually and romantically attracted to men whom possess the dark triad characteristics of machiavellianism, psychopathy and narcissism, naturally if a dark triad man values himself more than a woman within the confines of a romantic relationship or encounter, it stands to reason he would do the same within fatherhood. Dark triad men value themselves above all else, especially their commitments, this is not necessarily a bad thing, however I could write a whole article on that and shall digress no more into the topic.

As for feminism, it reverses gender roles so it affects men within themselves, how they view themselves and how they interact with women, but it also affects how women treat men, including how they raise their own boys. They tend to raise their sons to fit with their ideology, from the loving side they coddle them and make them their idea of the perfect Disney prince, but in all pragmatism this just makes said young boys weak and teaches them values which don’t result in success. On the more malevolent side of feminist-fuelled single motherhood if said woman feels a kind of hate or resentment for the young boy, they behave like emotional terrorists, bullies who wield psychological violence which sometimes manifests physically. Feminism makes women masculine and domineering whilst men meek and passive, it says it doesn't believe in gender roles, but this is a facade, its practical effect is to actually reverse them via social engineering and bring about a perverse sort of female supremacism, which in actual fact makes many women feel disenchanted and anxious, resulting in all time low happiness for the female gender in the United States. Women are given a mixed message, they’re socialised to go against their base instincts, shamed for being motherly rather than the feminist mandated “career woman” and as a result many find themselves in a state of utter conflict, confused what the path to happiness for them and all their intricacies really entails.

The way that feminism makes women more aggressive and men more passive is through how it frames (represents and conveys) the genders within its rhetoric, women being
stereotyped as fair and innocent, whilst men as members of an elite illuminati-esque all-powerful organisation known as “the patriarchy” the label applied to men collectively as a group, they are framed as calculating and predatory of their prey (women), when the reality couldn’t be further from the truth. Women are almost always framed by feminism as victims and men are framed as perpetrators, whenever there is a female aggressor and male victim, the ideology does not usually acknowledge or respond, if it does one of its many indoctrinated spokespeople will attempt to suppress it or rationalise the female behaviour as seeming reasonable within the perverted confines of the mainstream media (a feminist friendly environment of saturated gynocracy) such pathetic examples for illicit behaviour could be something as simple as “oh he probably did something to upset her” blame shifting back to the man, as if all of a sudden, she’s not a human being responsible for her own actions, how convenient for her, this is a classic feminist play, deploying one of its favourite cards from the deck of bullshit, the victim card in the flavour of hypoagency.

Feminism teaches girls and young women that they need to prove themselves to the world and to do that they should become more aggressive, to compete with boys and see them adversarially which essentially leads to them exploiting boys with their beauty privilege and being intrinsically distrustful of them, it teaches these girls to have a negative relationship with men and everything male, whilst her biology craves masculinity, a perverse form of existential paradox. Whilst males indoctrinated with the ideology are taught they need to be apologists for the misrepresented and unproven actions of their ancestors and this “patriarchy”, that they should not embrace their gender identity or be too aggressive, not to be too competitive or be outspoken (the polar opposite of what they’re teaching girls) and ultimately to accommodate the sensibilities and whims of women. In this sense feminism is most perverse in its double standard, it is quite humorous that quite so many are brainwashed to believe that feminism really represents some form of equality, especially the males supporting it, of whom feminism actively undermines.

Feminism is a form of gender segregation, it promotes hostility and misandry. It is in effect, the racism of gender creating a duality of hostility in sentiment between the two different biological gender groups, and in contemporary western society its most certainly a form of unrecognised bigotry which needs to be identified for what it really is. It is an ideology of superiority, conceit and self-serving elitism. Feminism is not equality and stopped having any sort of relation to it after civil rights were achieved, third wave feminism is about as far away from egalitarianism as it gets, it is now a self-indignant supremacist movement, having been hijacked by the radicals, which spreads nothing but discord and inefficiency among the societies of which it inhabits. It is bigoted, it is vile, it is an ideology which hides its odious and insipid hatred for men by winning sympathy, by playing the victim, and the irony of playing the victim is it creates power, it not only wins support, hearts and minds but it obtains raw power via legislation, through the enactment of the misnomer “positive discrimination.”

Relevant link: Law 22: Use the Surrender Tactic to Transform Weakness into Power.
There is an incredible amount of confusion and misrepresentation out there about what exactly the red pill is. There are those who simply dislike it and thus misrepresent it and there are those whom are new to the philosophy who among all the chaos of differing opinion, spam and plethora of theories and content are just left scratching their heads. I hope here to communicate the fundamentals of what the widely encompassing philosophy entails, and dispel many of the misconceptions that have formed around it.

First and foremost, the red pill is about giving males direction in order that they may fulfill their innate potential, in a culture which gives the male gender little to no guidance on actualising their sense of innate and biologically driven masculinity, where society has ignored male needs The Red Pill takes centre stage, a reaction to a societal problem, it attempts to give men of all ages the tools they need to introspect (take a look at themselves) and address their shortcomings in order to overcome them.

No rites of passage, a common prevalence of absent fathers and a feminised gynocentric culture has essentially robbed fathers of agency over their children, with a lack of fatherly input into the raising of children in modern western feminist societies men are becoming increasingly lost. These are the same feminist controlled societies which shame masculine norms and values left, right and centre and resultantly has left a lot of teenage boys, young men, fathers and divorced men feeling disillusioned because society simply just does not care about their existence, their growth or their needs. They feel invisible because society focuses purely on the needs of the feminine and ignores masculinity outside of a negative context.

When broken homes and single parent families are the norm there’s a lot of children out there growing up without the direction they need to succeed in life. Young girls are hurt by the feminist destruction of the family unit too, however The Red Pill’s main focal point is the male perspective of the fallout that institutionalised radical feminism has created and what we, young boys, young men and older men can do in the paradigm our ancestors left us by successfully adapting to it. There is a female branch of The Red Pill philosophy which can be found over at /r/redpillwomen on Reddit, however it’s viewpoint and aims differ from the main philosophy, it is a complementation of the philosophy from the female perspective for women who also recognise the inherent negative effects feminism has had upon society.

Let’s start with the name “The Red Pill”, the red pill is a metaphor taken from the movie “The Matrix”, for those who have not seen or do not understand the premise of the movie, allow me to break it down for you.

The Matrix is a movie about humanity living in a state of automated delusion, a world of fabrication devoid of meaning beyond the superficial. The protagonist begins to expect “something is not right with the world” and becomes increasingly suspicious, there is a
turning point where a character named Morpheus offers the protagonist an ultimatum, he states “You take the blue pill - the story ends, you wake up in your bed and believe whatever you want to believe. You take the red pill - you stay in Wonderland, and I show you how deep the rabbit hole goes. Remember, all I’m offering is the truth - nothing more.”

The protagonist opts to take the red pill and begins to see the numerous facades, elaborate illusions and deceptions around him shatter, he then goes on a personal quest of actualisation until he reaches a point where he is able to directly influence what happens around him because “he understands how the system works.” This is what red pill philosophy is about at its core, being able to identify the things in society which are simply outright bullshit and seeing past the illusions to be free of the restrictions of which they impose on you as an individual.

That’s brings me onto the next point, Feminism. The Red Pill is extremely critical of feminism and most definitively, anti-feminist. As feminism has become institutionalised and a social norm within western democracies, society has begun to take on more and more feminine values which have been enacted into legal legislation and it’s for this reason that the philosophy takes a lot of heat, why it has detractors, why it is lambasted, why simply, so many people love to hate it.

Many people are feminists, or identify with it due to their social programming and do not take kindly to any criticism of the ideology that they hold dearest. This is the core of the philosophy’s controversy, it is, since the normalisation of feminism from the first wave, one of few philosophies which has openly challenged, ridiculed, defamed or otherwise called out feminism on its weaknesses. Notice I have underlined the plural of philosophy, that’s what The Red Pill is, a philosophy.

The Red Pill is not a social movement, movements attempt to fight for change based upon their wants and needs, such as the Men’s Rights Movement (MRA) or first wave feminism. The Red Pill does not look to change the status quo, it looks to understand it, call it out for what it is, and leave you with consciousness, a sentience to evaluate your options so
you can the use the knowledge you have discovered to live your life to your utmost best by
learning to manage the innately deceptive nature of women and carve out a life for yourself
on your own terms; and should you choose to make a life with a woman, you will be well
equipped with the knowledge and experience to adequately handle her sufficiently to the
betterment of you both.

On the point of “the deceptive nature of women”, The Red Pill rejects the mainstream
narrative that women are the fairer sex, the so-called innocent victims of everything
masculine in nature, The Red Pill identifies that whilst males are naturally physically superior,
women have the manipulative edge, an innate proficiency in machiavellianism.

The Red Pill is a hybrid of self-improvement and anti-feminism. It embraces traditional
masculinity and rejects feminist ideas of what masculinity is. It follows the premise that a
woman does not know what it is to be a man and thus she is incapable of teaching boys how
to be men. A woman of intelligence knows what specifically makes her happy, but not the
inner workings of that, and how to communicate to a male how to internalise and embody the
successful traits required to be successful with women, this is crudely summed up by the
popular red pill idiom “a fish can’t teach a fisherman how to fish.”

Mainstream wisdom dictates a man be chivalrous and supplicating, but countless testimony
from thousands of men shows that this ill advise fails in practice. The Red Pill takes away the
de facto feminist hegemony over gender politics and places the discourse firmly into the
hands of the masculine viewpoint, a viewpoint which is all but ignored within the increasingly
gynocentric public space, be it the mainstream media, a conversation in a coffee shop or
within the modern day feminist bastion known as the higher education system.

The Red Pill realises the importance of masculinity in society and how a decline in traditional
masculinity since the 60’s and 70’s has led to a decay in society’s moral fiber, ever-increasing
public hysteria and delusion (fat acceptance, affirmative action, biased family law
e tc) as well as an acknowledgement of the shift from political conservatism to radical
liberalism which has accompanied and facilitated the rise of mainstream hegemonic
feminism.

Unlike feminism which believes in either gender equality or female supremacism (depending
on which niche of feminism you’re looking at), The Red Pill rejects that women are equal or
supreme to men, it believes traditional gender roles were the optimum roles for raising a
family and continuing the genetic lineage of the species. It believes women need men to take
charge, to bear the burden of responsibility and essentially “man up”, though not “man up”
in the way feminists use the term to shame men, but in the essential essence that men need
guidance which they’re not getting and that they need to overcome the effects of feminism
by rejecting it, improving themselves and ultimately rising above it.

On the self-improvement front, The Red Pill philosophy advocates fitness, being physically
healthy and in shape, in order to teach discipline and a sense of self-worth (it’s evident from
people who have only just turned up in the community that a lack of self-worth is often
endemic in men who have yet to “take the pill.”) The mantra of the philosophy is “to build
value” in order to respect yourself and get respect from those around you. There is a large
element of “game” which essentially amounts to devising successful sexual strategies in
order to be successful with women. As men have been culturally charged with the responsibility of instigating sexual liaisons with women, the philosophy attempts to help men increase their proficiency in this area of their lives. This “game” manifests in different ways, it can be used to have sex with lots of different women, maintain relationships with a lover or take control of a rocky marriage, simply it is the teaching of wisdom which can help men become more romantically successful, how the knowledge is applied and practiced is essentially up to the individual.

Detractors of the The Red Pill attempt to conflate the philosophy’s anti-feminist element with the concept of misogyny, that is to say, that disagreeing with feminism automatically means one hates the female gender, this is a false assumption (or if we’re to identify the fallacy – a hasty generalisation resulting in a strawman), where anti-feminism is affiliated with a hate for women, an idea which is not only logically unsound, but factually incorrect.

One does not need to be a feminist to be female, but it’s this trick of trying to make the terms synonymous, that being female and feminist are the same things which creates the perfect veil of protection for the feminist ideology, by using women as a psychological human shield they protect their ideology from intense scrutiny by shutting down the debate, so that when one decries feminism they are simultaneously perceived to despise women and thus silenced on grounds of intolerance.

This mental manipulation which is embodied in the very fabric of western society only serves to promote the interests of the architects and torch holders of the feminist ideology, therefore it is safe to assume that it’s in their interest to keep you believing that it’s oppressive of women as a whole to simply disagree with their doctrine. Radical feminists have ruthlessly hijacked feminism post first wave and attached their extremist ideology to both the concept of civil rights and the feminine identity when these things are in all actuality things which are innately and fundamentally separate, women had existed for thousands if not hundreds of thousands of years completely independent of feminism, feminism has been around for just over a hundred years, and the ideology only became powerful within the last 50 or so years, I think this safely qualifies that the biological state of being female can be independent totally and utterly of feminist ideology which is why it is incorrect to dishonestly associate a rejection of feminism as being synonymous with a dislike of women (misogyny.)

Interestingly, this is where feminism sees a clash with the women of Islam, but that’s a whole other can of worms for another post, the newsflash here is that one can disagree with feminism and love women all at the same time, which is an important distinction to be made if one is attempting to be intellectually honest when attempting to scrutinise The Red Pill and not simply misrepresent its existence due to an ulterior agenda.

Ultimately as /r/theredpill surmises itself, it is the: “Discussion of sexual strategy in a culture increasingly lacking a positive identity for men.”
A woman popped up in /r/theredpill last week asking questions about what red pill philosophy is, I answered her with a fairly long post and the post got a lot of attention (triple digits up votes) which is rare for anything that’s over 200 words long, so here we are, with some grammatical revisions and additions for your reading delight, these were my answers to her questions.

The questions are symbolic of the common pondering which newbies who aren’t fully acquainted with the philosophy will engage in, and thus my decision to enshrine this interaction into a blog post (due to its utility), you can use the knowledge in my interaction with this woman to help you interpret what the red pill philosophy is among all the misconception, disinformation or logical uncertainty you may have encountered. If you want to see the original post on Reddit then you can see it here: http://tinyurl.com/red-pill-q-and-a

“Are TRP men anti-feminists?”

Most people who utilise the red pill philosophy are, the ones who aren’t are sure keeping it quiet, feminism gets a lot of logical deconstruction and criticism here. I don’t think in the time I’ve been on /r/theredpill anyone’s ever made a successful case for third wave feminism. From what I can tell, most people seem to think that after civil rights the ideology just spiralled out of control and lead to this emasculated society where the family unit lays in tatters and deeper societal problems are spawning out of that as a result, such as the massive welfare state, the taxes needed to fund it (transfer of wealth from working men to
single mothers via taxation) and all the other economic/political collateral that comes along with it.

**“Is TRP misogynistic?”**

Some people are. It depends on the guy in question. Being disrespectful to women doesn’t necessarily mean you have an insipid hatred for them. It’s funny how effective being disrespectful to a woman can be in seducing them. I’d say most of us are definitely sexist, as in, we discriminate between that which is masculine and that which is feminine because we recognise them as fundamentally different but certainly not because we have a collective hatred for anything and everything female. There are probably individuals here who have been hurt very badly and do genuinely hate women to the core as a result of their pain, something that is often shamed as “bitter”, but unfortunately this is inevitable, people experience pain and they have to try to work through that.

**“Does TRP believe that men and women are on the same level?”**

No we don’t believe in gender equality. We believe a man needs to be strong to attract and maintain a successful relationship with a woman. We’ve noticed that when you’re a strong man, women become feminine, soft and less bitchy to you, the nicer and weaker you are the more masculine and scrappy they become. To sum up: the red pill philosophy believes in traditional gender roles.

**“Does TRP get frustrated with feminists who are man-hating?”**

The red pill philosophy doesn’t really take feminists seriously, we see them as deluded in their thinking and call them “bluepill.” The blue pill is essentially a slang term synonymous with “deluded” derived from the metaphor used in “The Matrix” movie.

**“Why does “an ideal woman” have to have as few sexual partners as possible?”**

Women don’t need to work to get sex, sure certain men may present a challenge because they’re out of her league but if she works within her level and goes out tonight and tells a guy that she wants him then 9/10 guys will go off with her there and then and fuck her. It takes no skill for a woman to get sex and therefore it does not merit any respect or admiration. Women are the gatekeepers to sex, men are quite crudely, generally up for it most of the time, specific men aside.

This means her “conquests” are not “conquests” but merely offerings, if she is offering herself up to half the town, to a guy that doesn’t warrant respect, but disgust. It essentially says “I’m low value because I offer the best part of myself for very little.”

High value women should only be giving it up to a boyfriend, the signifiers of high value women are that they have had few relationships lasting long periods of time and minimal hook-ups, if she’s constantly in and out of relationships, or constantly hitting the clubs and bars and going home with different men, she’s probably emotionally unstable and not worth touching with a bargepole.
There's irony here because if the girl is low value, guys want her to give it up on the first night because to them she has no value other than a fuck, however if they're considering her for a relationship they want her to be one of the girls who doesn't do that. The difference in preference is based on the approach. If you just want to fuck a girl you don’t really care if she’s a slut, in fact being a slut makes it easier to have sex with her.

If you want to build a family with a woman, you don’t want her to be a slut because it means you’re investing all this love, time, energy and investment into her and she may squander that by betraying you to fuck another guy.

Whores don’t make good wives, they make good lays. The problem is every whore hates the fact she is a whore, deludes herself that she isn’t a whore to maintain her self-esteem, tries to hide her past because in her heart of hearts she actually knows she is a whore and then attempts to “play the wife”, what happens is because she’s not been monogamous much of her life and had all these great sexual experiences and adventures when she was in her 20’s, she misses the excitement of that and throws the marriage away in selfishness, this can be because she’s bored or because she can’t resist the temptation of another man that’s on her radar.

Men are the de facto gatekeepers to commitment, they choose whether they want to stick around after fucking you. Your power is in your pussy (to begin with) your ability to keep a man lays in your personality traits. His power lays in whether he’s going to invest in you after he’s fucked you.

If you don’t seem like a good deal, if he doesn’t enjoy your company or he finds you to be shallow or annoying then why should he keep investing in you? Because otherwise he’s an asshole or because of your delicate sensibilities?

Red pill philosophy teaches men to put themselves before women, much to the dismay of mainstream society – if it’s not a good deal to him then you’re not worth the commitment. /r/redpillwomen essentially helps women become “a good deal” after all if you want long-term commitment, you’ve gotta work for it. It doesn’t just drop out of the sky, nobody’s entitled to anything “just because” but the concept of earning commitment seems lost to most women, they rely on their looks too much – then they get old and lose their looks.

This is what is referred to in the red pill philosophy as “the wall” it’s around the age of 27 – 35 (depending on the specific woman) when a woman’s physical appearance takes a sudden dive south she begins to finds her life becoming less enjoyable because essentially, her beauty privilege is fading. Guys now pay less attention to said woman and because she didn’t spend her youth cultivating personality traits which men value, the asset she has exploited for the entirety of her life to get by is beginning to fail her and she can feel her power and social leverage weaken in its sphere of influence.

As her social value falls, her misery increases – it’s usually at this stage where women panic, they want a family/baby and become more open-minded in regards to learning new things and essentially try to give their personality a makeover in order to secure a mate; both because they fear the prospect of being socially unsuccessful as well as reproductively which
ultimately leads to life loneliness.

This is the stage where if a woman cannot improve herself, she’ll “settle” for a man, quite miserably, who she perceives as “beneath her” because of all the hot guys she had back in her younger days, however because her sexual value has fallen with age she is unable to still get that same calibre of man for a one night stand, let alone a commitment and thus “the settling.” This is what ultimately leads to a lot of resentment and bitterness from women and constitutes a huge part of the core demographic in the most radical elements of the feminist movement, blaming their lack of social/sexual appeal on concepts like “the patriarchy” and “misogyny” to rationalise away their lack of biological attractiveness to the opposite sex and the social ramifications which follow from that.

“To me it’s seems TRP started as men just trying to get laid as much as possible and have developed the philosophy as a more effective guide to getting laid, is this correct?”

Guys love sex, a lot. Everyone knows that whether you believe in red pill philosophy or not, this is the nuclear missile in the arsenal of weaponry of every insecure controlling piece of crap with a vagina out there.

Game is about having success with women and it’s great for everyone involved. Think about it. Most women just stand around, dressed up and looking pretty, they don't approach they don’t do shit, they put no direct work in – their work is indirect, they invest in their appearance and then place themselves in a specific venue at a specific time, these are both things guys have to do as well.

The girls stand there like items in a shop window waiting to be selected, if guys don’t have the balls or confidence to approach you, you’ll have many a shitty night and many of the guys will feel regret the next day because they couldn’t find it within themselves to chalk up the courage. She’s certainly not going to risk rejection and embarrassment in front of other people, women leave that shit to the men.

A part of the red pill philosophy is about helping men get over that kind of crap and to get good at talking to women, approaching, seducing, building rapport and all the rest of it. In case you hadn't noticed, gender relations are pretty strained thanks to feminism and women aren't getting “un-brainwashed” by feminism any time soon, some are damn catty/arrogant and just plain unpleasant to even approach in the street. Part of having game is having the tools to deal with that and not care when you face rejection. This is something referred to as “outcome independence” and it is a symptom of one’s personality when they have built their own social value and sense of self up enough until they’ve reached the point where a random woman’s opinion or power to reject them means very little to them, they don’t delegate their self-esteem to the emotional whims and preferences of a random woman.

Thanks to said ideology (feminism) many women are simply undatable and not relationship material, however physically many are quite bangable so they’re whats crudely referred to as a “pump and dump.” That’s her value, she’s hot enough to fuck but doesn’t have the qualities needed to secure commitment. Most women get the aesthetics fine, but don’t cultivate the personality traits needed to secure long-term commitment from a high value
man.

If you want a life long monogamy, your looks are going to die out around age 30-35 and there will be far prettier younger women around trying to catch your man’s eye, so you need to possess other traits which make you seem like a good investment and set you a part from all the sluts, the higher value your man – the more interest he’ll get and the harder you’ll have to work.
Understanding The Dark Triad - A General Overview

by IM | November 17, 2013 | Link

Introduction:

The Dark Triad is an immoral trifecta of personality traits that result in immense personal power. It grants high social status, tight control over interpersonal social dynamics and elicits intense sexual attraction. It’s for these reasons that many men interested in red pill philosophy likewise have an interest in the dark triad and idealise ascertaining the psychological state of “being dark triad” or at least a simulacrum of such a state.

These men see power embodied within specific personality traits and they want to know “how can I be like that?” “How can I be the successful asshole?!” The truth of the matter is that if you did not neurologically develop a dark triad personality as a child, you will never be completely dark triad in the truest sense of the classification. The dark triad is essentially not something one can be trained to become, however it can be reverse engineered and emulated. I’ll elaborate on this later on in the article however first I’ll outline what the dark triad actually is.

Not too far back I mentioned the dark triad is a trifecta of personality traits. To be more specific, it is composed of three “anti-social” mental schemas which work in tandem to form “the dark triad.” Those comprising psychosocial mental schemas are as follows:

- Understanding Narcissism

Excessive self-love as well as ridiculously high, bordering on, or far exceeding, obnoxious self-confidence. Dark triad individuals are egotist incarnate, this component of the triad forms the superficial glazing which masks and distracts one from the murkier depths of the dark triad persona. It is this device that achieves a dark triad individual baseline social acceptance in most social situations, for people are innately drawn to those who exhibit vast self-
The narcissism is clinical, deep-rooted and intensely internalised. The individual truly believes they are superior to everybody else simply because they are who they are and they exist. This is something akin to a god complex. Naturally, this has the effect of rubbing off on other people despite being completely unsubstantiated. People assume unconsciously that someone who loves themselves that much must have a basis for their self-image and therefore wrongfully assumes such an individual is high value. Narcissists, in the absence of significant worldly success are huge proponents of the “fake it ‘till you make it” mantra. Except unlike your average Joe who exhausts himself with the pretence, it takes a narcissist almost no effort to maintain it, because despite the objective invalidity of their assertions they believe in their own delusions.

The strength of such concentrated narcissism in tandem with the fearlessness of psychopathy (more on that later) is that such extremely high confidence generates an abundance of courage. This facilitates rampant opportunism that manifests as a keen risk-taking eye as well as concise, solid decision-making. So it follows that by extension of this the narcissist has a high rate of success when engaging in personal aspirations, presuming that they can rationalise away failure rather than let it consume them. This is oft dependant on the individual and the type of narcissism that they exude, for there are two different types of narcissism I consider to exist: functional narcissism and dysfunctional narcissism.

The average person is insecure and low in confidence. Regardless of that, even other confident people will naturally gravitate towards someone who is highly confident. This then has the knock-on effect of raising the social status and popularity of the narcissist and circularly fuels their narcissistic supply by giving it logical and tangible reasons for existing in the first place. How this manifests is via all the positive feedback that the narcissist receives in their theatricism of audacious assholery. This is what is known as a “positive feedback loop.” The contrast: “nice guys finish last.”

Narcissism is very infectious and has a tendency to make people addicted to the individual displaying it. Especially by those who are low in self-esteem and strive to be like the person they admire. People of low self-confidence can vicariously ascertain confidence through the narcissists own confidence and have it “rub off on them” via prolonged exposure and mimicking the narcissist’s mannerisms.

The weakness/negative aspect of the narcissistic element of the triad is that normally it is so pronounced that the individual in question’s ability to reason can become impaired as they value their ego over truth. If they do not avoid or completely ignore an attack on their ego (which is common – they often feel above random remarks) they will deny reality/logic outright to preserve their ego. On occasion they may even go so far as to maliciously shut you down in order to make you pay for your insubordinate behaviour/threatening posture. They will do this by framing themselves as superior to you in a very aggressive manner, and highlighting a flaw (or two, or three) of yours to rebalance the frame of the interaction in their favour.

When a dark triad man exhibits his narcissism in his game with a girl, he essentially negs the fuck out of her, guilt trips her, makes her qualify herself (jump through a hoop) then rewards
her for being complicit. This is a form of operant conditioning and ties greatly into the next element of the triad (as each part of the triad is inherently linked with the others)

With training and self-improvement borderline narcissism (far healthier than clinical narcissism) can be acquired and utilised to improve one’s self-confidence, which as previously briefly touched upon is essentially all about forming and sustaining positive feedback loops.

For those who wish to emulate narcissism, it can be learned and is considered academically to be a “social maladaptive trait.” Basically, narcissism is nurtured, you can become a narcissist, or something akin to a narcissist in your chosen level of severity, should you desire it. It’s not something restricted to the realm of genetics.

- Understanding Machiavellianism

Machiavellianism is the tendency to see all social paradigms and scenarios as games of strategy that require meticulous manoeuvring. Machiavellians are emotionally and socially manipulative; they have a tendency to dehumanise and objectify humans down to their skills and utilitarianism rather than perceive them as entities with personalities to be admired. In a nutshell, Machiavellians have a tendency to view things purely in terms of value exchange “what does this person bring to the table?” and care little, if at all, for anything else.

Highly skilled Machiavellians manipulate themselves via stoicism to attain the outcomes they seek (something of a perverse form of delayed gratification) however dark triad individuals have no need for stoicism because they possess an underlying psychopathic element. Machiavellians quite simply are very tactical individuals who execute the vast majority of their social interactions like a metaphorical hybrid game of chess and poker.

The narcissism is their poker face for appearances and is the physical representative for all their manipulations. Their Machiavellianism is their core, their chess-like mind. They think 10 moves ahead of those around them, use smoke and mirrors (misdirection), leave bait for you and then switch the outcome from the expected outcome (a nuance on misdirection.) They pretend to be busy when they’re not to convey a false image/sense of importance, making their target feel disposable when they in fact, value them. They outright lie to achieve ends. They indulge in jealousy plotlines, making a person jealous via the deliberate inclusion and flaunting of another – creating competition anxiety. They ignore you because they want to attract you. Then there is dread game: making someone who values the dark triad individual doubt the stability of their relationship with them, causing the target to supplicate and be more malleable. The dark triad individual does not limit this scarcity mentality/competition anxiety to romantic endeavours. The list of manoeuvres goes on and on, Machiavellianism is the art of duplicity which forms the core intellectual component of the dark triad.

If you had to think of an animal that is inherently manipulative, it’d be a domestic cat. Most women adore cats, so go figure that one out, projection much? Women at a baseline level tend to be more Machiavellian in nature than men. The presiding theory in red pill philosophy is that men evolved to have a genetic advantage physically, making them more violent and physically dominant, whereas women evolved to be non-violent due to inferior musculature and small stature. Instead it is thought they evolved to use their adeptness in
Machiavellianism to have men fight for them on their behalf, giving them a far more intricate and diverse psychological skill set primed for co-option and manipulation.

If she’s a beautiful Machiavellian she can use her beauty to captivate a man and exploit him by controlling his desires, further facilitating her desires and devices. Think of the guy as a bear who loves honey, the queen bee leads the bear to a seemingly empty beehive full of honey, the bear puts his paws in to eat the honey and then the bear is caught by surprise as an army of bees come out to collectively sting him. Now the queen bee can dictate to the bear how he must behave because he tasted her honey and she has an army of bees to punish him if he does not comply. Women are controlling, they will always fight for control of the relationship, but once they get it they are dissatisfied and will move onto another man. It’s an unending test you are not allowed to fail should you desire continued association with the woman in question.

“Gold diggers” as a stereotype are a societal acknowledgement of women’s inherent tendency to perceive men as little more than useful idiots, resource providers. Gold diggers are essentially people with the ability to “use others for what they’re good for” rather than value them for “who they are as personalities.” It is Briffault’s Law on steroids: they prioritise what a person can do for them over forming emotional bonds. They don’t identify who a person is and what they can do for the manipulator in question as separate components, to a Machiavellian these things are both one and the same.

For example a Machiavellian wouldn’t think along the lines of: “John is great, I like John because he’s a decent guy” and form any sort of emotional bond. Their thinking would be something more akin to “John is a great negotiator, if I win his favour he can negotiate on behalf of me in hypothetical situation X, if I can’t win John over then I have no need for John and I should cut my losses.” Thus any emotional bond that appears to be forming is the product of superficial charm, glibness which is used to win John over so his utility can be put to use at a later time. No relation is formed out of legitimate admiration or desire for John; merely it is but a manipulation to commodify John into a redeemable asset.

Machiavellianism when concentrated towards a single person for an extended period of time is a form of mental abuse. It robs one of their agency (ability to freely make choice) for Machiavellianism as covertly as it can be deployed is inherently coercive in nature. It creates an invisible prison of sorts, a person thinks they’re free but they’re so trained to behave in ways specific to the desires of another that they’re actually enslaved. That’s Machiavellianism at its least destructive, non-violent, and passive. However it is important not to characterise Machiavellianism as purely a source of evil, as that is an inaccurate generalisation. How Machiavellianism is deployed is contingent on the agenda of the person deploying it and their relationship with the person they wish to influence. Machiavellianism can for example be used benevolently by people like parents and such; to protect, to preserve, to foster and to nourish. In dark triad individuals however it tends to be utilised for destructively selfish purposes, eg: hedonism and profit. Dark triad individuals are on their best days, amoral, at their worst, their capacity for immorality will fully manifest.

Machiavellianism can be present in either gender, however as a baseline women tend to have a much more pronounced proficiency in the skill set and utilise it far more auspiciously.
Man’s physical advantage is outlawed by the legal system, woman’s mental advantage is not. Combine this with their innate sexual appeal to men and it is fair to say that womankind has the edge in modern developed western societies. A woman’s logic being inherently contingent upon her emotional state only helps to facilitate and foster her Machiavellianism because her lack of consistency makes her seem more complex than she actually is. Not even she understands half the bullshit she pulls, and she is constrained neither by logical arguments nor an introspective need to understand her own irrationalism. She simply does what she feels she must do, and if that makes her feel happy, she is mentally and physically placated.

The sheer amount of weak effeminate behaviour characteristic of men at large in our modern society is indicative that many the great majority of men lack Machiavellian traits and capabilities to any beneficial self-serving extent. Governments want men complicit and mentally unaware so that they don’t rise up, but instead continue to pay the tax bills which fund for-profit wars and the welfare state. They want men to “man up” which means to be productive little economic slaves for the benefit of the state, and to a lesser extent the feminist bureaucrats and politicians who can only fund their perverse laws and practices with the aid of your sweat n’ tear tax dollars. Then when a man losses everything because he was too naive in matters of Machiavellianism to see what was going on around him, he is profusely blamed and shamed for his naivety. Dark triad men and women are proficient Machiavellians and can run rings around the average person, making them jump through all kinds of mental hoops and subjecting them to all kinds of tests and power plays; be it out of a desire to seek entertainment or to ascertain control over a situation. Machiavellianism is inherently in and of itself the most logical part of the dark triad persona which runs counter to the inherently delusive nature of the triad’s narcissistic component. Naturally, this makes it possible for said components to clash.

Dark triad men who are abusive and have women pining for them, wanting to fulfil their every whim do so by emotionally addicting said women. Their very presence causes said women to have rushes of dopamine/serotonin/cortisol/oxytocin as well as other neurochemical shit I don’t know about. It’s this hormonal cocktail of an emotional rollercoaster (better simplified as: drama) which causes women to form an addiction to said man. Women are addicted to dramatics; it is the basis of every modern soap opera, chick flick and romantic comedy. By associating the systematic release of these neurotransmitters and hormones with the company of a specific man who acts as the stimulus for these releases, they become biochemically addicted and thus mentally dependent upon him. The removal of such a powerful man from a woman’s life can thus elicit withdrawal symptoms similar to that of a drug comedown.

The stimulus is the dark triad man because if he’s absent for long enough the chemical processes stop and she has withdrawals from the cycle which leads her to start proclaiming shit like “needing him to go on” despite the small little fact he’s an abusive asshole. Controversial conclusion: mental abuse can be chemically addictive to women, as painful as it is, they get off on the theatrics. Women to this degree demonstrate a predisposition for masochistic tendencies, especially in relation to love and sex, this however is a topic that falls outside the spectrum of this article and is a topic for another time.
In summation of this section: dark triad individuals tend to pull people in with narcissism, control them with Machiavellianism and then addict them with the emotional rollercoaster previously described. The final element of the triad complements Machiavellianism quite brilliantly in how it aids in forming emotional addictions to the manipulator, that element is psychopathy.

For those who wish to emulate Machiavellianism, it can be learned and is considered academically to be a “social maladaptive trait.” Basically, Machiavellianism is nurtured; you can become a Machiavellian by studying the arts of political and military strategy and then applying the principles to your own social interactions.

- Understanding Psychopathy

Psychopathy is the reason you cannot train yourself to be a dark triad individual, psychopathy is how your brain connects your behavioural choices to your sense of guilt/remorse. These are essentially the body’s way of morally provoking you to cease immoral activity. If you felt no guilt or discomfort for making immoral choices, your likelihood of committing immoral behaviour increases tenfold. Furthermore if you actually derive pleasure from immoral behaviours, that can act as a social reinforcer for being immoral (read: sadistic pleasure, crime being profitable etc.)

Psychopathy defined in relation to the dark triad is the inherent ability for the dark triad individual to show no aversion for immoral or harmful behaviour, predominantly because they feel no empathy, guilt or remorse when doing bad things. This is perceived as a skill of sorts in the ruggedness of the oft unfair modern world but is medically defined as a mental disorder.

Commonly new and naive followers of red pill philosophy think “hey I can do that too via stoicism/Zen meditation.” The difference between stoicism and psychopathy however is that stoicism is the suppression and self-control of emotions that are released either after performing an action, or prior to an action. It is the suppression of detrimental emotion that elicits strong feelings which inhibit the ability to self-control, such as suspense, eagerness or anxiety. A psychopath on the other hand has neurologically weak connections between the emotional centre of their brain and the part of their brain responsible for behaviour/decision-making. This means they feel nothing or very little (dependent on the individual’s brain) when doing something immoral and thus have nothing to actually suppress to begin with. This isn’t a question of desensitization for them but more of an inability to care about the feelings of others. It is thus by extension of that inability that they are not limited by the element of guilt that would normally follow in the aftermath of such dubious choices.

This lack of ability to feel guilt or fear as consequent of their personal choices is a great source of the dark triads power (the power of fearlessness.) It’s this ability to ruthlessly exploit people which addicts women to dark triad men. Psychopathy is very closely linked with the Machiavellian component, however the sheer unpredictability and audaciousness of the psychopathic element is what addicts women to these individuals, the spontaneity and impulsivity is electric. It’s like crack to them.

The constant highs and lows psychopathy generates is the drama that women thrive off of.
Psychopathy is the delivery system of the Machiavellian core, the spontaneity, the audaciousness, the guile; it’s the creme de la creme in executing a tactical manoeuvre. However, when psychopathy gets out of control and manifests itself independently (say the dark triad person loses their temper,) it’s completely illogical and separate from the Machiavellian element, perhaps utilising elements of Machiavellianism but not actually being pre-meditated in nature. You may know this as “someone going batshit crazy.”

Psychopathy is a clinical condition and state of mental-being. The people who are afflicted with psychopathy have abnormal neurological structures, short of going and getting yourself brain damage no amount of self-determination will result in ascertaining psychopathy. You can mimic a psychopath and even fool others you are one with some degree of success, but neurologically you will not be one. You will still have to deal, introspectively, with the emotional consequences of your actions, something an actual dark triad individual does not. Hence your efforts will make you an imitation, not an actualisation of that which you lust to become.

Dark triad people are very powerful individuals. They are harmful both to society and themselves, as by nature of their personalities they are extremely unstable individuals. The fact of the matter is they tend not to care about changing their negative aspects even if they are self-aware enough to realise what the negative aspects of themselves are. They are more concerned with concealing the existence of their negative aspects and convincing others they do not exist or are otherwise justifiable or acceptable within the context of a situation. Rather perversely, they appear to be at peace with their deepest faults even if they verbalise the contrary.

Due to the psychopathic element of the triad a person cannot become “fully dark triad” as this element in particular appears to be something imbued either genetically or in the development stages of childhood brain formation. Dark triad individuals cannot be “fixed,” a dark triad individual will remain one for the entirety of their lives. Most of them don’t want to be fixed as they’re addicted to their own power and sense of self-importance. They can be emulated, you cannot “become one” but you can “become like one.” With training and study, one can demonstrate borderline or sub-clinically dark triad qualities and that is much the purpose and topic of this blog. So should you find this topic to be of interest, I recommend you follow this blog. You can do this by entering your e-mail in the top right corner of the sidebar.
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Feminism, Family Destroyer
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I intend this article to be more of an “academic entry piece” to red pill philosophy, so I have included references to my points for those who need a veneer of academic credibility in order to open their minds to facilitate the reality that can be readily observed on a day-to-day basis by any unbrainwashed human in a feminist society. I do however apologise that the citations do not link to the footnotes as I don’t have the software readily available to do it, so you will have to look in the footnotes manually to see the sources.

Feminism has caused a rift between the sexes, between the age-old union of man and woman, the yin and yang that makes two peas in a pod, men and women have been culturally emancipated from each other in a social engineering effort for them to “not need each other” or very specifically, so that women specifically “don’t need no man!” and can become “a strong independent woman” (read: lonely) which certainly begs the question, how did this come to be?

This paradigm was socially engineered via the efforts of an ideology known as feminism, it was an ideology that sold women the lie that men were inherently evil beings who were oppressive in nature, and by demonizing men told women they needed to give up their femininity and take on more masculine traits in order to meet men on a level playing field under some perverse pretense of “equality.” A divide and conquer technique used to pit the genders against each other, if you will.

We always hear about the “positives of feminism” some real, (civil rights) some imagined (women commonly adopting boisterous and narcissistic self-entitled behaviour? not so much) of course the negatives are something the incredibly biased leftist media neglect to mention or even explore (they give you only one perspective, the so-called “strengths”, but neglect to mention its weaknesses you see), so for once, let’s look at just some of the plethora of negative elements in society which we can attribute as either directly caused by feminism, or correlated with but not caused by feminism. Oh boy, don’t we sure have a lot to talk about?!


(READ: Single parent households are almost always headed by women [1]), this is because women tend to unilaterally get custody in the majority of cases due to a biased family court system, another reason for single parenthood is because women can have babies without the consent of the “sperm donor”, eg: she lies to a man that she is on contraception when she is not, when he leaves his sperm inside her post coitus she lets it fertilise inside her and has a baby without the fathers knowledge or consent (reasoning: because she’s broody and wants a child) by the time she carries the baby to term, the man is out of the picture and is completely unaware that his genetic material has been used to create human life.

Single parenthood is bad, one parent is not as good as two for multiple reasons: it leads to lower resource availability, there’s a lower chance of valuable skill sets being made available
to the immediate family because there’s only one parent with one set of skills, rather than two parents with two sets of skills and of course then there’s the big one, the primary socialisation of a child – only one gender influence on the child’s development. Atypically in modern western society this manifests as a feminist-feminine influence with no to minimal hegemonic masculine influence on the childs developmental process whatsoever, **the resulting lack of developmental diversity holds the child back and gives it a far from optimum start in life to fulfill the apex of its hypothetical potential.**

On the note of a lack of resources and the welfare state reliance which encapsulates the majority of those whom can be considered single parents, children raised in single parent households are more likely to be in poverty (as there’s only one adult who can bring in money. [2]) The poverty has a knock-on effect and increases the likelihood the child will commit a crime and spend time in jail [3], it also decreases the likelihood a child will reach university level and attain a bachelor’s degree, as at the high school level it has been observed they begin to fall behind. [4]

This trend is even more resounding in the case of young boys, women cannot teach boys masculinity and what it is to live in the male condition because they simply do not experience it for themselves and by the inherent nature of their own experience, have an opposing frame of reference. A woman can analyse and deduce masculinity from the outside and try to rationalise its nature based upon her observations, but this knowledge is inferior to that which comes from the condition of being male itself, from a man.

A woman cannot teach boys methodologies which men rely upon in their interactions in handling women, they cannot teach them to think like men, they are far more adverse in nature and thus have a tendency to wrap their boys up in cotton wool rather than foster his biological disposition to acquire strength via the tests and tribulations that are available to challenge and strengthen the fortitude and mettle of a young boy, this is strength an adult woman will expect him to have when he is an adult man if she is to choose him as a suitable mate and if he doesn’t “man up” and “grow some balls” his female peers will be asking when they all reach adulthood “where did all the good men go?” This but a mere manifestation of the scam which exposes the feminist idea of gender equality as a complete sham in actual practice.

The type of knowledge that boys need specifically from their fathers is that of which a man of significant value would impart onto his young son in various rites of passages such as: pep talks, trips together through hunting, sports and other male-to-male bonding experiences, experiences which fortify the bonds of father to son friendship and mentorship which young boys NEED to flourish and actualise the best versions of themselves.

**Denying boys their fathers is inherently setting them up to fail** with odds which do not favour them from the get go as the sheer multitude of knowledge they need to acquire which cannot be taught by their mothers must then be learnt through a psychologically painful, arduous and often humiliating process of trial and error, leaving only the toughest boys to survive and quite literally fight for their masculinity.

Do you need proof of these assertions because you’re cynical of such inherently conducive logic? Allow me to oblige: In single parent households where there is the absence of an father
there is a statistically significant increase in rates of suicide, drug abuse and alcohol abuse in young men [5], single parenthood lowers the educational attainment of boys and promotes higher dropout rates (girls are outperforming boys in education at all levels, but especially university level now) [6], it also increases the prevalence of behavioural disorders that can manifest in boys and increases the likelihood that the boy will commit rape. [7]

2. Institutional and social sexism (men must self-censor, women need not.)

The ridicule of men is overt and widely accepted in the media, at work, on the street etc. Women are allowed to make blanket generalisations which are often offensively directed at men (usually delivered in a delightfully catty, condescending manner) and nobody bats an eyelid at this overt display of sexism. Yet you tell a 50-year-old woman she’s quite old (a fact) and you’ve caused great offense which needs social correction that usually goes by something along the lines of: “You never ask a lady her age!” (so apparently the pre-requisite to receive the title of “lady” is simply to be old? anyhow, I digress) It appears that apparently women are so special that many of them can’t handle being old when they get old. Inversely a woman can say you’re a Neanderthal whose brain lives in his cock and nobody will bat an eyelid, a statement far more explicit than asking a woman her age or identifying that she is not young, behold that delectable double standard!

3. Men are safe to criticise and challenge, women are not.

Following on from the previous point, women are not allowed to be criticised anymore as apparently we must place an incredibly high amount of priority on what one could only consider inane sensibilities which manifest from one’s personal insecurities, criticism is about feedback and improvement but women on the feminist bandwagon tend to illogically rationalise anything negative sounding as oppressive and thus shut down completely, resorting to fallacies, shaming tactics and sticking their fingers in their ears to maintain their belief system (quite reminiscent of religious extremism really, isn’t it?) see a rather sublime example of the phenomena I refer to here: http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nvYyGTmcP80

For example, most fat women cannot handle being told they’re fat, that they need to lose weight and being given advice on how to lose their weight, more than likely the woman in question will be offended you’ve acknowledged she has an unhealthy BMI and she’ll either shut down on you, or if she’s american, possibly join one of these perverse fat acceptance movements. Ugly women (not necessarily fat, just ugly) would rather be told that they’re beautiful rather than be told they’re not beautiful and being advised to work on their physicality to help it become the best of what is genetically attainable for them.

In this paradigm where the feminine whims and sensibilities dictate the confines of what essentially constitutes a gynocentric society, society (including lots of clueless men) thus begin to talk more and more bullshit to placate the fragile and delicate egos of western women, rather than be honest and help them to work on improving themselves via the distillation of tough love, also commonly known as “the truth.”

Such is the way of life in places like Eastern Europe where feminism is less pronounced due to the ideology being prevented from spreading there until post-1991 (due to the Soviet Union and Iron Curtain), the ideology has only recently spread there as Eastern European
states have joined the EU and opened up their borders to western European nations (which are all feminist welfare states) however, I digress again.

**4. Children from single parent households are worse behaved.**

Children are no longer punished by schools or their parents, resulting in unruly behaviour and audacious little scrotes saying things like “what you gonna do then? you can’t hit me!” in a provocatively taunting manner, this factor is exacerbated by single parent households as the lack of a strong masculine presence often leads to a lack of self-discipline, substance abuse and all other kinds of shit which ends up in poor behaviour [8] (referenced earlier, but fuck it, have another reference.)

**5. Violence/Aggression and any such component associated with masculinity is portrayed as negative in all absolutism.**

Apparently these things can never be productive, instrumental or beneficial and they’re always unintelligent, uncontrolled and unproductive. Apparently violence cannot be intelligent or purposeful. Violence can be used instrumentally to discipline people, the military use it and they produce great, self-disciplined strong characters, men. Society used to use the same kind of discipline to a lesser extent, just look at how poorly disciplined most kids are now (go outside and observe if need be) to see what an absence of violence based discipline has resulted in.

Aggression can be used to negotiate/haggle/win/compete etc, masculinity is all of these things as is symptomatic of testosterone, to deny the male condition its right to exist is probably one of the most perverse and ironic things about feminism entirely - it claims to be about “gender equality” whilst it actively vilifies 1 of the 2 genders, masculinity, as inherently malevolent and in need of subjugation so thus by extension of that it demands that masculinity is subject to control in the form of checks and balances sanctioned by feminist approved research and dogma. In short: Feminism tries to pervert masculinity by redefining it with concepts like “the new age man” and demonising what masculinity actually is and always was.

Women test men for dominance like children test adults for dominance, if she thinks you cannot and will definitely not use your physicality as part of the contest for dominance then she will fear little from a man castrated of any iota of imposing physical dominance and use this fearlessness abusively, it’s not just about using violence, but more so the implied threat of violence, the deterrent – if you appear non-hostile as a man then to a woman, due to absence of fear, you are immediately respected less on both a superficial and psychological level. There’s a reason the high school jocks always got all the poon and respect, they were big, which subconsciously implies the ability to kick ass/protect/put her in her place when she’s being irrational and insufferable.

To put a more mainstream glazing on this because some of you out there with ridiculously poor logic will try to construct a strawman of me as encouraging domestic violence and thus all my reasoning null and moot, it is typical that a woman will respect a tall muscular man much more than even a muscular short man, simply because the size and the potential for that size to be used for protection/violence demands respect and it’s this implication of
violence which women find inherently masculine in nature and by extension of being masculine, attractive. We can see this most profoundly in mainstream science via woman’s dating preferences, where they are mercilessly biased towards preferring and dating tall men.[9]

Pre-feminism it was socially acceptable to slap or hit a woman or child who was acting out to put them back into line, all of a sudden post-feminism this became a taboo, a most heinous crime. People don’t seem to differentiate between hitting someone because they’re unreasonable and just mindlessly trying to kill them with your bare hands. It seems in a feminist society that a smack and kicking the crap out of someone until they suffer injuries to their internal organs are synonymous acts of atrociousness, they cry “violence is bad, you shouldn’t ever use violence!” “you should never hit a woman!” “I don’t believe in hitting children!”

The reality is, not all violence is bad, it can be instrumental in reinforcing positive and constructive behaviours as long as, like anything, it is not exploited to the point of extremity or systematic abuse. Research has found that smacking small children, as long as they know you are smacking them because you care and want to correct their behaviour, does not do any harm. [10]

Obviously, no such similar research has been done on the romantic relationships between men and women as even the lightest slap from (a man to a woman, but ironically, not from a woman to a man) is considered domestic abuse and thus it is deemed far too politically incorrect to study such phenomena, it would never get the funding in a modern feminist state, but I put forth and postulate that you’d find similar results in cases with male to female interactions, if you want to back it up with real-life observations try asking the baby boomers or the baby boomer parents their opinions and experiences on it (assuming the people in question are willing to discuss such things.)

6. Safety and comfortability are valued over liberty, risk and hard work.

What this means is a sizeable number of people are getting lazy and unproductive (welfare state dependency) and the authorities are able to keep tabs on an ever-increasing population size (police state – CCTV – NSA etc) This is an effective change from masculine moral values to feminine ones in terms of how state government is run. Women make up the majority of the electorate and thus have a bigger say in dictating social policy with their vote. Feminism is not the only cause of the ever-increasing emergence of what appears to be a police state in western nations, terrorism and 9/11 have been used as scapegoats to justify such impingement on ones personal freedoms, however although not the sole reason it is safe to say that the legacy feminism has left is certainly a significant reason, if not a facilitator of today’s emerging western police states. Scare the women, give them a vote, they’ll vote for safety.

7. Wages have lowered in real terms since women entered the workforce.

I won’t say a lot here as the title speaks for itself, however look at this rather sensually telling graph compiled by research done by CNN Money:
Wage rates in America declined in real terms since 1968, not so ironically, coinciding with the eruption of the feminist movement. Where one wage used to be enough to feed an entire family, now often enough at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale two wages are needed. [11]

8. **People are more unhappy than they used to be due to the destruction of the family unit and the loneliness it spawns.**

More and more people are living alone and dying alone. There are more houses now with 1 person living in them than ever before, we’re becoming more disconnected as a society as more and more family lines cease to continue their lineage, instead falling into disarray due to the ease of divorce and an overly sexualized society which promotes promiscuity over commitment in order to sell products - it’s essentially an implosion of moralistic self-destruction which attacks societies collectives baser instincts in order to “rape them” for profit. [12]

9. **The casual normalisation of “Hyper Promiscuity.”**

People are casually fucking others without any real pair bonding and then opting to settle down when they’re much older out of fear of impending loneliness and forced solitude or choosing not to start a family at all. The mating culture for people of most ages is simply to use people and fuck them, forming no real pair bonds or emotional connections. Some people attempt relationships but the strength of these relationships is adversely affected by the external temptation which is hook-up culture, say when a relationship is going through a turbulent time, the opportunities offered by hook-up culture can seduce a spouse, leading to adultery, the eventual divulgence of said adultery to the other party involved and then typically an end to said relationship.

Hook-up culture is a direct consequence of the “sexual revolution” which feminism sparked, ignatmed and proclaims so loudly to be proud of. The notion that female promiscuity should be untamed and socially acceptable conduct, this can still be seen even today with feminisms efforts to normalise female promiscuity via campaigns such as being “anti-slut shaming” sure, because encouraging promiscuity is not only putting one at sexual risk via the prevalence of sexual disease, but is psychologically unappealing to a man looking to seriously build and create something with a woman for the long-term, thus damaging her
own long-term chances at attaining happiness with a suitable suitor. Oh the self-inflicting irony.


12. BBC, ‘People living alone ‘are more depressed’, <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-17475240>
Understanding Machiavellianism
by IM | December 2, 2013 | Link

“Everyone sees what you appear to be, few experience what you really are.” – Niccolò Machiavelli

What is Machiavellianism? Machiavellianism is predominantly an art form, keenness for strategy and personal characteristic. As a psychological phenomenon, it is the strategy that takes place in the realm of subtext, a label for the battleground on which psychic warfare is conducted. Mental gymnastics, mind games, charm and subliminal subtleties that alter and influence through the psyche are all components of interpersonal Machiavellianism.

As a term, Machiavellianism is etymologically derived from historic political philosopher and Italian statesman Niccolò Machiavelli. As such, for all intent and purpose Machiavellianism should be interpreted as a synonym for cunning.

What machiavellianism does is create uncertainty, usually via the utilisation of secrecy and selective honesty so once sufficiently confused, the target of the manipulation can be controlled, influenced or led to believe/disbelieve a specific element, an element which you can then build upon, some people would call it “a seed” in order to nurture your agenda, it can otherwise be used to give you wiggle room by being non-committal to any expectation people may try to place on you and thus not held to any specific course of action.

Machiavellianism is the shit that you were hoping that crappy psychology class would teach you at school, the ability to mind fuck with and influence people, to walk like a king, talk like a king and be respected like a king. Instead you found it was a weird amalgamation between biology and sociology.

Let’s be honest, world governments don’t want to encourage machiavellianism and foster its adoption en masse via training their own populace’s to be more cunning, it’s not just powerful knowledge but an indispensable tool, inherently academic and vocational, machiavellianism is the weapon of choice and common domain of the powerful and the elite
so it’s “certainly not to be used by peasants!”, the downtrodden and those otherwise required to maintain the pyramid structure which essentially makes up the social class system of each and every country on the planet (except in Scandinavia where they rape you to death for taxes, but that’s an entirely different tangent!) You can bet your ass any rags to riches tale you know of which doesn’t involve some perverse unexpected 3rd cousin inheritance (EG: 50 Cent) are individuals who possess great machiavellianism to drive forward the rise in their quality of life and had to influence the individuals standing in their way, along the way, to make their ambitions a tangible reality.

Where there is uncertainty there is always an opportunity for a power grab and convincingly rationalise post-power grab that the grab was a necessary move, if people begin to doubt your new-found position you pander to their whims by utilising your new position to reinforce the belief that you’re right for said position.

For example, let’s say you just got promoted at work because the old supervisor left, you’re the new supervisor now, however the group of 5 office bitches don’t respect you enough and are constantly challenging your authority, making your job hard and wearing on your psyche – if you let this continue you will probably lose your job or get demoted as you’re not popular, so what do you do?

Firstly you need to make them (not request they) respect you, as respect is inherently a choice, respect is always given by choice and requesting it only makes one disrespect you more by symptom of your tenacity to express entitlement to that which the person in question has not deemed you to be worthy of yet, thus only serving to further reduce your value in their eyes.

You don’t get respect by pleading to a persons “better side” you earn a person’s respect by being powerful and being manipulative is being powerful, they are synonymous. You need to control these women and make them fall in line so again, what do you do? You weaken their power, you turn them against each other (divide and conquer) by manipulating the fuck out of them until they all segregate themselves for you thus removing the power vacuum they all maintain by bouncing off one another and feeding into each others disrespect and bullshit festering. Allow me to exemplify further on this:

Say in our hypothetical scenarios there’s 5 bitches, pick 2 of them, make it the 2 hottest girls as the uglier girls will already have a predisposition for being jealous of the hotter girls, so your manipulation can buy into this insecurity of theirs and add further fuel to the flames of jealousy. Tell each girl in private that they could have a 10 minute longer break than the other girls, you’d say something to each of them one-on-one, something like “you’re a woman that’s been doing a special job lately, so I’m going to let you have an extra 10 minutes when you go for break, keep it hush, don’t tell the other girls, because if they find out they’ll get jealous of you and I won’t be able to keep letting you have these longer breaks which I feel you frankly deserve.”

Notice how you’ve addressed her as a woman but all the other women as girls, you’re basically informing her she’s the alpha woman of the group, you’re feeding into the sense of entitlement that feminist society has taught her she has by merit of being alive, effectively you’re feeding her narcissism and its this which is granting you power over her on a more
personal level as she eats up your validation; this is of course further amplified by the fact it comes from a position of authority (you, by being higher in the company) said women would most likely (in most cases, very few women would ignore the opportunity to get ahead and fight for the reputation of their colleagues) get incredibly fucking tingly off the validation of a superior and would thus be more than happy to indulge in the extra leisure time awarded to her by you, that’s the bait and the silly self-interested bitches are going to take it. This is step 1 of turning one of your office enemies into an instrumental peon.

The other women will begin to notice that the 2 hotter chicks keep coming in late from their breaks unexplained without visible punishment and would get upset quite quickly, however unless there is one particular woman who is masculine in energy (usually old non-sexual undesirable battle axes or ghetto chicks), it would take them awhile to come forward and contest the covert privilege these other 2 women are enjoying under the guise of what seems like “favoritism” to the unprivileged but “an entitlement” to the women enjoying said privilege, because hey you validated them as being superior workers and so superior people deserve superior treatment, right? I’ll bet my asshole in a gay bar that the women in this hypothetical scenario would tend to think so, you can have the rationalisation hamster do it’s work for you.

When any of the 3 girls you’re not giving longer breaks brings it to your attention that these 2 chicks keep taking longer breaks and they tell you that apparently “it was ok with you.” not only are you going to openly deny that, but there’s something for you to pay heed to here. The girls getting longer breaks shouldn’t have said “it was ok with the boss to take longer breaks” to the girls not getting longer breaks as you instructed their pretty little asses not to do so (and to be less crude, it was a violation of your trust in them) as you didn’t want to create discord through visible favouritism, so if they used that as a defence to the “non-privileged chicks” in our hypothetical scenario here, you’ve now as a side bonus learnt that you cannot trust these specific women as they have essentially betrayed you to defend the privileges that you gave them to begin with – Maxim: “Don’t bite the hand that feeds.”

Sure you had motives behind “giving them a free lunch” (if you’ll pardon the pun) but at the end of the day, you still gave them freedom and privilege that their colleagues weren’t having and they foolishly sold you out to try to save their own reputations, rather than honour the agreement they had with you.

Never let people who do this get too much power on your watch and punish them for their indiscretions how you see fit, overtly or covertly, the choice is yours to make. Relevant here is the 48 laws maxim “Crush Your Enemy Totally”

Anyhow, once confronted, you’d say to the chick(s) approaching you who are not getting longer breaks that you didn’t authorise it, otherwise by seeming openly unfair you’d earn their scorn and they’d become a bigger social threat, which runs counter to what your agenda is actually trying to establish, lowering the threat level and earning the respect of your peons.

If you really wanted to crush the power of the female herd in your office and break them up so they’re more manageable or even eating out of your hand, you would always need to create a power imbalance among the women, once they no longer see as each other as
equals or as “a team”, but as competitors (and women are generally naturally competitive among each other and catty as fuck anyway) you can divide and conquer them and run them more efficiently for the benefits of your own sanity.

The best way to do this would be to actually subtly encourage the power imbalance by means of a guiding hand, a further example of this to exemplify this already very long example is that you would start giving the 2 girls who both think they’re the individual beneficiaries of the longer break their breaks together at the same time, both taking the extra 10 minutes and both seeming to “come back later” together at the same time to the other women, plus by giving them their breaks at the same time they’re quite likely to share the break together and thus become closer to each other.

The perceived privilege imbalance between the 3 girls getting standard breaks and the 2 girls getting longer breaks would create segregation and would cause the 2 girls to bond more closely and form their own offshoot group as the other girls start to seem more hostile towards them. You could encourage it by telling them both to go for their breaks at the same time to really rub it in the face of the 3 girls on standard breaks. This would covertly solidify your desire for the other 2 girls to get on better and form their own group so that you can thus have the group of 5 harpies split up into 2 smaller more manageable groups. A 3 group and a 2 group who are not only a more manageable size now due to less power, but may even weaken each others power by attacking each other with catty snide remarks and defensive body language, making themselves that much more manageable for you.

You’d think something so small wouldn’t piss off women or fuck up their “relationships” however it does and it can, they’re incredibly petty creatures and impulsive to the point of self-sabotage, really they do a lot of the work for you once you’ve planted the seeds of doubt and started guiding them in the direction you want them to go in as long as they think they’re doing what they’re doing for their own interest and not because they’re being exploited.

Exploitation, real or imagined is synonymous with oppression to women (feminism just changed the pimp from the husband to the CEO/store manager), and this activates their victim card superpowers and inherent inferiority complex that feminism has indoctrinated into their collective mentality via years of social programming and inculcation. Western women today tend to be very selfish, self-centered and independence orientated so this is what you’re buying into, their need to prove themselves to you by doing exactly what you want them to do in as long as they think they’re doing what they’re doing for their own interest and not because they’re being exploited.

Ironically the hypothetical women would end up doing a lot of the work for you because they’re forced to work with the cards you’ve handed them, if they think it’s for themselves and they think the cards that are handed to them are for their benefit they’re more than happy to instigate your agendas for you. It’s simple, you sell what you delegate to them as being for their own personal benefit (appeal to self-interest) and can do it with a reward (like the women lapping up the longer breaks and “taking the free lunch”) or as a punishment (you’re going to have to stay behind an extra 10 minutes, I’ve noticed lower productivity
from you and I’m concerned about your performance!) as long as you put some semblance of benevolence into the delivery of your punishment, you can socially ostracise a person without ostracising yourself thus removing the target of their power and weakening their frame. Punishment in this manner stops others devaluing their perception of you, although you should use this sparingly. This is also a great thing to use on AMOGs, backhanded compliments and devaluing them in the eyes of others by essentially questioning their capabilities with faux concern, but that’s a topic for another article!

If that’s enough, it’s enough. However if you’ve read The 48 Laws of Power and believe in Law 15, crushing your enemies totally, then listen up, we’re now going to completely tear shit up here.

In our sensually hypothetical situation you’d eventually call a staff meeting and address that there were some complaints about the 2 pretty girls getting longer breaks than everyone else (tell them in private you didn’t really want to have to do this to them but the other girls were kicking up a fuss – blame shift that shit, you’re the good guy, it’s the girls fault for getting jealous of the hot girls inherent superiority – those hot girls were entitled to that longer break!) now you say to make up for this indiscretion, the 2 hottest chicks will stop getting longer breaks and this will be justified “as only being fair” that 2 of the girls who didn’t get longer breaks before should now enjoy longer breaks for the same duration the original 2 did (in some perverse attempt at displaying your love for equality and democracy, which will earn you brownie points with all the angry leftists no less.)

What about the leftover chick you’re wondering? She’ll get her longer breaks later, unfortunately you cannot allow 3 girls to all have longer breaks as you wouldn’t get all the work needed done so that forces that leftover girl in our hypothetical scenario to accept this bullshit, pissed off as she is, she has no power to do anything about it except walk out – if she walks out she’s an eliminated threat. If she stays, she’s felt so isolated for so long that she’s the most malleable out of all of them, she’ll do whatever it takes just to feel accepted again.

What this will do is invert the jealousy, so now the 2 hotter chicks are pissed off they lost their privilege whilst simultaneously envious that 2 of the other girls are now enjoying it in their place, whilst the girl who still hasn’t had longer breaks is jealous of fucking everyone and by merit of that is feeling entirely excluded herself and probably far more prone to cathartically bitch at random “well I haven’t had any extended breaks yet!!!” I can already hear our hypothetical loner proclaim.

You tell the 2 new girls on longer breaks that they are deserving of it, one-on-one, to boost your own personal relationships with them, you’re also a man of your word – you’re backing up your claim that you think they deserve it because they are being rewarded, they’ll see the immediate dynamic – not the bigger game at play (abstract logic is not your forte ladies who may be reading!) so the women in question see you as credible here as after all, you’re following through.

Eventually the last girl gets her solitary break and everyone hates on her for doing less work for a month or however long it was these “longer break cycles” were lasting. Plus she was hating on everyone beforehand because she felt left out. Voila. As if by magic, you’ve completely culled the herds union, they’re nothing now and they’ll all answer to your
authority.

Divide and conquer bitches, this is shit governments and institutions of any significant power use, we’re just applying it on a micro-level here eg: in an office, not on an entire country or a society. Of course in this example you already had company sanctioned power, you were higher up the food chain than those you were manipulating, when you are very low-level in the hierarchy the dynamic is different as you don’t have your privilege of delegation to sanction your agendas, in these situations you maintain popularity in order to receive promotion so you can then gain access to the power to delegate and thus cast influence with your personal agendas. Just like a politician, you’re everyone’s friend who you never really cared about for any reason at all other than their ability to lend you their personal power out of admiration, then once you’re independently empowered by their previous blessings and you win a majority you can shit on everyone one by one with your poker face and do whatever the fuck you like. Can’t stop you now, they shouldn’t have voted you in! Bloody naive electorate! Ah, the flaws of democracy.

Example aside, and I really didn’t want it to take up so much space because I wanted to discuss machiavellianism more in and of itself, machiavellianism gets its etymological route from the man credited with devising its tenets or at least, attempting to codify the art of manipulation into literature, Mr. Niccolo Machiavelli, a Florentine politician and philosopher of prolific prestige from the renaissance Italy period.

Every human has power to varying degrees, the potency of one’s power is gauged by their value, value is discerned by material wealth, genetic fitness (such as physical beauty and strength), “valuable skills” (which can be subjective culture to culture) and specific behavioural traits.

Skilled machiavellian’s are very good at creating the illusion of being more powerful than they are and thus regardless of their actual power, are usually perceived as more powerful/cunning than they are in reality. They don’t just possess power but they project the image of having power to those around them. A machiavellian will run rings around the average person, to the uninitiated the machiavellian’s grasp over psychology and their ability to wield manipulative cognitive tools so effectively can seem almost esoteric due to the amount of control it commands, but it’s like anything - if you can stomach the inherent amoral nature of machiavellianism and apply your intellect to study it and actualise it, you can ascertain it for yourself, it is only beyond the grasp of the incredibly un-intelligent and the morally indignant and self-righteous.

For a machiavellian, reputation maintenance means everything, and its this illusion of amplifying your power so that it works for you which is at the core of every Machiavellians agendas, examples of this are people simply not even challenging you on things of a controversial nature, or say groups of women wanting to have sex with a man because they perceive said man as so incredibly high value within the social circles they all frequent. This results in a positive feedback cycle where the Machiavellian in question almost constantly has the home-field advantage because of the insane amount of pre-selection he or she enjoys from their environment. Constant validation, constantly desired – it’s part of what fuels the narcissistic part of the dark triad.
This however is not an active deployment of machiavellianism, it is but a passive effect, a “rolling-on bonus” of a Machiavellians power manifesting.

Under red pill philosophy the term “hamster” is used a lot, it basically means “to allow people to fill in the blanks and come up with their own rationalisation regardless of whether what their minds filled the blanks in with is actually the truth or even logical” so basically, you’re letting people assume shit about you without revealing information, you guide their assumptions by being playful but refusing to confirm something because “you don’t kiss and tell” (if you’re gaming a chick) or if it’s a drug dealer on the streets “you don’t snitch.”

A Machiavellian projects power by having some semblance of credibility, but when questioned or tested deliberately allows a certain space for speculation and error, people, out of ego, like to believe their own conclusions more than they do other peoples because it makes them feel valuable or with the extremely insecure even “special” to get something right, so by allowing them to fill in the blanks for you not only can they grant power to you but they can validate themselves by proxy of discerning something about yourself.

If they fill in the blank with something that demonstrates high value you can agree with it and because the person thought that in their own mind, believing it’s their own device of thought, they are thus more likely to believe the otherwise untrue notion. This also gives one plausible deniability to rebuff any backlash “it was your idea, not mine.” Such is the power of ambiguity and mysteriousness, you can activate the cerebral human hamster which is typically far more profound in women.

Say in the example of gaming a chick, you can have her frame you as being fuckable all by herself, simply as the Machiavellian, you’re mentally guiding her into that direction and rejecting all and any detrimental labels or shit tests she will inevitably subject you to whilst affirming any ideas that she comes up with which raise your value as being true; or at least, not denying/crushing them like you did with the negative labels. This allows for further assumptions on her part such as: “OMG you were with another girl that night weren’t you?” or an example from a situation I had a few weeks back...

Her: “You have money don’t you!?”
Me: “Yeah I do have money, £2.50 bitch”
Her: “OMG why won’t you just tell me?”
Me: “I’m deliberately mysterious, deal with it.”

This phenomena inverses into what I’d term “egotistical machiavellianism” if you’re willing to agree with someones incorrect poorly reasoned conclusion not because you actually agree, but because you want to appeal to their ego, win their validation or have a sense of closeness with another. Reddit call this phenomena “a circle jerk” but it happens in real life all the time EG: delusional women all band together and go out to a restaurant together to support each other in some irrationally insane session of delusional approval seeking where everyone gives out copious amounts of unwarranted and unsubstantiated validation in order to “Get everything off their chests” which is more legitimately known as “diffusing all personal responsibility onto third parties who aren’t present” in order to gouge on and embellish a tidal wave of simultaneous emotional catharsis and egotistical titillation.
If narcissism is the egotistical fuel which imbues machiavellianism with its inherently risk-taking and audacious choice of delivered behaviour, then machiavellianism is the computation of said behaviour, the solidified strategy, the psychological chess-board incarnate.

**Relevant reading material for budding Machiavellians:**

Office Politics: How to Thrive in a World of Lying, Backstabbing and Dirty Tricks by Oliver James - [USA] - [UK]

The 33 Strategies of War by Robert Greene - [USA] - [UK]

The 48 Laws of Power by Robert Greene - [USA] - [UK]

The Art of War by Niccolo Machiavelli - [USA] - [UK]

The Art of War by Sun Tzu - [USA] - [UK]

*The links for this book do not go to an original, but a superior edition of the book which contains annotations to explain it, this is an ancient text and thus requires academic clarification to be best enjoyed and understood.*

The Prince by Niccolo Machiavelli - [USA] - [UK]
Women are a huge fucking shit test for men because they make no sense, at all, even to themselves. They have a tendency to act first and rationalize later, women thrive fundamentally on spontaneity. Women are the quintessential example of what constitutes irrationalism, poor logic and a propensity to think with feelings rather than material facts. It’s this fundamental lack of rationality that creates the outward impression that women aren’t very credible people seeing as generally speaking, there is little consistent reasoning to their behaviours. Most women are not very self-aware, especially younger women, they live in the moment, they are easily swayed and they jump from one emotional impulse to the next.

They hate to take responsibility, they hate to admit to faults, they’re so allergic to being wrong or being exposed in some negative way that rather commonly they’ll emotionally lash out, either at you or whoever is close by and seems like a suitable scapegoat in order to cover their own asses, even when what is being said is either truthful or reasonable. Women inherently value their own sense of well-being above reality and truth, justice doesn’t factor into the equation unless she personally feels indignant about the dispute at hand.

Funnily enough, if you explained and presented to a woman her illogical behaviour and circumspect decisions but instead of framing it as being part of her own behaviour you instead told her they were the actions of another woman, she’d concur with you that this behaviour was wholly irrational. It’s when you apply those same facts to her, she immediately begins to feel judged and then starts shutting down, when you direct the truth at the woman involved she can’t mentally handle the manifestation of her own inadequacy, it makes her feel uneasy and she will do anything to escape that sensation, so what does she do? Out of mental self-preservation she dissociates from reality and rejects the truth using flawed reasoning and stubbornness to alleviate her discomfort.

Feminism does not have a strong logical basis, its followers are typically not rational in nature, advocates of feminism have pavlovs dog type responses to anti-feminism, or, if that word offends one’s sensibilities, we can call it “a systematic critique of feminisms weaknesses” or “the negative effects of feminism” simply put, as far as feminists are concerned, the ideology they choose to identify with most strongly and live their life by can do no wrong, it delivered the poor women to salvation where once they were traumatically and mercilessly oppressed by the cold calculating hands of a vindictive sociopathic patriarchy!!!!.... yeah right.

This kind of thinking is incredibly synonymous with the close-minded sentiment that religious extremists and devout followers express, a lack of impartiality, be it due to a lack of ability or simply a lack of desire to see objectively both the strengths and weaknesses of something, because that something is something they hold dear to them, something they personally identify with on a deeper level, and to shatter that perception is to shatter a part of who they are – something that deeply troubles them. That’s why feminism thrives, to its followers it can do no wrong – it is the apple of their eye as it is nestled comfortably in the core of what
comprises their sense of self.

An example of this is a piece I wrote about the negative effects that feminism has had on the family unit. I looked at how feminism directly contributes to messing up children, increasing a child’s chances of living in poverty, increasing a child’s chances of committing crime and even how feminism and its effect on the family unit affects the educational attainment of children from single parent families, however the women and men which adhere to feminism simply don’t care about these harsh realities, even with the statistics, studies and journals to back it up. Do you know how these people can insanely ignore such perversity despite claiming to be all about social justice? Because they’re not using logic or reason.

Their entire argument/point of view is emotional and subjective by its very nature. “Women were always oppressed therefore – feminism!” “we need feminism because women are equal to men but unequal without it” this is quite ironic as this basically translates into logical talk as: women are inferior to men and need a government sanctioned ideology to achieve a perverse form of equality which redistributes privilege and wealth to women but frames this redistribution of social privilege and resource management as “independence.” If you tell feminists about the inequality men experience, they bigotedly disregard it, if this woman is even remotely representative of what constitutes a modern-day feminist you can see that they tend to have an obnoxiously elitist disregard for MRAs and give no fucks at all about mens inherent lack of rights/privileges in important areas of modern-day society.

Typically a feminist will address any form of male experienced inequality with dissatisfaction or disbelief, disregarding it with some idiotic statement such as: “well that’s not as bad as getting raped” as if they’re under this incredible sense of perverted delusion that you can justify an inequality by saying there’s a worser type of crime/inequality out there and therefore, hey, fuck this other type of inequality because it’s not the worst one in existence! It’s horrendous reasoning, truly; and this silly fallacious logic has even reached the family courts, to the point where a man can be arrested for a woman’s change of mind.

**Example:** I was in court in my country (England) the other day, I was watching from the side and a woman had got a restraining order put out against a man who had fathered a little boy with her, meaning that he was not legally allowed to visit her or see his son. The hearing was in the lowest court of the land, the Magistrates Court and the man had brought a solicitor along with him to put his case forward.

What had happened was that despite no history of violence, the court awarded the mother a restraining order against the father of the child back in 2010, per her request – the reasons for the original order being granted were not stated. The man had not seen his child since November 2010. The mother (the “victim”) randomly got in contact with the father again earlier this year (2013) welcoming him back into her life. Yes, the supposed victim was welcoming back the supposed “bad guy” into her and their child’s life.

The father spent two months living with the mother, raising his little boy with the mother until she decided that she did not want the father anymore and kicked him out on to the street. Distraught, as he had been building a bond with his son over the two months he had been living with the mother, he sent the mother of his son some non-violent text messages asking when he could see his son again, the mother ignored him and rather manipulatively
presented the texts to the court as evidence of harassment. Without her verbal consent to be in contact (as she had rescinded her consent for him to see his son as casually as she had invited him back into her life) he was in violation of the restraining order issued by the court in 2010 (contacting someone via text message who has a restraining order out against you is in direct violation of the restraining order.)

The court clerk (a woman, no doubt) convinced the 3 magistrates presiding that they did not have sufficient powers to deal with the case (maximum sentence in a Magistrates Court is 6 months imprisonment) so the case was moved up to the County Court and will be heard at a later date in a higher court where a more serious penalty can be awarded. Does more than 6 months in prison for violating a restraining order with two text messages sound like justice to you? Does that sound fair? Does this man deserve to have the right removed to see his own flesh and blood? Does the child, a 7-year-old little boy too innocent to know of the perversities of reality deserve to grow up without a father because quite simply his mother is confused, irrational and possibly spiteful? No, not at all. The court doesn’t care, the feminists don’t care – women hold all the cards, the child nor the man has any say in the matter at hand here.

In terms of inequality, the fact of the matter is, men have always played dominant above women, men built this planet, they made most of the discoveries, built most of the institutions, the technology, philosophy, every extravagant splendour you can imagine – most were envisioned, imagined, built, crafted, manifested and delivered by men. If women were so great and so on par with men it isn’t too much of a long shot to deduce they would have played a much more active part in the socio-evolutionary process, instead they reared children and kept house – they played logistics/nurturer, supporting man so he could fight to live another day.

Feminists argue women were held down, but if women were equal to men then how could they be held down by men? Violence you say? Then they weren’t equal were they? They were weaker in a fundamentally limiting aspect, they were lower in the social hierarchy by merit of their own ineptitude. True inherent (and not socially constructed) equality would suggest that men would be insufficient to enact such a penalty, if you have two equal parties, one cannot overpower the other in a stalemate situation, this is assuming the preposterous notion that all men were abusive oppressive women beaters, which is a simply hilariously bigotedly close-minded belief to hold about human history, however it’s not something which is far off from what the average feminist has been taught to believe.

The reality is, for most of human history it was accepted that the gender roles assigned to men and women were efficient and benefited the species in being structured in that way, that’s it – there’s no evil “patriarchal entity” systematically enslaving womankind. Feminism continues to ignore the achievements of man and focuses on the lack of achievements of women, blaming men for this paradigm rather than appreciating men for their continued sacrifice and dedication to improving the human condition – as I said at the start, it’s an incredibly biased and one-sided group of people who have no room or tolerance in their worldview to see feminism criticised in the even most slightest of negative contexts.

There is power with dominance, this is what a lot of the extremist feminists saw and idolised,
but with all power comes great responsibility” there is a heck of a lot more
expectation and responsibility that comes with power, as addictive as power is to humans –
there’s a price to pay for having it. It’s quite funny really because even in western nations
people are brainwashed to say men and women are equal, but then people always expect
more and better from a man, even women themselves do. It’s like an invisible sense of
cognitive dissonance which permeates the social fabric.

People rely on men, they lean on men, depend on men and burden men with their emotions
and what appreciation do men get? Fuck all. It’s an obligation, an expectation, not a favour –
you don’t get a pat on the back for expectations “you’re a man, that’s what men do.” and
hey if you’re not deemed superior enough to be a man you will be hit with some textbook
shaming “grow a pair” “man up” etc. It’s funny that feminists use these insults at all,
actually, because it infers subliminally that masculinity is inherently superior to femininity by
holding men to a higher standard of which they do not hold women to, I’m sure of course this
irony is totally and utterly lost on them, as delicious as it is to identify.

Men get vilified, they’re painted as the bad guys and it’s safe to openly disrespect them
without anyone screaming “misandry!” – it is a perverse civilization, one that has always
been and is wholly dependent on men, yet fails to appreciate them as a group for their
combined contribution to human betterment. Women today are like children who were
spoiled too much, you give them the world, you keep giving them rights, you keep
supplicating to their whims, you give in to all their demands and what do they do? In their
own privacy they fantasize to 50 shades of grey, vigorously masturbating the shit out of their
clitoris’ whilst conversely talking shit about men and their negative nature during the day in
the public sphere, the very same thing that they’re getting off too when it’s put on steroids in
an erotic novel. Wow, that irony there, again, I think the modern woman’s sense of ironic
contradiction is completely invisible to her, if you ever needed “proof” women aren’t logical,
that generalisation would do a lot to enlighten you.

Women don’t respect men “for who they are”, they objectify them as success objects, they
respect a man’s power as it indicates his ability to be successful, not his character but his
power. If as a man you become too weak, a woman will leave you – and leave you to rot she
will. The expectation is that you will be better than her, stronger than her – by nature of
hypergamy as if you are not, she simply does not find you attractive. It’s for this reason alone
the sheer notion of equality, in all pragmatism is not only deluded but completely
incompatible with human sexual attraction. A woman’s loyalty is tied directly to her man’s
power, not his character. No power = no attraction.

Example of power: you’re a manager at a store, sure you can fire people/get paid more, but
you also have to make sure everyone is OK, comply with regulations, everyone comes to you
if there is a problem etc. Woman’s inherent ineptitude to reason makes them bad at these
kinds of jobs, the best women make great support roles, there’s a few outliers who can lead
well, but generally as a demographic they are simply not cut out for leadership. Their
inclination is to burden their staff with their responsibilities by moaning (which creates a bad
leadership image), they blame-shift their faults onto others and of course they delegate their
own responsibilities to others, generally, to men – expecting them to pick up the slack.
Women are just not very good with pressure, they panic and they dramatise and ironically,
you’ll find this funny, if you were to say this to them it would elicit a sense of panic and drama, one that touches the essence of her ego for making her aware that she is utterly incompetent in such a manner. Through sheer indoctrination and modern female narcissism, this repeatedly observed phenomena, a widely observed truth, would be disregarded and decried. Hilarious.

I like women a lot, I do, I value their strange quality of seeming almost in the moment, almost innocent in their lack of ability to reason even despite their all too common and incredible capability to effortlessly manipulate and inflict mental pain upon people, it is something I can never be or experience because I am far too logical in my disposition and thus it presents a certain element of mystical esotericism to me – it is truly fascinating. However feminism corrupts the feminine sensibilities and sells them the lie that men are inherently bad people and that they as a group, women, should be wary of the group known as men. Women swallow this bullshit up, fearful as they are.

Women are stupid, brainwashed and emotional enough to believe this bile, internalise it and regurgitate it “patriarchy!!!!” before you know it’ll turn out Santa Claus was real, oh please. Men who were brought up by women or otherwise raised in a feminist environment get brainwashed too, they’re derogatively referred to as manginas, they’re bumbling estrogen fuelled apologists with a cognitively unhealthy level of self-hatred which manifests as this perverse need to supplicate to the contemporary feminine social identity. It’s sad. Feminism does fuck all positive for society anymore, civil rights were about the only positive thing to come out of feminism.

I perceive modern-day feminism as a form of gender segregation, it’s like when the whites and the blacks sat on different sections of the bus in slavery, now you find women sticking with women, men sticking with men and apart from when everyone is drunk and seeking sex, the two groups barely mingle – their opinions of each other are bad, gender relations are strained and some people are opting out completely, just giving up on the other sex entirely.

It’s for that reason I’d encourage my fellow-men disenfranchised with the current state of women and their indoctrinated feminist influence to seek out more fruitful friendships with other men and focus on themselves, rather than focus on the pursuit of attaining or impressing women. Sure you have sexual needs, none of us can help that – but placing so much of your happiness in the hands of an “idealistic woman” a gentle woman, a kind woman, a non-vapid, intelligent, cerebral, wise woman – a type of woman who has been culled en masse by the brusque, curt hands of feminism will only seek to damage one’s health mentally and bring forth great pain, what you seek is a unicorn and unicorns are a mythological specie of animal, there’s simply not enough to go around.

We all deserve better than this feminist bullshit our forefathers have left us to deal with, but we deal with the hand we’ve got and live the best way that we can. That’s a core tenet of the red pill philosophy, be the best man you can be – don’t give in, do not relent. Constantly work on yourself.

Don’t give in, find pride in yourself through both your heritage and your potential to be better – actualise your potential, swimming in feminist ideology will just destroy you. Feminism is something you need to be aware of as it’s so entrenched in western societies, but it’s like a
sickness and red pill philosophy is the antibiotic to get it out of your disease-ridden system, a strong dose of reality to slap all that propaganda out of one’s indoctrinated head.

Acknowledge feminism, understand it, analyse its perverse nature, accept it’s not going to disappear anytime soon – but reject its message. You can’t change it so you must co-exist alongside it without believing in it, just like people of different religions in secular countries live side-by-side worshipping different gods without believing in each others religions relatively peacefully, you must live side-by-side with feminists, not buying into a single iota of their babbling shit.

If you can do this you can find some semblance of happiness. Best of luck to my fellow brothers who have been unjustly wronged by this corrupt and perverse social system we’ve inherited.
1.) Preamble:

A few notes before we begin: firstly, the laws of power are more akin to the ingredients of power, that is to say, they are granular elements of a grander framework, behavioural ingredients that once formed into a cohesive recipe (a grander strategy) result in power projection at the macro level. The ingredients of power project a measure of power by themselves, but they are smaller in scope than recipes of power.
Recipes focus on the future and the end-game, they form the overall arch of a long-term strategy and dictate strategic policy. You have an agenda (your reason for strategising) a recipe (your general policy or approach for enacting an agenda at the institutional or business level) and then ingredients (behaviour you utilise at the personal level to further your cause).

Like any recipe with ingredients, power is no different from food in the sense there is overlap, like cooking ingredients interact with one another to make tastier albeit more complex food, the ingredients of power interact with one another to create a stronger albeit more complex power structure.

Where the ingredients of power are micro Machiavellian manifestations, recipes are macro Machiavellian manifestations. Where the ingredients of power are but mere gambits, the recipes of power are the strategies dictating said gambits.

At the lowest levels, **power games** play out solely on a micro playing field, that is, people use the laws to influence one another to get respect or meet their immediate needs. At the highest levels, this remains, but there is likewise a vision or agenda driving interactions and decisions at the micro level. The simplest way of explaining the relationship between the micro and macro is that the macro is “the why” and manifests in big business and military decisions, whereas the micro is “the how” that manifests as conscious behavioural decisions.

Micro strategists are present-orientated and work from a bottom’s up approach, they are thinking of the next move, and their goals are smaller in scope and scale. Macro strategists are future-orientated and work from a top-down approach, they hold a grand vision that requires a greater timeline to actualise, and are thinking multiple moves ahead to see this vision expressed in reality.

Greene does not give recipes for power (macro strategies) in The 48 Laws of Power, only ingredients, it is in **The 33 Strategies of War** he approaches the macro, detailing the recipes of power. Where the 48 Laws should be your main reference for micro strategic personal interactions, The 33 Strategies should be your reference text for more macro things like economic warfare between companies.

To simplify these ideas, micro strategy is optimisation of behavioural psychology on a small scale to yield personal benefit, whilst macro strategy is the optimisation of behavioural psychology, political and economic positioning in order to yield organisational benefit.

2.) **Understand Your Social Surroundings:**

When you’re new to a group and your position is unestablished, you should immediately look to determine the group’s leader. If you’re a strong character, do not dominate or humiliate the leader, and endeavour not to monopolise too much attention. If the group leader is inferior in an obvious capacity, you will have to play down or otherwise conceal your talents. Befriend the group leader, win their trust, and you’ll win their approval. It is always wiser to befriend power than to challenge it, for this yields the most profit with the least energy expenditure.
When entering a new group it is vital you quickly identify and address the leader, being sure to ingratiate yourself. Doing so communicates an implied recognition of the hierarchy, and a respect for said hierarchy. Many leaders are suspicious of new people entering the group as they fear you will upset the pre-established hierarchy, by demonstrating social intelligence and showing the proper respect, you assuage this insecurity and increase your odds of success with the group.

Should the group leader feel disrespected or otherwise outdone, they will mobilise the troops and instruct them to attack, making your life significantly harder. When you are unestablished, this is a scenario you should seek to avoid at all costs as it is unlikely you can weather the storm. Inversely, should you win the leader over, you gain massive influence over a group, leapfrogging many of those in line to positions of power by having greater favour.

Leaders are the gatekeepers of their social group’s trust, their words alone can heavily skew opinion in one direction; this phenomenon is as true of school cliques as it is corporations. In consideration of such influence, it becomes glaringly obvious that greater benefit is derived from the favour rather than the disdain of the powerful. The prior can carry you to heights of incredible lustre, whilst the latter may plummet you to depths of unimaginable horror.

For example, whilst a celebrity endorsement may increase your sales by a factor of ten, a celebrity condemnation could likewise decrease them by such a factor. If there were a group of three attractive women, you would initiate, challenge and subsequently charm the bossiest one. By winning her, you win the group. If it were a group of frat boys, your target would be the most dominant boy. By winning him, you win the group.

If the group leader doesn’t like you in spite of your sincerest efforts to win them over, abandon that group. Take the loss, move on, and seek greener pastures. Trying to become a part of groups where the leadership hates you is rarely worth the uphill struggle. It is better to thrive where you are liked, than be contemptuously tolerated where you are not.

Do not outshine people who in whatever situation, possess a stronger position than you do. A local drug dealer may be a king in one part of the city, but four streets over a rival gang may want him dead. Your ego can be your own worst enemy so do not let the ego you’ve built up from being successful at whatever it is you do delude you into thinking you can immediately take centre stage wherever you go. The environment you are in and what is working to directly benefit you within that environment is of incredible importance. Your environment passively implies a cap on your power. It either grants you further personal power by making things easier (home field advantage, high status jobs) or takes power away from you, forcing you to compete on less favourable terms (away turf, low status jobs etc.)

In light of this it stands to reason that one must always be aware of their terrain; be it the mud in a game of football, the cover in an online shooter or the dynamics of a social group. Fighting for dominance in a group where a leader’s hegemony is already established when you are either an outsider or newcomer is not recommended, for you are at a considerable disadvantage. By demonstrating early on that you possess a desire to alter the pecking order you also inadvertently reveal your hand. Even if your demonstrations were aggressive and impressionable, unwilling to entertain your challenge and unproven, you will be rejected. Of
course although almost all care for popularity, he who appears to care the least wins. This comes down to reputation, saving face. When you try to outdo a person whose reputation within the group is perceived as more prominent, admirable and credible than your own, you exude weakness. Likewise you present yourself as an unwelcome upstart, a challenger, an enemy of the group leader and thus by extension, the group. If you are the enemy of a leader, you will naturally become the enemy of his infatuated followers. Strong, popular leaders in the primacy of their leadership therefore make poor targets for deposition. To effectively depose a leader, that leader must grow to be hated, or seen as increasingly irrelevant, out of touch. Deposition requires much planning and great patience, with both you can tip the scales of power in your favour.

2a.) The Classroom Example & Target Selection

A classic contemporary example of foolishly outshining the master is within the classroom. A teacher and a pupil have a master and apprentice relationship. It is important not to forget that despite their accolades, the teacher will have an ego. If you consistently correct the teacher or call them out on the credibility of their knowledge, you will aggravate and annoy the teacher by presenting yourself as an upstart. They will view you as a critic, a haranguer. If you dislike your teacher but other students do not share your disdain, they will equally view you with contempt and loathing. Do not outshine the master. The teacher is presumed and accepted to be the authoritative expert on the topic area in which they are paid to teach. Even if they’re less knowledgeable than you are about a particular facet of something, this minor contrivance is largely irrelevant to the social dynamic. The mere perception of authority is enough to solidify their position and you would do well to acknowledge that as such.

Outside matters of social favour the teacher likewise has more capacity to legally punish you than you do them. They have the power to get rid of you, and the social influence to limit or otherwise sanction you (eg: have you attend an anger management class, see a counsellor/psychiatrist for diagnosis etc.) You on the other hand do not have the reciprocal level of power needed to affect their life in an equally discomforting manner. You cannot, within the confines of legality, match their audacity. This is why it is more favourable to win over and co-opt the teacher. Do not challenge the teacher needlessly unless the teacher is a weak target, ideally isolated and disdained by your peers.

As mentioned three paragraphs prior, knowing when a leader is a target ripe to be overthrown is crucial. An example of such a target in the context of the teacher would be where the teacher is hated by his students for demonstrating repeated incompetence. In such a scenario rather than become agitated by your haranguing finickiness, the other students will vicariously get off on your challenging of the teacher’s authority. If in the collective hype a mob mentality is formed, they may even indulge in it themselves. Likewise the teacher will feel too henpecked to retort effectively, because you have the support of the majority. If they are to single you out for punishment, you can claim you were merely one of many. You can use the concealability of the crowd for defence, claiming to be a weak mind caught in the chaos instead of an architect of such anarchy. Even if they know better, plausible deniability may swing it for you.
3.) Popularity & Respect Carry More Authority Than Job Titles:

The master is not always the person in the highest hierarchical position of an organisation; the master is truly whoever holds the most sway with the crowd. It is near useless for you to be the head honcho of a workplace who can inspire neither admiration nor respect when a subordinate is capable of both. In matters of pay, you would be higher up than said subordinate, but in matters of social dynamic you would be lower on the food chain. You see in spite of your organisational position it is possible to hold less social influence. In such a scenario any attempted coup d’État by the subordinate would be largely supported by the group. They would support your deposal, rather than help you preserve your power by punishing the upstart for his insolence. In times of struggle, the preservation of your power will become contingent on your reputation, predominantly on how well you are liked, and how much you are feared. The crowd should always be your shield, acting in your interest, either out of fear or out of love. A king without an army is all but defenceless. When the crowd is indifferent to your leadership or even worse, working against you, your downfall is a matter of “when” rather than one of “if.”

Where you are the upstart or simply second fiddle to a more dominant force, the well-liked teacher is someone you should appease. They are an individual whose favour is worth having and whose wrath is not. They should look to you favourably, give you that reference for a job, or happily commit to small favours such as signing off on your work. They should not be an impediment, a threat or a competition to your efforts; they should be a social resource, not an adversary. If they are an adversary, it is more than likely an outcome of inferior social strategy on your part.

Adversaries are typically formed via the indignation of ego, that is to say, master or not, one feels as if they did not receive the level of respect they felt entitled to. This caused a break in rapport, a conflict of some kind, and an unhealthy rivalry was born. Making those with more power than you feel adversarial towards you is a sure way to lose at the game of life as they look to crush you before you can gain any significant headway. A staunch leader knows all too well of the importance in nipping poisonous buds. Power flows in one direction, commanding in various levels of succession from the top-down. A Machiavellian does not fight against a raging upward stream, they wait for when the current is more favourable. A Machiavellian looks to influence the architect of the current with their cunning so that they may traverse the river with ease. **They utilise timing to attack with patience.** The Machiavellian desire is to covertly pull the master down whilst elevating themselves to replace them. Where successful this is done subtly so that the master does not become aware of or feel threatened by the correction in power differential. Such a feat can even be executed seductively, in a way that the soon-to-be replaced master finds enjoyable. The level of comfort achieved dictates exactly what you can get away with, how quickly you can act and how bold your moves are. The lower the level of comfort achieved, the quicker your scheming will be detected.

4.) Successfully Outshining Masters:

Say you’re at the gym and you’re telling people bigger than you that their form is bad. Even if it’s objectively true and you meant well, they’re bigger than you so in all likelihood they will
not listen to you. In matters of physicality the power differential is visibly clear from the offshoot. You don’t have the credibility, respect or trust to issue such unsolicited advice. Challenging people with more respect, power, followers or higher status must be done tactically and specifically. The attack must hit a nerve. It should be done visibly for all to see, it should be well pointed, and it must have a measure of believable substance in order for it to gain the recognition and effect desired. The desired effect is of course an increase in power for you, the upstart. Typically to hit a nerve, the attack should be humiliatory in nature, and to give it plausibility it should be based upon an already verified half-truth. That way the audience observing the spectacle can be swayed into perceiving the accused negatively.

4a.) The Michael Jackson Example:

A notorious example of this was Michael Jackson’s fun fair at Neverland Ranch. It was well-known that Michael had his own private playground, and out of sympathy (having had a hard/mentally abusive upbringing himself) he would invite sick children to enjoy themselves at his fair. It was philanthropic. Now this established truth was used as a platform to form the plausible component of a reputation destroying lie. It follows that looking to extort Michael, the accusation was made he had inappropriately touched children that had been invited to his ranch. Now whether he did or didn’t is irrelevant to the lesson at hand here. The lesson is rather simple: had it not been established that children were regularly invited to attend the Jackson estate, such an accusation would be deemed outlandish because it would be entirely implausible. However, give it a modicum of plausibility by injecting a half-truth into the equation and all of a sudden the complete product including the fabricated component of the accusation becomes plausible. Half-truths hijack truth’s plausibility to give credibility to fabrication. Such fabrications then go on to become accepted as fact by popular opinion. It is popular opinion which builds and destroys reputations, dictating the accepted reality. What the actual reality is in matters of reputation is all but irrelevant.

From the previous example many boxes for successfully outshining the master were ticked. Michael was a megastar, his accusers, nobodies. The accusation hit a nerve: Michael was known to have a mentally abusive upbringing due to how his father treated him, yet he stood accused of physically abusing children. That would have made the accusation difficult for Michael to ignore. Next, it was humiliatory: he was accused of something so theatrically controversial that people would pay it attention even if Michael had managed to ignore it: pedophilia. Finally, it had plausibility borrowed from half-truth: he did invite sick children to his estate to make use of the private fun fair, just not for the reasons that his extorters stipulated. His extorters defined the narrative through spin-artistry, managing to play the victim role successfully. As such Michael Jackson lost the battle psychologically and was forced to tactically pay an out of court settlement as mere damage control in the fiasco. The out of court settlement likewise had the bonus effect of making it seem like he was admitting his guilt, reinforcing the credibility of the fabrication via his chosen response. To really nail this point home, take in just how absurd this passage taken from MTV.com sounds: “Michael Jackson insisted Thursday that his $25 million out-of-court settlement with the boy who first accused him of molestation was not an admission of guilt.” That’s some expensive damage control.
4b.) The Ja Rule Example:

An upstart has little to lose whilst a well-established figure has much to maintain. This is why relatively obscure and unknown people have a tendency to attack well-established figures. They try to hijack the reputation of well-known figures so that they may slingshot themselves into the limelight; they are plunderers of reputation. They plunder by performing spectacles which redistribute popularity, destroying others’ to build their own. Likewise, the greater the number of people exposed to a spectacle, the higher the chance the upstart will profit from their attacks. Attention is a sparse commodity, but certain key individuals (industry leaders, celebrities, and people well-known within a niche) command large amounts of attention. These are the people who are targeted by reputation plunderers. Essentially the more important you are, the more targeted your reputation will become. Stealing another man’s supporters is quicker and easier than trying to gather your own, assuming one has a suitable scandal to set-up the exchange. People will line up to destroy you merely for the chance to build themselves up. Everybody loves a scandal. The controversy is magnetic, similar to the duality of yin and yang; where one man falls – another rises. Thus it follows that the more successful you become in life, the more people will target your reputation quite publicly. If you do not realise what is happening when this occurs, you can find yourself giving away much of your power.

A really good example of this can be found in Hip-Hop with Curtis Jackson’s (50 Cent’s) initial rise to prominence in the early noughties. When Fifty was a nobody lusting for fame and success, he started off his hip-hop career by attacking the reputation of a famous and successful artist of the time, Ja Rule. Ja Rule responded to Fifty out of ego (rather than ignoring him for what he was at the time: a nobody) and among other factors at play, Fifty rose to prominence whilst Ja Rule faded into obscurity. Fifty used Ja Rule for free publicity. As soon as Ja Rule replied by directing a diss track to Fifty, who was a fairly unknown artist at the time, Fifty had won. Fifty had gotten Ja Rule to promote him to a large group of people who otherwise would not have heard about him. That had been Fifty’s intent all along. Marketing budgets are expensive, it is easier and more cost-effective just to get someone important so hot and bothered that they start blabbering on about you instead. When you are small, all publicity is good publicity.

5.) Accidentally Outshining:

Sometimes you can outshine the master unintentionally by simply being proficient at what you do. If your baseline skill level is way above that of the average individual’s then it is easy to be seen as a show-off as you thoughtlessly dazzle the crowd with your proficiency. For example, say you’re a very articulate person with a big vocabulary; you will easily make those who stumble over their words with small vocabularies feel intimidated by your silver tongue. You could inadvertently outshine a socially important group leader if you were not to play down this ability (eg: speak less, pretend there’s a word you don’t understand etc.) You must be self-aware of your own abilities, as well as the abilities of those around you, and where your ability exceeds that of the group leader, you must downplay your own ability. Conceal it, downplay your ability by pretending to struggle, and if yet your talent is still seen in all its glory, give credit to the leader for “their support.” If another’s ego is complimented by your ability, they will feel invested in your prowess rather than intimidated;
this is how you want the leader to feel. We do not do such things merely out of respect, or even because we like to, but we do so because we must. It is important to avoid the leader’s contempt and insecurity. If the leader feels like you are more competent than they are in something which they value, their insecurity will cause them to designate you a threat. They will then use their influence to make life harder, stopping you dead in your ascent on the ladder of power.

If you’re an intellectual person you will outshine the average person in general knowledge terms. When you’re around social groups with low logical capacity and/or academic knowledge you will find such people are typically insecure about their lack of intelligence. As such it is quickly evident they feel threatened by indicators of intelligence, they view intelligence negatively. With such people you have to make small talk, normally making jokes or discussing simple observations that they can comprehend and relate to. If you try to teach them anything with your knowledge prior to winning their favour, they will reject you because their insecurity causes them to feel as if you are implying you are better than they are – “are you calling me stupid?!”. You can’t outshine the master even if the leader of a social circle is an idiot. This may seem somewhat hilarious, yet it is equally important to remember should you ever find yourself in such a group.

The Japanese have a proverb “the nail that sticks out gets hammered down.” This pearl of Japanese wisdom is in all likelihood a mechanism of their conformist culture more than anything but to the Machiavellian mind there’s a nugget of knowledge to be derived from this saying. Not being socially accepted is a form of isolation or in this context, social ostracization. If you find yourself in an isolated position this is likely to create suspicion regardless of your hierarchical position within an institution. **Law 18 - isolation is dangerous** is very relevant here in explaining why isolation (sticking out negatively) is dangerous when attempting to either gain baseline social acceptance or cultivate a relationship with the master. Leaders have more leeway to isolate themselves, but they too cannot commit fully to the endeavour without arousing suspicion, distrust and eventually: contempt.

6.) Building Trust and Kinship - The Apprentice Method:

Being more competent than a master in the absence of strong rapport is one of the surest ways to isolate one’s self and earn their scorn. It is in this manner the master will perceive you as a threat to be dealt with rather than an asset at their disposal. Whenever someone is more experienced than you, higher up the ladder or older etc, even if you’re more competent than they, do not outshine them. Do not correct them. Being pedantic and arguing the fine points of an observation will win you no love or gratitude; in fact to the contrary that is one of the fastest ways to alienate yourself. The momentary Schadenfreude derived from correcting someone is rarely ever worth the social fallout that follows. So it follows that if you are a pedant you must learn restraint.

A Machiavellian fosters a relationship with the master. They act a little goofy; they intentionally do things to a lower standard than the master. On occasion they may ask the master how to do something properly in order to compliment the master and simultaneously build trust. Teaching someone how to do something is a rapport and trust building exercise;
however this method should not be abused. If it is, the master may find the Machiavellian to be an incapable, distracting annoyance. Used sparingly though you will achieve great results because **the master gets off on showing the student how to do things correctly**. The student who was incapable but became capable due to the master’s input elicits a sense of accomplishment within the master. Subtly, it validates the importance and prowess of the master, massaging the ego. By allowing the master to teach you something and then executing it in the way they taught, you become a part of their narcissistic supply. This is why often teachers (masters in the classrooms which they hold court) refer to the process as being “extremely rewarding.” This is also one of the fundamental reasons that volunteers give away their labour for free. Volunteers value feeling important, necessary and desired so much that they are willing to exchange their most precious commodity for it: time.

An alliance must not only be fostered with the master, but it needs to be maintained once established. Disproportionate alliances where the inferior party (the student) takes more value than they provide from the superior party (the master) must be handled carefully. The power differential is so large that the master can terminate the alliance with ease, **being dependent on you for nothing.** Therefore to maintain the alliance you must adapt to the master’s needs. The master must see you as a tool to be fashioned for his own use, therefore causing him to sharpen you. Along your rise to power, you must be obedient, reflexive, and adaptive, **you should think how you like, but you must act as he desires.** Make a friend of your master, not an enemy. As an enemy, if you are deemed a potential threat the master will learn to despise your power potential. If you present no threat, the master will simply seize investment and cut you off leaving you to fend for yourself.

The more a person invests in you, the more of themselves they pour into you. Get them to pour enough of themselves into you and you become a dominant element within their mind. Naturally this will cause them to deem you significant and you will hold influence with them. The least significant people, the one’s the master has no time for, they are the ones powerless to influence the master. Their identity and actions will have almost no bearing on how the master uses their power; the master will act regardless of their wants or needs giving them no consideration. On the contrary you want to be the diametric antithesis to that.

**7.) The Apprentice Method – Utilising Submission for Self-Gain:**

There is a dominant and submissive dynamic to the master/student relationship. As a student you need to borrow an approach from the feminine playbook and convey a type of “curious submission” to the master. This should be perceived by the master solely as submission to effectively conceal the true depth of your ambition and its accompanying intent. The reason alluring submission is so effective at concealing your agenda is because in the egoism of dominance and control there is a sense of self-assured comfortability, self-majesty and self-importance. It is the trifecta of these egotistical elements which blinds the master to your true intent as they become consumed by the superficial, unable to pierce the veil. Your rise to prominence can be hidden in plain sight if you present yourself as the eager appeasing apprentice in need of direct guidance rather than the hyper-independent confrontational upstart.

To use a figurative metaphor, this is much like stealing food from the grocery store whilst...
wearing a $1,000 suit. Security is far less likely to monitor a man in a suit due to his personal appearance, therefore should he steal his theft is likely to go completely unnoticed. The security is so assured he has no need to steal that they believe this means he will not. This is a form of concealment (the suit hides your intentions by communicating high wealth/status,) it fosters ignorance (the security write you off as a threat) and it is based on superficial appearance (the majesty and spectacle of the suit) rather than depth (your intent and character.)

This is exactly what I refer to when I talk about “curious submission.” The curiosity is your interest, the engine for your agenda, the excuse for probing and interacting. The submission is the blanket over the Trojan horse which lulls the target into a false sense of security, encouraging them to invest in a threat under the misguided belief that the threat (or growing threat) is a malleable asset. Likewise in matters of sadism there is a kind of irresistible attraction to innocence, to imprint and inscribe upon minds which are impressionable, malleable. Those who are uneducated but likeable often elicit a desire within the strong-minded and the accomplished to take them on as a project and “educate them.” Those who are pure we often want to defile, this is the primal urge you’re tapping into here with the weaponisation of submission, a tool that has been used instinctively by women for millennia to exercise puppet like control over overtly powerful men. Naturally, women do not like to take the centre stage, puppeteering or “power by proxy” has always been their coveted method of choice (more on this later.)

This is why an illusion of innocence and yielding submission is an effective device for grabbing a master’s attention. The allure of submission is so seductive, so irresistible to a master that when tailored to their specific tastes they can do nothing but take the bait. The seduction is so distracting it takes on the mental equivalent of anaesthesia; it makes your intent invisible and the enactment of your will, insidious. The air inside the treasure chests of innocence are filled with plausible deniability, and with your ignorance seen as a virtue you are not only cherished but likewise unquestionably trusted. It is through such a device that with calculation, patience and apt timing, you may reverse the polarity of the connection with the master and influence them; succeeding them when they choose to step down, replacing them should you opt to eradicate them.

This is the exact way in which calculating women destroy great men. There is a mixture of submission and puppeteering involved, and when she tires of her toy she will abandon it or break it in half. In relationships with such women the man is “the teacher” and “the provider” because “she’s submissive” and “needs him.” She takes and continues to take from him, money, wisdom, energy, time, everything. She’s a parasite, a black hole, but she frames herself as a willing accomplice who needs investment to return dividends to an eager, naive, hopeful investor. Eventually the man in question has nothing left to give and is dried up both spiritually and financially. Now he’s been drained for his utility she becomes aware that although he elevated her self-development, she has become more valuable than him. Better yet with the taster she’s had and the strides she’s made she believes she has the opportunity to become even more. Thus rather than return investment as initially promised or implied, out of pragmatism, disrespect and insatiable hypergamy she will betray and abandon her prior mentor to repeat the process with a new one. One who she considers to be more worthy of directing her. Effectively, this means finding an even higher level man to surpass her
newer, more recent elevated status.

7a.) Surmising The Apprentice Method:

When you showcase too much of your skill, you run the risk of instilling fear into the master, for they will fear their own impending obsolescence. This can be mitigated by the cultivation of substantial friendship: trust, affinity and charm. If the master likes you and is invested in you, they will be happy to see you rise, they will invest in that ideal and they will promote it. They will do that by seeing you as a narcissistic extension of themselves rather than an enemy or hungry parasite. Submission is the ultimate anaesthetic, an egotistical master can be bitten a thousand times but not feel an itch even once when captivated by superficial submission’s seductive allure. Do not outshine the master until the master is enthralled by you. If the master is enthralled by you then when the time is right they will leave you to take over their legacy. Become an apprentice rather than an enemy and you can co-opt a power position rather than contest it. Outshine the master only when prior planning has been done and all the right mechanisms are in place. **Timing is everything.** With the “apprentice method,” the master approves of you eventually taking their position, or otherwise helps construct a position of autonomous power specifically for you, eg: making you director alongside them, helping you set-up your own business by providing you with clients in your niche etc.

8.) The Puppeteer Method:

Puppeteering is not solely achieved via tactical submission, but likewise it can be achieved via blackmail. **It is the necessary concealment of your intentions** which allows those who should not trust you to open up to you, **exposing their own weaknesses** which can later be used as leverage should they choose to defy you. Secrets carry great power, but the apex of a secrets power comes in holding its potential perpetuation hostage to the party who desires the nature of the secret remain concealed. If the target is willing to take the loss on the secret and calls your bluff or otherwise reveals the secret before you do, the payload a weaponised secret carries when detonated is vastly reduced. In matters of defence, masters may reveal secrets on their own terms. By anticipating a strike against their reputation they can pre-empt the attack with a half-truth which mitigates the damage done to their reputation once the attack is underway. In this way the subsequent exposure of their secret has a moot or negligible effect, essentially nullifying the attack. It may even possibly create an avenue for them to criticise you for your “excessive and slanderous criticism” in reference to your mitigated attack.

This method when used successfully allows you to puppeteer a master without actually replacing them. Having considerable influence over a master allows you to utilise their power without taking the risks that come with possessing power. Essentially via an implied threat to the master’s power one can temporarily hold their hand over the master’s hand and guide it with their will. The master can be used to commit the action desired on the puppeteer’s behalf, whilst the committed action appears superficially to be a desire of the master’s. The puppeteer is invisible, as part of the threat within the social contract usually mandates that an omission of the puppeteer’s existence is necessary. Once the master has performed the action desired or the puppeteer has otherwise temporarily tired, the hand is gently removed.
from atop the master’s so not to alarm the master. Cause them too much distress and they will not be utilisable for service at a later time.

Puppeteering can be thought of as a kind of “power by proxy.” The class favourite, the corporate schmoozer, the office bitch who flirts with the boss getting people she doesn’t like fired; they are all puppeteering in one way or another. Sometimes they are pulling a string or two, at other they are operating the master almost entirely.

9.) In Closing:

As mentioned prior, when manipulating a master playing stupid is never a bad move. People do not fear the stupid. In fact they trust them too much and reveal information to them they would not entrust with a mind that appears to be more intelligent, more cunning, and more self-aware. As long as you are not stupid and merely act stupid, you cannot be exploited because your stupidity by nature of its illusion is inherently a manipulative device rather than a sincere limitation. Truly intelligent people cannot become stupid; they merely feign it out of utility. Intelligence is a state that is all but inescapable, the intelligent do not ever truly become stupid. On the flip-side if you knew someone bright and they put on an appearance of stupidity, it is circumspect they have an agenda in play to conceal, the ramblings of superficial stupidity but a disguise.

Generally speaking, those who seem overtly threatening are merely posturing out of defence. A skilled and effective Machiavellian on the attack is more likely to be a friend or romantic partner than an obvious self-declared enemy. They keep you close to monitor you, use you and influence you. They want to change a part of you so that they can best make use of your abilities, favour and social position. Are you the manipulated master or the submissive student? Appearances aren’t what they seem. Machiavellian submission is at the apex of cunning.

Purchase the 48 Laws of Power:

Buy The 48 Laws of Power in the USA
Buy The 48 Laws of Power in the UK
Buy The 48 Laws of Power in Canada
What is SMV? SMV is known as social market value or more commonly, sexual market value. It is the inherent value of a person, the crude 1-10 rating of where a person is in the social hierarchy. In the context of social market value, this encompasses friends, colleagues, contacts, acquaintances and etc – how many do you have? How well-connected are you? Can you use nepotism to get ahead or are you reliant purely on the whims of meritocracy? Sexual market value is the same thing, but within the context of your sexual attraction and viability for mate investment.

SMV is not concrete or even absolute per se, but it is rather dualistic within its nature as fundamentally it is both tangible and non-tangible.

You have perceptive social market value which is what people (including yourself) believe your SMV to be based upon their personal interactions with you (And with yourself, your own self-esteem and sense of validation), this is the illusory factor, the glazing to the substance of who you are and what you’re worth, these are things such as how you behave and how you carry yourself (carrying yourself as a concept is basically demeanour and self-control combined into one) perceptive social market value can lead people to think you’re a few points higher or a few points lower down the scale than you really are.

The absence of information aka mysteriousness can also force people to rationalise (or hamster) that you’re higher value than you are, causing them to fill in blanks about the substance of who you really are; such as believing you earn more money than you do, have more contacts than you actually have or are more sexually desired by the opposite gender than is truth.

Inversely, it can also have the opposite effect, it can lead people to think you are less desirable than you are by merit of your reluctance to disclose too much (the assumption you are ashamed of something hidden or somehow shifty), so should you be practicing mysteriousness, be it to raise attraction in women or to maintain your privacy from those whom you do not trust, be sure to prod those probing you for knowledge on your life into a direction which forces them to make positive assumptions about you rather than negative ones. This way you can manipulate the perception of your SMV to be a few points higher, rather than a few points lower – make your perceived social market value work for you, not against you – because it’s doing one or the other. This shit right here, this is the stuff of rumours and gossip.

Then there’s your actual social market value, this consists of tangible things that cannot be refuted such as your conventional physical attractiveness, your financial wealth and skill sets you possess (such as languages spoken, instruments played, martial arts known etc.) Actual social market value is easy to discern, you write a list out of every asset you own, every valuable skill you possess and everything that’s positive, esteemed or commodified about you by wider society. If what you have or can do is in demand or coveted as desirable by others, then it is inherently a high value possession or trait. If the element in question is
not in demand or coveted then it does nothing for your value in wider society.

**Group Dynamics**

Once you have your place in a social group after the introductions have occurred and you have been analysed, tested, judged and given a position, your place within that group is then set in stone. However, with some difficulty, one can re-chisel parts of the initially ascribed judgement from the metaphorical stone.

One’s social status and pecking order within a specific group is in a state of incremental flux, actions which demonstrate high value increase the perception of you positively bit-by-bit, actions which demonstrate low value increase the perception of you negatively bit-by-bit. Try not to get confused with my usage of positive and negative.

Positive doesn’t correlate to nice and negative doesn’t correlate to nasty. If you do something negative, say, you ditch a member of the group when you’re out together because they’re disregarding you, then that negative action demonstrates high social market value “I won’t put up with your shit” whilst inversely, tolerating their anti-social transgression and even going as far to allow yourself to commit to this persons safety and getting them home safely when they give no fucks about you and are having the time of their life demonstrates low SMV “you’re more important than I am and therefore I’m going to sacrifice my time and happiness to make your life better.” It’s supplicative, subservient and does not elicit respect in anyone, neither women nor men, with a particular focus on women.

Women are more likely to exploit your weakness or “niceness” for their own gain if for any reason, out of feminist-fuelled ego and self-entitlement. If you aren’t a respectable man who will ravish a woman then what are you to her? A tool. A wallet. Logistical support. A babysitter, etc etc. When a woman doesn’t respect a man, he’s a not a man to her hence all this shit about “boys” and “men”, when a man isn’t respected by a woman, he’s either a tool to be exploited, or he’s baggage which is to be detested and shunned. Women are very superficial and judgemental of men based on their SMV, your physique, your wealth, your popularity, your fucking height... they’re discriminate creatures. These factors are all tangible things which increase both your social and sexual market value.

Back to the topic at hand, you can essentially be very high status in one group whilst of mild or even low status in another, this is due to whom the group is made up of and what they desire and expect, it’s about relativity, your SMV is affected in relevance by the competition and thus your SMV within a social circle is affected by the status of everybody else within the group. If the standards are low in the group and you’re at least average, then you’ll be perceived as having high SMV to that particular group. If in the other group the standards were exceptionally high and you’re average SMV, you’ll be perceived as having low SMV in that group. Like I said, it’s all relative. Going to the gym and getting ripped wouldn’t mean shit if 99% of men were ripped, it would be more of an obligation than it would be an advantage.

To exemplify what I mean about the perception of SMV, let’s use the variable of intellectualism as an example. In groups where say nobody has a university level degree and you yourself have one from a respectable field, to them you would seem
smart/knowledgeable because in relation to them, stereotypically, you’ll know more random crap than they do. That’s not always the case, but for the sake of the example let’s say it is. To rebalance this perception you’d need to play dumb, for an extended period of time and then frame your initial “intelligence” as being the device of some “effort to impress” on your part. Keep up the pretence of stupidity for long enough and eventually, the group would accept you’re not all that smart. Whether being smart or stupid within that particular group is a good thing or not is subjective and based upon the needs and perceptions of the group, so simply put, this could increase your value in some circles whilst decrease it vastly in others.

This is how you “re-chisel” the initially inscribed perception of yourself, the old facet of yourself people were so convinced was smart, now with great effort, energy and time expenditure on your part can be changed to make them believe that in actual fact you’re not that smart. Remember you haven’t actually lost any intelligence, you’re just merely altering that social circles perception of what they think your intelligence is. Often one has to ask themselves a question in relation to this, is this social circle even worth expending all this energy on? Will the effort outweigh the reward? If the answer is no and a simple cost-benefit analysis returns higher cost than benefit then logic would suggest that you ditch said social circle for richer pastures, quite simply like in finance – **the return is too low to return a yield worthy of investment**. There’s such a thing as “knowing when to quit” or “cutting your losses.” You have to be willing to lose/quit to “come out on top” sometimes.

When a social circle does not work for you, but rather you for it, altering the perception of your SMV is something of an inane endeavour. The group likes what you bring so keeps you in the group eg: resources, but they don’t respect you for what you bring because of how you carry yourself EG: easily pushed around and manipulated. These are the toxic social circles which if you’ve been silly enough to find yourself in, you need to ditch. Now. Exit, fast.

Any stragglers from the group who want to remain in your orbit and facilitate one-on-one relationships with you are of course, welcome to do that, presuming you equally value that individual to some measurable extent. After all, it’s not personal to the individual in question (unless with that individual, it is) really you’re looking at the circle as a whole, looking out for your own interests and leaving the circle because it was not working for you, but you for it, and thus it was too psychologically unprofitable to redress the imbalance. **If you are being socially exploited, respect yourself and make it stop.** It is a fundamental building block to building confidence and ego. **This includes your job.** If your job is self-deprecating or demeaning, try to find one that offers you better working conditions. **Letting a job suck up your soul just so you can get by is no life - it's a hostage situation.**

It’s easier to join new social circles and go for off-the-bat perception of high value than it is to contest the perception of your status in an already established circle, the old adage “first impressions count” rings a bell here! Our ancestors, they were wise people. Pre-liberalism the red-pill was called “common sense.”

Your time is precious and limited, you will not be young, in good health and fast learning forever. Things that are most difficult, arduous and challenging (EG: learning a language, getting fit at the gym etc) are best tackled at the youngest age possible when your brain is at its quickest, your hormones at their best ratios and your energy levels are at their highest.
Relating this to SMV, if it will take too much energy to fix a bad reputation or otherwise fix a perception of low status within a group, **don’t contest it, just forget it**, you have better shit to do, such as improving yourself; rather than begging for validation and approval from one specific social circle.

Even when you are already a high value individual, not everyone will appreciate what you bring to the table, not everyone is attracted to the same things, this goes beyond merely women but counts for friendships and business contacts too. Some people have game breakers which turn out to be deal sealer’s for others, EG: being intelligent, **diversity is ironic like that.**

The guy/girl you know who is friends with everyone **simply projects different images to different people, a social mirror, a chameleon** - this creates a mirage of someone being alpha/desirable through similarity and shared interest, but really it’s a manifestation of insecurity and weakness, whilst the ability to be so deceiving is certainly beneficial to one’s survival from a Machiavellian perspective, the lack of congruence in identity and an overwhelming need to be validated by others screams insecurity. Unless this is targeted specifically to achieve an agenda, spontaneous needless manifestation of such behaviour is weak and ill-contrived. **Don’t try to be everyone’s friend, it’s insecure and suspicious.** Instead, you improve yourself so much so that your value is high and everyone is **trying to be your friend instead.**

The red pill goes along the premise that if you are high value, you will make friends, get laid, find more success and attain fulfillment, however what is high value to some is perceived as low value to others (because they feel threatened by those traits or are ignorant/arrogant to them) for example, keeping with the earlier example of intelligence, many people don’t like people who seem smart because they think you could undermine their power and on an emotional level you make them feel inferior to you, this is why they feel safer trusting an inferior and socialising with people who aren’t smart, your intelligence is seen as a threat via projection of their insecurity.

Likewise many people don’t like a person who’s an aesthetic 10/10 because they feel they can’t compete for mates in their presence, they envy the 10/10 persons beauty privilege and the dividends it pays off because it seems unfair and puts them at a tactical disadvantage in fulfilling their own mating strategy.

It’s not as black and white as “be high value and you will lead everywhere you go” but certainly at all costs one should pursue as much self-improvement as possible so that they can have their fingers in as many pies as possible. Diversify your portfolio of interests, spin many plates, have varying hobbies, fill up your time – and when one thing inevitably fails, **and it will**, your social market value will remain high because like a conglomerate corporation, your investments are diverse and many, not reliant on the niche of a single market. As we say in England “you should never have all your eggs in one basket” yes, you see, before all this liberal bullshit, the people of England came up with some fucking great proverbs which still hold true even today.
Success is “Alpha”, Failure is “Beta”

by IM | December 26, 2013 | Link

I believe alpha/beta are mind-sets based on a confidence to success ratio, for example, you could pretend to be effeminate as a deception to access a particular circle of women and if you gain access to that group by doing so and then tune up your manliness to build attraction and start fucking girls you’ve already built comfort with then that’d be “alpha.” This is how “gay/bi guys” get laid with hot chicks. Why’s this alpha? Well despite the effeminate charade, you won. If you don’t believe your own effeminate bullshit but merely use it as a tool to get what you want then utilising that behaviour instrumentally to ascertain success does not make one beta. I correlate “alpha” as a concept to being successful, not to dominance or aggression, sure dominance and aggression are masculine, but being masculine doesn’t make one necessarily alpha. You can be masculine and be a fucking loser by nature of incompetence. Think aggressive homeless people.

Alphas don’t need to be the centre of attention all the time. Think aloof game. Not giving a fuck is more “alpha” than the guy who’s always trying to assert himself. Don’t be a try-hard.

You can be an alpha and do absolutely terribly in a social situation, who cares if you weren’t the Marilyn Monroe centrepiece? Perhaps you don’t have particular things in common with those people or the circumstances are unfavourable, whatever, don’t chase, replace. Apply that concept to everything except job applications, nearly everything is replaceable.

Abundance mentality. Find a new group that you can be bothered to interact with, one you do resonate with. Failure is inevitable, desensitise yourself to it, being the hostage of failure will hold you back for the rest of your life.

Attain outcome independence.

If you win and obtain what you want, that’s “alpha.” If you do what you do because you want to do it, if you play the game of life on your own terms, then you’re an alpha male. If you decide/lead/command/take responsibility for others, then you’re alpha. If you’re indecisive, follow, obey obediently and avoid responsibility then you’re beta because your will is not strong, your motives aren’t in play, you are a pawn rather than a player.

A lot of people new to red pill philosophy and I’d hazard a guess, generally, younger people, think specific decisions can are “beta” or “alpha” these are things they confuse with “assertive” and “passive.” You use passiveness strategically and come out on top, that’s alpha because you’re winning at life despite the lack of chest thumping and overt shows of manliness.

If you’re a leader implementing a tactical retreat, you didn’t “commit a beta move” you simply made a call that was passive in nature for whatever logical reasons that you have. When a general pulls his troops out of a place where the fight is being lost, the general isn’t “being a beta”, he’s still a smart, respected man, in fact one could argue that by choosing to keep his troops in there, out of pride, that this move of aggression “is the beta move” as the needless posturing results in higher losses and thus heightened failure, see what I mean about confidence to success ratio? This is an example of misplaced confidence which resulted
in an outcome producing failure, failure is never “alpha” unless it’s tactically planned, in the case of a sacrifice or compromise it must be intended and produce some kind of dividend, if the sacrifice or compromise was not beneficial or intended, you’re a casualty of war, not a game player.

Whether you use passive or dominant moves to achieve your goals has nothing to do with whether you are an alpha or a beta, you can use either to win, winning at life is what makes one alpha, losing at life (and/or with women specifically) is what makes one “a beta.” A beta is synonymous with failure and a lack of success in one or more areas of life. Generally speaking, socially (can’t make friends), sexually (can’t build attraction) and financially (can’t do much of anything!)

Let’s look at what someone might think fits as being alpha because its macho “an alpha move”, say you get arrested by the police because you had a fight with a girls boyfriend who fought you after finding out that you had sex with his girl. This is not winning at anything, it’s paying the price for the pussy, if you didn’t pay in dinero, now you’re paying in blood, I don’t know about where you live my fellow reader but in the UK they give good money for blood, I don’t intend to donate that shit to some frustrated boyfriend because I got some poon from his leg spreading whore on the side. Being smart and having success is winning, although by fucking another man’s girl you might get the last laugh ego wise, spilling blood for a whore is a price too high to pay. You should value your own health, time and safety more than some random little bitches vagina.

You should intend to keep the price of low commitment pussy as low as possible by making sure the supplier (the girl in question) isn’t going to blow up on you and cause collateral damage (don’t shit where you eat, make sure the BF isn’t a psycho murderer, avoid bitches expected to have sexual diseases, girls who show signs of previous abuse, single mothers hunting for a baby daddy etc.)

Don’t fight some guy because your ego tells you “hey man, backing out of a confrontation is a beta move, better man up!” that kind of retarded immature thinking is what reduces your quality of life because now you’re paying in pints of blood for a random whore and you’ve gone and squandered valuable self-improvement time sitting in a hospital getting patched up for her. Yeah the mere minutes in the pussy are so totally worth those couple of hours in hospital. Logic my men, logic.

My “contention” is that actions aren’t inherently beta or alpha and trying to label specific courses of action/decision in a vague context as either is a poor application of red pill philosophy. Backing down, although passive, is not “a beta move” calling specific decisions or behaviours or even traits “beta moves” is dumb because everything is contextual, we have something called “beta game” for a reason, simply put, sometimes seeming like “a typical beta” will produce the best results in a situation, e.g. when you need to earn trust, build comfort or open a social circle. You can bait and switch to open up places you otherwise couldn’t, let’s face it, people view “alpha males” as threats to their success/pussy/security. If you build up trust with beta game, you can then exploit that position of trust by switching things up and building attraction.

People are wary of domineering people they don’t know, so toning it down can help a metric
fuck ton in the presence of those who are mate guarding, cockblocking or otherwise an obstruction e.g. you won’t get the promotion seeming overly masculine, mix up alpha flirting with beta eagerness in the “work review” with the post-wall chick, feed her ego with validation whilst not seeming overly “misogynist” and boom, enjoy the pay rise.

A beta is a culmination of things within a person’s character which results in an unsuccessful and/or unfulfilling lifestyle, it’s a place on the hierarchy both sexual and social, applying it to actions, thoughts and all manner of intricate things is counter-productive as it causes one to over analyse and second guess, it’s almost as if one is going back to the PUA route of mechanising and learning specific things and picking them apart for external understanding (like canned lines and routines, following a specific model from comfort to attraction etc.) rather than internalising a mind-set which allows certain behaviours to manifest as a natural by-product of such internalisation (also known as “inner game”) thus allowing the individual to “do the right things.”

You do the right thing because you possess a confidence and mind-set which facilitates success, there should be no rehearsing, just practicing, real shit. Know the difference between rehearsing and practising. Practising is when you do shit over and over and again to fine tune your craft and improve on its technique, presentation, delivery etc. Rehearsing is taking the same crap over and over and trying to emulate it verbatim as best as you can. Practising allows growth, rehearsing encourages stagnation and keeps you dependent on pre-fed procedures that you don’t have a true grasp of.

We had a thread on /r/theredpill, perhaps a month or two ago that was stickied saying “stop calling specific things alpha and beta its fucking stupid” or something along those lines, however I see a lot of people still doing it “oh he decided not to approach, what a beta move!” this is the crux of this post, this is what I disagree with – getting hung up on whether something is alpha or beta in nature in and of itself is counter-productive and fictitious, how you perceived some shit doesn’t necessarily make it so, it doesn’t help people improve, it makes them second guess themselves which isn’t something someone with strong inner game should be concerning themselves with, do you think someone whose “alpha” is there thinking to themselves “that action was kind of beta of me?” Of course not, it just stinks of insecurity, sure you can fuck up and fail but if you learn from your mistakes and start finding success you’re on the path to becoming alpha. Only constant failure makes one beta, as in, failure so regular it’s almost absolute, an inability to learn, an ignorance.

The typical failures of getting to grips with a learning curve are nothing to be concerned with, they’re normal, as long as there is some success mixed in with your failure as you get to grips with your journey of self-actualisation there’s nothing wrong with not achieving a perfect result on your endeavours, the failures encountered in the learning process don’t denote “being beta”, it’s being a failure, constantly failing, which makes one a beta, this is fundamentally different from failing as necessary upon the path of practice and self-improvement.

A beta is someone who doesn’t understand women and/or hasn’t got their shit together mentally and/or fails to understand the nature of the game of life, betas are simply delusional low value people who are lacking on one of societies main judgements of value, be it
economically, sexually or socially. In fact, I’m going to add a “half caveat” here, the only action, which I guess is more of an viewpoint than a definitive action per se which I would consider inherently “beta” in and of itself is putting the pussy on a pedestal and to fit in with the main theory I’m positing here, what does that kind of view/behaviour result in? Failure of course. Sending long text messages? Telling her she’s beautiful and special? Being overly attentive? Failure, failure, failure. She’ll construe all that shit as neediness, not sexiness.

However, in and of itself calling specific causes of action beta is unintelligent. Should we start calling one guy who isolates and ignores the rest of the group “a renegade alpha move” and another guy who does nothing “making sigma moves?” It’s retarded thinking. These terms are used to describe psychological archetypes, not specific actions and behaviour.

For example, maybe it’s a beta move you don’t try to AMOG the group alpha? Or maybe its alpha you’re being “the better man” by not doing that or maybe it’s beta that you don’t “man up” and challenge the group alpha. Do you see what I mean? Perception is a transparent bitch, apply whatever lens you like to this shit, it’s all fictitious “hamastered” garbage. Actions aren’t inherently beta or alpha, a person’s frame is within a specific context, if you can well justify (and I mean justify, as in strategically and not rationalise) why you weren’t aggressive with something then by all means don’t kick yourself in the testicles for not being high off your own testosterone, there’s a time and a place for aggression, apply it meaningfully and accurately, not needlessly and endlessly. Those who misapply aggression show the intelligent among us they are insecure within themselves and thus overcompensate by demonstrating ferociousness as a guise.

When I see guys who feel like they need to squash every little challenge and never let their guard down, despite their masculine/aggressive frame their inability to allow transgression screams insecurity. That’s not what defines being an alpha, being an alpha is about living on your own terms and not taking peoples shit whilst still finding success in what you want and do, with that should come self-certainty and a kind of independence that most people don’t have both physically and mentally, this includes things such as not being a wage slave, not giving too many fucks about people’s opinions, getting pussy without being chained to alimony/child support etc. Independence and freedom are beautiful things for those who can handle them.

On the topic of dominance, in my own personal interactions I self-deprecate a lot, which to someone who misunderstands red pill philosophy, may mistake for “being beta” as they don’t understand the underlying Machiavellianism in play and how what I do actually gains me power covertly.

When I’m around people with weak egos who need to make themselves comfortable by insulting others/shit testing nefariously I agree and amplify to the point of ridiculousness. You call me insecure? Sure, I’m so insecure I still suck my thumb to help me sleep at night. Let’s make me the target of aggression and laugh at me, I’m comfortable enough to not give a fuck and if it makes a guy’s insecurity dissipate so we can have a good time? Good. Doing this assists people who aren’t as resistant to scrutiny/criticism as I am and helps them loosen up and accept the social dynamic without being anxious or restrained, self-deprecation is a
great ice-breaker, I really recommend the shit – that’s for another article, however.

To the untrained eye I look like a beta letting these guys get away with saying insulting things, to those who know their shit, I’ve just made a bunch of friends and demonstrated high value by showing that I not only have a sense of humour, but if you’re going to talk shit about me I won’t give a fuck about your views, mere words don’t faze me, **I don’t hand my power over to you.** See what I mean about perceiving specific actions as alpha/beta? It’s a psychological lens, not an actuality.
Understanding Psychopathy
by IM | December 28, 2013 | Link

“The psychopaths are always around. In calm times we study them, but in times of upheaval, they rule over us.” – Ernst Kretschmer

Firstly to define what psychopathy is for the purposes of this article; some experts, specialists and such talk about Machiavellianism and narcissism as being traits characteristic of psychopathy. Now although this is true in the sense that these “personality disorders” have a propensity to overlap with psychopathy, this isn’t always true. For example, not all psychopaths are charismatic, and not all charismatic people are psychopathic. Not all proficiently Machiavellian individuals are psychopathic, but almost all psychopaths are Machiavellian. Thus it seems that when psychologists, psychiatrists, CIA profilers and such talk about psychopaths, what they’re really referring to is “a dark triad individual.”

They use the term “psychopath” as a synonym for “dark triad,” when psychopathy in and of itself is more nuanced, comprising a mere third of the entire personality framework. When I refer to psychopathy, I will be looking at psychopathy specifically. Not the related but extraneous character traits that psychopaths often possess such as narcissism and Machiavellianism. These are traits that although fall into the category of deviant behaviour known as “the dark triad,” are capable of existing entirely independently.

In this article you’re going to learn what psychopathy is as well as how to emulate its beneficial aspects. This is relevant so you can differentiate (although not without difficulty) between someone who is very good at being an asshole by practicing detachment consciously (by practicing stoicism) and someone who is clinically incapable of empathising with another human-being (which is what psychopathy is.) There is one major difference between competent stoicism and psychopathy, the choice to care. In practice, a psychopath’s
empathy switch is constantly set to “off” and cannot be turned on via conscious or subconscious choice, it’s a neurological defect (or improvement, depending on your world view.) A stoic’s empathy switch is set to “off” consciously but can be turned “on” or vice versa, the empathy switch is “on” by default and can be consciously switched “off.” The characterisation of this is of course dependent on the stoic in question and their level of competency in the endeavour.

Psychopathy is essentially the inability to empathise with others; it is both a gift and a curse in and of itself. It is a gift for the psychopath because it presents them with many avenues in which to act without any internal moral conscience or feeling of guilt nagging at them. It’s this lack of conscience which makes psychopaths feel somewhat omnipotent, feeding into their narcissism, because they don’t feel anxiety when pondering morality should they choose to ponder it as an intellectual abstraction (which is all it is to them.) Any pondering they do of morality is merely intellectual in nature, it’s not emotional in basis. They have no morality, but this doesn’t mean they don’t make moral codes for others. Psychopaths are amoral by merit of their inability to empathise. Their emotions are for them, and them alone, they are solipsistically emotional, in their opinion other people’s emotion exists for no purpose other than to be manipulated by them. They do not attribute value to other people’s emotional states the way in which they attribute an intrinsic level of value to their own. Psychopaths are amoral or immoral (depending on how you look at it.) To have morals you actually have to care about people and by nature of a psychopaths neurology, they’re incapable of doing this, or so barely capable of it that it is statistically insignificant in any decision-making processes they go through. Such a neurological defect can be shown by a low amount of brain activity on an MRI scanner.

Many people who read red pill philosophy are aware of the power which is inherent to “not giving a fuck”, characterised acronymically as “IDGAF.” A psychopath never gives a fuck, at least, not about you as a person, your well-being, your problems or the essence of your being. What they do give a fuck about is getting what they want by any means necessary. Symbolically, they characterise ruthlessness. They never care about YOU in and of yourself, but merely as a by-product of your utility to them. This is why in some circumstances they may conditionally care about you (because in such scenarios you represent an extension of their self-interest.)

Your perceived utility to the psychopath is defined by what you can do for them. Psychopaths value people who can provide them with an immediate service or a service that can be banked (in the form of a favour) and called upon in the future (to “use you”.) Thus it so that they want to safeguard you, their “investment”, until they can come to collect on the expectation of said service you will render to them. This is the limit of the psychopath’s capacity to care. They do not care for your personal well-being in and of itself; this is something a psychopath is completely incapable of. A charming psychopath can convince “their target” that they care, but they don’t. No matter how much you desire it and how much they feed into that desire, their façade of caring for you is merely a manifestation of Machiavellianism layered in charm. They are totally and utterly incapable of such behaviour. Anything you believe in this context is fanatical in nature, substantiated by idealistic desire and misdirection, not tangibility, reason or fact.
Some psychopaths are so cold it is completely obvious they are psychopathic, others are very good at cultivating an outward charismatic persona which conceals their true character. These types are the wolves in sheeps clothing, those you would never guess are psychopathic from mere interactions. It depends on the psychopath in question, although all psychopaths share the trait of being uncaring and incapable of empathy internally, they are still fundamentally different characters independently of that thus affecting how they choose to present themselves to the world around them. Some are very obviously detached and cold, others can be incredibly charming and warm (in order to co-opt, befriend and betray etc.) What one must realise is that the emotion a psychopath feeds you (because that is what they are doing to you, feeding your hindbrain) is inherently superficial, it is a device to manipulate you via your emotions, to gain leverage over you, to influence. To them it is a tool to be exploited, to you it is a way of viewing the world. You cannot influence their view of the world with the same mechanism (emotional pleas), psychopaths are attracted to and influenced by power.

Psychopaths likewise have incredible powers of observation and deduction. Your body language, your eye movement, the placement of your hands, your posture, your vocal tonality, they are the masters of discerning the strength of one’s frame. Worse to be a person with a weak frame that realises a psychopath is analysing their every fidget, glance and bodily scratch than be an ignorant participant in a psychopaths internal observational process where mental notes are made on your presentation and correlated to personality traits. EG: the likelihood of your susceptibility to certain types of behaviour and courses of action as well as a quick cost-benefit analysis which deduces your risk factor as an adversary to them. Psychopaths are social predators, they will use this information to control you and reduce your working effectiveness as well as in some situations, ensnare you totally if you’re not prudent. Their motives depend vastly on your utility, perhaps how sexually appealing you are as well as how much you’ve tried to shit on their ego (psychopaths tend to be egotistical.)

All psychopaths are machiavellians, but not all machiavellians are psychopaths. You can learn some of the traits psychopaths use by utilising stoicism to emulate psychopathic traits. In a way one could argue, you could in fact emulate a psychopath so competently through training that it’s difficult to discern the difference between you in your stage of completed training and a legitimate natural psychopath, however, you cannot neurologically become a psychopath. You will always have to keep on top of your emotions and stay in control, suppressing your ability to care for others rather than lacking that capability entirely. Things which are innate to a psychopath by mere nature of their biology you will have to contest, suppress and/or reconcile. Examples of this are the psychopaths inability to empathise with their victim’s pain and thus no inclination to deliberate over the morality of such actions or experience any of the emotional fallout associated with it, such as guilt or remorse. For a psychopath there’s no process for them to deal with they do something immoral because the emotional process simply never occurs for them. For a non-psychopath, it does, a stoic is simply a master of suppression.

Machiavellianism can be taught but psychopathy cannot. One is a vocation/art, the other is a neurological disorder. Although you cannot become psychopathic, you can learn skills which come naturally to the psychopath.
To a psychopath you are always perceived through the filter of “being a tool” if you have no utility to a psychopath, a psychopath will not bother you. If you are a liability to a psychopath and you have no utility, they will not hesitate to fuck your shit up. Psychopaths are the personification of the concept of “cruelness” because they are completely liberated from guilt and are thus mercilessly ruthless. As previously stated, they are biologically incapable of empathising with other human-beings and thus guilt is not a phenomenon they ever have to contend with. The ability to connect with other humans and feel guilt is what stops the typical person from indulging in their own amoral selfishness, it is the barrier between their desires and total decision-making liberation.

Due to their genetic (hormonal) propensity for emotionalism, female psychopathy is rare. In its place the average woman commits immoral acts by dissociating from reality in order to justify her actions, placating her emotions that she is “doing the right thing.” So although a woman’s behaviour can achieve a similar result to that of a psychopaths, there is an emotional component to their decision-making process. This emotion manifests through “feeling” and they have to deal with it, women tend not to have “an absence of emotion” like a stoic does through suppression but rather they are good at “coping with emotion” as in, addressing it when it comes along and rationalising it away to avoid cognitive dissonance. They do this by deluding themselves to believe in falsehoods that can be typically characterised as idealistic and biased in their perception of events. It is this mechanism which allows them to reconcile their sense of guilt with their committed atrocity. EG: blame shifting, justifying, tweaking facts. It is by merit of this mechanism that the average woman is not technically psychopathic, but seemingly capable of performing callous acts.

The average woman is very good at making herself believe delusion due to the foundation of her reasoning stemming from her current emotional state. Their current emotional composition can completely rewrite their internal narrative, allowing them to self-deceive and disassociate in a way that most men find remarkably difficult.

It’s ironic that, within a context of “red pill, blue pill” that the psychopath has probably some of the most astute, observational insight you’ll ever hear uttered from human breath. Their ability to observe deeply and comprehend the synoptic workings of the various elements which make up a targets persona allows them to weaponise the truth. By having such a strong understanding of the inner workings of a person’s specific circumstances they can mold the relevant knowledge to overwhelm a target with a tirade of truth. Truth delivered in such a callous and cold way that it borders on abuse. This is truth that the target usually isn’t mentally strong enough to hear or handle; kind of like “swallowing the pill” except the person espousing this truth has ill-intent and is subjecting you to everything they can muster, with the intent of destroying rather than assisting.

Psychopaths can bury the truth in a glazing of bullshit and reattribute the credibility of the truthful elements within their presentation to convince the target of the false elements via repetition and false appeals to the credibility inherent of the truthful elements. These are the “grains of truth”, not the elements which are fictitious or illusory in question. A psychopath will attempt to transfer the credibility from the truthful statement(s) onto the untruthful statement(s) in this amalgamated package bundle of psychological bullshit, and it’s for this reason they make exceptional gaslighters, going through a tirade of bait and switch,
conflation, and trickle truth, effectively. They possess the ability to drive people insane because they won’t feel guilt for emotionally abusing you. This paragraph of text overlaps heavily with machiavellianism, but a machiavellian with minimal psychopathic traits cannot gaslight in a way that a psychopath with machiavellian traits can.

If machiavellianism is neutral, a tool which can be forged as a means of attack, defence or even mere abstinence, psychopathy has a distinctively aggressive edge to it, as by its very nature, it will cause harm. It cannot be suppressed or argued – it simply “is.” It is a condition, a state of being.

What does this mean for someone who isn’t psychopathic but wants to implement this facet of the triad into their life? How can you “utilise” psychopathy when it’s a neurological condition? Well what you can do is utilise the psychological abilities that the condition rewards its occupant without being restrained by the curse of being incapable of emotionally connecting to other beings. As I’m keeping narcissism and machiavellianism separated to their respective corners of the triad, I’m just going to look at the powers of perception and observation psychopathy awards as well as the self-control and frame control it grants rather than explore the other facets of the triad.

“Not giving a fuck” – Empathy, guilt, fear, anxiety etc - the crippling, limit imposing emotions.

To embody this trait a typical non-psychopathic person must substitute the psychopath’s inability to empathise with a non-psychopathic equivalent, which is not an inability to give a fuck, but a proficiency in suppressing how many fucks you give – stoicism.

Stoicism, verb form “to be stoic” is the mental process of suppressing emotions, not thinking about them, not reasoning with them, not reconciling them but simply concentrating so strongly on the emotions at hand with “nothingness” that you destroy the integrity of the emotional presence within your mind using sheer will. Concentration, intense focus, like a ray of sunlight refined into a narrow beam through a magnifying lens is the embodiment of mental power, discipline. Emotion, unacknowledged, without any facts or bullshit added to it will pass, it is simply a biological impulse, a feeling, one part of your brain sending a communication to another part that causes discomfort. By addressing feelings you give them more importance and power than they inherently possess via rationalisation. Their power lays in their potential to influence you. If you destroy their potential they become powerless, nothing but mere tickles, tingles and sensations.

If you are for example, as is common with many nowadays, anxious, concentrate on the anxiety, embrace it rather than pretend it isn’t there, concentrate very hard and try to clear your mind focusing on the sensation of irrational fear (which is what debilitating anxiety is.) In a way one could say this is a form of meditation, it is disconnecting ones thoughts from one’s feelings so that the irrational and harmful nature of negative emotions cannot pollute the thoughts and thus the actions an individual commits to.

One could well argue that stoicism can be utilised as a purification process of sorts, it allows one to keep self-control, frame and become the master of their own destiny. If you can overcome negative emotions, the debilitating emotions, your power as an individual spikes
massively. Fearlessness is power. Confidence is power. These are things which come naturally in the absence of negative cognitive feedback loops and unhealthy detrimental emotion rampaging around in one’s mind. I recommend practising meditation, look up Buddhist temples in your area and see if you can go along and meditate with them. Weightlifting, additionally, is good in reducing the mind’s natural production of anxiety.

I have this book on my Amazon wish-list until I do my next shop as I was recommended it to be a good book on Zen/frame control: Zen in the Art of Archery: Training the Mind and Body to Become One

“The powers of observation - The ability to understand, discern, correlate or simply “connect the dots” based on non-verbal cues”

The powers of observation are not psychopathic per se, but anyone who has formal training in psychology based roles such as psychiatry tend to have heightened powers of observation; a critical mind that can observe and deduce to create fairly accurate deductive analysis. Manipulation does not know stupidity and psychopaths are always manipulative, and it is analysis which plays the part of providing data that the psychopath can use in decision-making. This is why the job of a shrink requires them to be able to comprehend psychopaths in some kind of tangible manner. In order that they can create some kind of evaluative report. Even if the report isn’t completely correct, they have to medicalise how fucked up the dark triad individual in question is and somehow rationalise an explanation for their deviant behaviour.

OK, to the gritty now, cold reading is essentially what you’re after. Cold reading is the ability to create deductions based upon non-verbal observations and the nuances in verbal communication, so nonverbally we’re talking posture, body language: what direction do they face, their hand placement, their eye movement speed, are they fidgeting or controlled, do they scratch or needlessly touch areas of themselves for no obvious reason (eg: putting your hand on your neck, bringing hands together to make hand gestures etc.), non-verbal but auditory cues include sighing, breathing heavily and making noise with the air in the nose, such as snorting. What direction do they gaze in, can they hold eye contact - yes or no? Who looks away first? The last one is a hugely important one, it signifies confidence and dominance.

Verbally we’re talking tonality, with word choice do they self-censor? Do they use Ebonics? Do they swear? What idiolectal mannerisms do they adopt? In the UK accent often gives away one’s social class and economic standing, with the better educated trying to hide their natural regional accents (you see this a lot in places like Scotland/Newcastle) by consciously changing their pronunciation of vowel sounds to sound more southern, whereas the lower class give no fucks and pronounce many things incorrectly, staying true to the local dialect/accent.

There’s overall articulacy (to indicate speed of thought, knowledge base, intelligence, wit, charisma etc.) and then there’s vocabulary, do they use simple words or complex ones? When they use complex language is that natural or a redundant effort to impress present company involved?
Clothing, make-up and overall presentation. What do they wear? Why do they wear it? What image are they trying to convey to the world around them? Is it a rocker full of tattoos and piercings? That types want to communicate they’re rebellious and don’t give a fuck, they don’t respect boundaries and demand respect. Is it a man in a suit? He wants to communicate he’s socially and economically successful. Black guy in a jersey wearing abundant, opulent and excessive jewellery? He’s peacocking to welcome attention and wants to command respect by implying he’s a force to be reckoned with both physically and economically.

Make-up is a bigger one in and of itself; it demonstrates vanity and a preoccupation with the perception of one’s physical presentation. Makeup is worn by most women; their looks are both their strength and their weakness as it’s their major and preferred tool for self-empowerment. Women who wear little to zero make-up and don’t look like candle wax just melted are the natural genetic beauties. Women who wear abundant amounts are insecure of their natural beauty and trying to deceive you by employing illusion to convince you they are more sexually desirable than their genetics naturally signify. Every time they see a naturally pretty girl, they get jealous because women actively compare their own to beauty to other women’s.

Through cold reading you will fine-tune your intuition to a point where you form heuristics that allow you to know things about a person without really being able to reason why you think these things, despite the high degree of accuracy said heuristic grants your perception. Once competent, your “intuition” or “gut” will be right the majority of the time about your deductions. The great thing about cold reading is it’s called cold because its covert, you can ascertain all this information, a plethora of it, via mere observation. You need not have any meaningful or probing conversation with the person in question (which would be overt/hot) – it’s a great way to reconnoiter a person psychologically before having to deal with them head-on. You can then use this knowledge to make rational assumptions about a person and employ it as you see fit in your future interactions with them. This will aid in decision-making, protecting yourself, or if you should choose to, influence or befriend the person in question.

I recommend you sit around in public places, say coffee shops and just observe people. Listen to people earnestly. Look at them closely. Eavesdrop profusely, don’t stare just glance around, use your peripheral vision to “look, but not look at people.” If you have sunglasses, great – you will conceal your line of sight, can be more overt but still conceal your intent. Observing how different types of people behave will only attune your ability to read people and discern things about them based on externalities. The more you do it, the better you’ll get. Like anything, you will have to put the time in, but desensitising yourself emotionally and improving your powers of observation are capabilities which both fall within the realm of possibility.

**Relevant Reading:**

**Blog Material:**
**Everything in the Dark Triad Portal**

**Also, specifically:**
**Utilising The Dark Triad: Machiavellianism**
Book(s) on Psychopathy:
Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in the USA
Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in the UK
Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in Canada
The pursuit of power is a fundamentally human drive which knows no exceptions, every single last human craves power, we are all in competition, all conniving, plotting, designing, participating in the competition of all competitions – survival via domination, life, the game of who gets the rights to pass on their genetic lineage and damn well enjoy themselves whilst they’re at it.

We all seek success, however, success comes at a cost – it comes at the cost of personal sacrifice, it requires self-discipline, it requires zest and motivation, it requires unrelenting selfishness, it requires a sharp effective mind but perhaps most sinister of all it requires you have no qualms in taking power from others, as an old lecturer once said to me, a red pill post-wall woman in her mid 30’s a little something I’ll never forget “Not everyone can be a winner in this life, if everyone was a winner then who would clean the streets?”

There is a finite amount of power, power is relative; power is measured in comparison to everyone else’s. If everybody was equally smart or rich then the edge being smart or rich gives would be almost negligible, power is about balance and thus if you become more
powerful by grabbing opportunity by the bull horns then that is an opportunity that someone somewhere else has been deprived of acquiring, lest they directly challenge your position.

Power is about being better than other people and the pursuit of power is fundamental to man, absolutely fundamental, if he ever wishes to respect himself or command respect from others, if he wants to be a leader, renowned, noteworthy or dare I say even legendary, he must possess power. Life for a man should be about the acquisition of power and then maintaining/defending said power once it has been acquired.

Some people say they don’t want power. They are lying, either just to you or both to you and themselves out of delusion. Everybody wants power. Even women, although they may like to be submissive in the presence of masculine power, they also like to influence that power, their power is indirect, their power is to control a man’s power and have him use his power to benefit her, “power by proxy theory” they do this by trading off on their youth and giving men sexual access to their bodies, which is why to the bitter dismay of feminists everywhere, female power decreases with age, women never truly attain their own power, they’re always using someone else’s – however I digress, that topic is for another article.

Unlike women who should be using their youth to lock down a suitable suitor in their early 20’s (preferably an accomplished successful man in his late 20’s or early to mid-30’s) a young man of the same age should be doing everything he can to improve his position in the social marketplace, not just to get laid but to utilise his own innate potential to evolve and become better than he is. To do the stuff that your average insecure 20 year old male needs to do to make him respect himself, feel productive and set foot on the path to becoming a man.

Your entire 20’s as a man should be about actualisation, self-improvement, chasing the wind, enriching yourself, improving your skill sets, you are free from commitment and the debilitating burden of family life, you have no responsibilities, no ball and chain (wife/girlfriend), spin plates for sex but by dear god, do not have a serious girlfriend if you have serious considerations for power, if you are happy with the level you’re at then that’s good for you, your personal ambition is satiated, but this article is focused on those who want to be at the top, the mega ambitious, those who lust for the trappings of power.

Women being the liabilities that they are will bring nothing but expectation, drama and undue stress to your life that will do nothing but hamper, impede and hold back your efforts to improve yourself – why even set yourself up for the responsibility that is maintaining a relationship with a woman when you’re not even the man you want to be yet? That’s fine when you’re in your 30’s looking to start a family and already have a power base built up from the draft, sweat and experience of your virile 20’s, but firstly you need to build that power base so that your 30’s are enjoyable, not just another decade along the path of a meaningless life culminating in a worthless death. A simple life is a life unfulfilled.

How do you build power? Well I’ll start with the obvious and say that internalising red pill philosophy is very empowering, seeing things for what they are rather than what you want them to be is an incredible commodity in today’s society of indoctrinated unwashed masses.

There are fundamental cornerstones which grant a man his power and these are...
Game:
This is the most important element of a man’s personal power, not just with women but with people/existence full-stop. Game is interchangeable with “social skills.” Gaming and building attraction doesn’t just have to mean sexually but it applies all the same non-sexually too, think in terms of making people value you and accept you, this is the stuff that builds your social circles, allows you access into other social circles, allows you to network and gets you the job at the interview, it’s all about cultivating your personality and being real, not needing to act because you don’t like who you are but actually enriching who you are to be powerful and attractive.

Game is developed over the span of one’s life and never becomes obsolete or irrelevant, to further subdivide game up into interchangeable elements, it consists of:

- **Machiavellianism** – knowing how to perceive and play a situation to come out victorious, knowing what’s real and what’s not, why people are doing what they’re doing, knowing when you’re being played either as a pawn or as a theatrical fool in someone else’s game – read more here.

- **Wit** – this is what allows you to pass shit tests, essential if you ever want to get anywhere in life, everyone will shit test you when they first meet you so they can personally ascribe you value based on their impression of you. your speed of retort, the creativity of your communication and a successful delivery style are all elements of wit, this is the cornerstone of a strong frame and is needed for all common shit busting strategies eg: agree and amplify. If your wit sucks I suggest watching lots and lots of stand-up comedy. That link should serve as a starting point. You’re welcome.

- **Charm** – this is simple narcissism, self-confidence, self-assuredness, this is what subtly (or not so subtly) demonstrates non-verbally that you are a high value person, it is the sense that you are inherently superior, it is better to be grounded in reality (because you work hard and are good at certain things) rather than be baseless, however the only delusion I’ll ever endorse for those fresh on the journey to self-improvement: fake it until you make it!

- **Humour** – another cornerstone of a strong frame, humour is often at the expense of negativity, it produces positive energy from a negative source and communicates non-verbally that you are capable of staring at the face of failure/negativity without becoming unhinged by it. Humour shows who are the real tough motherfuckers and it’s the favourite tool for men to use when they’re shit testing other men, one way men form lasting platonic bonds with their fellow man is via humour. Those with sensibilities are weak, sheltered, and emotionally fragile to what merely are words without any real tangible bearing on the paradigm which is their life. If your humour has limits, eradicate them – humour is a cornerstone of power and influence and ties in closely to charm. Humour can be used a lot in conjunction with agree and amplify EG: “**yeah I’m so annoying and effeminate people can’t decide whether to call me Justin Bieber or Miley Cyrus**” …. “**Miley Cyrus has a way more manly haircut than Justin though, I hope hers is the nickname that sticks.**”

Money:
Good game will help you get money, you need money to build connections and get into the
despot networks that hire and promote based on personal favouritism and back scratching. Meritocracy has its limits as fundamentally we’re all humans seeking power and a leader at any level of the hierarchy would rather have someone on their side that they like rather than someone who’s better educated but simply fucking annoying to work with or perceived as a threat (eg: that cliche excuse for rejection that you’re overqualified for a job.) You can contest this thought and get into notions of meritocracy and blah blah as you sit their stone broke until pay day with no nest egg reading this article, but when you see that idiotic vapid dickhead drinking from champagne showers embracing an oversized bottle of Moet between his legs as if he’s subconsciously displaying a phallic symbol for all to admire “I’ve got a big dick girls, really!” then maybe your idealisations of meritocracy will shatter somewhat and you’ll come join us here in reality.

Money requires more externally than game, game is all about your cognitive wiring, money relies on that but it also requires an external skill which others can directly benefit from. It requires something the economy will pay for because it needs it. If you’re going to university then choose your degree wisely. If it doesn’t pay or even have an at least 50% chance of paying then don’t bother doing it. Sure I like philosophy as much as the next guy and psychology is kind of cool too but if you don’t want to be working in a grocery store for the rest of your life and want to be a competitor not a survivor then you better fucking well study something that pays right or not bother at all. If you’re doing a degree in creative writing you may as well just save up the loan money, live frugally and default on the loan (if that’s possible in your country) because I can write pretty creatively and I don’t have a degree in that shit, neither do many other writers.

Your economic skill doesn’t have to be academic, if STEM isn’t for you and you’re too much of a bitch to get your hands dirty by building, plumbing, being an electrician or basically becoming one of civilizations builders and maintainers of our mortar then you could always learn to cook. Quite literally anybody can look to cook, it’s hard work and long hours but the opportunities are numerous, people always need to eat it’s not an industry that’s going anywhere, and it’s an art form, if you get really passionate about it and put in the man hours you can go far, open a restaurant one day, write a cookbook – only you limit yourself, your mind, your vision, your beliefs – don’t give up your power by not bothering. Have a focus on a discipline of some sort that makes money and stick with it, otherwise you’ll be saying “Do you want fries with that?” or “Can I pour you another?” like the little economic bitch boy that you’ve allowed yourself to become.

Insults designed to motivate aside, game leads to money and money leads to better game which leads to more and more money creating a positive feedback cycle. Poverty is oppressive, it is the opposite of what I just described a negative feedback cycle, it’s what keeps you from ascertaining greatness, poverty is socially accepted slavery – as in you work for a pay cheque that doesn’t liberate you from your condition of drudgery because it demands a high time investment in return for a low financial return. Most people in poverty for much of their life accept their position and die miserable, trying to anesthetise themselves with porn, cheap games and alcohol because they’ve’ given up on themselves – don’t be that guy, be a competitor.

More money means more opportunity, more opportunity means more growth. Money is the
single most powerful non-sentient object in existence; it is a decimalised measurement of objective power which each and every life needs to continue to exist. Get money, lots and lots of fucking money. Philosophically it means little, as a measurement of power it means everything. For those who have none it is everything, for those who have plenty it is nothing (because they’re already enjoying the lifestyle, have excess and thus perceive and spend less personally, again, another topic – I’m a serial digresser)

Aesthetics/Beauty:
This is way more important for a woman than it is a man but don’t think because you’re a man your looks are irrelevant, beauty privilege is a real thing, good looking people get perks ugly people don’t. Sure you can get one night lays and be an ugly motherfucker in the right situations but we’re talking about power here, not simply getting laid on one random night where logistics are right and you demonstrate high enough value in other areas.

Why neglect one cornerstone of power when you can be even more powerful by giving this area its due attention? It goes without saying, go down the gym, not only does it increase your strength physically but it improves how you look. It gives you a body you feel you can look at and respect. It increases your testosterone and your drive, mentally invigorating you as you get stronger and stronger.

Maintain your hair, facial and head hair, a badly groomed man makes an ugly man. Dress well, a poorly dressed man communicates low status in the sense that he is either poor, stupid or both - people judge us very much so on our superficialities so be sure to overcome everything you have control over. If you’re a midget, your cocks small or you have some chronic non-treatable condition or deformity then you’re going have to deal with it, that’s life, compensate in other ways, these things will stop you from achieving a perfectionist ideal of power because their drawbacks are significant, however, they will not stop you from being powerful if you’ve got your mind right so don’t use that shit as an excuse to cop out and give up. **If you give up on yourself then enjoy being powerless because nobody else gives a fuck.**

Practical skill sets:
While you’re young you learn at your quickest, the older you get the harder it is to learn and the slower you learn specifically useful skills (EG: foreign languages) so get it out of the way right now, A.S.A.P, treat your learning like a woman’s biological clock running out of eggs, get it done and get it done whilst the conditions are at their best, it’s never too late but why make life any harder than it needs to be?

Examples of skill sets which boost your social market value significantly are:

– Having an understanding of any discipline - e.g.: cooking, building, plumbing, DIY, car mechanics, etc.

– Dancing, basically it’s a human mating call – choose a style that suits your personality.

– Speaking multiple languages - shows intelligence, sophistication and opens up social circles which would otherwise be closed to you due to language barrier, e.g. “my Spanish crew” “my Arab boys” etc. Contrary to popular ignorant Anglo sphere belief there’s a lot of likeable
people who could enrich your life that don’t know English and of course an entire ocean of pussy.

- The application and demonstration of physical strength – martial arts, although it is a physical discipline it is psychologically different from the other disciplines listed, knowing how to kick the shit out of people does a lot for a man’s sense of confidence and thus his attractiveness to everyone around him, you can protect you and yours, anybody who messes with you or your friends will face a force to be reckoned with. If there’s ever a zombie apocalypse you can go down snapping some heads off, there’s no reason to neglect this it’s something every man can work on and acquire.

It goes without saying that all these goals are easier to accomplish without a serious long-term girlfriend monopolising your precious neurons with her phatic unimportant babble and irrational emotionally cacophonous small-minded concerns.

You’re looking at the bigger picture, your average 20’s girl is thinking about getting dicked by an alpha, what she should wear, why did she feel that way earlier and how will she feel if she does “such and such”, what do her friends think of her? Blah-de-fucking-blah. Fuck that noise, spin them as plates but don’t give away significant commitment until you hit your 30’s, that way you can clean up on the hot young twenty somethings and have your pick of the litter because your SMV will be sky high.

It’s tough to be a man, you have to work for it, you don’t bust out into the world with a low cut top at 18 being the object of desire for 50% of the population, it takes a lot of blood, sweat and tears as well as years upon years of both economic and personal graft. This is why your twenties isn’t “your time to have fun because you’re young” but it’s your time to “build your life and become the man that you want to be”, if you’re not going to do it now when you’re at your most malleable and most energetic, when the fuck are you going to do it? In your 30’s? Your 40’s? Forever a teenager condemned to playing Xbox and masturbating to porn streams? You can do that, plenty do and what they get to enjoy is a limited existence, you’ll never get powerful being that guy although you may find joy in the acceptance of your comfortable monotony, your rut.

To sum up, it goes without saying: Use your 20’s to become the man you want to be, to acquire power of all and any kind, in your 30’s enjoy the power you’ve accrued and enjoy being the man you’ve built, supplementing and maintaining what you have built so that you can enjoy it way into your 40’s. The quest for power is never truly over, but a 20’s man has a long way to go before he becomes powerful enough to be in the top 5% (aim high fuckers!)

Your elders, especially the accomplished ones, may fear you out of self-preservation but play your cards right and they will mentor you with experience and resources, seeing a younger version of them, within you. Godspeed my brothers!
Never be dependent on a woman, not for her love nor for self-indulgent emotional catharsis because women don’t love us in the way we love them, they love differently and thus expecting from her what she expects from you will doom you to failure. Women fundamentally fail at reciprocating love to the extent we’ve been taught to or at least tend to typically expect of them. As soon as any of your weaknesses are made abundantly clear she will begin to feel disenchanted and this will cause her to start a process of weighing up her options so that when/if the opportunity presents itself to branch swing (trade you in for a more fitting man), she will indeed do so with great haste. If you’re a loser and she’s not left it’s because she has no better options or at least believes she doesn’t (eg: low self-worth) so she “tolerates you” you’re the fill-in; but as soon as she can find a replacement you are history (randomly and seemingly sociopathically dead to her.)

Her abandonment of your relationship will be backward rationalised, if she really felt for you she will even delude/convince herself to believe in her own faulty incoherent rationalisation (an inaccurate but convenient lie) in order to portray herself most favourably to her own conscience but most importantly to all of your shared peers as to maintain a healthy reputation which proves conducive to her survival. Women are great at saving face and even better, believing earnestly in their own bullshit.

I won’t preach this too much as it’s the topic of a future blog post of mine, however, this is why women almost always play the victim card. In the game of social dominance one does not regard that which they consider as weak to be threatening, which is thus how women can get away with doing the most terrible of things and then shift the punishment for the outcome of said behaviour to a man, most men make the perfect scapegoats because they never see it coming and know not how to defend against such deceptions, their own logic deluding them with notions such as “rationality” and “fairness” and an expectation that these alone will save him from such slanderous libel, whether she behaved badly or her story is untruthful is irrelevant, if she can avoid shame and ultimately the blame (do read up on the concept of feminine hypoagency) for such behaviour by making your peers believe it was YOU who was at fault rather than her, then she avoids any feelings of guilt and thus is completely free to behave and strategise in whatever way she may please no matter how immoral that may be. Women are not bound by honour - it is a male abstraction.

My men, for all their lack of logic and supposed frailty, truly, many of you do wholly underestimate the power of the feminine and the allure of the submissive and thus fail to understand the inherent control and influence that such pleasant devices have upon your manly senses to the most primitive of levels, pleasant they may be but devices they still are.

Men love to play this game of convincing themselves that they’re in control in their relationship with a woman when in fact they are falling slowly into her grip, softly, like an innocuous looking hand slowly tightening around the neck. This doesn’t happen to the “plate
spinners” and “players”, oh no, men engaging in this mating strategy do not become invested enough in a woman for long enough to form a pair bond and let the woman infect their sense of self with her feminine wiles, however those of you in a long-term relationship, you are fighting a continuous battle, a battle you may never win, a battle you must simply fight in order not to lose.

You are maintaining the war and optimally do so that it balances in your favour, however victory is prohibited, for winning the battle means losing “her love”, love is metaphysically a state of consistent conflict, periods of peace followed by periods of war by the day, hour or even week – without conflict, there is no love, without conflict there is boredom, passionless after the initial grace period this is described colloquially as “the spark not being there” in “womanspeak”, perhaps this serves as insight into one of the many reasons why women are so capricious as to create unsubstantiable drama – to give attraction a vehicle to manifest via the tension of conflict. **The beauty is in the game itself, not the outcome of the game.**

**If you don’t enjoy the game, you cannot take the lead in it.**

**She will always put herself before you**, ultimately, as the bottom line. You are not special to her, your strength is, how you make her feel is – but not you – **you are a vessel for fulfilling her desires in the many ways in which she cannot** and oh boy, she has many desires, more than those of a man who by all comparison seems rather basic in need, food on the table, pleasing aesthetics and a blowjob before you fall asleep going a particularly long way. You are not your strength, you utilise your strength, you call upon it, you project it, you wield it – but you are not it - your feelings, your weaknesses, your concerns, your insecurities…. these are all things that you have no luxury to indulge her with. She will indulge you with hers to heal herself emotionally via the process of catharsis and you shall not be repulsed by it, **you will feel it is your duty to fix her emotional issues as will she, this is an unspoken agreement, however the reverse is not true**, you have no such outlet to utilise her in such a way and still maintain attraction and thus by extension, a functional and fulfilling relationship. That’s why there is no such thing as “gender equality”, for such displays of weakness will do nothing but to have her view you with contempt and ultimately, disdain, even hatred.

This is what we mean when we say **women do not love you, but the idea of what or who “you” is.** (read: yourself isn’t enough unless “yourself” is dark triad) They are **incapable of loving you in the way in which you imagine it.** They love themselves primarily, no matter how insecure and unconfident they are, and of course their children, more than they will ever love you, one is a love of vanity and entitlement, the other is of sacrifice, the loyalty and sacrifice men idolise as admirable traits in a woman for a long-term relationship – these are things that when push comes to shove will result in your downfall and have already resulted in the downfall of countless upon countless men. Even if they think they do love you and declare it, it is not in the way in which you love a woman of your affections – **she will not sacrifice her well-being for you, not even out of loyalty** something as a committed man you are willing to do – you desire this reciprocation from her, but it is naive to do so. **Remember, honour is a male abstraction.**

They may say their love is unconditional and ironically, perhaps it is “in the moment”, it’s for this reason it’s safe to assert that womankind seem somewhat completely deluded, being
incredibly un-introspective creatures who lack much clarity of mind and self-awareness, despite their own inability to realise that they take you (man) for granted and “love you” they do so with a cumbersome metric fuck ton of conditions attached to said “love” is such tightly conditional love really worthy of what the word entails in the most absolute sense to men everywhere? This is a question that will perhaps haunt mankind for eons to come. In comparison to the male idea of love she espouses the word in vain, same word, same delivery, different meaning. “Till death do us part?” Such utterances constantly chanted across churches everywhere are done so in complete ignorance for they are based on an unfounded and naive foundation and proclaim extravagances such as “eternal love” without any measurable iota of validity as such.

Women love “the idea” the idea of “what it is to be a man” hence their constant obsession with the no true Scotsman fallacy “a real man does this” “a real man has been to Krypton and had jagerbombs with Superman at least a dozen times” basically - power. The measure of a man is more important than the measure of a woman because essentially, as men, we define the extremities, the limits of the species - the last line of defence and the forefront of innovation as civilizations builders, protectors, maintainers and arbitrators. Women are attracted to power, weakness is not permitted within the powerful - that is the burden to be powerful, the caveat to power - a sense of indentured solace imposed as a side effect of one’s burden, the weight of the power one wields. Embody this idea of superiority and maintain it within your character for a lifetime and that’s the closest you will get to being loved (via admiration, the most profound form of respect) in the way that you desire, the way that a man most earnestly loves a woman or comparatively, how a woman loves her baby.

Men love conditionally too, but men don’t compile laundry lists for what makes the ideal woman, women however write books on what makes a man and how a man should behave, that ugly washed up thing on OKCupid deluded on her own entitlement will have a personal shopping list of requirements that a man must fulfil, her bargaining power is irrelevant - she is crazy enough and deluded enough to desire it and demand it and if you are weak enough you shall yield it whether she is objectively worthy of such, or not. She is worth exactly what she can get for herself, such is the nature of female hypergamy, machiavellianism trumps actual merit although arguably, is a form of merit in and of itself. The longer the list of requirements the woman in question has, the more maintenance which needs to be done in order to maintain a “state of love” with her. Heck, mainstream society calls many women “high maintenance” for a reason, they just don’t go past the materialistic elements when analysing this concept. Digression: this is why western men love third world bitches – less expectation, higher appreciation.

This is a part of how men and women love differently, women are extractors, their imperative is to extract from you (time, money, DNA, emotions, logic, sacrifice) and ultimately they will utilise you for their own gains be it through incentivising methods (sex, submissiveness, kindness, flirtation) or fear (won’t see the kids again, will make a fraudulent rape claim, will take half your assets in divorce, will cause you to form dependency on her and then abandon you etc.)

Those who think relationships are not war are simply naive, I understand why my words will not be popular with the majority, but then I don’t assert that which I do with a
desire to appeal to populism, but merely, truth, in all it’s forms - that’s where the red pill gets its power from - setting you free from your delusions by bitch slapping you with a dosage of truth. Once you get over the initial pain of realisation, you become a stronger and more productive man. No pain, no gain, right? Yes these stupid little idiomatic proverbs do have a lot more wisdom in them than the average listener gleans from such emphatic wordplay. Ultimately, some kick and scream more than others but you don’t become a winner in life by elegantly floating to the top on Aladdin’s carpet even if that’s the image you’re conveying.

They (women) are fucking tyrants (for a man to deal with) due to a relentlessly capricious absence of logic. The less intelligent among womankind don’t even realise how destructive their instability and brash utilitarianism of man is to all but the strongest of men for they run primarily on instinct, an absence of reason or arguably preference for reason leads to nothing but instinct to take hold, often described colloquially as “How I feel.” This is something men have realised for thousands of years, go and read some ancient or even medieval philosophy and look for the proverbs, quotations and papers on the nature of women, it’s something as old as time itself - Aristotle, Friedrich Nietzsche and Arthur Schopenhauer should get you started. You want to take the pill? Are you sure you can handle it? A lot of men today are completely fucking clueless, there are many levels to the rabbit hole and it gets deeper and deeper as you progress. Each time you descend into the pits of reality you’re reminded of all your prior learning, eviscerating all the delicate sensibilities you have acquired in your pursuits of utopic idealisation along the way.

Those of you still near the beginning of your understanding, measuring success by bed-post notches rather than the ability to successfully pair bond, dominate and lead a relationship “oh yay I got 13 numbers and had 2 lays the past month!” don’t even realise the half of it. Pyrrhic victory may taste like victory, but it is not victory. If this is your permanent mating strategy (as in, you will not pass on your lineage) then this is fine – but if you ever want a family, it’s not enough, you need to learn long-term relationship game to raise children.

Men are humanity’s true romantics and thus this is why man must guard his heart like a bank vault, treat his commitment like African blood diamonds, to squander it frivolously is to perform a most terrible disservice upon one’s self. If she breaches the vault, if one finds themselves in love with a woman then don’t let her leave by any means necessary. If she finds a way into your heart, hold her personally accountable for enacting herself upon you as such and draw as much power as you can muster to take charge. At no cost must you allow yourself to lose, the bottom line in all elements of life is VICTORY or FAILURE, relationships are no exception despite the hijacking of your minds clarity which oxytocin induces upon your psyche.

Ultimately do not allow your sense of injustice to turn into hatred for women, for their inability to reciprocate sacrificial love for a man is a limitation imposed by nature, not a choice, some rare women may even try to oppose their nature at great distress to themselves, although that too is futile.

To hate is to self induce torture and misery - things that as someone who competes for
power are devices that you cannot allow to possess you as they will divorce you from your ambitions. Realise the limitations of womankind, accept them and come to terms with the fact that a man is always truly alone, there is nobody “higher up” for you to depend upon, you’re the end of the line, in the absence of a belief in God. This is why we are so sentimental with our memories and the older and more experienced the bastard, the more sentimental he will be, harbouring what is essentially a chamber of moments where he didn’t feel quite so alone, which a part of his fiber no matter how stoic and disciplined his consciousness may be will involuntarily and vicariously draw from for comfort in the darkest of times. These memories enter through the retina and ear canal, spend some short time in the brain and then continue to weigh on the heart slowly in varying measurements of weight until one’s dying breath. Wounds heal but scars are indeed forever. Every man has a burden he must carry, none of you are exempt, not even the psychopathic, as even a psychopath has their own feelings to contend with regardless of whether they care for yours.

In brief moments you have companionship, those who make the best companions are those with a sense of loyalty, credibility and honour, other men, brotherhood.
“To her you’re just a play thing; she’ll make you out to be a king, then she’ll set fire to your throne.” – Anon
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1.) Introduction:

Dark triad women are women who possess zero negative empathy disorders; a "zero negative empathy disorder" is a term coined by autism researcher Simon Baron-Cohen of Cambridge University. It effectively means: “a lack of affective empathy” (the ability to feel what another feels as they feel it, eg: sadness) in combination with a lack of moral concern for the well-being of others. Both must be present to constitute a zero negative empathy disorder, otherwise we end up with a different classification of empathy disorder such as autism.

Zero negative empathy disorders predominantly include narcissists and psychopaths, as well as borderlines to a lesser albeit significant extent. It excludes those on the autistic spectrum
who are empathy-deficient, but typically neither Machiavellian nor morality negative. This article is based upon a woman who was in my estimation a type P (psychopath) or if we are to use a clinician’s term, a woman with **anti-social personality disorder** (ASPD).

You may see overlap in the description of women you have known diagnosed with different psychiatric disorders (bipolar, borderline, **narcissistic personality disorder** etc) in my descriptions of the type P here. However, such empathy deficient psychiatric disorders have marginal differences, mainly their underlying cause and the nature of their manifestation. The nature of their manifestation alluding to whether their behaviour is consistent with a personality running off a single mental schema (ASPD and NPD,) or a binary personality that follows a cyclical pattern of alternating **schemas** (borderline and bipolar).

People who are educated on the differences between various cluster B personality disorders will contend the last paragraph was ignorant if not controversial, but to the perception of the neurotypical person (the majority,) the outward differences manifested by cluster B personality types are superficially marginal. Case in point, going from the feedback I’ve had discussing female psychopathy with my readers, most men are unable to distinguish a psychopathic woman from a borderline. They think they’re one and the same – but they aren’t. In all fairness, the differences are marginal and one would need to get a little too close for comfort to discern such subtleties.

Nevertheless, in spite of the nuances pertaining to cause and manifestation, zero negative empathy disorders are effectively a collection of variations on psychopathy. To define psychopathic behaviour as an ASPD diagnosis rather than a lack of empathy combined with a lack of moral concern is disingenuous. Once you account for cause and manifestation, there is significant behavioural overlap between all zero negative empathy disorders.

Therefore it is prudent for the layman to term this collective group “psychopaths” and deal with them as such, for each behaves as callously and cunning as “a true psychopath” whether they have an ASPD diagnosis or not. A dark triad woman is as such, any woman with cluster B personality psychopathic inclinations, not merely a woman with an ASPD diagnosis (which is for a slew of reasons I don’t want to digress into, quite rare.)

In this article I discuss the female psychopath, or as a friend and I colloquially refer to them, “a Lucifer’s daughter.” The term “Lucifer’s daughter” was chosen to describe the cold contorted nature of the dark triad female; the choice of a religious term being to emphasise the dangerousness of such women.

2.) **Characterisation of the Female Psychopath:**

Psychopathic women are incredibly calculating, like their male counterparts they tend toward immoral action based upon the amorality of unconventional thought. They’re incredibly opportunistic and unsympathetic towards others, whilst competent at inauthentically simulating feelings for purposes of dissimulation. **Their thinking is solipsistic** yet pragmatic, their perception of others can be surmised as: “what does this person do for me, if nothing, what could they do for me and how can I manipulate them into providing that for me?”
Women with a type P empathy disorder are what I consider the crème de la crème, the quintessential epitome of the feminine psychopathic form. A high-functioning high IQ sadist, not the hapless histrionic borderline typically associated with female psychopathy. No, this woman is an apex predator who only casually adorns the clothing of sheep whenever such a thing appears to be the optimal strategy. She is a woman who runs rings around men, giving even male type P’s a magnificent run for their money.

The female psychopathic type I allude to, the type P, has a personality that is shrouded by a thinly concealed and barely contained undying rage. She’s like a little nuclear reactor in makeup and heels, superficially cute yet psychically volatile. Such women have the propensity to accentuate a neonatal appearance in order to convey a disarming innocence, one which belies the antithetical psychopathy characterising “the real them.” The idiom “don’t judge a book by its cover” could not ring any truer than in the observation of a woman’s aesthetics, doubly so for dark triads and even more so the type P.

These are women of incredible psychological prowess who utilise the power of the victim in all its perverse and incredible might to amass a horde of allies who’ll put themselves on the line so that she need not. Like their narcissistic counterparts, for better or worse they excel at creating a cult of personality. Think of Trump, only female, about 25 and as equally mind-violating in her use of “straight forward honesty.” Her honesty being more of the tactical, brutal and shit testing kind, deliberate and aggressive rather than clumsy and inappropriate in its nature; her pertinence but a weapon dressed in the clothing of honesty, something flaunted as virtuous when it is anything but.

To such a woman, there is no sanctity in human life, for an inability to pair bond lends itself to a crisp capacity to dehumanise and objectify effortlessly. She uses people like consumptive items (a can of drink, a pack of gum) and once they carry out the functions imagined for them, they are disposed of. If she finds another (new) use for them, the cycle will repeat. If she cannot, she’s gone. A small frail psychopathic woman need not lift a weight nor a finger, for if her psychopathy is accompanied by physical beauty, she has all the power necessary to command those around her. Type P women are social predators drawn to those in positions of power, their sole aim to co-opt influence.

Much like their male counterparts, female psychopaths possess a psychological plurality in who they decide to associate with. They are attracted to people who fall on the extremes of personality, not the average. For example, type P women are fond of the weak and naive. They love to make others instruments of their will, and the cognitively weak represent easy pickings for an intraspecies predator. Like any predator, whilst a battery of easy pickings is always necessary for hard times, the hunt is its own sport, a guilty pleasure for the bored psychopath. As such, the powerful are not just coveted for their influence, but likewise the challenge that they symbolise. She welcomes conflict, for prey that fights is the height of fun.

Early on such a woman can be quite charming. Once trust is built she changes tack, switching to coercion and calculated aggression. Despite being emotionally violent, she will blame the target for her abusive tirades, validating her cruelty upon the slightest observations of guilt or reticence. She will continue this systematic campaign of mental pressure (consisting mainly of push/pull tactics, veiled threats and wild accusations) until the other yields, her
goal to emotionally exhaust the target into a pliable state. She does not care if she controls a person through fear or love, for both are merely means to the same end. Once a person falls into her web, she becomes very territorial of them. Commands are issued under the threat of gaslighting, should you defy her, she will escalate her assault to keep you complicit.

3.) Female Psychopathic Interpersonal Methodology:

Firstly, she will try to isolate you from your peers and family. She might do this by accusing you of something extremely unsavoury (e.g.: physical abuse) to win the sympathies of your natural allies. Once you are estranged from your emotional support, she will target you with more focus, gaslighting you with repetitive cycles of scorn and forgiveness; this will continue until you’re inculcated into believing her fabricated portrayal of events.

Psychopaths of higher intelligence incorporate elements of truth into their fabrications in order to make them plausible. Once you feel guilty enough to take responsibility for fictional events, she will leverage the responsibility you feel to reassert control. She will reel you back in, except angry that she had to exercise her grip on your reins, she will punish you for your attempt at escape. Psychopathic women are vulnerable to abandonment because they are extremely egotistical. It offends the sensibilities of the psychopath to communicate you have the power to leave them. Inversely, she may have no qualms with abandoning you, but the exit must be on her terms. If it is not, as a product of ego, she will relentlessly obsess in achieving vengeance.

The type P woman is a creature of schadenfreude, for those who don’t understand the term, it’s a loanword from German that directly translates as “harm-joy.” Put more aptly it means “to derive joy from another’s pain.” Type P woman have a knack for finding that someone or something which symbolises your weakness. When they discover it, they will pervert, corrupt and expose it in an attempt to mount an attack against you.

Quintessentially psychopathic women make for fine tacticians. They understand the importance of monopolising the herd, that one must ostracise or be ostracised. Divisive by nature, divide and conquer is in their very nature. In line with their sadistic tendencies, they derive great joy from seeing your allies alienate you, be it immediate or gradual. The severity of the ploy used to ensure your ostracisation depends on the context and aim of the woman in question. It can be as mild as diminishing your popularity to reappropriate people’s favour, or something more akin to all out psychological warfare.

If you are weak, a type P woman will expose the full height of her power, downplaying subtlety and indirectness for a more brutish approach. However if you are powerful, she will puppeteer rather than colonise. In their dealings with the powerful type P women opt for charm rather than coercion, recognising direct conflict is less likely to lead to a desirable outcome. To become favoured they turn themselves into the target’s source of dopamine, overwhelming them with positive feelings in order to form mental dependence. At a glance this may sound harmless, but the intent is insidious nevertheless. The psychopathic women wishes a powerful target to crave her, for it is via that mechanism she can control them.

4.) Psychopathic Women & Sex:

www.TheRedArchive.com
Regardless of her **specific cluster B classification**, sex with a dark triad woman is never recommended. Typically when a man and a woman have sex there is a psychological power exchange that leaves the woman feeling exposed, and the man, stronger. This is not the case with a female type P. Such a woman does not feel “used up” for sexing her target, quite the contrary, she feels empowered, for she has acquired leverage. And should you ignore her leverage, you will prompt her to publicly reveal your liaisons, and when she does so with most elegant spin, spin that society is all too eagerly willing to eat up – “he took advantage of me!” If you’re a man and it’s your word against hers, you will lose.

If she can become a source of sex, you will become increasingly addicted to her. And should you choose to cut her off, she has the ability to **threaten your reputation**. When things turn ugly the sex becomes a weaponised secret, leverage for blackmail that can be used to threaten your job or your family should you not comply with her wishes. Even before she inevitably escalates she has won, because men are malleable when they are getting “crazy girl sex.” And should this man come to his senses and wish to escape her influence? She wins yet again because she has the leverage to blackmail. Such a man finds himself stuck between a rock and a hard place, for bribery does nought but win a promise of retreat, it does not negate her leverage. Nothing stops her taking a bribe for her silence, only for her to instigate further attempts at blackmail later on.

Psychopathic women covet secrets because they understand profoundly that the holder of secrets holds the keys to power. And so should such a woman be unable to uncover any secrets, she will create one to get the leverage she seeks. And what better way to do this than through “forbidden sex,” to fuck her target? The type P woman seeks leverage by any means necessary. Knowing that the powerful will be incredibly resistant to a more direct approach, she adopts an insidious albeit innocuous one.

Despite the predatory nature of type P women, the malevolence of their nature is normally rationalised by self-identifying as a victim. The whole filter for their reality is seen through that of an unaccountable victim’s, and it is within this mental construct they self-justify carte blanche ruthlessness. The objective predator uses the psychology of prey to justify its predation, a marvellous feat of self-deception. And thus so it is apparent – the truly best deceivers begin with themselves.

5.) **In Closing:**

Type P women have no concept of loyalty, their loyalty is only for their self-interest. They are the centre of their world; everyone else is just an observation, a pawn, a by-product, a target, an obstruction and so forth. Due to empathy deficiency and an incapacity to pair bond, they epitomise the distrust they hold for others. Their power but a combination of their attraction and **machiavellian prowess**. This is how they attain gratification and stimulation in a world they feel perpetually disconnected from and underwhelmed by.

Perversely, the closest thing to bonding a dark triad woman experiences is when she tortures a target with her more aggressive side. The relationship between abuser and abusee is the closest thing to love a type P woman is capable of; somewhat ironically this is how they “love”, call it reverse Stockholm syndrome if you will.
Like other dark triad women, the type P thrives in chaos, she holds nothing but contempt for peace, for with peace there is no emotional energy to harness and self-stimulate. Think of dark triad women as human poltergeists, they need conflict in order to feed their compulsion to dominate their surroundings. Where a chaos deprived atmosphere pervades for too long, they will go out of their way to create drama as a way of reasserting dominance.

Psychopathic women are not well-suited to any but the most empathy deficient and thrill-seeking of men. Even her relationship with a dark triad man is nought but a union of two sadistic thrill seekers engaged in a perpetual wrestle for power. If you are not high enough on the psychopathy spectrum to derive enjoyment from the conflict of a psychopathic woman’s unending histrionics, you’d do well to steer clear. Believe me when I say the mere words here do no justice in expressing the true severity of what they describe. If you meet one of these women and aren’t dark triad yourself, run and don’t turn back.

6.) Relevant Reading:

Wisdom of the Psychopaths is written by Professor Kevin Dutton of Oxford, he talks about the positives of psychopathy and how they are crucial to certain job roles (soldiers, surgeons, finance etc.) When you want to know how psychopathy manifests and effects different industries, this is what you want to read.

Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in the USA
Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in the UK
Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in Canada

Professor Simon Baron-Cohen discusses various kinds of empathy deficiency, including psychopathy, borderline personality and narcissism. He also goes into detail about the neuroanatomy of the brain’s empathy circuit. When you want to understand the complexity of empathy disorders, this is the book you’re looking for.

Buy “Zero Degrees of Empathy” in the USA
Buy “Zero Degrees of Empathy” in the UK
Buy “Zero Degrees of Empathy” in the Canada
Firstly I’d like to thank /u/Archwinger for his topic on Reddit here and /u/Human_v2’s follow up post here which serve as the basis of inspiration for this post. We hear a lot of talk about the friend zone and a lot of women bleating indignantly in response about how “what she does with her body is up to her” and all that other irrational defensive hyperbolic nonsense which does not even address why the existence of the friend zone is even an issue of contention to begin with. Then there are the worthless assertions thrown around such as “real men accept what a woman is comfortable with in a quote unquote friendship” or some other bullshit true Scotsman statement based in fallacy from someone who has no clue neither authority to possibly know or dictate exactly what it constitutes to be a man. This article and it’s follow ups aim to hopefully get down to the “nitty-gritty” of things and really iron out just what the fuck is actually going on with the friend zone.

Briefly for your understanding this article will discuss: why does the friend zone exist? (to serve the needs of one party, typically the females, without fulfilling the needs of the other party) what’s the problem with the friend zone? (it’s an issue of value transaction, the friend zone is an inequitable exchange of value which only fulfills one of the party’s desires, typically the feminine imperative) and finally how the friend zone that is often viewed as an obstacle on the path to attaining sex from a woman can retroactively be implemented after the fact [sex has been had] in the form of no future sexual favours being on the table once emotional commitment has been unilaterally secured, typically although not exclusively resulting as a product of marriage. Future articles in this series will look at identifying the different types of friend zone and how to make an escape should you find yourself already trapped by the grip of some feminine iron will.

This article is aimed mainly at guys who for lack of better language have not got a fucking clue about women and find themselves a slave to the whims of any attractive female in their lives who throws them some attention, be she the hot girl at work or even your own wife, these guys are the same guys who generate the problem which is the female ego quantum singularity by not being on top of their shit, putting the pussy on a pedestal and letting women take them for a ride. There are many pretty girls in the world, abundance mentality is a cornerstone in avoiding the friend zone, however it is also paramount in having respect for one’s self and maintaining a healthy sex life (as the late and great Patrice O’Neal would say it: “showing a bitch you’ve got options“) this still applies once you have reached the mating stage that is a relationship or dare I say it, marriage – you can never stop gaming.

As a man you have to realise what your leverage is and how to apply it to get what you want out of a woman (which if you are completely honest with yourself and your desires includes a pronounced and fierce monopoly of her body as a sexual resource), essentially by not realising what your capital is within the context of a relationship with a woman you have nothing to barter that has value to her of which she doesn’t already receive from you, suffice to say that if you’re in the friend zone then you’re essentially giving away what she values for free without even realising it (or you wouldn’t even be “a friend” to begin with.)
Friend zone friendships are strictly one-sided as they allow her to derive more benefit from the arrangement than you do. By not making a woman work for what she wants [from you] she will never grow to appreciate what it is you bring to the table, in fact she will come to expect it and she will even go so far as to punish you for any perceived slight or insubordination should she have grown accustomed to your emotional commitment. If you were to suddenly out of frustration at being a friend zoned chump get annoyed with the situation and pull the plug (because you’ve finally woken the fuck up) by ceasing to provide her with the emotional nourishment she was deriving from you and may perhaps have become dependent on from you then her wish to reprimand you for pulling away will be pronounced most indignantly. In such a situation, one wants to slowly fade out of her life rather than having an over the top and dramatic altercation where she will attempt to re-ensnare you, however that line of discourse is content which is par for the course in a follow-up article.

Beige Phillip Rule #3 – repeated favours become obligations. Your emotional commitment [to a woman] is worth its weight in gold in terms of how much value and desire a woman places upon it, a woman desires a man’s emotional loyalty (and essentially her monopoly of that) above all else, whilst as a man, your desires firmly place sexual loyalty (and your monopoly of her body above all else) this is the exchange of value taking place in a successful “romantic” transaction, your emotional commitment and resources for the use of her body. This is why men are always asking “why is she so clingy, why does she nag so much, why does she become so dramatic and overbearing at times?” whilst women are asking “why is it that all men think about is sex, why can’t they look past that and see women [as people] and not mere sex objects?”

The difference in male to female perspective is simple, women don’t need to use men for their bodies to fulfill their gender imperative and thus it is not their psychological inclination to do so, they are wired to use men for their resources and commitment and a one-sided friendship where a woman has a man in the draconian friend zone fulfills her imperative whilst simultaneously the male imperative to pass on his DNA and satiate his raging testosterone fulfilled libido is not fulfilled by said arrangement, it is a biased arrangement which fulfills the needs of the woman to some or all ends (depending on the severity of the arrangement) whilst not being mutually beneficial for the man in any similarly equitable capacity.

In blue pill (every day) society men are made to feel bad for their sexuality, they are scorned for not wanting to be used by a woman in the manner which the friend zone in place sets out and often shamed into compliance, they’re scorned for their sexuality and lustful desire when in reality as a point of justice the ones who should be scorned are the women. The same women who ruthlessly use men so callously and pragmatically as “surrogate providers” for their desires and lifestyle choices whilst not providing any return on the services he provides, or doing so begrudgingly or sparingly merely as a manipulative effort to keep him content enough to stick around. Cue the notorious “duty sex” or “pity sex” women throw beta men, the sexual scraps that essentially only the best of the best beta providers can acquire after having provided an inordinate amount of value. Yet again this results in a biased and unfair transaction between man and women even though sex does take place rather than the typical mono directional level of emotional and material needs being fulfilled on behalf of the
man whilst comparatively the woman provides no fulfillment of needs in return for such provision, the predominant masculine need being the monopoly of her sexual favour.

Women are aware of why men do things for them, they play dumb but on a machiavellian level they are quite smart, they have high machiavellian intelligence. They play stupid for the sake of appearances so that they can squirm and escape accountability by keeping their hands clean via the employment of plausible deniability, but ultimately a woman with many beta orbiters despite any well-placed display of ignorance she feigns knows full well what she is doing and why she is doing it, the reality of the matter is she just doesn’t care about the needs of the man so long as one or a number of her needs are being met by that man and so as long as he “fulfills his purpose in her life.” She is entirely happy to carry on exploiting his sexual desire of her whilst not reciprocating or giving in to these demands, only implicating the promise of sex to keep him around should he look likes he’s about to leave and throwing him duty sex should she really value his contributions to her life, in fact there was a documentary made in the UK of such women who engage in this behaviour albeit in a more ostentatious and predatory manner, you can see the sole episode aptly titled “Sex, Lies and Rinsing Guys” by clicking here.

Using a mans sexual proclivity for a woman and turning him into a provider for said woman without said woman giving said man any sexual access is exploitative of the mans nature and completely immoral on the behalf of the woman yet this happens all the time and society is perfectly happy to ignore, reinforce and even encourage said behaviour. Men and women are ultimately never equal in part due to the differences in our sexual imperatives let us not forget and the difference in agenda and how it is pursued by each gender is merely one significant indication of these sexually dimorphic differences in mating psychology.

The friend zone however is not just a hurdle on the path to getting sex from a woman which magically disappears once sex has been attained, a woman can friend zone you even after having had sex with you and a more cunning woman may use sex as a way to secure your commitment before withdrawing it later on and simultaneously seeing if they can extract emotional commitment and resources from you without having to keep up their end of the bargain. If you let her imperative win here within the context of a relationship or even marriage, you’re allowing her to power drill nails into the coffin of your romantic arrangement as once you allow such behaviour to become commonplace she has you pegged for a chump. Allowing her to derive benefit from you without requiring sex from her causes her to lose attraction to you as there’s no value exchange, the ability for her to benefit from you without being required to service your needs causes her to lose respect, the dying attraction is often communicated in feminine candy-floss ethereal mumbo jumbo bullshit-speak as: “the spark’s just not there anymore“ and thus she’ll reconnoiter off to start the cycle all over again with another man, shit testing him to see how easily he’ll give up his commitment to her and then offering her sex to him when he maintains attraction without freely and disposably giving away said commitment to her.

As a man, emotional investment in a woman should only be given to her as positive reinforcement for behaviour that is conducive to your desires and/or the betterment of the relationship, suffice to say that if she’s fucking you and engaging in desirable feminine behaviours then keep giving her love and emotional nourishment, however if she’s going to
callously cut off sex and withhold it in an attempt to test the boundaries of the relationship and get you to do what she wants you in turn need the ability to callously cut off your commitment to her or otherwise you set a precedent that every time she withdraws sex you fold all your cards without her losing anything she values, despite her atrocious behaviour. This is the only leverage you have (also known as **dread game**) and is ultimately why marriage can turn into the Guantanamo bay of friend zones.

Now onto the idea of marriage being a glorified friend zone, beta males in sexless marriages are in effect existing in a form of legally sanctioned friend zone, a husband who isn’t getting any from his wife has been essentially “soft nexted” friend zoned for his utility but no longer deemed sexually attractive and thus not respected by his wife, furthermore she’s probably fucking another guy behind his back unless her birth control has turned her into something of an asexual automaton (which is not as rare as you’d perhaps think.) A woman who respects her man, fucks her man – if she’s withholding sex for any reason other than the most extreme of medical reasons then her withholdment of sex is considered a transgression which violates the nature of your manly desires and thus can be considered an unspoken disrespect of your position within the relationship.

Quintessentially in essence although in something of a more extreme and heightened state a sexless marriage engages in the same social dynamics as an 18-year-old beta orbiter who picks up the girl of his affections in his car and then drives her around acting on her whims as a glorified taxi, buying her gifts to demonstrate his affection because in all its beautiful blue pill bullshit “she’s just such a good friend.” These behaviours are typically engaged in as some completely vain attempt to try to impress his way into her pants, by giving her everything she wants up-front without asking for anything in return.

The difference as a married man and not an 18-year-old beta orbiter are that you’re actually legally obliged to ensure her feminine imperative is fulfilled, and fuck, perhaps there are even a few children thrown into the chaos for good measure which effectively ensures you remain firmly placed in the friend zone. This dynamic does nothing but culminate in the successful attainment of the female imperative, her [your wife] receiving the ultimate commitment her biology desires from a man [you] backed up in all it’s strength by the full force and recognition of law. Should you so choose to violate this legally mandated commitment you will be taken for everything you’ve got whilst quite perversely remaining in the marriage leads to an incredible sense of frustrated entrapment, leaving you with little a desirable exit strategy to remedy your quandary.

Allowing her to ruthlessly trap you by enforcing an unhappy sexless marriage is tantamount and equivalent in value exchange to that of the friend zone where the man in question is “just a friend” providing benefits to the arrangement whilst not receiving any [from her] himself.

If she cuckolds you, what can you do as a married man? Nothing. Whatever you do results in immense loss for yourself, you cannot come out unscathed, it is the ultimate form of modern-day socially accepted slavery which allows women to systematically and legally pillage a man for everything he has without remorse and not be punished for such behaviour either socially or legally. Marriage is no longer a religious institution that holds people accountable for their
behaviours as marriage oaths have become nothing but ceremonial pleasantries rather than promises which are hold both parties accountable, oaths being so easily and nonchalantly broken as they are, marriage has been hijacked by the feminist agenda and perverted into an engine of exploitation by women of men which has ultimately resulted in what is known as today’s growing marriage strike across the anglosphere.
“No sensible man ever engages, unprepared, in a fencing match of words with a woman.” – Wilkie Collins

The fundamental difference in what women say they want, and what they actually want is a product of the notion that women tend to exercise rationalisation, not reason in and of itself. Most women have extremely weak reasoning, you’ll notice in arguments with them that they will try to attack the credibility of your logic to try to make themselves look better, this is the classic “I can’t beat the competition so I’ll try to make the competition less effective” strategy that women employ on a grand scale with ideas like fat acceptance, but applied on a micro-scale in their interactions on a one-to-one basis.

Questioning a man’s logic and credibility is a way a woman essentially “brings a man down to her level of absurdity.” There comes a line of questioning so invasive, so interrogative and so unreasonable, that a man, feeling like he is on the defence, will yield his logic to his sense of frustration, and then the woman who deliberately and calculatingly imposed this form of mental tyranny in her sense of outrage will then use this frustration as a weapon against the man to further reduce his credibility by pointing out quite proudly that he is in fact no more logical than she!

Women will hold you to your logic as it forces you to take responsibility for things they do not wish to, but they are bound by no such logic themselves because they have no prevailing internal dialogue that is actually based on logic, at best they tend to have segmented ideas based on emotional thought layered with rationalisation that works to present a veneer of intellectual credibility, which is later necessary for the purpose of saving face. What women are doing here is exploiting the nature of logic and the sense of duty to the truth which is
inherent within it, they make you feel bad by making you feel like you violate your own sense of duty to the truth whilst simultaneously feeling no such duty themselves. This gives them an edge in verbal combat as once you are emotionally compromised within your own frame of reference, questioning your own sense of logic due to your emotionally provoked slip-up, they can then exploit this momentary weakness to dominate the agenda.

They do whatever they do and then worry about making themselves look good later on, unemotional reason does not permeate the thought process beforehand. Satiating the “need” caused by the desires of their current emotional state is of the utmost importance to them; essentially they care more about feeding their emotional state more than they care about the tenets of objective logic. Emotional preference beats rational preference for them almost every time, as much as they hate the fact this makes them seem less credible than men, and thus to some extent inferior, this is practically a universal truth that not even government imposed “equality” has managed to rectify, women are not held any more accountable for their actions now than they were pre-feminism, you only need to look at sentences handed out by the judiciary for confirmation of this.

When you’re inherently unreasonable you are prone to making mistakes, making mistakes makes you look bad – looking bad is bad for your status. This is why women are good at saving face and maintaining a reputation whilst simultaneously practicing poor reasoning ability. This is where manipulation comes into play; you’ll find that, women are very good at spinning things, far more so than your average man is. They’ll talk to you, they’ll hold you to your words and get you on the defence, constantly questioning you, but they’ll ignore any criticisms directed at them as if to say with the unspoken word that your concerns or notice of their irrationalism is unworthy of validation. Then they use your own words against you, using underhanded and subtle spin, to make you look like an idiot. The more you put into an argument with a woman the more likely you are to lose with her because she will act most deviously in sabotaging your reputation whilst she layers hers.

To a woman, an argument is not usually an exchange of information between one person and another where despite opposition, ideas can be exchanged and information learnt. To a woman, an argument is a battleground for pushing an agenda, and reputation maintenance always comprises part of that agenda, there’s nothing more and nothing less to the nature of their argumentation. This is why typically, they cannot be held as accountable and thus even remotely equal to men due to an absence of credibility, they demonstrate repeatedly that their mental faculty is averse to claiming responsibility via honest, transparent discourse. Even when they are in positions of power which require by nature of the job description that they be held completely and utterly accountable, they still demonstrate reluctance to give up plausible deniability and be forced into a position, analyse any female bosses in the workplace you’ve had to draw a personal inference if you need so.

This desire for plausible deniability is what creates their blame-shifting nature and makes them, happily to themselves, not only unaccountable, but to their simultaneous dismay, incredible (not credible as a group of people.) Women will always move the fixation of the analytical microscope from themselves onto the opponent in their defiant acts of emotion-fuelled verbal sparring. This is how they defend themselves. They are wholly incapable of standing up to scrutiny on a logical level (due to the lack of faculty previously explained) and
this is thus why they do everything in their power to remain out of the spotlight, shaming and scapegoating others in place of being a target of scrutiny themselves. As long as “it’s not my fault” and “I don’t look bad” she doesn’t care.

Despite the common woman’s indignation at being deemed illogical or, at least in terms of mental faculty, far less capable of logical reasoning than man himself, women in all their self-honesty beyond their hubris and ego maintenance do in fact realise that men are the more logical party. How is this you ask? Something I have observed in my arguments with women over time is a tendency for them to say that “you claim women are illogical, but you’ve just been illogical yourself!” again as mentioned earlier, this is a device used to try to bring you down whilst they bring themselves up, it’s the credibility game of “making you seem less credible by destroying the appearance of your advantage (your logic) to onlookers” however, the irony here is that such statements are often made after the woman in question has been incredibly irrational herself.

However, if you as a man are to make one wrong step, to make one statement that isn’t totally sound in logic, you are immediately held at gunpoint and this one faux-pas in comparison to her long list of logical mistakes is held up as an example of just how illogical you as a man are. How is this women admitting that they believe men to be more logical than themselves I hear you ask? Well as usual, they’re communicating it via the subtext, not with words. They’re holding men to a standard where even one sentence or idea uttered illogically is immediately picked up on and condemned, thus they have the ability to identify irrationalism, yet ironically they perpetuate their own irrationalism as gospel. They’re holding themselves to a lower standard of logical accountability than they do the male party. Gotcha there, ladies.

A man is condemned for being illogical and immediately compared to a woman for being so, yet the same woman who draws this comparison is the same woman who will try to condemn you to save face using all the most argumentatively illogical Machiavellian tactics in the book. **Women KNOW they are illogical**, they know they are not fair to you in discourse, they push all your buttons and drive you crazy with their irrationalism, and quite simply, they don’t care as long as it fulfils their agenda. They are undeniably selfish and hold commitment to their personal needs higher among their list of personal priorities than the diction of intellectualism. The only thing they care about is feeling like they’re right and getting their ego stroked, not actually discovering that little known thing we value called “the truth.” Solipsism does not need truth, equally accountable standards of logic applied to both genders however **does** need truth as the truth is objective. The truth has the potency to be harmful to solipsism and the female sense of well-being, and therefore, typically, the truth is an adversary of the female, only an ally when she needs it to make someone else appear weak.

What they’re doing despite their lack of intellectual integrity is making themselves look more credible than the straight-talking logical party, which is typically the man, so that when it comes to saving face they win the game of “appearing more sophisticated.” As sophistication carries a grace of validity and credibility to it, this is what they are mostly concerned with in the perpetuation of their thoughts. Women care about winning arguments, not about being right per se. To a woman, being right is using whatever underhanded tactic is required to get her own way and come out of the conflict favourably, being right is not obeying the laws of
logical objectivism but spinning other people’s logic to make her look better than them whilst offering up some weak arguments herself just to get the ball rolling.

There are a few ways that they can put spin on the argumentation at hand, one of them is to shame you. By shaming you they can make you react emotionally, once you react emotionally you have lost – they will then make a theatrical example out of your show of emotion and use it to condemn you. Another way they put spin on things, one they favour greatly, is to play the victim. All of a sudden all the verbosity of being equal turns into “I’m just a girl and you’re being mean!”, water tears get worked and everyone looks at you like you’re the asshole. The fucked up thing is you will probably even feel like an asshole too, even though you’re in the right. Voila, she gets her own way and that’s all she wanted to begin with. There is no low too low for womankind to steep to if it means she gets her own way and secures her interests.

Women are very egotistical, because ego, like everything, is composed of emotions, and emotions are that much more de facto dominant in women than they are in men. Next time you argue with a woman, remember the agenda at hand is to appear the most credible and maintain a superior reputation in juxtaposition to your own. If she tries to bait you into reacting emotionally (and she will, she is dependent on your anger to have a chance at beating you to a pulp with your own words) do not take her seriously and just laugh off her words, because really, they are nothing more than baseless Machiavellian nonsense that will drive you to insanity should you take such words seriously and attempt to engage them at face value.

I’ll end this post on a high, and allow Bill Burr to reiterate what I’ve said in a more comical format:
The average woman has typically little to offer of value to a man other than her body, some women are even self-aware enough to realise this and so they monopolise the fact by narcissistically spending all their time trying to look good, accentuating the only real asset that they have in order to gain power by becoming dominant in the realm of superficiality.

However in words uttered by the mouth, very few women will actually admit they are nothing other than a glorified excuse of a series of fuck holes, because such “dehumanisation” harms their ego, damaging the core of who they are, the outward persona that they’ve built up around themselves and the very narcissism they look to reinforce to feed this persona via external social validation; now cue a tirade of dopamine hits from filtered Instagram selfies, Facebook likes and her inability to put down a smart phone combined with a rigorous routine of careful makeup application and carefully selected clothing choices.

Patrice O’Neal demonstrated it best when he asked an entire crowd of women what they would do to keep their man if he was thinking of leaving them and they didn’t have a vagina, most of them said they would blow him or let him stick it in their ass. This was a covert test to see if women would objectify themselves or not, learning to cook better or engaging in hobbies and activities close to their man’s heart were non-sexual options, among others which were not the typical go to response of his audience. This example aside, women seem to objectify themselves, but don’t have the clarity of mind neither the narcissistic inclination to admit as such, certainly, cognitive dissonance is at play. They use their sexuality to get what they want via a process of strategic self-objectification whilst simultaneously possessing sentience and thus, agency. Patrice had to deceive the women in his audience with a little game in order to get the truth out of them and yes, surely, a comedy gig is not the best place to have a rational discussion about such things, but nevertheless, the measure of validity which can be taken from such an anecdote is quite eye-opening.

Having any negative opinion about woman no matter how well justified or well-reasoned it may be is automatically misogynistic in the eyes of women. You not only harm their egos by being critical of their group collective as they are of men, but their proclivity to be reactionary married to an addiction to emotional input means they become lost in the indignation and the wrath that follows from it, rather than attempt to critically deduce truths from the logic which you posit. In short, they do not respect logic and truth in the way that men do, they do not prioritise these things above everything else, no, they respect feelings above all else, and it is feelings which are of the utmost priority to womankind. Making women feel bad due to criticism is in and of itself a misogynous act as a far as a woman is concerned, because she does not like the negatively charged aspect of the turbulence you bring to her emotional whirlwind. Like Patrice would, if you use humour, you can get women to speak the truth, the delivery matters far more than the content when interacting with a woman, less straight-talk, more powertalk.

When looking around at the quality of modern-day women, the majority would be considered
by men to be utterly disappointing long-term material, their traits, their composure and their very nature are all entirely questionable if not downright undesirable. Society downplays, justifies and otherwise ignores the weaknesses of women with cultural ignorance that mislabels objective criticism as misogyny, whilst it simultaneously and quite ironically misrepresents women in a positive light by projecting all these unsubstantiated idealistic qualities onto them, claiming that such qualities are fundamentally innate merits of the universal female identity.

In all its unfounded perversity, this baseless bullshit is a type of religion, everyone believes blindly in “the goodness of women” because they have been raised to do so, contrary to the behaviour that women around them are actually engaging in on a daily basis. Even when said behaviour is found to be bad, it is always disregarded due to some baseless belief in female sanctity, which in reality is nothing more than an ideal, a projection, not an universal truth. It is this unfairly unrealistic deception, this hallucinogenic depiction of womankind that is presented to women, which leads men who begin to learn what women are like in nature to feel disillusioned and disenchanted, they feel this way because what they were taught to believe about women from a young age is far removed from who they really are. Whilst women are flattered by the bullshit pandering that they are sugar and spice and everything nice – men are crushed by the fact that they are indeed, not so.

In comparison to all the hopes and dreams men have been fed to expect from women, it’s this perverse Disney funded fantasy that makes men everywhere feel duped, let-down and even misanthropic when they find themselves ill-equipped to cope with the let-down which is the modern-day woman.

Those living in today’s Anglosphere and western European civilizations should typically expect very little of women, so few are worthy of anything more than a rumble in the hay simply because they haven’t been raised right, cue the malignancy of the single mother epidemic and the erosion of conducive moral, religious and family values <here>. Even good company and banter with such women tends to be a rarity as quite a many of them lack the ability to be mentally stimulating on a conversational level. Occasionally you may find yourself pleasantly surprised and in such a circumstance run the risk of falling very hard for the woman in question, as in comparison to her brethren she will shine out like a lighthouse in a sea of drudgery with imposing prominence, however no matter her beneficial difference, she is a woman like any other. She has the same psychological and most importantly, emotional needs and as such will run all the usual shit tests, making the same type of demands that the legions of broken women will, the question you will find yourself asking though is, is this one worth it?

For those who decide yes, such a woman is worth it, and are in the right phase of their life to do so, you have a project on your hands, one that will require much mental investment. If you want yourself a desirable woman you will have to cultivate femininity and desirability into her yourself if you deem she has the necessary raw material to become a desirable lady worthy of raising a family with, wife material. Such is the inherent focus of the red pill woman project.

Red pill women are women on a quest to be “wife/mother material” to the perception of a
man, they are works in progress, the counterpart to the red pill philosophy. Essentially, they are guided by a social network of traditionally minded matriarchs and if in a serious relationship, the desires and authority of the man she has pledged her allegiance to. For those of us who have neither the time nor the inclination to practice the patience required to effectively create our own red pill woman, indulging in the idea of red pill women is not an option for us. Women of all kinds require vast reservoirs of patience and love as it is the basis of their erratic emotionalism which leads them to be ever demanding.

Heed me when I say that all red pill women are trained by men, they are not magically born out of the womb, a “unicorn” is merely a high quality red pill woman raised, cultivated and overseen by men of value, integrity and intelligence. Whether that man is her father or later on, a serious boyfriend, she is trained and maintained by men to be a quality woman. To an extent she is trained by her mother also, who respects the strength of an authoritarian man and imparts the ideas of the father onto her daughter by proxy, but a mother who was unable to secure a strong man, in her bitterness and ineptitude, will typically not pass on conducive moral and sexual values that will lead to romantic success for her daughter. After all, she cannot do for her daughter what she was unable to obtain for herself.

Often a woman who is of quality from a young age, non-promiscuous, good-natured, talented, intelligent, humorous, not hateful of men and **emotionally stable** is a woman who has had a good relationship with her father. Her father having been what for lack of a better term is considered an alpha male, instilling positive traits into her psyche with a firm, loving hand, raising her to respect men and accommodate them in the social contract; rather than hold them in contempt and challenge them as adversaries like mainstream society would indoctrinate.

It is the job of the man who commits to such a woman romantically to then maintain the legacy that her father left, **good girls will turn bad in the absence of a strong male figure**, for it is woman’s emotional transient nature which causes them to stray from the path of romantic success. It is woman’s emotional nature whether she consciously desires it or not that necessitates her need for strong trustworthy leadership, so that she may absolve herself of responsibility in her inevitable moments of weakness, she wants someone to lean on but fears that the dissolution of that responsibility will be abused, a connection of trust to a powerful man is what women crave.

In essence, this is why women tend to look for “men who were like their fathers” they seek dominance in which they can trust, and it is this dominance which allows them to remain emotionally stable, offloading their neuroticism onto the stoicism of the man that they pair with. Good women are not only made by men, but must also be maintained by men. In the absence of such leadership, women take on detrimental qualities in the name of “freedom”, being poor leaders themselves (due to the erraticism of emotionalism) and in the absence of authority (typically a strong patriarch and an equally traditional matriarch) they become feral and pursue self-destruction, always chasing the nearest perceivable “emotional high”, rather than planning ahead for the days where the temporary adrenaline-filled joyful experience that short-term liaisons provide are no longer available to them as their sexual appeal evaporates with age, leaving them without legacy and family with a firm foot in spinsterhood.
Essentially, all women have daddy issues (no I’m not going to qualify that as “most” or “some” but forthrightly tell you ALL), if he was a good father she wants a serious relationship with a man who was like her father, strong, compassionate, worldly, a badass, but with a soft spot unique to her, women love to feel special, in fact, they crave it. If she had a good father, as a man looking to date such a woman (a woman with a good father) your life has already been made infinitely easier by his diligence, he has already raised an appealing woman and then left the foundations in place to cultivate this valuable raw material into a long-term partner, a mother and a wife. However, the onus is on you to be strong enough to maintain the status quo, such a woman will not respect weakness and thus will not follow the lead of a man who is too inept to take charge, such a woman will hold you to the standard set by her father and as such will compare you both in starkness.

If her father was absent or otherwise a let-down, she wants her boyfriend to be everything he wasn’t, her mind has filled in the blanks with what he should have been, some of that of course will be complete fantastical bullshit. What she will want in this scenario is for a man to essentially fill the emotional void the lack of a father figure left her with, whilst perversely in simultaneity she will find it hard to trust men due to her sense of abandonment. Maintaining a healthy, loving and conducive relationship with such a woman will be exceptionally difficult. She will effectively be both her own as well as your own worst enemy, actively sabotaging everything you’re trying to build with all the irrationality of her delinquency manifesting itself in the present day as morbid insecurity.

This is why women with poor relationships with their fathers are a massive red flag. When eying up a woman for a prospective long-term romantic engagement, find out what her relationship with her father is like, the absence of a father or a negative relationship with her father are massive red flags as she is already set-up to be a poor romantic prospect, mainly due to how she was (or wasn’t) raised. Single mothers quite simply are inept to raise quality children singlehandedly. The presence of a weak father is better than nothing, but typically you want her to have had a father who was a patriarch, a dominant man who taught her discipline so that her base schematic of “what men should be like” is healthy and isn’t formed from unhealthy feminist stereotypes and the ramblings of a bitter and romantically unsuccessful single mother. Still, even the presence of a patriarch in a young girl’s life isn’t always enough to ensure a quality woman; as the prevailing socially engineered cultural forces around her proactively do their utmost to undermine the will and intent that her father’s best interests have for her.

Red pill women are not “unicorns”, they are women capable of curbing their instincts whilst using logic to be more desirable in an effort to secure provisioning in their old age, effectively they’re investing in the long-game and have been made self-aware enough to realise that being a slut getting by on her sexuality and youth is not a gravy train that is going to last forever. They are women who will compromise and work with a man who is equally strong enough and patient enough to deal with them. Everything is a compromise with women, whether she’s a cunt, has BPD, is unintelligent or is as high-caliber and well cultivated as an emotionally stable and feminine red pill woman, the inherent difference between masculine and feminine nature leads to a process of unending compromise.

No matter the woman, she will test your patience; this is just women full-stop. Not got a lot of
patience? Women are going to just piss you the hell off then. It does help however when a woman can offset this inherently annoying trait of trying a man’s patience by bringing more than merely a vagina to the table. As a man you should be informed that an inherently irrational being is going to do nothing but antagonise the patience of someone who thinks in logic rather than the cognitive cartwheels of reactive transient emotionalism.

The biggest flattery of all to women, which only an intelligent woman will realise, is that despite the sheer frustration and pain she causes him with her volatile emotivity, is that such a man still chooses to stick with her and provide for her despite her shortcomings. A female’s self-awareness of his sacrifice and a declaration of appreciation for that sacrifice goes a long way to help reconcile the huge fundamental differences in expectation that men and women have of each other, women being far more audaciously demanding and stringently needy by nature of their disposition than men are.

I’ll end this article on the following closing thought: it is somewhat insane how the appreciation of an intrinsically irrational woman within the paradigm of a relationship is valued so intimately by the romantic disposition of what is otherwise a rational man. It is often true after all that we value that which is hardest to obtain, and a woman’s appreciation is scarcely given in earnest.
"If you can imagine yourself being happy in spite of rejection, then “the power of no” becomes moot and you achieve outcome independence.”

Due to the formation of the system we live in and how it’s set up (predominantly, social inequality and counter-productive institutionalised ideology) the energy that people tend to exude is negative. Negative energy acts as a repellent, if others are chronically negative, you will want to avoid them and likewise if you are poignantly negative then others will do their utmost to avoid you. Negativity is synonymous with powerlessness and powerlessness is the ultimate form of scarcity. Scarcity is never attractive, neither socially nor sexually.

If you encounter a positive person they are either: aware of the game and have a reasonable amount of control over their own life (privileged and/or intelligent enough to be free), too stupid to understand their own powerlessness, or actively rejecting reality and superimposing projections of fantasy in its place. Many people, mostly beta men and women, opt to hold the idea of fantasy as a preferred reality, they are good at rationalising desire and idealisation as fact regardless of if such ideas have actually been experienced or proven.

People for the most part tend to be negative because without delusion and escapism to keep them preoccupied they find themselves existing in a state of scarcity, these are the people who live their lives feeling powerlessness, when one feels so powerless that their ambition for power is lacking, they avoid reality by hiding in fantasy, they avoid reality rather than
accepting it and using the awareness from said acceptance to build a foundational power base. These are the types of people who always feel like they are the effect of things rather than the cause of things, this is a mode of thought which is inherently beta, it is self-defeating and avoidant rather than pursuant in improvement. A rejection of the truth is the quickest path to weakness.

In the working classes people often don’t have enough money to pay their bills, they don’t have enough money to pay their rent and yadda yadda, this is the reason why a great number of the overall population is negative, for it is the working class which is the biggest social group, by the very nature of its own powerlessness, the pyramid is always widest at the bottom. In the lowest social groups basic needs cannot be met and the inability to fulfil these needs results in morbid frustration which translates into parasitically contagious negativity. This is the most concentrated form of scarcity in modern society and thus is where negative energy particularly thrives, the working class view the world through a filter of scarcity materially and this seeps into their social interactions causing them to perceive people from a position of inferiority.

Move up to the middle class and the problems of material scarcity are no longer such an issue, basics are afforded, as are things considered luxuries to the working class but essentials to the middle class, such as a “nice car”, a “decent smartphone” and a trip abroad at least once a year, however even with basic needs met and disposable income at the ready, the middle class have been sold a much more opulently luxurious lifestyle than the one that they live, for it is the very nature of consumerism to create an insatiable appetite to desire luxury goods, the middle class suffer from “luxury scarcity” which is essentially working class “material scarcity” on steroids.

You can blame MTV music videos and aggressive advertising for the middle classes’ “luxury scarcity” and thus their powerlessness is not based upon scarcity in and of itself but ultimately their negativity stems from jealousy, a desire to have only the very best society has to offer married to an inability to possess that certain Bugatti Veyron or condo with a sea view. They envy the rich, they ignore the poor and legitimately “feel poor” because by ignoring the “real poor” and focusing all their jealousy on the rich, within their own world they are by contrast of the subjectivity of their own perception, the least wealthy. The irony is that these people have far more than at least half the population who live in working poverty do. The scarcity mindset has a proclivity to permeate the middle, although it is not based on rationalism like it is with the working class but rather, jealousy.

Move up to the rich/upper class and of course you find an abundance of resources, yet still very many of these people live in a mindset of scarcity. They have so much wealth that they have neither material nor luxury poverty, they have “love poverty” they’re not sure who to trust, they’re often paranoid, cynical and sceptical because they have a lot to lose. The insecurity of the rich also manifests as comparing themselves to the super rich, 5 million doesn’t seem much to a guy who has a friend with 50 million, although 5 million is enough to not have to ever work again and still live good.

Whilst a middle class individual compares themselves to a millionaire, a millionaire compares himself to a multi-millionaire and a multi-millionaire compares himself to a billionaire. Who
does a billionaire compare himself to? A god, a mega celebrity or an esteemed historical figure. There is an insatiable appetite for glory manifesting as scarcity among most of humanity, even among the wealthy. Scarcity within the rich manifests as insecurity, there is always someone richer or more powerful and if they aren’t focussing on those better than them, they’re focused on those slightly less powerful than them posing a threat to their position and possessions. Being rich is stressful, but for different reasons, and the scarcity is emotional, not material. The scarcity of human connectivity is what the rich tend to suffer from as by merit of being so materially rich, trust becomes an issue (are they only interested in me because of my money?) and isolation thus tends to become a part of life, even in matters of family.

The truth is, no matter what position you hold in society, the de facto energy that people tend to carry is negative in its nature. Negative energy is everywhere which is why a positively charged person is a beacon of light in a sea of darkness, people will be attracted to the positivity you choose to exude whilst in an abundance mindset, however that attraction will not always be welcome.

Some will want to befriend you and spend time languishing in your aura exchanging jokes and good feelings, others will be outraged you’re so happy and will try to pollute your energy with negativity. Many times in my own life I’ve been accused of being “too energetic” or “so lively” or questioned pretentiously “are you high?” or “why are you so happy?” by people who were attracted to my positive mind state for the wrong reasons rather than the right, with jealousy rather than enthusiasm. There is a sizeable demographic of society permeating class boundaries who have become perfectly comfortable with misery and they perpetuate it, often, unknowingly, as a matter of habit. They are payday loan borrowers, college teachers and yacht owners. Avoid these people at all costs and more importantly, avoid being that person yourself.

The quantity of people in your life is irrelevant to the energy you carry. The quality of people in your life is what is relevant to whether you possess a positive or negative aura about yourself. Every person should have a purpose and they should all add something. The no gooders have no place in the lives of great people, they are a faceless audience, hating and criticising, they’re spectators unworthy of companionship, they are neither supporters, nor players.

It is far better to have an absence of negative people in your life whilst concentrating on harnessing your own energy into a default positive state rather than endure the demeaning negativity of the helpless, the dysfunctional, the irritating and the spiteful. There are many types of toxic people out there and they are all too easy to encounter.

These are the kind of people who dwell in the recesses of hopelessness, moaning about shit they can’t change, criticising things, taking offence to harmless conversational topics, an inhibition and reticence to laugh, they’re sometimes unmotivated, often directionless, usually always critical and almost always easily irritated whilst simultaneously incredibly irritating. These people are toxic people, walking danger signs.

You should be the centre point of your universe, you must be “me-centric” this doesn’t mean you have to be a shameless narcissist empathically pronouncing your individuality.
obnoxiously for the world to admire, but you should be self-centred with a stringent criteria for who you allow into your life. If you want to make a quality person out of yourself, naturally you want to associate with other quality people too. Avoid low quality individuals who add very little distinctiveness to your life, when interacting with the rabble keep your interactions brief and succinct. The average person tends to live in scarcity, whilst building an abundance mindset you don’t need the construction of your perception being co-opted by those who live in a psychic prison. Ultimately the difference between those who view the world through scarcity and those who view it through abundance is liberation. Those who view the world through scarcity are mentally imprisoned, often oppressing themselves with thought patterns that lead to negative feedback cycles, whilst those with an abundance mindset are doing well to improve their situation.

**People with a scarcity mentality tend to exhibit:**

- An exudence of desperation resulting in the pursuit of social dead-ends. Chase women.
- They cannot hold frame.
- Spend a lot of their time living mentally in the past. Going over and over things they cannot change.
- Have profound regrets which shake their confidence.
- Are averse to taking risks, they hold themselves back. Low T.
- Do not believe in their ability to succeed which presents itself as reticence, procrastination and a lack of confidence.
- Fear rejection from people.
- Require external validation from the group to feel content, they’re insecure and lean on others.
- Ultimately perceive themselves and the world around them as lacking where it matters, happiness and opportunity.

**People with an abundance mentality tend to exhibit:**

- Nonchalance and indifference, sometimes they’re arrogant, typically uncaring of small matters. Replace women.
- They hold frame well under pressure.
- Spend a lot of their time living mentally in the future, only coming into the present for breaks.
- Have profound ambitions which fan the flames of confidence and acts as motivation for action.
- Tend to be adrenaline junkies who get off on high risk, dangerous behaviour. High T.
- Are obsessive about success and confidently bold.
- Expect rejection from people.
- Validate themselves through their self-improvement, as long as they keep momentum they’re secure with themselves.
- Ultimately perceive the world around them as rigorous, but conquerable.

The scarcity mindset is the beta mental model; the abundance mindset is the alpha one. Ultimately, the only person you have is yourself and if your mind is co-opted by scarcity, you are compromised and in need of fixing. When the good times roll remember that good friends
and good women are bonuses, if you become reliant upon such fancies you will grow weak in character, don’t rely on these people – choose these people to come along for the ride but don’t rely on them to give you a ride. Self-reliance is a key component of abundance.

Although some of this may sound frighteningly morbid to many at first glance, it can be incredibly therapeutic when one considers just how toxic a huge swath of society really is. Interact on your own terms, cultivate positive energy within yourself and avoid the negative that presents itself in others. If you’re not in control of who you interact with and how, the negative energy of others will infect you from the inside out and your mind will become an enemy of your desire, you will sabotage yourself. Being a lone wolf is simple, it’s a clean slate. There should be no room for men and women in your life who don’t contribute value to you. Be ruthless with your selectivity, success is of more paramountcy than popularity.

**Relevant Reading:**

*How To Be Happy*

*Monk Mode*
The red pill is a philosophy based upon a set of observations which emphasises the utilisation of logic as a tool for explaining the reality around us, as such it is accepting of many ideas and stances, however one thing it is most decidedly not accepting of is ideology which presents a faux sense of egalitarianism out of unsubstantiable idealism, such ideology operates on poorly constructed reasoning and it is for this reason alone that the ideology in question is unilaterally rejected by the red pill, the most prominent of said rejected ideology of course being that of feminism.

Feminism and irrationalism tend to go hand in hand, this is the core basis behind why feminism is prominently rejected by red pill philosophy, however the relationship between irrationalism and feminism is not exclusive, any position which is not backed by solid logical reasoning is ultimately rejected by red pill philosophy. Fallacious ideology such as feminism, which often makes demands and claims of strength when something is to be gained for the ideology whilst equally (pardon the pun) claiming weakness when something else can be gained for the ideology, is an ideology that we can only reject as being philosophically absurd and thus rationally incoherent.

Feminist rationalism lays in its consistency: it entrenches its ideology by making successful power grabs, this is rational and consistent of any ideology, its irrationalism however lays in the arguments it presents (its methodology) in executing these power grabs, and it’s the fallibility of the methodology which exposes the ideology as being fraudulent. You cannot argue “different but equal” and claim weakness where it benefits you (divorce laws/appeals to tradition – argumentum ad antiquitatem) but simultaneously claim equality to be benefitted in other areas (job opportunities/sexual “liberation” – rejection of tradition) and not expect your system of thought to be deemed deliberately hypocritical, implausible and fallacious in nature by those of rational mind.

The red pill is poignantly anti-egalitarian, incorporating a self-improvement approach built upon self-reliance and personal accountability to one’s self, the red pill is pro-meritocratic rather than pro-egalitarian, some members still hold out hope for egalitarianism, but those are the few who hold on to idealism and dewy-eyed dreams of a better tomorrow, it is an idealist notion that goes against everything the environment teaches us and essentially what the red pill as a philosophy and a collective believes in. We’re a hierarchical species, women attach themselves to powerful men and weak men get left with nothing, that’s how it is, and no amount of rationalisation or declarative to the contrary will change such a notion.

Egalitarianism is a mythological idea that has been co-opted in all its incredible irony to benefit a privileged subsection of the population, mainly, those who identify as feminist and utilise its power and influence to get ahead.

I’m an intellectual myself, but I embrace pragmatism and realism, that is to say, to see things for what they are and form opinion as well as a mode of operation based upon the nature of
my environment, when I say “nature of my environment” I refer to the most logical method of interpreting my immediate reality, that is to say how it functions at the bare bones, not the illusion or lick of paint that “civilized society” glosses over it to make realities harshness seem more palatably accessible; and most definitely not the perceived nature that propaganda and cultural indoctrination commands that one should perceive. It is thus that when a fellow intellectual starts espousing idealistic nonsense about fairness, cohesiveness and equality I simply cannot be bothered to engage with such a buffoon, literally, for what is the umpteenth time, in debunking this completely unsubstantiated line of Mickey Mouse reasoning that the person in question has been indoctrinated with.

Through encountering many people who are indoctrinated with politically correct/feminist dogma, I’ve learnt to assess when my mental faculty and logic will be wasted in argument, if I assess that someone is not sufficiently open-minded or will be far too ruthlessly demanding of my mental faculty (E.g.: claims they want to be convinced of my position and that it is merely up to me to adequately justify my position, but is seemingly already combative, very intellectually stubborn and resistant in opening up to my line of reasoning regardless of its logical validity) then I deduce the endeavour is a bad use of my time and I refrain from discourse.

Ultimately, the type of person I have just described is the type of person who finds themselves incredibly disappointed in life. They do not live in reality, they live in a projection of fantasy of which they have convinced themselves is a tangible possibility, they overlook much and rationalise that which they do not overlook in order to reconcile fantasy into a form of digestible “truth”, this “truth” not being truth in the truest sense but rather a subjectively flawed interpretation of truth that is held as being a fair representation of “the truth”, when in reality such ideas of “what the truth really is” are far removed from anything close to indicative of the human experience.

These people are what we call ‘bluepillers.’ These are the people we (believers of red pill philosophy) do not tolerate sharing their views, their views lack value to us because they are based in what we perceive to be fantasy rather than reality. The #1 rule of the red pill community is that if you’re going to talk, it better not be with bullshit. If you talk with bullshit, you will not be tolerated. Just because we have a succinct stern posture on this doesn’t mean we’re a community of dim-witted handymen limited to speaking in “straighttalk”, what it means is that we’re accustomed to dealing with the truth and anything that carries the potential to be perceived as a possible truth regardless of whether rhetoric is used to present such truth, or not.

Many times someone with an above average ability to argue the semantics out of something will come onto the red pill subreddit, nit-pick at a crevice in an argument, and take part in what I like to refer to as “academic antagonism” by arguing possibilities, definitions and all sorts of tangential pedantry in order to chip away at a position through a bombardment of questioning that can only be described accurately as inquisition. Ultimately it always concludes with the bigotry that in the absence of evidence (a scientific study which they find to be of repute) that the hypothesis must be deduced false/incorrect. The irony to this is, science sets to either prove or disprove the hypothesis but claims no certainty until either
has been achieved, these people use the absence of scientific proof to say the hypothesis must be wrong, this is a hasty generalisation, as there is no proof here to say these things are wrong and the scientific method has not debunked them as much. It is quite hilarious when ‘bluepillers’ and red pill critics alike think the absence of evidence is evidence in and of itself that something is wrong by the merit of being unproven, they irrationally conflate the state of being “unproven by scientific study” as being “disproven by the absence of scientific study” this is fallacious thinking, ultimately the absence of evidence means that something has neither been proven nor disproven, however the person positing the hypothesis has a predilection or leaning in one direction or the other as a hypothesis must usually take a position in order to be tested (especially common in the realm of the social sciences).

Much of the hypothesis within red pill philosophy is based upon social observation, it is not completely unsubstantiated and made-up, sure it is subjective and not subject to scientific rigour, many things are not, we don’t all exist in an academic bubble that is the educational establishment, it is simply elitist to deduce that if an idea does not stem from academia, that it is not credible and is to be immediately disregarded, I see this argumentum ab auctoritate all the time from people on Reddit, especially our detractors, when you corroborate many similar observations across a vast cross-section of the population from multiple cities and nations of similar culture, plausible sentiments start to overwhelmingly present themselves as ideas which demand respect regardless of whether the scientific powers that be will confirm or deny such observations by giving them validity via the academic process and the educational institutions.

What one needs to be very aware of is that, in the market of free ideas, educational establishments have become increasingly politicised, they are not the objective bastions of free thought that they claim to be, if you’re not allowed to oppose an ideology in the realm of so-called intellectuals, then said establishment can hardly claim to be objective or really intellectual in the truest meaning of the word. Institutionalising feminism is like institutionalising religion, it is subjective, intellectually dishonest and inconsiderate of those who do not follow, conform or otherwise abide to said belief system.

What one must be aware of is that the institutions of education themselves are pro-feminist environments, this essentially politicises the administration of the educational environment and the social science faculty therein with ideology that holds their respective disciplines hostage to the tenets of its belief system, rather than promote the legitimacy of objective scientific processes. You must then must bear in mind how many professors and lecturers start to identify as being feminist, it is then that you start to build up of a picture of just how many of these people in fact cannot profess to be teachers in the objective sense of the manner as they infuse their teachings with their personal values and beliefs, passing their bias off as “education” when the intellectuals among us in the truest sense of the word, those with a critical mind, are capable of piercing the veil and seeing this display of bullshit for what it really is, a farce.
“To progress again, man must remake himself. And he cannot remake himself without suffering. For he is both the marble and the sculptor. In order to uncover his true visage he must shatter his own substance with heavy blows of his hammer.” – Alexis Carrel

Monk mode is a self-improvement framework for improving your worth, and in turn, increasing the quality of person you are. Many people fail to integrate self-improving habits into their life because they have psychological hurdles they struggle to overcome and are easily distracted by nonsense that confers them no benefit.

Monk mode is about mitigating distraction and focusing solely on self-betterment by filling up your time with activities that improve you as a human-being. Naturally, such an endeavour is going to demand sacrifice. However, the rewards you reap, the sense of direction you gain and the power you feel from the self-control you’ll exercise will feed your growth immeasurably, in turn passively increasing your self-esteem and outward confidence.

The sacrifice: you’re going to be minimising your time contribution to social obligations and
junk activities. The reason for this is because these activities **consume much of your time** whilst yielding little to negligible increase towards your **social market value**. Monk mode is a serious commitment that is not to be half-assed. You’re either doing it, or you’re not. It’ll be a struggle in the beginning, but once you’re fully engaged it becomes a beneficial, productive and dare I say even addictive lifestyle.

When I talk about “junk activities”, this is the kind of thing I’m referring to:

- Going out for coffee or sitting around idly.
- Playing video games.
- Watching marathons of television series/movies.
- Watching porn.
- Constantly refreshing social media and internet forums.
- Being out of action with a hangover/come down from alcohol/drug consumption.

All these activities are distractive or masturbatory; they confer no benefit in the long run, but are fleetingly pleasing in the short-term. Entertainment is necessary to cool off from periods of hard work, but leading a life of continuous instant gratification leads to nowhere but a path of regret and failure.

If all you do is distract yourself by spending your time on junk activities, there’ll be no time left for the things that really matter: activities that build long-term value. One cannot hope to have high social value without investing in themselves, and this is exactly what Monk Mode is – a commitment to maximise your capabilities to whatever esoteric limit it is they’re capped at.

Cutting your social time to a bare minimum is incredibly important, more important than you may think. It’s nigh impossible to lead a productive life when people are telling you their problems, gossiping, and introducing otherwise vapid and unimportant nonsense into your life. It’s all too easy to get caught up in a whirlwind of banality, because let’s face it, if you’re low value, the people you know will be too, **winners don’t hang out with losers**.

If you accept you’re a low value human-being, but you want to rectify this and become better, cutting off mundane people is crucial. Mundane people, also known as average people, don’t share your ambition and will jealously deride you every step of the way on your path to self-betterment.

Minimising distractions is crucial, low quality people, low quality media, you need to quarantine yourself from all of it – and it is only then you’ll be able to focus on channelling your desire to be better into real life gains. Because instead of walking around in a half-sentient stupor, you’ll have a rough plan for productive living, and execute it to the best of your ability.

**A brief but relevant tangential interjection on self-respect:** If you hate yourself or do not value yourself, it’s because you’ve not given yourself a reason to value yourself. We don’t just disrespect others who are low value, we disrespect ourselves for it too. The exception to this is those with narcissistic personality disorders that make the individual delusional about their own value. If the bulk of your time goes on junk activities, you will be directionless.
There will be no feedback loops in your life to give you self-esteem. There will be an absence of activity where you push yourself, see a small gain, get validated by your small gain and then feel the resulting pride that comes from being better at something and seeing yourself grow in some small way. As humans, we are meant to grow, to flourish, to actualise. We desire growth and live for growth, for without growth we feel purposeless. In the absence of growth, we flounder. When junk activities start to comprise the majority of your time expenditure you rob yourself of the opportunity to grow. The higher your social value, the more you will come to value your time by merit of recognising your abilities and possessing a resulting self-respect as such. High value or not, we all have a finite amount of time until we die and every second wasted is a missed opportunity feeding into a sense of lethargy and mediocrity.

Now back on topic to monk mode, the core structure of monk mode is based on the three I’s: introspection, isolation and improvement. Monk mode is a temporary form of MGTOW, by cutting yourself off from the rest of the world for a while you can fine-tune your focus, calibrate your direction and confront yourself. You’ll be acknowledging your weaknesses and then formulating a plan of action to deal with them. For the things that can’t be fixed, such as being born ugly, mitigate them with damage control: work out, get stylish haircuts, dress well and etc.

**Introspection** is to look inward, to evaluate one’s self. You’re going to be identifying your weaknesses, making yourself aware of them and then accepting them. Rather than hide, begrudgingly co-exist with or deny your weaknesses you must acknowledge them and accept them. Only by doing this can you gain the power to rid yourself of such afflictions. Accepting your weaknesses allows you to own your flaws rather than permitting them to imprison you within a negative mental feedback loop of helplessness. The most unintelligible thing a person can do, and “the average person” does this all the time, is to ignore one’s weaknesses. Weaknesses are ignored out of ego, out of emotion, to sustain your sense of being, and whatever shaky foundation of self-confidence it is that you have. However, it is this wilful ignorance of such weakness that amounts to nothing more than a shoddy farcical fabrication of confidence. It’s not pure, rational confidence, but delusional, narcissistic confidence. By not addressing your weaknesses you allow them to take control of you in whatever manner it is they manifest. Rather than patch up the hole in your armour, you are pretending there is no hole there at all. And thus by ignoring the problem, you only grant it the opportunity to extend its foothold within your psyche, damaging your chances at success and happiness.

A conscious denial of an accepted truth for the sake of one’s ego leaves you vulnerable to the potency of the truth. A core part of red pill philosophy is to be harmonious with the truth so that the truth is fighting on your side rather than against you at the side of your enemies. Whoever is congruent with the truth, can monopolise the truth and expose liars. Those who are reliant upon fabrications must expend massive energy on maintaining their façade. As someone who lives harmoniously with the truth, you need not expend such energy, giving you a further edge. When a person tries to use one of your weaknesses against you, aware of the truth, the power of embarrassment will be absent and you will be able to keep composure (hold frame) rather than let a scrupulous detractor rob you of your power within the primacy of the moment. You need to be honest with yourself so that you know what you’re working
with, without awareness you cannot hope to achieve success. On a **Machiavellian** tangent, nobody lucks into success contrary to what they may have led you to believe about their accomplishments.

**Isolation** is necessary to encourage an amplification of focus and a fortification of one’s personal direction. Handling social politics such as relationships, logistics, people’s feelings and yadda yadda is burdensome on one who is looking to mitigate or otherwise eradicate their weaknesses whilst working to enhance their strengths. You have a certain number of things you can contend with at one time, social obligations will quickly obliterate your workload and leave you feeling overwhelmed when you’re looking to achieve loftier goals. It is important that one has their own space and the freedom to self-govern and direct their desires, and a modicum of solitude is necessary to achieve this. With awareness of one’s weaknesses comes the clarity of self-determination. With a clearer and more lucid mind the path to accomplishing higher desires becomes more obvious and self-evident. Confusion is an affliction which causes many to float along in life, lost, without any real purpose or goals. You do not want to be one of these people, the “average person.” In order to achieve greatness you need clearly obtainable goals, an awareness of your position and the peace, space and freedom to determine your self-governance independent of undue external manipulatory influence.

Without the conflict of social obligation or the dissent of outside opinion, you are free in isolation to forge yourself into the very thing that you want to be. What you want for yourself is more important than what anybody else wants you to be. Through introspection should you not already know it, you will deliberate until you know exactly what it is you want to achieve. Ultimately you’re the one who is stuck with yourself for the rest of your days, forced to endure whatever weaknesses or failures that you may or will have due to inaction. It is thus up to you to be responsible for your own happiness and dictate to yourself what needs to be done to actualise your desires. The influence of others has the potential to be beneficial, but for the sake of monk mode we will assume the precedent that the majority of external influence is absent in value and thus incongruent with the diction of your planning. Others can aid you in your goals (such as a personal trainer or should you be still undecided of your direction despite much introspection, trusted advisors.) However, nobody should be dictating what those goals are and making decisions on your behalf (such as your parents, or people who have a vested interest in you not improving yourself.) You shall be your own planner and you shall plan diligently. Do not underestimate the importance of isolation if you are a social animal, for it is most necessary in order to ensure success.

Introspection and isolation make up what are the psychological components of monk mode, they are the processes which when successfully enacted allow a man of procrastination to forcefully impose his will upon the world, to take action where others merely theorise. You must become a doer, a mover, a player. You must become a man of action rather than allow yourself to be one of inaction.

**Improvement:**

Refer to **Maslow’s hierarchy of needs** for an illustration of what your immediate life priorities should look like, starting with the physiological and moving upwards, note the
inclusion of “sex” in the physiological category, I believe this primarily refers to an orgasm in the literal sense (which can be masturbation), this is not the same as “sexual intimacy” as shown in the love/belonging category:

Self-improvement activities are things such as:

- Lifting/jogging/playing sport (a workout of some kind.)
- Tidying and cleaning your room (if your ground zero is spotless it will do wonders for your mental state)
- Learning a language (increases your skill base and opens up foreign social circles)
- Learn from non-fiction books, they’re especially good for turning wasted commute time into productive time.
- If you’re a student of some kind, study hard, don’t waste the opportunity, be good at your specialty and you can make money from it if you’re in the top percentile.
- Learn a martial art/instrument.
- Learn to be funny (great for making friends and easing social awkwardness.)
- Learn to cook, use recipe books/trial and error (very important to aid nutrition and fuel your gym gains.)

The younger you are when you begin investing in yourself, the better. That doesn’t mean if you’re not young anymore that you should just give up on the idea however. If you’re 40 years old and only just realising you’ve wasted most of your life up until this point then it’s better to turn around now and start making a change rather than doing it at 50. Once you hit 50 you only would have said “shit I’ve known this crap since I was 40, I should have done something back then!” and then compounded your own sense of frustration further. It’s like compound interest albeit more inadvertently masochistic. Control the time you have left on this Earth and make it valuable or you will have to live with insufferable pangs of regret until your deathbed. You need to maximise the efficacy of your time, time is your most valuable commodity and it’s incredibly finite, like an hourglass, it trickles down, except unlike an hourglass you can’t turn it around and start again if you have wasted the sand granules that have already dropped on pointless shit. You have one continuing trickle of sand that
symbolically represents the fleetingness of your existence on this Earth and that’s it. So use your “chance at life” wisely if you want it to have purpose and are to attain some semblance of self-actualisation.

Practicing your social skills is important, too much reclusiveness results in rusty social skills and reduced articulacy. If you fear your social skills may be deteriorating then go out intermittently, however socialising should not feature prominently within your calendar until you reach the top 10% of men. Even then, once you make it to the top you need to be wary not to grow complacent and lose what you’ve built for yourself as a man of ever-increasing social value. In high society social circles, business is often mixed with pleasure; bear the importance of that in mind.

When choosing friends: surround yourself with funny people, people who can take a joke and aren’t overly defensive. I personally make it a habit to talk to people with a keen wit or a sophisticated sense of humour as well as watching stand-up comedy in my leisure time (yes, even in my leisure time I like to passively learn from other people’s wit.) Comedy should be important to you; as comedy is medicine for the soul. Comedy can stop a man in pain from turning insane, immerse yourself in the world of comedy and the world of comedy will do your state of mind wonders. Not taking serious matters too seriously is a great coping mechanism for aiding one’s mental endurance. Use comedy as a painkiller to aid you in your journey of self-improvement if you need it to take off the edge, it’s a far healthier way to spend your down time versus drink and drugs.

**Leaving Monk Mode and utilising your gains:**

How do you know when you’re ready to leave monk mode? It’s simple. You will manage to resist junk activities and sustain self-improvement as your modus operandi (factory setting.) It could take you a long time to reach this state; it depends on your starting point and more importantly, your self-discipline. Monk mode is as much about learning self-discipline as it is engaging in self-improvement. When you manage to sustain monk mode as a way of life you’ll be on your way to cultivating a lifestyle of success. You will be wrapped up in the self-importance of improving all the facets in your life, managing them with a keen eye and watching all your personal investments flourish (much like a stock portfolio.) Your schedule will be so packed that you won’t have time to waste on low quality, frivolously time hungry exercises. If someone’s got something going on and you know you’d get more done doing your own thing, then keep doing your own thing. You are the basis for your sense of direction; don’t get drawn in by other people’s whims. You should never feel like being the tag-along, you have the ambition, the vision and the determination to keep moving towards the top. Your time is far too valuable to even contemplate wasting it as a “tag along.”

Leaving monk mode with your SMV gains does not mean you can become stagnant in your endeavours. Retain your hunger for betterment no matter what level you’re at. This is the defining quality (successful maintenance of one’s SMV) between someone who is “doing great” and sustains the greatness achieved through monk mode and someone who was “doing alright” and has now fallen off the wagon and begun to relapse. Do not accept half measures from anybody, but most importantly, do not tolerate it from yourself. Stop being your own worst enemy, free your mind and begin actualising.
Addendum: A book I really recommend in helping you refine your focus, ambition and general direction towards a certain direction or career path in life is Robert Greene’s book “Mastery.” Mastery is a practical guide to becoming successful in your chosen field, giving historical examples of masters, gaining apprenticeship and refining your focus to maintain a relentless motivation. Such a book would make a great read as part of your monk mode endeavour and I would even go so far to say it would help you with disciplining yourself to stay in monk mode by helping you figure out what you want out of life, rather than monk mode just being this “thing that you did that one time.”

**Relevant Reading:**

- [Buy “Mastery” in the USA](#)
- [Buy “Mastery” in the UK](#)
- [Buy “Mastery” in Canada](#)

I likewise highly recommend you devour the books listed on [this page](#) (of which Robert Greene’s “Mastery” is included.)
Shit Tests Ad Infinitum
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She will never stop testing you for weakness. To be crude and for a lack of more succinct language, women are what I’d consider to be perpetually biologically insecure. They are always thinking in the back of their heads “what if I have made a mistake.” It is this constant need for romantic reassurance that causes them to rigorously shit test their men, on a seemingly primal level women are utterly obsessed with feeling safe, both emotionally and materially, and so will thusly test their boyfriends/husbands to see if he still has what it takes to make them “feel safe.” Women do not rigorously shit test their men out of malice, but merely out of insecurity, out of a need to feel protected, out of a nagging sense of insecurity that they “just need to make sure” they have made the right choice and are still in a relationship with a man who is badass.

They will wear their men down with their insecurity, self-sabotaging the relationship they have with him, seeking affirmation of his strength by acting out to see how he will handle the situation. The feedback gained from “seeing how he handles shit” thusly allows her to re-evaluate her opinion of him, to deduce if he is still the strong man she originally fell in love with, or if he has become weak and thus an obsolete romantic artifact in sore need of replacement. The psychological pressure from a woman’s shit tests on a man’s psyche, repeatedly and over a period of a relationship may be the very cause in all its sheer irony for a strong man to become a shell of his former self, the very thing women despise. How or why such a man became weak is irrelevant to her, all that is relevant to her is if the man she is with is strong or not, that is her fixation, as far as she is concerned if she was so easily able to make him weak with her mind games then he is unworthy of her, period. Female nature is utterly and brutally ruthless in this way, some would even argue sociopathic, indeed what men perceive to be beautiful almost always comes with many a hidden condition attached, the incredible prerequisite that he will shoulder all and any burden on her behalf.

As soon as a man can no longer give a woman “that safe feeling”, she will leave him and find a guy who can make her feel safe. She will then rewrite history in her memory to say the man she is leaving was always a pussy and that he failed in his duties to her, she will paint him as the bad guy so that it makes it easier for her to branch swing to the next guy without feeling bad or having any sense of personal responsibility for it. She has to demonise him and paint herself as the victim within her own mind to allow herself to carry on without hating herself, it’s easy to wrong a man she has convinced herself is “the bad guy”, but a conscience makes it all but impossible to wrong such a man despite his shortcomings if she were to cast herself in the role of antagonist rather than he. She needs him to “be the bad guy” so that she can move on. As far as she is concerned, it’s his fault she lost interest in him, regardless or despite if he did everything in his power for her. It’s always the man’s fault in the mind of a woman. She wants a man she can’t change but she tries to change him as a form of counterintuitive test of his strength, and if she succeeds in changing a man into someone who is no longer dominant she will grow to hate what she has made of him.

In a way, one could say women use masculinity up in this manner. Going from one
relationship to the next, weakening a man until he is no longer attractive and then when he has become too weak from his love for her, in her disgust and repulsion of what she has made him she moves onto another man only to again repeat the tortuous process. Jumping from one man to the next until she finally comes upon a man who she is incapable of compromising in such a manner, the immovable rock. This is the man who she will ultimately fall for; to women these are the men of commodity, the one’s that can be relied upon, the one’s worthy of their love.

These are the kinds of men who realise that men aren’t allowed to fall in love the way that women are, as men we can never “just love a bitch”, love and emotional indulgence are luxuries reserved for the realm of women, it is this which is their ultimate privilege, despite their seeming obliviousness to such a rule of attraction. If we, as men, are to indulge in the same emotions that women do, and let them grow to the intensity that our women do, to let them take hold of us and weaken us, we will ultimately lose the girl and become unattractive to her. In stark contrast, if a woman falls in love with a man and lets her feelings go and loses a part of who she is to that, then it’s fine, the relationship will not fall apart, the man won’t lose attraction to her because she shows weakness, in fact he may love her more for appreciating who he is as it is the ultimate form of endearment that nearly all men long to feel. Women can show weakness and be sexy but men cannot, even when such a woman is begging to see that weakness so she can “feel connected to you” it is always the burden of man not to give in to such sugar-coated duplicity. If a man is to allow himself to fall in love to the extent that he starts to lose who he is independent of that woman and her love for him, he starts to be perceived as weak and it is game over for him.

Women want you to fall in love with them, but not so much so that you don’t make them feel safe anymore. They want to be loved, but as a man if you fall in love and allow that to change who you are, to be overwhelmed by them and allow them to erode your identity, you no longer remain attractive. To keep a woman you must remain everything you were when she found you, despite everything, despite a tirade of emotional manipulation manifesting itself as shit tests. You see with women it’s not you in and of yourself that they are attracted to, it’s your masculinity and how that makes them feel which they find attractive. The esotericism of dominance is what triggers and captivates female attraction; its absence will have her discard you in search of a new source of dominance. The wholly irrational thing about this whole sordid ordeal is that you cannot properly love a woman and let them all the way into the fiber of your being without such a love directly translating into psychological vulnerability. Agape inherently elicits vulnerability. Women desire connection with that vulnerability whilst simultaneously, feel contempt for that vulnerability when it becomes prominent enough to translate into weakness.
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"It is double pleasure to deceive the deceiver." - Niccolo Machiavelli
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1.) Introduction:

This piece discusses the relevance of power in comparative as well as absolutist terms. One thing I have found is, the word “power,” contains specific connotations to most people. They hear the word “power” and it conjures up an image of absolutist, concentrated power. A king, judge, dictator or some other esteemed or highly influential individual. However, these roles are merely the symbolic embodiments of a concentration of power, saturated power. Power permeates the entirety of the societal structure in subtle and not-so-subtle nuances that dominate each and every social interaction. Everyone has a place. There is a pecking order. Sometimes the contrast is oblique, other times it is resounding.

Power and popularity have an incestuous relationship; they fellate each other, reciprocally. One would argue that popularity itself is a manifestation of power, although popularity is
Certainly possible without power. Some would say popularity is a form of soft power that can precede hard power. Of course this begs the question “of which comes first?” and we find ourselves facing a “chicken and the egg” philosophical conundrum.

Regardless you can escape neither power nor popularity. You must learn to understand power as the social equivalent of water. You cannot avoid it. You need it. Without any power to command anything, you would have nothing. With minuscule amounts of it, you would subsist minimally. With moderate amounts, you live comfortably. With excessive amounts, you risk corrupting yourself, probably becoming narcissistic, potentially becoming sadistic.

So what should you care for? This is an introspective question common in a culture obsessed with seeming not to care (or at least, caring too much.) Regardless, everybody cares for the opinion of at least one other. This is normal and natural behaviour. Yet many of us realise in the quest for social dominance that one must be able to outbluff a bluffer should one wish to get their way. He who shows the most indifference and composure is oft the person to come out on top in negotiation or argument. In the theatre of masks, he whose mask begins to crack and shatter first, loses. This is what the manosphere means with all its talk of “holding frame.” From a Machiavellian viewpoint, the person who retains more composure relative to the other is forcing the other to play the cards they deal. A person with a solid frame forces others to react rather than dictate. When one is indifferent to the behaviour of another, where that other would expect you to be upset or angry, you can command shock value that can flip a power struggle on its head. By “letting it go over your head” you retain emotional independence, with independence there is respect and social dominance within the interaction. He who sets the frame effectively controls the rules of engagement. He who is definitively reactive, or at least, comparatively reactive, communicates himself to be a social inferior.

2.) Bluffing:

A bluff is when you hold a deceitful frame to get what you want. If you can maintain the bluff with congruence, with minimal cracking in the façade that is your mask, then it will pay its dividends. It will allow you achieve things that your “true self” is normally incapable of achieving. At least, not until you integrate the themes from your bluff into your natural personality. Which much like any significant process is a timely one. This is where the idea of “fake it ‘till you make it” comes from. Of course there are different levels of bluff, characterised by both depth of temerity, and severity. Who you’re dealing with and what you’re trying to achieve affects how much your bluff will be challenged/tested. Some bluffs are fairly inconsequential, seeking small measures of power in the form of small favour. Used repeatedly and in increments, they can lead to big redistributions of power and a sense of responsibility or obligation in the mind of the bluffee (he who is being bluffed.) This is particularly true once the bluff becomes ritualistically ingrained, an act of habit.

Other bluffs are however more ostentatious, and thus due to their noticeability far more likely to arouse conflict. They will be more rigorously tested by the individual you are trying to persuade or intimidate than smaller bluffs. Cumulative bluffing is a form of systematic desensitisation to an expectation and thus effectively, a form of social conditioning. The power of a bluff comes from the boldness of its misdirection, implication and plausibility. An
implausible bluff exposes itself and commands no credible pretence for power acquisition. It is for this reason that in the game of bluffs half of the game is based upon deterrent, the other half being the ability to execute the implication that the deterrent puts forth. This is typically characterised by the utilisation of fear and an absence of any threat or promise that is empty. The instrument used to instil fear and assert control can be characterised in a multitude of ways. There is the physical: a capacity for violence. There is the emotional: a capacity to overwhelm another’s reasoning and state of mental-being. And there is the economic: a capacity to deprive someone of resources they rely on.

A good example of a bluff no matter how unintended that bluff may be would be a person’s height. Say you are 6’2 tall; it is unlikely throughout life you will have been challenged to a fight very often. Those who do challenge will quickly renege if you back the ferocity of your height with a congruently menacing attitude. Could such a man defeat a 5’5 man who trains in Brazilian Jiu-jitsu? No, he could not. But who is more likely to be challenged and thus need that skillset to begin with? The 5’5 man is. Most people are too fearful to even escalate with the larger man because of his stature. His stature is a bluff of sorts, implying the taller man is perhaps more physically power than the mind of the onlooker should be led to believe. On a biological level it communicates to another person’s instincts “this man is capable of physically overpowering me.” Resultantly, said person is trying to cope with their involuntary fear response whilst trying to make a rational decision whether or not they should issue a social challenge. This is a primal feeling a small man cannot invoke in others regardless of his abilities. He must demonstrate his abilities to elicit the same effect, merely standing there is insufficient. The power of dominance via stature (known militarily as command presence) is an avenue of passive power closed to men of a small stature. Instead such men must express their power in other ways, such as by utilising displays of: wealth, wit, proxy muscle and etc.

Whilst a bluff is oft an aggressive manifestation, a deterrent is inversely, defensive. This is not to say outward bluffs can’t be defensive and deterrents cannot be aggressive. They can. But typically, they are not characterised as such. On the deterrent side of the bluffing game, there are tools available at one’s disposal such as selective validation (operant conditioning.) This is something that can be utilised to encourage the behaviours you prefer in another whilst discouraging behaviours you don’t. Half the game is mentally and physically passive in nature. These things manifest in both how you present yourself and likewise, how you behave in the company of others. The other half of the game is your raw power. Being able to put stock in the collective illusion your outward behaviour and appearance summons with tangible talents, wealth, social capital, aptitude and other substantive elements capable of enacting change through sheer substance of will. Raw naked knowledge is useless in the game of power. If you cannot apply knowledge to execute effectively, then that knowledge despite its relevance is useless to you until you can wield it properly. Power, much like knowledge, is ineffective if it cannot be suitably wielded.

3.) Judgement, Self-Perception & Self-Discipline:

If you’re not sure what should be important to you, the bottom line of your agenda should be to increase your power and connect with and co-opt those who can aid in the endeavour that is power acquisition. Spending much of your mental faculty on people who cannot help you (tangibly or intangibly) when you yourself are weak, is a demonstration of low self-esteem. As
a person who seeks growth it is a waste of time in the face of self-betterment to invest your
time and attention in those who offer you negligible benefit. Caring about those of low value,
those who cannot bring you anything you need superficially, intellectually or spiritually may
in fact put you at risk of degrading your own faculty as they seek to parasitize you. It
surreptitiously communicates to your self-esteem and the perception of others that you are in
fact yourself a powerless individual by mere method of association. Philanthropy can be a
great ego boost now and again, but one must not become the very thing that they set out to
help, should they not seek to become a member of the needy.

People judge you not just by the company you keep, but by how opinion affects you, and
lowly opinion should bounce off you like the irrelevant banality that it is. This doesn’t mean
you must be horrid to the downtrodden, but do not be seen to be strongly associated with
them. Unless you’re so powerful you can use the weak to amplify the perception of your
benevolence and solidify yourself a healthy reputation eg: engage in decadent acts of
philanthropy, you have no place to be seen with the weak. As an addendum it is important to
add that investing stock in the opinions of the powerless and those without a potential for
power is an idiotic endeavour that yields little to zero return. If you see potential in a
powerless contemporary, like any stock, they are investable.

Not disappointing yourself in an endeavour is an act of self-validation. Do not forget that self-
esteeem can validate itself when you do something good and are impressed with yourself for
being able to fulfil your own objectives. A lack of self-discipline comprises the core of low self-
esteeem. The repetitive nature of personal failure owing to low self-discipline creates a
negative mental feedback loop. This is something inverse to the cultivation of narcissism,
more akin to the creation of insecurity and poor self-worth, or “anti-narcissism.” That
feedback loop then reinforces the idea to the psyche of the individual in question that they
are intrinsically useless by mere absence of achievement. In all its emotive sense of
helplessness, this creates momentary low self-esteem. The dichotomy of low self-discipline is
that inevitably, personal failure will recur, reinforcing the idea that one is in fact useless or
lowly. And indeed without this self-control, one does become that which they believe
themselves to be. The consequence of subsequent failure to adhere to one’s goals becomes a
form of learnt helplessness which solidifies into a personal belief that one is unworthy,
stripping them almost entirely of personal power. With no belief in themselves, they look to
latch onto others parasitically to maintain themselves because “they just can’t do this on
their own.”

If you keep failing at things because you cannot discipline yourself to do them or get good at
them then you’re going to feel like a failure. Decide what you’re going to do. Start off by “just
doing stuff” and then repeat it with intent to develop a healthy habit. Eventually as it
becomes more natural to you, you will become sensitive to technique and look to
subsequently refine the thing it is that you’re doing. When you can do something well, it will
give you power. It will give you confidence, a degree of certainty, and pride. You are not only
useful to others for what you can do, but internally you will begin to respect yourself and gain
some justifiable confidence. Confidence is the primary ingredient in the fuel of power, there is
no power without confidence for they are intertwined. You can (appear to) be confident
without power (a bluff) but you cannot be powerful without confidence. Confidence within the
realm of subtext implicitly communicates you are powerful. It creates the assumption in the
mind of others that the confidence is a product of power, regardless of whether this is true in nature or not. As such it can be perceived that confidence in and of itself is a type of power.

4.) Silence, Saboteurs & Platforms:

Sometimes the best move you can execute in a situation is to simply do nothing, ignore it, be aloof. Do not feel compelled to act in the discomfort of uncertainty. You should not act for the sake of acting, but rather, with meaningful, willful intent. You should ignore unimportant and irrelevant opinions that look to sabotage you from those who you have reason to suspect look to undermine you. The people who issue these challenges want to destroy or at least, reappropriate your power. They are saboteurs and thus one should always be seen to look down royally on those who oppose them, rather than validate the basis of their challenge.

It is not necessary to completely destroy them, but you must refuse to validate most if not all of their attempts to be an upstart. By validating detractors you give their ideas no matter how banal or asinine a measure of your credibility. You lend your power to their comments by giving their criticism a platform. It is within these words it should become apparent to you that this is the inherent utility of censorship. Indirect censorship via the refusal to entertain a challenger (rather than direct, which is forceful silencing/covering up) gives said person no opportunity to latch onto your reputation and thus by extension, no avenue of entry to bolster their own power. When people like this happen to appear in your life it can sometimes be an indication that you’re doing well for yourself. That you are succeeding at something and it has been noticed and flagged as threatening. When others feel threatened by you it often means you’re gaining power, although you may simply be violating one of the laws of power, such as outshining the master. Be situationally self-aware.

When those who oppose you invest a lot of energy into hatefully disagreeing with you, in all its ironic perversity it’s the closest thing to a compliment that such a person can give you. By forcing them to act on emotion, they give your cause energy, and it matters not if that energy is negative, for all energy is relevant to the sum of an ideas prevalence. Energy is the stuff platforms are made of. Energy gives your ideas a platform by helping them to gain recognition from within the flamboyancy of detractive hatred. Inadvertently and unwittingly to the dismay of the jealous critic and obsessive saboteur, they garner you more supporters, further attention and increased notoriety. Acknowledgement is the fuel of social status. Gods as entities unproven and fictional as they may be got their power from within human civilization via acknowledgement. Do not underestimate the power of acknowledgement and the components that form it, recognition and validation, for it is central to everything. It is these things which form repute. Reputation is a cornerstone of power, in fact reputation is more important than reality itself when one wishes to exercise or protect their power. Like confidence, reputation in and of itself can be seen as a form of soft power rather than merely an ingredient of hard power.

You gain power by doing things that are effective in and of themselves, or by undermining the power of others. These are two very different styles of power acquisition. The first being creative: build yourself up so much that you tower over the opposition. The second is destructive; topple the opposition’s reputation to the extent that their power is lesser than yours. You outbuild the competition via accomplishment, or you sabotage theirs whilst
preserving your own. Indeed if you are neither powerful nor the target of someone’s personal investment, then nobody would give breath for you. They would not even summon energy to criticise you. They’d simply ignore your existence. Hate is a reactionary emotion which spawns from other emotions, predominantly from fear. Fear of the unknown, fear of self-preservation, fear of a loss of personal power and up there with self-preservation, the fear of making a bad investment.

5.) Family Power Dynamics & Parental Investment:

This is my belief as to why so many parents fear their children being failures. Some opt to lie to themselves that their children are not losers even when it is quite evident that they in fact are. What they ultimately fear is having put all this time and effort into their legacy only for their child to squander that effort by yielding them nothing in return. No power, nothing for them to be vicariously proud of, no return on investment, zilch. This I believe to be the fear of every parent and by extension, grandparent. The fear that their own lives were a waste of time as they will not leave behind a legacy built upon their core values. This idea is of course closely linked to the fear of self-preservation, albeit a type of preservation that the mind seeks to enforce past the cycle of one’s natural life.

6.) Concluding Statement:

The bottom line is that everybody cares for power. Don’t believe otherwise unless you opt to be taken for a fool. Power (or the lust for it) is the imperative to spawn all imperatives. Do not be fooled by romantics and the esoteric gooeyness of emotions that elicit idealism and compassion. Sure, these emotions play a role regardless of power and in relation to power, but the balance of power is inescapably present in all things. Sink or swim. Succeed or fail. There are no alternatives, by opting out of the game, you lose the game by merit of forfeiture.
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1.) Introduction:

The focus of this piece is on the application of Machiavellian ideas contained within “The 48 Laws of Power.” Numerous people have communicated to me how confounding they find Robert Greene’s best-selling book despite how indisputably excellent it serves as an introduction to the world of Machiavellianism. It appears there is something of a disconnect between the reader’s interest in the book and their ability to utilise the lessons taught within it. If one is to derive maximum benefit from the book and see tangible improvements in their life, the book and its tenets alone are not enough to bring about the outcomes enjoyed by
compotent Machiavellians. Certain skills must be learnt, methodologies must be developed and a deeper understanding must be obtained.

There are talents which need to be developed by the reader that are irrespective of the book. The book does not teach the importance of qualities which aid in and are fundamental to the successful execution of Machiavellian devices. These are qualities which are necessary, not supplementary. Should one wish to successfully implement the “laws of power” into the fabric of their social interactions, they will need to master said qualities. Having knowledge of the skill sets needed to be a fully competent Machiavellian is vital. Essentially, the scope of this article is to inform the wannabe Machiavellian of the skill sets necessary to successfully apply Machiavellian strategy on a day-to-day basis.

There is much profound information to be found within the depths of The 48 Laws of Power but the book lacks methodology and application. Consider The 48 Laws of Power to be a cookbook of manipulative devices, with the laws acting as the raw ingredients quintessential to the schemes of all great power games. Robert Greene gives you the ingredients necessary to achieve power, but he doesn’t giving you a working blue print (or to keep with the analogy, a recipe.) The book does not educate you on becoming Machiavellian; instead, it matter-of-factly states how certain aspects of Machiavellianism work. It is in this sense that somebody alien to the purview of power, politics and manipulation is spectacularly introduced to an otherwise unfathomably unintelligible world.

With Greene’s reticence to supply methodology there belies an absence of instruction and methodological example. For instance the book never states anything along the lines of: “in contemporary and relatable situation X, you could apply the law in question by doing Y.” You don’t get taught how to apply the laws based on a scenario that the average person will find themselves in. Instead you get a list of psychological ingredients relevant to the pursuit of power that are illustrated by stories from history demonstrating how each ingredient manifests when stakes are high. A mere understanding of the mechanics of power however does not translate into a transferable skill which can be wielded for self-gain. It is for this reason I have begun work on essays which elaborate on the ideas discussed within The 48 Laws of Power.

It was Greene himself who said “I’d rather the book be used for defence against natural psychopaths rather than be used to hurt people.” As well as “psychopaths don’t need this book, most of this stuff is innate for them” (to paraphrase him.) It is for this reason the book does not give you a step-by-step guide detailing how to specifically apply the laws in your everyday interactions. The book raises awareness and elucidates by encouraging abstract theoretical analysis of Machiavellianism via storytelling. By opting for a theoretical and passive analysis the book teaches you to understand Machiavellianism as a series of easily remembered nuggets of wisdom that are reinforced in their emphasis by the splendour of extravagant stories. It does not communicate through intellectualisation how to master what is essentially a learnable vocation. It does not instruct how to master the art of strategy and apply it in one’s life, which is effectively the goal of most who seek power and prestige. The direction Greene chose not take is the direction I dedicate a large part of this blog to. Where Greene’s desire was for his book to be utilised as a shield rather than a sword, I find it equally important to become acquainted with the weaponisation of Machiavellianism.
2.) The Vocational Toolbox: Necessary Skill Sets

In paragraph 2 of the introduction I briefly mentioned skills fundamental to the successful implementation of Machiavellianism. In this section said skills will be identified and described in further detail, comprising the meat of the article. The following six components are what effectively make up the vocational toolbox necessary for one to apply the 48 Laws of Power with any consistent degree of competency. Learning the book whilst possessing only a few of the qualities listed will not make you a competent Machiavellian. Without the entire toolbox at your disposal you will lack the vocational competency to put your knowledge into effect. You will be nothing but an “academic” in the realm of power all but powerless to apply your wisdom to the world around you. The book in and of itself is not enough to create a Machiavellian, merely it enables the all but obliviously average to correctly identify when they’re made subject to manipulative devices. If you wish to become a successful Machiavellian it is therefore imperative you master the following vocational skill sets:

2a.) Develop An Analytical Mind

One should possess an analytical mind; a mind that not only thinks more than it is feels, but can subdue feelings with thought. It is imperative that your primary mode of operation is dominated by logic rather than emotion. This is vital if you are to adequately discern, deduce and calculate. Emotive reasoning encourages fallibility, transparency (which is anti-Machiavellian) and self-exposure. Women in particular find this incredibly difficult to master because in essence it is something which goes against the very basis of their nature. Emotional reasoning leads to incorrect deductions, poor judgement and a loss of self-control as the ire of an emotive surge takes hold. Emotive reasoning is inward (solipsistic) whilst logical reasoning is outward (abstract.) In order to analyse one must be looking outward and comprehending the outward with as little confusion from the inward as possible. When this is achieved one will be able to analyse (discern and deduce) with marked precision. In analysis, one’s own emotions serve as nothing other than an unwelcome distraction. The analysis of the emotions of others however is crucial, and is discussed more intricately further into the article.

2b.) Master Subtextual Communication

Your mind’s perception for the unseen must be sharp. You must develop the muscle of your wit. You should understand people’s words and actions on multiple levels: entendre, innuendo, puns; they are the language of rhetoric and subtext. You must be fluent in this language. If you cannot pierce the realm of subtext, you cannot hope to be a successful Machiavellian. If you cannot understand the subtleties and nuances of a person’s character then you cannot hope to ever truly comprehend them. The complete nature of their being will fall beyond the limits of your mind’s capacity to understand them. Subtext is a realm of communication all of its own. If you are blind to it, it will become your Achilles’s heel and your obliviousness will reduce your overall effectiveness.

Communication is multi-layered; you should always understand what is being said, what is truly meant and what may possibly be implied. Do threat/reward assessment and measure the likelihood of each. Balance all three possibilities in your mind, attributing methods of likelihood to each variable based upon the data available to you. Calculate likelihood,
incentive and threat and make your move only when it is advantageous (when you will make a net gain) or necessary (to prevent loss.) You won’t make correct choices in your interactions all the time, but you will reduce the number of blunders you make. In the midst of failure you will be able to proactively assess the damage of a poor social choice and adapt a new approach in response. You are allowed to make mistakes, making mistakes is how we refine our methods. Damage control however should be top priority whenever you make any socially dangerous blunders, assuming of course forfeiture of the relationship is inconsequential and thus viable.

2c.) Become Eloquently Articulate

Your quickness of mind must manifest itself through the smooth eloquence of your speech. You need the competency to verbally riposte. Your mastery of language is a weapon, and your voice, a delivery system. This skill is incredibly important, especially as a means of defence to aid with deflection and pressure reversal. It may also however be used as a tool of interrogation should that be one’s proclivity. Eloquent articulacy is particularly useful when one finds themselves caught off-guard in psychological ambush. For example, say you are **psychologically tested** in full-view of an observing audience where there is surmounting social pressure for you to respond or otherwise incur social penalty. In such a situation quick wits will safeguard your reputation; an inability to pass the test will lower your station by damaging your reputation. A successful Machiavellian knows how to, and is sufficiently able to defend themselves from the devices of others. In a world where physical violence is unlawful we must prioritise the composition of our well-being’s defence via psychological assets. Inversely, such a talent can be used to influentially persuade others.

2d.) Emotional Intelligence & Infiltration

You must develop sophisticated emotional intelligence. This is where women with their preference for emotional communication make up for their weakness as identified in section 2a. This doesn’t mean you should analyse with emotion but rather that you must be capable of communicating with it and inspiring with it. There is no charm in robotic behaviour. You must understand the relationship between emotions by learning how they invoke and relate to neighbouring emotions. Likewise to be capable of this you should have an intricate grasp of the characteristics and depth of each emotion.

You need to understand the nature of each individual emotion so that this can be leveraged to influence people into predictable outcomes. If you can feel as others feel you will be able to glean intimate knowledge on how to best influence them. Do not act out of constraint instinctually to the shared emotion you feelings will demands of you. Instead, use this emotion and all that pertains to it as a data point. Data that is vital in understanding how best to influence the individual you are dealing with; who unlike yourself is constrained by the imperative of their emotional state. To better summarise: you must experience how others feel and feel how they feel, whilst being detached from how the imperative of that emotion would typically compel a lesser mind to behave. You must feel as others feel but unlike them you must not instinctually act upon your feelings.

With this knowledge you can strategise in many ways. For example with an understanding of what emotionally propels a person you can fill their emotional void by reshaping yourself into
the source of their desires. (Relevant: law 11 - keep people dependent on you.) Not only that, but shared emotions build both trust and rapport. With enough knowledge of a particular character anyone can be a source of emotional sustenance for another regardless of their wealth or status. This ability to fluidly transform into an emotional object of desire (much like water changes shape to fill volume) can allow for emphatic social influence. The importance of this point is most emphatically not to be underestimated. Men especially can be flippant in matters of emotion, but they would do well to refine and ultimately master their understanding of such an area. Especially when dealing with women, for a woman’s emotional state no matter how fleeting is her reality whilst it presides. Emotional intelligence combined with an understanding of a person’s social relationships can be utilised to identify an individual’s emotional weak spots. Those in turn can be leveraged for self-gain should you opt for a more aggressive approach; the world’s the limit so use these “newfound powers” wisely.

2e.) Cold Reading

You must develop the ability to cold read. Cold reading is the ability to detect, comprehend and decipher subtle non-verbal cues such as vocal tonality, posture/body language, eye/facial movements, choice of clothing/accessorization, accent/lingual register etc. This allows you to deduce someone’s state of mind and make inferences about what they’re thinking/immediately prioritising without needing to overtly enquire. Knowing how people feel about you regardless of what they say is invaluable. Having the ability to make accurate generalisations about a person without even psychologically probing them gives you a massive advantage over those untalented in the discernment of non-verbal cues. Cold-reading is undoubtedly a prerequisite for any budding Machiavellian as it contributes vastly to the effectiveness of one’s deductive capabilities. A good book recommended by my readers on this topic is Joe Navarro’s “What Every BODY is Saying: An Ex-FBI Agent’s Guide to Speed-Reading People.”

2f.) Superficial Charm

Machiavellianism requires constant in-field analysis and ample socialisation. Every interaction you have should have meaning to it. In your conversations you should be summing people up and collecting information on them so that you may better understand their nature. If you can do this you can calibrate your demeanour to their tastes and successfully socialise with a diverse range of characters. Likewise in the process of doing so you may also happen upon valuable information which has the potential to grant you power over said people (e.g.: secrets, admissions in confidence etc.)

We live in a time where the average man and woman will greet you with an inauthentic version of themselves, their fabled social representative. It is this learned defence mechanism people commonly employ that you will need to overcome in order to become properly acquainted. In light of this one should realise that Machiavellianism is executed best with an air of charm and humour. Mentally, charm is the anaesthesia of suspicion; it allows you to probe deeply into the psyche of others without causing pain or paranoia. It is in matters of a more physical nature that sedatives allow doctors to operate on a person in much the same way. Here however the internal adjustment being made to “the patient” is
cognitive rather than mechanical. If people do not feel they can trust you because you lack the ability to make them feel comfortable then the interrogative nature of Machiavellianism can result in ill-feeling and alienation. For best results one should always apply charm. Charm is necessary for comfort and comfort is necessary to trust. Without trust, your options for mutual co-operation are limited. A good book for fortifying your charm is Dale Carnegie’s best-selling “How To Win Friends and Influence People.” Well worth a read if charm (or a lack of it) is one of your underlying social weaknesses.

3.) Concluding Statements: Misapplying The Laws

Not all of Robert Greene’s laws of power apply to each and every situation. There are laws in the book which starkly contradict each other. This is often a source of confusion for wannabe Machiavellians and younger readers alike. Greene likes to inverse laws by flipping them on their head and showing how a reversal of a law can be just as, if not more effective than the law itself. It is up to your analytical mind to deduce whether or not the law should be applied as it is presented or if the nuances of the situation at hand would benefit you more if you were to instead reverse a law. It is your responsibility to understand the situation you find yourself in and how you must behave in regard to that. You must be able to comprehend the people who make up the social landscape you are in (their statuses, usefulness, opinions of and relations with one another, their motives, desires etc.) The book is giving you ingredients that you can use to attain power, but it is not hand-holding you. Generally speaking the easier your life has been up until this point the harder you will find it to employ the books teachings effectively. The power of pain is in the exuberance of its energy. Pain is a cataclysm for change that opens the mind to otherwise closed or unneeded possibilities.

With thorough analysis of your social environment you can build up a picture of what’s going on behind the scenes and selectively utilise laws which complement the situation at hand. Essentially, one must tailor how they implement laws to the target of their devices, bearing in mind the scenario and the implications/consequences that applying the law will have. For example, law 34 (act royal in your own fashion) and law 1 (don’t outshine the master) are largely speaking, contradictory laws. You could not typically apply both laws to the same person at the same time. To act pompous and royal is to inevitably outshine, trying to be both things at once would send out mixed signals. You’d arouse suspicion with the dichotomous perversion evident in your demeanour’s erratic duality. Using law 34 on a narcissist or on someone with more power than yourself is going to put them on guard and inspire them to defensively analyse you as a means of self-preservation. Whereas implementing this law in your interactions with people of low Machiavellian intelligence and narcissism will inspire respect and even admiration for your show of grace. Using law 1 on a superior, a narcissist or a person with high Machiavellian intelligence will lower their guard and build trust. On the other hand implementing law 1 in your interactions with someone of low Machiavellian intelligence (or a social inferior) will inspire them to write you off as being even lowlier than they.

To simplify this: the strong want to believe you are weak, so fulfil their beliefs by playing to their wants. It is in this way you can get the strong to accept you. A competent Machiavellian
should not allow the strong to perceive them as competition until it is too late. Only when the competition can do nothing to stop the emergence of a Machiavellian’s devices does a Mach make his grand entrance (Law 28: Enter Action With Boldness.)

The strong desire your passivity because they wish to retain their dominance; their primary motive is to preserve their power. They are players, and competition means a threat to their power. The weak on the other hand want you to be strong because they are fearful and seek to anchor themselves to the powerful. They have no fear of maintaining power and prestige as they have very little, if any. Their fear is of ensuring their survival when lacking the power necessary to forge their own destiny. It is for this reason the weak anchor themselves to the strong, seeking direction, guidance and comfort. If you are strong or powerful already you must be wary of this. This can turn into a form of emotional parasitism where such a relationship is unwelcomed; although effectively this is what law 34 (act royal in your own fashion) exploits when applied to the average, who in their averageness, are weak.

The misapplication of the laws of power will result in social failure rather than success. If you misapply the laws clumsily they will not have the intended effect, at the very worst they will ruin your reputation. Likewise you need to adopt and master particular skill sets in order to be proficient enough to apply the laws. Finally, some word of advice: in your quest to refine the vocational skill sets required for Machiavellian proficiency you should practice the refinement of your art on those you care little for. That way when you inevitably ruin said relationship through Machiavellian experimentation, its disposable nature will mean no significant value will have been lost.
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“When a father gives to his son, both laugh; when a son gives to his father, both cry.” – William Shakespeare
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1.) Introduction:

It is unbecoming of a man to identify as a victim, thus I never encourage men to see themselves in this way. However, a boy raised by a single mother or family with a submissive father has been deprived his birthright. These are the lost boys, the unwitting victims of poor parenting. I label them victims only in the sense they have been done a great disservice, that is not to say this cannot be overcome, but that merely a most deleterious handicap has been conferred on them.

A boy raised by a beta is not taught social dominance, or how to protect himself physically or mentally. He’s not shown how to attract women, and chances are he will lack basic yet necessary life skills such as self-discipline. Like the boy of the single mother, he is forced
to employ the internet as a surrogate for the father he never had. The need for young men, as well as lost boys who have grown into adult men to be “good at being a man” is dire. To any man masculinity is important, but due to paternal deprivation this need is even greater among lost boys. It is as such that in a time where there is little in the way of support for boys and men, the manosphere has manifest.

Boys need a strong paternal figure in their life, someone to teach them of, and guide them in the ways of men. More importantly, they need someone to shield them from the estrogenic tirades of a struggling mother. A young boy is not fit to adequately handle nor sufficiently cope with an adult woman’s emotions, yet in the absence of a strong father this burden as “man of the house” is imposed on a young boy to his developmental detriment. A woman’s emotions don’t care if her boy is only 7 years old, if she’s got to emote, she’s going to.

So what happens when, through no fault of his own, said 7-year-old grows into a young 20-year-old who never had the strong paternal figure he needed to become the best version of himself? When due to such poor upbringing, he is clueless in the ways of men, inadequate with women, undisciplined, depression prone and mentally unbalanced? He goes onto his computer, he tells his problems to his therapist, Google, and if the “I’m feeling lucky button” works right, he ends up here.

2.) Father Hunger:

The lost boy is damaged, driven to spiritual dysfunction by excess exposure to estrogen. For a lost boy estrogenic influences are abundant to the point of toxicity, with testosteronic influence but a scant repository oasis-like in its scarcity.

Whether a boy came from a single mother or a weak father, the root and core of his problems as a man are one and the same. In his formative years, he lacked a dominant albeit benevolent masculine role model to guide him. A boy needs a patriarch to teach him the ways of men, and so a woman will not do, for the condition of her existence knows not the male experience.

A woman interacts with men as a woman, a man’s behaviour in relation to her is thereby measured in its response to the presence of femininity, how men behave with her is not how they behave with one another. A woman only sees what a man portrays. She does not understand the why or the how, thus she is ignorant to a man’s inner-workings. Women only ever see the end product, not what it took to create.

As such, a woman may in her hubris think she understands men, but what she can never know is how to be a man among men. Because she knows not this, nor what it is like to be a man and deal with a woman, her guidance in raising a boy is merely necessary, not sufficient. Boys intuit this and men know this, but because single mothers have been catapulted atop a cultural hero pedestal, nobody dares address the elephant in the room.

Likewise a low-tier man will not do, for he is an inferior version of man, and therefore like a high school physics student holding a symposium on molecular quantum mechanics, ill-equipped to teach much of anything. Some of the boys birthed by single mothers are rescued, an alpha grandfather or uncle raises them as their own, but this is spiritual surgery.
to what is otherwise an avoidable problem.

The bond between father and son is sacrosanct, for boys take mental nourishment on how to be from their fathers, not their mothers. What single mothers provide their boys is a female model for how to be, and naturally this leads to feminine and broken men, not stable, competent and masculine men.

In spite of what a woman’s narcissism may screech – “his father was a jerk, my boy is better off without him!”, the reality is that boys want fathers and fathers want sons; it is the gynocentric cultural and legal framework which emancipates them. It is the rights of women to the detriment of men which emancipates them. It is a mother’s legal entitlement to her children, where a father has no reciprocal entitlement which emancipates them.

3.) Pain of The Lost Boy:

The lost boys have no voice and they dare not speak, for they do not expect anyone to care for their tale of struggle. Speaking, for the little that its worth anyway, would thus be quite pointless. “You are a boy, boys must be strong!” is what the bigots parrot in retort to a male’s exclamation of struggle.

The concept of sympathy and an extension of aid to boys and men suffering adversity is all but absent. Their hardships are often met by sociopathic nonchalance at best, and contemptuous disgust at worst. The lost boys understand indifference quite intimately, whilst comprehending little in matters of love, for they have never really been loved properly. At least not in a way that does not serve to only weaken them further, be that the maternal love of a coddling mother or the heartbreak of puppy love.

Whether it’s clear to them or not, what they need is the strong unwavering hand of paternal love. Paternal love is the love that keeps on giving, it is the richest love, and yet the spiritual medicine the lost boy needs is the very thing he can never hope to have.

It’s the delinquency caused by an absence of such love which cements a type of loneliness into the boy it afflicts. Something is fundamentally missing, these boys are broken, they can’t seem to make their lives work, they struggle to find themselves, they know they have a problem, but they don’t know what to do about it and nobody seems to give a fuck. This is the plight of the lost boy.

4.) The Lost Boy, A Feminist Bastard:

The ever-increasing isolation of today’s young men is a social affliction endemic in developed countries. The isolation, feminisation, neglect and underachievement of such men is a pronounced trend. A trend which only came to prominence since feminism murderously toppled the nuclear family, leaving nothing but broken homes in its wake.

When the nuclear family was the norm, and women were neither quite so naive nor financially incentivised to raise a child alone, the likelihood a boy had a fruitful bond with his father was greater. Simply put, bastards were uncommon as was divorce. As a direct consequence of feminism, boys and men alike are all the worse for it. Before feminism came
to dictate the social narrative, having children out-of-wedlock was considered neither acceptable nor desirable. Now it is commonplace.

Nobody talks about how boys are failing, nobody at all. However, despite the sordid indifference and neglect of society’s inclination to address such a fundamental social ill, it’s not as fringe and uncommon as perhaps some of society’s more privileged would like to imagine, “imagine” being the operative word here.

Why is society so apathetic to the plight of the lost boys? Well to aid these boys would be to politically undermine the hegemony of feminist thought, and thus it is not part of either the political or cultural imperative to address this modern plague. Instead, we sweep it under the rug and pretend it isn’t there.

Chances for a lost boy to socialise outside of the home will have been at school, and in the workplace. Typically such institutions yielded little to no social reward for them, that is to say, because the lost boys were not high value individuals taught proper social skills, nobody ever really wanted to know them. Who cares about poor guys who aren’t good-looking, naturally charming, wealthy or connected? Nobody, and yet, this aptly describes the majority of men born into poverty with nobody to provide them what they need to reach their potential.

If even a fraction of today’s boys and men were lucky enough to find the red pill, they would be immediately awash with regret, yet simultaneously relieved. Finally, they’re awake. With their path to recovery and masculine self-development laid bare, where once there was only pain and nihilism, there is now a glimmer of hope. The red pill is not a cure in so much as it is an effective treatment. Nothing can replace the hole left by an absent (or inadequate) father, but the advice and guidance of a good father can be replaced – that’s what the red pill does.

5.) How The Lost Boy Copes:

How does a lost boy attempt to break away from the shackles of his personal hell? Most do not find the red pill community. Some become bold with a “I’ve got nothing to lose motherfucker” kind of mindset, dialling up their dark triad characteristics. They may sell drugs or get involved in gangs. They do anything that gives them money, respect, status and sex, casting all sense of conventional morality out the window. People who have nothing break the law to get something, not necessarily because they enjoy breaking the law. Frustration breeds criminality as much does poverty, so when both are present you have a real recipe for disaster.

What about the lost boys who are too timid to take the dark triad route? What about lost boys from a slightly better economic background? They end up incubating their sadness with technology, namely porn and video games. This anaesthetises them, it allows them to forget their lowly, drab existence and provides a false sense of achievement. In reality, they’re not going anywhere, but at least in this cocoon, they’re not falling anywhere either.

It is of course without its drawbacks, a lack of everyday social interaction creates an irrational fear of socialising. If you don’t spend a lot of time around people, you foster an irrational fear of them. Lost boys have become so socialised by emotional neglect that
voluntary solitude has become their modus operandi. Quite the dichotomy it is, to fear loneliness whilst simultaneously fearing social interaction, this but a mere glimpse of the personal hell a lost boy endures.

Escapism is a form of self-preservation for people who don’t know how to or simply aren’t brave enough to engage in self-improvement. When you have nothing, when you have nobody, stepping into the gym and lifting some weights around a bunch of strangers is a big deal. It takes courage for a lost boy to do what is otherwise seen as a mundane activity for regular people. A lost boy’s anxiety can become quite debilitating, it will actively stop him from pursuing self-improvement because beholden to fear, he is paralysed. The cycle must be broken for progress to take hold, but lost boys are oft slaves to fear because rejection and failure is all they’ve ever known.

6.) How A Lost Boy Quits:

The standards for masculinity are high, whilst the infrastructure to cultivate it is all but non-existent for many. No wonder then so many incubate themselves from a dreary existence with porn, games and internet. When you feel like society doesn’t want you, why would you want to participate in it?

If you’re isolated and the struggle is getting you down, one may as well make the confines of their psychological prison as comfortable as possible. It’s not that I advocate this lifestyle in any way, quite the contrary, but simply that I understand why it is as common as it is, to be succinct: its psychic anaesthesia.

Relative to loneliness is preselection. A lack of preselection can form the basis for a lost boy’s social ostracisation. Most people are close-minded and judgemental, they won’t even try to look beyond superficialities to see if there’s anything likeable about you, so if you’re not a high-flyer, a great deal of people are not even interested in sharing oxygen with you.

“Everyone wants to be with a winner, if that’s not you and you’re a collective heap of problems stemming from the promiscuity of your mothers ovary, then fuck you because nobody gives a shit about you.”

7.) Advice For A Lost Boy:

Take up as many hobbies as you can afford to, fill your timetable with them. Fixate on becoming better, you’re not going to settle for mediocrity and idle escapism anymore. Your commitment to yourself is to invest what your parents never did. You want better, so you’re going to strive for it.

One of the first things you should do is join a gym, exercise is great for staving off depression and increasing personal confidence. I know if you’re feeling particularly low that this may seem quite scary, but it is necessary. Exercise is one of the basic building blocks necessary to fuel all other forms of self-enhancement, as is reading.

More important is developing skills from extracurricular activities. Debating clubs, dance, martial arts, languages, instruments, the list is endless. That which allows you to socialise,
whilst gaining a skill is something inherently worth pursuing. Working on skills builds your value, building your value should be a huge part of what your life will become. If you don’t know what you like, experiment until you know.

Take one step at a time, do not fret over the slowness of your self-improvement. Frustration will only serve to undo your progress, inspiring unwelcome regression. For someone in a position such as yours, it is a wonder you are even improving at all. It’s a wonder you survived long enough to find this blog and even seriously think about your situation. It doesn’t matter how slowly you build, only that you do. Rome wasn’t built in a day, you won’t be either.

More information pertaining to making this kind of lifestyle change can be found here.

8.) In Closing:

The ideological weaponisation of wombs by feminism has disrupted the patriarchal line. The systematic segregation of father from son brought about by changes to the legal and welfare systems have deprived two successive generations of men their masculinity, and will continue to do so for as long as this ideology is granted any judicial or academic legitimacy.

As such, we now have the perverse circumstance in which a man is present to raise his boy, yet would himself be considered unfit in the ways of men by his contemporaries. Likewise we have women ‘raising’ boys, equally ignorant to the ways of men, yet heralded as champions of bravery for what is often no more than promiscuity absent contraception. This promiscuity and taxpayer dependency is then retroactively repackaged as independence, and young boys grow up not only fatherless, but penniless.

However, the most perverse injustice is where men uneducated in the ways of men are charged with raising boys. These men replicate their masculine illiteracy by imparting their psychic castration onto an impressionable and unsuspecting son. This is perhaps one of the greatest tragedies of all. Not only did this man miss out on a fulfilling manhood, but without malice of intent, through his own hand his boy will too.

9.) Relevant Reading:

Buy “No More Mr Nice Guy” in the USA
Buy “No More Mr Nice Guy” in the UK
Buy “No More Mr Nice Guy” in Canada
Buy “The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men” in the USA
Buy “The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men” in the UK
Buy “The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men” in Canada
Buy “The Way of Men” in the USA
Buy “The Way of Men” in the UK
Buy “The Way of Men” in Canada
What would happen if the red pill ever became a mainstream intellectual framework? In my estimation society would either a: collapse or b: a sizeable number of redpillers would evolve into neoreactionaries as they begin to analyse the entire system and implement change at the political and legal levels. Essentially the state of affairs would devolve into all-out ideological warfare with sex-positive feminism, the prevailing hegemonic ideology in the west as it stands. Modern day contemporary feminism is but a shadowy figure of doublespeak and doublethink which stands defiant and omnipotent in what is a post-religious collection of societies, succeeding the role of religion as both moral and social arbitrator, espousing it’s radicalist rhetoric through various imperative and declarative assertions in a hysterically hyperbolic manner such as: “thou shalt not rape!”, “thou may judge man, not woman”, “keeping a home is slavery!”, “you can have it all!” (if you’re a woman) among other such asinine and societally dysfunctional beliefs.

Feminism as the dominant societal ideology in the hearts and minds of the citizenry is much like the religion of past society, to openly disagree with feminist beliefs and to a wider extent, politically correct egalitarian belief systems is the west’s modern day equivalent of blasphemy, because if you’re not with them the dichotomous nature of their indoctrination leads them to believe you must be against them, inevitably leading to career blacklisting, libellous defamation/vilification and the harshest of social exclusion from the proverbial herd. This is why anonymity permeates the redpill community, nobody is willing to lose their livelihood and ability to subsist due to the opinions they keep being held in the wrong era, whilst I’m on the topic here’s a relevant law of power you should observe. In the modern west to be perceived as feminist friendly is not an ideological choice that the citizenry are free to make, but rather a requirement of anyone wishing to progress or at least sustain themselves in the corporatism of modern capitalism, especially should they happen to be male. Failure to tow this line will have such a man’s repute eviscerated via the public declaration he is a hateful misogynist (allowing him to be placed in the position of oppressor and thus justifiably punished whilst ironically it is he who is actually being oppressed), much like the church would previously denounce their blasphemers as heretics, accusing their detractors of all kinds of crazy shit “this motherfucker casts magic, a child of satan!” the day’s modern feminists are mutually always in the market for a good witch hunt. It’s the same shaming mechanism and same ideological hegemony but with a different ideology, funny how that works.

The de facto hegemony of radicalised feminism alongside the decline of religion is one of the main proponents (although not the sole proponent) owing to the increase in amorality/immorality and the decline of a moral and honour-bound culture. Increasing apathy, isolation, anxiety, desensitization, depression, distrust and ultimately sociopathy among other dysfunctional and detrimental human behaviours are all symptoms of the feminist induced collapse of the traditional family unit complemented by an increasingly impersonal and globalising world. In essence, feminism alongside other social engineering efforts such as multiculturalism as well as wage deflation through mechanisation.
and its outsourcing via globalisation has transformed western societies from homogeneously high-trust to low-trust multicultural socially unintegrated melting pots. The decline of the Anglo-American and European social and moral fabric is not sustainable, and neither is the red pill’s way of “playing the system” as “the system” will eventually change/evolve/devolve or crash entirely. This is not a criticism of TRP as much as it is a reality of it, as a civilization we are in a constant state of flux, by the time you have your own grandkids (assuming you choose to continue your genetic line) the things you learnt on the red pill would need to be calibrated for the environment that your grandkids will find themselves in should you choose to pass on red pill knowledge to them. The most basic and rudimentary maxims will hold, but the methodology of their application will more than likely, not. For example Arthur Schopenhauer’s 19th century German philosophy on women, as well as concepts such as hypergamy and female sexual plurality will remain largely static, however how such things are exemplified and interpreted will depend upon the political climate (the level of power and relevance that feminism will hold in that timeframe as a social ideology), as well as the effects of technological leaps influencing how people interact and socialise with one another.

For example, an alpha grandpa would have no concept of tinder (no computers/internet existed) and as feminism was weaker/less radicalised marriage to him wasn’t automatically deemed a high-risk, low-reward investment. TRP is ultimately a pragmatic and contemporary philosophy, if “the system” (the dominant ideology, social policy and politics of society were to change) then TRP will either cease to be (out of obsolescence) or change with the system proving itself as an intellectual framework that is adaptive rather than maladaptive, having its history archived on the internet in relation to the-then contemporary issues of the time. Being a philosophy born on the internet, it will leave a fully transparent data trail that will allow all who dig through the depths of the internet to see in its entirety how the philosophy has evolved and progressed in line with its adherents understandings and deductions, deductions that will eventually culminate in taking red pill insights in their present day form to their natural conclusions, accounting for any significant shift in the political and ideological makeup of society along the way. This effectively leaves the red pill wide open to scrutiny, and should it ever stray down an incoherent path it will be possible to see where it went wrong or what effectively corrupted the philosophy and allow for correction where deemed fit.

The seduction movement better known as PUA evolved independently of the Men’s Rights movement and it was the consolidation of both of these areas of thought that gave birth to TRP through the increase in self-awareness that their entanglement entails, essentially the “consolidation” was a process of connecting all the dots between PUA and men’s rights with the supplementation of self-improvement thrown in for good measure, amounting to a perspective that looked to be a superior improvement upon its predecessors. In a way, one could say it was an industrial revolution of ideological gender philosophy within the masculine vein of neoreaction, bringing many separate ideas together under one umbrella and interpreting them with an anti-feminist, pro-male, amoral slant to give pragmatically useful and rational understanding to a multitude of social issues that the common man faces in the face of a contemporary paradigm where such a man would not have any other effective alternative avenue for recourse. Prior to this consolidation and concentration of consciousness, PUAs had “woken up” (to a limited extent) by learning that society was fucked up in ways that were previously inconceivable to them, and perhaps hilariously (or
quite worrying) the reason they “woke up” was because they couldn’t get laid. With an almost even gender ratio the men that began to form the demography of the seduction movement began the movement thinking “getting laid shouldn’t be this difficult”, “how can I make getting laid a lifestyle or something easily performed?” many of them having followed the poor advice mainstream society gives on relationships “happy wife, happy life” “get a good education, get a career, be nice, provide, have kids” and yadda yadda yadda to no avail.

Despite the prevailing social condition that a society of feminine primacy had endorsed, men who took to the seduction movement did so because initially they had begun to feel not only awkward and out-of-place in their everyday interactions, but socially and even morally wronged, women seemed intangible, confusing, as well as socially and legally superior to them despite the so-called egalitarian social standing that each gender supposedly enjoys (courtesy of the bullshit that is the mainstream academic elite’s progressive narrative.) It was thus that men of various ages, nations and races began to simultaneously feel disenchanted and out-of-place with their existence, finding themselves both socially and sexually unfulfilled across the globe in societies that valued feminine primacy, in locales where feminism is a state endorsed ideology, men in significant numbers were struggling to find romantic happiness because their needs and wants were vilified, ignored and largely unconsidered by their cultures. Having a harder time than their female counterparts whilst being unable to place their finger on exactly what was wrong with themselves and the culture they lived in, they began to irk that something was off, they just didn’t know what that something was. Ultimately it was the consolidation of knowledge gained about women through the trial and error of pickup artistry (the relearning of knowledge that feminism had suppressed about women through political correctness) and the growing visibility of feminine primacy via the increasingly obnoxious voice of radical feminism not to mention the light shone on male legal subjugation by the men’s rights movement that culminated in the eventual birth of the red pill.

The next step after fully internalising and understanding TRP is to become a neoreactionary, that is, to understand the culture you live in and why it is how it is in a more complete form, not simply master the understanding of intersocial behaviours people in your culture exhibit within a sociosexual dynamic, but to effectively dispel all the idealistic politically correct lies that compose the crux of “the progressive narrative.” Unlike TRP/PUA which are overwhelmingly male dominated (with RPW and fPUA being minor, if somewhat far less notable offshoots), neoreaction is far less gender exclusive as it is a reaction to the state of contemporary western civilization as a whole and not simply the gender dynamics of society which albeit central, are not wholesome of the entire paradigm we find ourselves living in. Neoreaction spans many different areas of academic ideology pertaining to modern civilization of which it criticises are the cause of its decline. It runs across race lines, economic lines, political lines, religious lines, as well as gender lines.

As I said prior TRP is the masculine vein of neoreaction along a gender line, whilst the institutionalisation of feminism was the female reaction fifty years prior. The neo-neo reaction to TRP has quite ironically been the vocalisation for more radical feminism, with the radfems exposing the ugliness of their disposition by trying to silence TRP by declaring it (and petitioning the US government to declare it) a hate movement, whilst also trying to use TRP
as something they can use to validate their sexist, bigoted and misandrist beliefs rather than acknowledge feminism and it’s radicalisation had begun long before TRP was even an anxiously horny glint in the eye of the first PUA. In essence, feminism tries to paint TRP as the boogeyman to try and give itself legitimacy as a competing victim narrative in a civilization where it is not only becoming increasingly obsolete, but one where the ruling “progressive narrative” ensures that the bigger the perceived victimhood is of a particular group in society, the more power, privilege and politically correct social capital they are given to abuse to the detriment of the collective whole.

Unfortunately, not everyone will make the complete journey along the road of PUA to TRP to neoreaction (most progress in this order through their journey of continuing and increasing awareness) as the further you go along, the steeper the intellectual incline becomes. That is to say the further you go along the path of rational and intellectual enlightenment and self-discovery, the more brain power you need to comprehend just what the hell is going on among the complex intricacies of the diverse modern social fabric. Due to its breadth and vast area of focus neoreaction is infinitely more complex and arguably far less pragmatically applicable than the red pill is and for that reason alone, alongside the intellectual bell curve required to try and comprehend its arguments, it will find itself being far less popular than the red pill, the red pill in a way serving as a sort of gateway into neoreaction once the most intellectual redpillers feel they fully understand TRP and seek more in-depth and profound understanding in areas outside the sphere of gender dynamics. Neoreaction is not a direct evolution of the red pill, but more of a complement in overall awareness to it, that is to say, neoreaction will not override TRP in relevance in the way that TRP has overridden PUA, but it will complement TRP by exposing the delusional nature of various mainstream narratives and systems of prevailing academic thought much in the way that TRP exposes the fallaciousness of modern sociosexual dynamics from the masculine perspective.

Metaphorically speaking if PUA were a country, TRP is a continent and neoreaction would be the entire planet. If you do not want to do anything but get laid, PUA is enough, if you want to explore your neighbours and build a better-rounded successful life you’re going to want TRP, if you want to traverse the world, and add an in-depth understanding of the various prevailing economic, political, religious and other miscellaneous associated narratives and agendas of our time then you’re going to want to add neoreaction to your arsenal of understanding. Ultimately it is TRP that will give you the power to act and behave and instigate change physically whilst neoreaction will further amplify your understanding of the world, in essence, neoreaction in the metaphorical sense is a “second red pill”, not everyone needs it, not everybody wants it (letting go of all one’s ignorance is incredibly toilsome and has a tendency to induce existential nihilism) whilst if you simply don’t care about your genetic line or the state of civilization but desire to merely live a good life whilst you have your time on this Earth then TRP should be more than enough for you. Neoreaction isn’t for everyone, not everyone is an intellectual or budding revolutionary and that’s fine, but for those that are, there are definitely dots to be connected between TRP and neoreaction and I invite all the more veteran redpillers “looking to find further understanding” to add /r/darkenlightenment to their list of subscribed subreddits.

For all related thoughts use the comments box as usual, for unrelated thoughts, advice and questions contact me via the “about/contact page.” I do try to reply to all my messages.
although it is not always possible for me to do so considering the length of reply and effort required that some enquires warrant.
Hardened men make for attractive men, for toughness is a trait that men and women alike covet in men. Almost all respect a hardened man even when they dislike him. At the same time, hardened women make for utterly repulsive beings. They do not inspire desire nor respect, merely alienation. Hardening is conducive to the cultivation of masculinity, but to femininity it is toxic. To femininity it is harmful, deleterious. Women must seek wisdom and respite in the face of suffering, not masculinization. For women to preserve their greatest asset: their femininity, they must avoid masculinisation at all costs. This is healthier and more conducive to a woman’s development than adopting masculine boisterousness.

Women are taught to debauch their femininity in pursuit of power and social acceptance under the rule of feminist dogma. They all too unwittingly realise not what they give up by capitulating to feminism. Much to woman’s detriment, adhering to the feminist roadmap results in a vitiation of her desirability to the kind of man she yearns for. Of specific note in regard to this is the contemporary culture. The current economic model and prevailing social-programming of the time push women towards masculinity by framing it as “liberation.” Feminism sells women the lie that to masculinise is to become free. It convinces the feminine to divorce herself from her nature and to aspire to be that which she isn’t. That her desire to nurture, support and mother is weak. She should become more manlike, fierce, assertive, a conqueror! Indeed what banal trite, there is no man of worth breathing that wants to commit to the fabled feminist “real woman.”
As such, the typical woman aims to emulate the qualities of men rather than master the art of femininity. These women have been contorted in belief to reject traditional femininity as abhorrent, weak. They delusively idolise emulating the behaviour of man whilst ironically harbouring a hatred for man. They idolise such behaviour because they have been taught it is necessary to acquire success and respect. They could not be any more wrong. Nothing raises the ire and disdain of man more than a woman who attempts to make him obsolete by emulating him. Men desire not masculine women, neither do they wish to compete with them. Men desire feminine women, they want to take care of them. Men of substantial worth reject women devoid of femininity.

Women have two distinct choices, the prior I believe leading to richer, longer-lasting happiness and the latter, not so. They may refine their femininity and cultivate that quality to captivate the love of a powerful man. Said man will provide the bulk of the income. Work will be relegated to the realm of hobby, coming not before family, keeping house and child-rearing. The latter is that of the career woman, of independence. This is the ethos that has led to the collective masculinisation, stress and misery of today’s women. They forgo the refinement of femininity to work in the world of business. To be competitive in such an environment they toughen up to survive, reducing their social appeal.

Toughness (distinct from resilience) reduces a woman’s femininity, thus mitigating her desirability to men. A resilient woman can maintain her femininity and draw upon feminine strength without masculinising. Resilient women continue to build upon and maximise their femininity in spite of hardship. They do not give in to the corruptive allure of masculinisation and poison themselves with a lust for conquest. They expend their efforts on becoming personable, wise and altruistic. They look for shelter in friendship and compassion, rather than sacrifice their femininity on the altar of feminism. They enhance rather than contort themselves. They do not entertain bitterness and allow hatred to warp them into pathetic vaginal caricatures of masculinity. They embrace traditional femininity for the value it holds to men and the rewards that yields. They do not adopt the contemptuous inferiority complex symptomatic of feminism. They do not chain themselves to the views of “friends” who condemn them for aspiring to be traditionally feminine.

Those who undergo pain often become tougher of heart as a coping mechanism. With toughness comes a certain masculine component. The more damaged and pain afflicted a person becomes, the more they harden and toughen. This hardening is a natural response to ineptitude, dysfunction and disappointment. Hardening is necessary for masculine self-improvement because men are charged with leadership. Men cannot be attractive and fulfilled in their relationship unless they lead, women can. Men can have it all, they can become harder and likewise more desirable in their masculinity.

This could even go so far to explain why in the psychological sense women have a propensity to value the ruggedness that experience brings in men. While men on the other hand tend to prefer innocence and inexperience in women – defining this as not only as seductive but psychologically desirable. The why is simple: such a woman is free of the contamination of bitterness and cynicism that the failures of experience would wrought upon such a woman. These psychological aspects are the predominant culprits responsible for spoiling a woman’s femininity. There is little feminine that can remain feminine in the presence of distrustful
cynicism and vitriolic bitterness. Such women find themselves unloved, condemned to loneliness for they reek of repugnant undesirability.

In essence the more worn and experienced a woman becomes, the less feminine she becomes. Whilst a more battle-scarred and experienced man becomes more masculine. This is symptomatic of toughness, for toughness is a masculinising procedure. It is thus I must make an observation: it does indeed appear that men become more masculine with time and sufficient hardship. Antithetically, women, less feminine. Therefore it stands to reason that toughness is conducive to masculinity whilst detrimental to femininity. It is thus I must make an observation: it does indeed appear that men become more masculine with time and sufficient hardship. Antithetically, women, less feminine. Therefore it stands to reason that toughness is conducive to masculinity whilst detrimental to femininity. It is in my estimation that men not only prefer young women for their more nubile bodies, but additionally, for their more innocent – and so feminine – disposition. This perhaps goes some way in explaining the feminine obsession with maturity, for mature woman are (physically) oft perceived less desirable than the immature. Diametrically an immature man is of markedly lower desirability than a mature one. What’s good for one is not good for the other. It seems to be the nature of gender and biology itself to impose different measures of desirability upon men and women. Without these differences, there cannot be union. Yin-yang is necessary to maintain the balance needed for love to flourish. Women being yin, men being yang. When we try to reverse yin and yang so that women become masculine and men, feminine – monogamous love fails to flourish. Indeed it seems the position of yin and yang within the gender duality are static impositions.

This leads to my next point of estimation, I do believe that the fundamental reason the societies of the world have always tried so hard to protect and provide for their women in a manner of care that is all but absent in nature to their respective men is due to something of a matter of instinct which seeks to preserve the spiritual femininity of women, with an inherent understanding that the failure to protect women from the world and its evil would lead to the masculinisation of their disposition and thus rather tragically, the irrevocable loss of their femininity, for not enough new girls can be born and protected sufficiently from their older counterparts to replace the entire female demographic with women of femininity. It would seem that societies on some fundamental level have realised, perhaps not always in a way that they are conscious and eloquent enough to articulate, that femininity in and of itself carries a certain intrinsic value that is necessary for the sustenance and self-preservation of a society, and it is this value that is to be protected and sustained. These societies realised that subjecting women to the same kind of pressures that men are subject to would cause them to lose their femininity along the way, and such women would better benefit society by retaining their femininity rather than sacrificing it out of necessity in the emulation of man. For if society should forfeit femininity, demanding women fend for and coarsen themselves with the ugliness of survival, the very society reliant upon those who would maintain it would feel the tremors of emancipation as the feminine spirit is forcefully eviscerated from the societal psyche, leaving nothing but a collection of beings who strive to be manlike in its wake.

Without the counterbalance of gentle and demure femininity to complement the assertiveness of traditional masculinity, any affected society would foster detached apathy through competition within its citizenry rather than inclusive empathy through community.

Femininity is not just a gift to women, free of the shackles of responsibility that define
manhood and the accompanying economic struggle that brings, but likewise a gift to men also, who would confide in and find emotional solace within the spirit of their lovers femininity, expressing momentary vulnerability to the softest of souls in a way that only a man in agape with a woman would dare. A woman who feels safe enough and looked after enough is feminine in the most natural and charming way, momentarily carefree as she “lets her guard down”, she is a happy woman, a sweet woman, a kind woman and perhaps most importantly to our humble species, an attractive woman. Rarely do women get to experience this type of innocence anymore as the forces of feminism masculinise them into perverse hybrids, women composed of the worst that femininity and all her flaws has to offer whilst likewise borrowing the very worst that masculinity has to offer, educated to never let their guard down “in the face of oppression”, be this evangel preached directly through activism or indirectly via the harshness of the workplace and the economic machine that it serves, today’s women face emancipation from femininity, like their fellow-men do from masculinity, sold a narrative that their inherent disposition is incompatible with the gender identity that the prevailing ideology would demand of and subscribe to them.

Just how can the feminine continue to exist within the modern world when it is psychologically beaten out of women on a day-to-day basis? How can women be kind, caring and sensitive when they must work in the world of business, a masculinising albeit sociopathic world of margins, deadlines, quotas, targets, bottom lines and politics? You see the workplace itself undermines the cultivation of femininity, the hardened woman is but a feeble caricature of the ideal man, should she be stripped of her femininity via the hallways of heartbreak, the glass table of the boardroom or perhaps an amalgamation of both, such a woman is a walking emanation of all the ugliest that masculinity has to offer and with none of its perks, for she learns the ugliest of masculinities along a pilgrimage for personal conquest rather than learn it in whole in the way that only a boy who seeks to become a man can. She does not learn the nuances of masculinity, its duty, its honour, it’s burden or it’s inherently biological need to protect and provide and thus forth and so such a woman imposes herself ruthlessly and demandingly, without thought nor care for those she imprints her apathy on, belittling the men she hates along the way with vapid deep-seated hatred, corrupting fellow women in her wake, imploring that they too sacrifice their femininity under the guise of “motherly advice” in the promotion that her younger counterparts become like that which she has become, a caricature of a man, a woman who emulates the worst of masculinity without embodying any of its finer or more nobler traits.

Such a woman is a parasite, wondering what value she can take from those around her rather than what value she can add, she is psychologically unlovable to the desires of man and yet some remnant of femininity remains, she craves to be loved despite the impossibility such a task proves to be. It’s hard to love a monster and men do not love monsters like women do, they loathe them, even fear them and in the most extreme of circumstances, they kill them. You see masculinisation affects women differently than it does men, within men it fosters growth and actualisation, within women it fosters contempt, dissonance and discontent, corrupting the very souls of who they are, stripping them of any desirability beyond the flesh, which too, will eventually fade with age.

Is there anything less feminine in the world than a ball-busting cynical parasite devoid of the charms and femininity that men the world over have come to admire and cherish in women
for eons and eons? No, no there is not, and it is the crucifixion of femininity being perpetuated as an affront to masculinity within modern ideology, feminism containing the largest amount of estrogenic blood on its hands, that is unilaterally killing feminine spirituality in favour that we sacrifice it on the altar of corporatism in an effort to “equalise” the feminine with the masculine. What this really means it to condemn the true and natural feminine spirit as weak, to redefine it with masculine ideals, reinforce those ideals and then imprint those ideals onto society’s men and women until they believe this perverse form of femininity is “true femininity”, calling for the worship of this one brand of ideologically sanctioned femininity which remains to be nothing more than a corrupt bastardisation of the femininity that comes naturally to women who are free of Anglo social engineering efforts. What feminism has failed to realise is that although it has benefited many women superficially, it has done so at the cost of that which makes them truly women, that which makes them valuable to men beyond their bodies, the overlooked spiritual sense, the beauty that can be derived from their natural femininity. You see feminism spoils femininity in the name of equality, then the imbeciles who cause the damage are so incredibly ignorant (or incredibly intelligent, I cannot but tell the difference) as they seem to be at such a loss to understand just why men and women, but markedly women, are unhappier than they’ve ever been before.

I do think perhaps one of the most abhorrent things in the modern female psyche is that of scorn. Scorn is something I consider to be a truly fascinating state of being, you see scorn is a particular feminine flavour of revenge, it is effectively revenge on steroids with a feminine twist. Scorn is where the death of femininity within the soul of a woman rebirths itself vengefully in a manner of heightened sociopathy, such a woman bears the physical hallmarks of the feminine form, but to her very soul is ravaged by the most detestable, despicable and deplorable facets of both the masculine and the feminine. A scornful woman who derives her current state of being from the defining moment which initiated the destruction of her spirit’s femininity is a woman who is emulating the traits of man, straying from the path of womanhood and crossing into the realm of manhood, albeit such a woman will never truly be a man for she will lack the logic of a man, the appearance of man as well as the burden and societal expectation of a man, and so thus at best her bitterness leads to this type of quasi woman, a caricature of a man, embodying but the worst traits of both the masculine and the feminine, leaving us with what can only be described as a hollow, hybrid monstrosity that is neither man nor woman in the truest sense of the word regardless of its physical anatomy.

You see unlike men who can become better, stronger and more attractive men by growing through their pain and thus amplifying their inherent masculine energy, women do not become better women with pain, they become more manlike, and thus they are stripped of that which makes them attractive to men to begin with. See what is good for man, at least in this instance, is not good for woman. When women become “hardened” it, rather poetically, and quite ironically in its majesty, strips them of the very thing that makes them attractive beyond the realm of the physical to men in the first place, it emancipates them from their femininity, and to ensure a man truly loves a woman, and simply doesn’t just view such a woman as a disposable fuck puppet at best or a blathering idiot at worst, she must capture his interest psychologically and emotionally, not just physically, because many women can capture the eye of a man, but only a woman of some real feminine energy and depth can capture the heart and thus devotion of a man. You see femininity, like masculinity, must be
cultivated, although rather unlike masculinity it mustn’t be taught through pain, but through love.

Puppy love is the exception: it is the one love that can be educational to men. Puppy love is the inevitable experience in which naivety prevails, boys become men, and they learn first-hand through the misery of heartbreak and the cacophonous confusion of the indecisive female mind that the unilateral worship and adoration of the feminine form, the willingness to be captivated in the beauty of the feminine form, be it from the sound of her voice, to the touch of the skin, or the smell of her sweat, is nothing but a futile and suicide-inducing endeavour. Men learn for themselves in their quest for masculinity that they must not worship women, but rather, that they must lead them. Women do not go on a quest for femininity; they are born with it, and oft sacrifice it short-sightedly for power within the depths of delusion that makes up modern groupthink, only to realise in old age once their beauty has faded that they traded in their greatest intangible asset long ago.
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The red pill community and more generally speaking the manosphere have something of a love-hate relationship with women. I don’t love women as a collective, but seeing them for what they are to the bare bones I have learnt to accept them. In the rare instances they occur I can appreciate the minority of well-raised women that’ll contribute positively to my life. I can see how men are idealistic romantics that need/crave a woman in their life to “have a kind of connection they can’t have with another man,” but by the by, women are nothing to be lauded or worshipped. Western women in general are just shitty people. Red pill men have all the reason in the world to hate women when it’s made painfully clear how they operate and how much bullshit they manage to get away with. As unpopular as that notion is, it is far from unjustified. Being hateful however is merely cathartic, not constructive. Long-term catharsis is a sign that you are stuck in the bitter phase in your understanding of women, rather than progressing onward to accepting their limitations whilst simultaneously self-actualising.

Being continuously angry will not help you improve yourself. For the sake of your own mental health, you have to look past the flaws of modern women by being extremely selective with which ones you’ll reward with relational commitment. Ultimately, you must employ RP strategies to hold frame and maintain dominance with women who do manage to make the grade. It is in this way that you can learn to enjoy their positive attributes whilst mitigating their negatives, and if necessary subsequently drop them like hot shit when they cross the line. Which of course many, if not almost all, will at some point.

Imposing your boundaries is imperative. If you catch a woman young enough and she is merely uncultivated, as in lacking depth and desirable non-sexual traits – rather than the alternative, which is the complete and utter corruption of the psyche caused by the fucked-up feminist culture we live in – then you may just have a shot to make such a woman into what you want her to be. How is this accomplished? By training her to be someone that’s likeable rather than just fuckable, otherwise known as “long-term relationship game with an aspiring red pill woman.” Even so, not every man is willing to take a woman on as a full-time project alongside his own self-development. A woman who has taken the initiative to make herself worth a damn regardless of the value of her pussy is vastly superior to one who hasn’t; she didn’t need a man to take up the reins of father figure and teach her how to be a good woman, an effort which involves fighting her every step of the way on each and every detrimental habit she’s acquired over the years.

There is, however, a phenomenon I have noticed with a number of veteran red pillers: the total inverse of bitterness. The proud proclamation that in spite of the volume of knowledge and wisdom they have amassed on women, they have come to “love women.” Accepting women for who they are and managing them, adjusting your management style to complement their individual quirks is one thing; loving them as a collective just for being women is something completely different. An appreciation of the feminine form is a refined
predilection that all men possess, but allowing this to take hold as “love” is futile. If taking the lens of political correctness off women to see them for who they are has caused you to “love them” in spite of the perversity that is the modern state of femininity, something is definitely wrong with you. Just how shitty do women need to be for you to not “love them?” Or are you going to be a hopeless romantic no matter how low the bar is set?

When I hear a “red pill” man say “I love women!” (plural) rather than a particular woman, it strikes me with all the familiarity of Stockholm syndrome delusions. It’s almost as if there is a desperate urge to love women as a collective in such a man (an irrational ideal), rather than simply to love a specific woman where conditions permit. Stockholm syndrome is defined as the desperate need to love someone in spite of their abusive nature. With some “red pill” men in the acceptance stage (and blue/purple pill men) this concept is applied to women as an ambiguous collective rather than any one particular individual. It goes something like this: you so badly want to see the best in modern women and crave to be in love so much that you’ll consume yourself in the self-accountability that the quest for masculinity and self-improvement has taught you. Then in your romanticism, naively project your new-found sense of hyper-responsibility into your relationships with women.

Your only inherent responsibility is how well you objectively govern, not any affront to your governance. If you lead well but she fails to follow, that’s not your fault. It is implied that a good leader will not lose influence over their subordinates, but that is not necessarily so. If someone thinks there are better alternatives than you or is simply delusional, they will leave or otherwise rebel against you. In your endeavour to embody all things masculine, placate your ego to realise that you cannot control everything. You can merely stack the deck in your favour. It’s as simple as that.

I’ll give you an example: say you manage a company and despite meeting all your quotas and ensuring the staff are looked after and have their grievances met, one member of staff persists in disliking you. Is it your fault that this particular member of staff doesn’t like you? Are you going to blame yourself for not having read “How to Win Friends and Influence People”? Or is this person simply influenced by extraneous factors outside of your control? You wouldn’t blame yourself when one of your employees disliked you despite great leadership, so why blame yourself when things fuck up with your woman after you played your cards right?

Men in love lose cognitive clarity: even the most masculine of men burdened by the responsibility of romantic leadership blames himself for any mishaps that occur whilst the woman is all too happy to kick back and agree. Romanticism seems to profoundly cloud otherwise lucid reasoning within men. This is the delusion I see with some of the guys in the acceptance stage: all-encompassing hyperagency, rather than holding women to account for their shortcomings. This is a blue pill error that even the most seasoned masculine man will make, and it is something that will come to kick you in the ass with the precedent that “always taking the blame” sets.

The feminine imperative combined with masculine pride has convinced even the most red pill of men to take the blame for all manner of things in spite of the irrationality of such a policy, and it’s pathetic. For your own happiness and sanity you should learn to accept women for
who they are, but realise they possess far more negative qualities than they do positive. Women are an unending source of drama, they are a lot of hassle, and they need constant management. It is for this reason we refer to women as “the most responsible teenager in the house.” When you romanticise them in any way that deviates from reality you’re adding tinges of blue into your view of women. To love them, worship them, or even prefer spending time with them over men despite having read a lot of manosphere material, is not red pill at all, but really, a purple pill mindset that’s gone full circle.

To elaborate, it looks a little something like this: you began as an average uninformed guy, you were blue pill in your beliefs because you were ignorant and had no success with women. Then you 180’d to being red pill but bitter, angry or otherwise indifferent but well-informed about the nature of women. After employing some asshole game, you had some success with women and got yourself a relationship. She then managed to wear you down and begin to betafy you over time, and as a result you’ve 180’d again into a purple pill hybrid. You have red pill knowledge but you find it easier to give your chick free passes and blame yourself for her misbehaviour rather than put your foot down. You confuse leadership with being a hegemonic scapegoat. You’re the wilfully ignorant guy blaming yourself for any mistakes that occur because you believe women have no agency and merely reflect how you’ve made them feel. You don’t hold her accountable because you believe that by being the leader everything automatically becomes your fault. This is hyperagency.

For those who don’t know what hyperagency is, it is the male tendency to assume responsibility/fault for things that weren’t directly the man’s fault, but through some indirect slippery slope reasoning can be convincingly rationalised as being his fault. Men who have taken the red pill and gone down the path of accentuating their masculine qualities to then successfully land themselves a relationship tend to be hyperagents, whilst plate spinners are more likely to throw caution to the wind. Hyperagency is the inverse to the feminine hypoagent instinct, which you guessed it, is the predilection of women to divert responsibility for their actions away from themselves. She will take credit where it is due, but where fault is to be allocated her instinct is to blame shift and shirk accountability. Being accountable to yourself and acquiring discipline and honour to keep yourself on track in the quest for masculine self-improvement is fine. Holding yourself accountable for a woman’s fuck-ups, however, is as blue pill as putting them on a pedestal. It implies they are better than you are because they are beyond the realm of fallibility. Yes, you can influence a woman’s behaviour greatly, any masculine man can, but assuming all responsibility when anything goes wrong is irrational and just plays into the narrative of the feminine imperative – the innate Machiavellian tendency women possess to absolve themselves of blame. If accountability is important to you then blame is attributed where it is due. Logic will best deduce where blame should be attributed. Treating yourself as a catch-all for anything that goes wrong is not the answer and it doesn’t make you “a real man” or “a proud man”; it makes you an honourable idiot.

Ultimately as men I think we’re fighting our instincts. Our instincts are to romanticise women, care for them, provide for and protect them, seeking sexual favours in return to pass on our genes, whilst our culture has made our instincts deadly to our own survival. All of this is exacerbated by cultural Marxist indoctrination which makes us ripe pickings for women who have been trained to be less empathetic, more narcissistic and more predatory towards men.
Women are manageable when their egos are kept in check (this is why negging works) but, allowed to get high on “you go girl!” instant validation streams for the tiniest and most asinine of things (such as a selfie), they become increasingly self-centred and unmanageable. Combine men’s predisposition to romanticise women with women’s Machiavellian nature and what we have is a disaster waiting to happen: a culture that brainwashes men to give in to their romantic instincts whilst dissecting and supplanting their masculinity with feminine sensibilities. These sensibilities then get mixed in with the male protector/provider instinct (masculine romanticism) in such a way as to make them hard to tell apart from one another. In part, this is why guys sometimes pathetically bicker over what “being alpha” is, especially in relation to women and long-term relationships which are no doubt the trickiest sphere for any man, let alone a seasoned red piller or manospherian.

Feminism, as institutionalised as it is in society, is responsible for exacerbating female narcissism. It encourages women collectively to celebrate and exemplify their worst traits (hypergamy/entitlement and solipsism) in order to make us collectively (as men) responsible for their material betterment, training them to hang us out to dry rather than learn to appreciate us and work with us despite our differences. Part of the facilitation of this conditioning is to create conditions in which women can’t love, trust or pair bond to any one single man. This is accomplished by encouraging them to be “sex-positive” aka huge sluts. It is a well-established maxim throughout the manosphere that the more partners a woman has had, the less capable she is of bonding romantically to any future partner. This is great if you want casual sex but it’s bad if you actually want to be in love/start a family. A woman who’s had many dicks and relationships no matter what she rationalises or desires is near incapable of pair bonding. These women are often bitter, they feel owed something from their chain of suitors as a symptom of their latent narcissism and view men collectively as an arbitrary segment of the population that can be exploited for self-gain as a result. All of this only makes the conscious choice to “love women” as a collective even more insane.

Without a patriarchal society in place to enforce honour on women, our freedom to love women is diminished because they have the ability to destroy us and get away with it. Allowing yourself to love a woman should not mean tussling with the Devil. Due to the vast chasms that separate masculine and feminine nature, equalism fails in matters of love. This is predominantly caused by three things: 1) femininity’s lack of reason; 2) femininity’s lack of honour; 3) perhaps most importantly: the ability of the female mind to so easily rationalise away atrocities as necessary for its emotional well-being, and therefore, perfectly acceptable. This is what is known colloquially as “hamstering” and it ties in with the earlier point made about the feminine predilection to absolve herself of blame in order to avoid cognitive dissonance. This instinct is so strong that it will even override the decision-making process of women that otherwise possess strong logic.

By making them our legal and social equals without their being our rational and ethical equals, we have upset the balance between leader and follower, captain and first mate, and left ourselves susceptible to their whims. What has this done? Destabilised society, leading to massive increases in divorce rates, the ensuing post-divorce suicide of what was previously a husband, and a whole bunch of other fucked up crazy shit that no attractive woman’s sweet voice, long hair and gentle touch is worth. For all the flak they get, the “men going their own
way” are in some ways the rational ones here: they’re rational in pursuing their own happiness, but irrational evolutionarily as they implement the destruction of their ancestral genetic line. If there was ever a war between nature and nurture, this is it, and it’s socially engineered human reproductive kryptonite.

**Update:** This article has been revised for grammatical refinement and has been updated as of 26/08/2014 to reflect the implemented changes.
“One must be cunning and wicked in this world.” – Leo Tolstoy
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1.) Introduction:

To get the most value from this article, I highly recommend reading the following material first:

Understanding The Dark Triad - A General Overview
Understanding The Dark Triad - The Second Overview
Understanding Machiavellianism
Understanding Narcissism
Understanding Psychopathy
“Lucifer’s Daughter” – An Introduction to The Dark Triad Woman
Nuance In Manipulative Style: The Machiavellian Trifecta

Without the background knowledge acquired from reading this body of work, a capacity to appreciate this essay’s content cannot be assured. That aside, let us begin.

2.) Media & Literary Representations of The Dark Triad
“Are there any videos (movies, documentaries or anything of the sort) that you would recommend to give a more clear-cut example of Dark Triad behaviour?”

To my knowledge, few good documentaries exist on dark triad behaviour. I recommend watching prison-based documentaries, as roughly 1-in-5 prisoners is a psychopath. Naturally being a prison setting, it is likelier you will observe low IQ blue-collar psychopaths rather than white-collar high IQ psychopaths, however despite this bias in sample, you will see the occasional high IQ.

Differentiating the lower from the higher IQ is easy as higher IQ prisoners will engage in creative pursuits and use violence instrumentally, whereas lower IQ prisoners will lack creative pursuits and thus seek conflict for stimulation. It is my contention that because lower IQ prisoners lack the intellect necessary to creatively abstract, acts of violence comprise the totality of their interest.

Nailing down a higher IQ white-collar psychopath is incredibly hard as their greater impulse control means they’re better able to conceal themselves, however Vice was able to base a short documentary on one.

There is an English documentary called “Psychopath Night”, which contrasted an FBI profiler’s analysis with the behaviour of an imprisoned high IQ psychopath. There was likewise input from Oxford University’s Kevin Dutton, a professor known for his friendship with an ex-SAS psychopath that has partnered with him on numerous psychopathy texts. These texts are useful, but not well written.

Dutton constantly attempts to normalise psychopathy as something that’s “cool but slightly quirky” with an overbearing chummy tone, and it is this which detracts from the authority of his writing. It’s hard to take somebody seriously who discusses the ruthlessness of negative empathy with the salivation of a hyperactive teenager, and oh boy does Dutton salivate.

Nonetheless, Dutton rewards those with the constitution to endure his blabbering should you prove either masochistic or curious enough. If one can exercise a little patience, one will find Dutton has many valuable insights. Dutton’s books are not literary masterpieces to be absorbed and pleasurably savoured, but rather, verbose drudgery to be dissected for occasional nuggets of gold.

As for media examples of Psychopathic characters, there are countless, but to name a few:

- **Jordan Belfort** in The Wolf of Wall Street is a narcopath (an ego dominant psychopath)
- **Marlo** from The Wire is a psychopath. If autists were psychopaths, they’d be like Marlo.
- **Omar** from The Wire is a sociopath (like a psychopath, but has sympathy for his in-group.)
- **Snoop** from The Wire is your typical butch dyke psychopath
- **Katherine** from The Vampire Diaries is a more accurate portrayal of typical female psychopathy/BPD behaviour.
– **Lord Varys & Petyr Baelish** from Game of Thrones are Machiavellians.

– **Frank Underwood** from House of Cards is a depiction of the highest form of psychopath, a “General.” Unlike others on the negative empathy spectrum who blunder out of a need to indulge shortcomings (e.g. violent tendencies, excess depravity, historicism etc) “Generals” have evolved beyond such indulgences. A “General” puts the requirements of the game above desire by strategising before fulfilling his urges, whereas his lower-tier counterparts prioritise their urges before the game and thus become unstuck.

A General is instrumental rather than reactive; to react to provocation or give in to pettiness is not characteristic of the General, for the General recognises the tactical pitfalls these things represent and possesses the iron will necessary to resist them. The General realises only a correct sequence of steps will get him what he wants, thus he is future-orientated where his lesser counterparts are present-orientated. If you want to learn more about the General archetype, [read this article](#).

As the list above alludes, dark triad characters comes in many shades and varieties. Whether they are criminal, corporate, violent, cold or charismatic, one thing is universal among them: they’re cut-throat and cunning. The media is rife with different variations upon the same theme, although there is something one should be aware of when scouring the media for dark triad personalities – the characters are plausible, but their schemes aren’t.

In TV shows timing is too perfect, and so the elaborate schemes in play are so utterly contrived they’re inimitable. As such, only analyse a fictional character’s psychology, not their schemes. The schemes by merit of their fiction are ridiculous, and therefore unviable for real world emulation. When a show’s writers ensure a character always wins and can perfectly execute his plans to the nanosecond, cunning is deified to a realm of fantasy through the misrepresentation of what is humanly possible.

3.) **Macro Dark Triad:**

> “Have you considered the macro societal result for when becoming a dark triad psychopath becomes the norm for getting pussy? – Are you a traditionalist after meditating on the matter?”

It is inconceivable “becoming dark triad” would ever “become the norm for getting pussy” because most men are incapable of incorporating sufficient ruthlessness. That is to say, men may increase their ruthlessness out of sheer volition, but said ruthlessness will pale in comparison to the psychopath’s.

That being said, “the macro societal result” has been in play for a very long time, gaining traction since the institutionalisation of feminism. It has not done so under the umbrella of “men embracing and internalising the dark triad”, but rather in the semantic context of “men endeavouring to be meaner” in response to the growing vacuum of narcissism “independent women” embody.

Why do men have this desire to be less empathic and more dismissive, or in a nutshell, to become more narcissistic? Simply put, it’s because of the women. In order for a man to
have sex with a woman, his narcissism must trumps hers, and so what we’re seeing is an adaptation to an environment in which the collective feminine ego has run amok. If empathy and kindness got men laid rather than exploited, such adaptation would not take place. As women’s collective ego is culturally bootstrapped by feminism, men must defeat girl narcissism with superior narcissism to remain viable.

Another reason many a man wishes to diminish his natural empathy for women is as a measure of self-protection. As our society becomes ever decadent and dysfunctional, predatory women (some of whom study these very texts on power) grow ever numerous. Women bestowed the sovereignty to live as they see fit oft reward the immoral man at the expense of the moral man, and so in a culture where women are not subject to their men, men must play by women’s rules.

Religion recognises the folly inherent to women’s preferences, and thus in its infinite wisdom sets about teaching the importance of following rather than defying man, lest both parties suffer. This is neither an endorsement nor advocacy of religion in so much as it is recognition of the value religion offers the sexes at the macro level.

Where there is no religion, absent the immigration of the religious, political ideology fills the areligious vacuum by replacing its executive function as a culture’s dominant belief system. Everybody needs something to believe in, and thus where one rejects religion, they almost always look to replace said religion with ideology. In the case of western women, this is the rejection of Christianity (or a diluted adherence to it) in favour of the dysfunctional and colourful depravities offered by feminism.

It is due to women’s chaotic propensity to punish the virtuous and reward the unvirtuous that virtuous men question the value of their virtue. When there is a disincentive to be moral, or morality otherwise comes with harsh penalties, reasonable men will shun many of the costs associated with morality.

This is neither desirable nor sustainable from a macro-societal perspective as civilization is built on the backs of the hard-working, the noble, and the selfless. However in all her grand retrograde dilapidation, feminism has all but confined virtue to the realm of luxury, and so man’s reproductive future lies in emulating rather than defying the dark triad.

Gentle, kind and innocent men are punished for their empathy in a way that contorts them at the most primal of levels. It is women’s inexcusably poor ability to differentiate kindness from weakness that perpetuates man’s collective movement toward a darker disposition. As women reward men demonstrating dark triad traits, without a social force to compensate for such disposition natural selection will push men toward becoming what women incentivise.

Woman’s attraction is primal, unsophisticated, and unadapted to the needs of modern civilization, and so bereft fatherly dominance or meaningful religious guidance, “free women” sign the ominous decline of society. An unguided woman is a feral woman, for she navigates society promiscuously, exploiting the good man whilst welcoming the evil; and it is in this lunacy there lies no greater retrograde force, no greater battlefield in which virtue flounders in the face of unvirtue.
When women win the gender war nobody wins, because the nuclear family dies out, the welfare state grows beyond all control, and the population of bastards soars whilst the fertility rate plummets. The cost inherent to rewarding feminine insolence is a cost too high for either society or man to bear, and thus a society of insolent women represents nought but a grand projection of the innumerable regressive relationships that permit women’s despicability.

I surmise a return to traditionalist practices are what’s best for the health and prosperity of western civilization, although I do not believe what is good for civilization is necessarily good for the contemporary man. The traditionalist male social role is incompatible with the matriarchal model of marriage legally institutionalised at present, but nonetheless I make neither recommendation nor judgement on what a man should do as I fundamentally believe this is something every man must decide for himself.

4.) The Probability of Acquiring Dark Triad Traits:

| “Do you believe it possible to become completely Dark Triad?” |

Narcissism is cultivable and Machiavellianism is studied, whereas psychopathy is neither. Realistically, subclinical psychopathy, achievement-based narcissism and a devotion to the study of warfare is as close as an average person can come to being dark triad. This however is not an overnight thing, and will require many years of study and cultivation to actualise. Merely reading this publication will not make one dark triad, however it may serve as the spark that ignites a trip down a life-changing path.

I’ve been presented with theoretical ideas on how a neurotypical could become psychopathic, but I’ve yet to be presented with a working methodology that takes said idea beyond the stage of conception. So yes whilst it may fall within the realm of possibility, for all intent and purpose it is impossible. If someone figures out how to create an empathy chip to “treat the empathy disordered” one day, they’ll almost certainly likewise find a way to make said chip turn empathy off – just imagine the military applications!

Negative empathy results from reduced neural activity in the brain’s empathy circuit, as I understand it, it is caused by one of two things, one is to be born with such a brain, the other is to develop such a brain due to severe childhood trauma. The brain is highly malleable in childhood, and so it is thought that particularly bad upbringings can short a child’s empathy circuit effectively “bestowing” psychopathy.

Psychopathy is not something that can be studied and internalised, but it can be studied and to a crass degree, emulated. Second to psychopathy and attainable to all, stoicism serves as something of a psychopathic simulacrum and lacks all the negative connotation of the prior.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

Prior to my remastering of this article, there was an additional section positing a generalised question accompanied by an answer as lengthy as the question’s breadth. I have omitted this from the remaster, as I believe my rework of said question is a project unto itself.
I am fielding questions for a potential successor article, so should you have any questions pertaining to the dark triad, leave them in the comments and if they’re good enough I’ll answer them in the follow-up.
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Zero Degrees of Empathy
When you get a woman you learn one thing very quickly. They're like fish out of water. They never know what the fuck they want so they just stare at you with a wide fixated eye, flapping all over the deck until you make a decision. They claim to like one thing about men but then react positively to the polar opposite of said claim. This propensity to counterintuitively undermine their words with their actions is a spectacle that has left many a man stood, jaw ajar, thinking “What the fuck?!“ for millennia. You see, it is the fish who contradict themselves for all to notice, with the underlying assumption that you will forgive and overlook their bullshit. Almost as if, when it’s convenient for them, it’s tacitly known in the subliminal that you shouldn’t take a single word seriously. “You should just get it!” Let’s give you a classic example of this in the form of the pervasive bullshit peddling that has been espoused by womankind since time immemorial.

“I like nice guys” the petite prominently plump-assed perky-titted 20-year-old says, but her behaviour and track record on the other hand, indicate otherwise. In fact Ms. Perkytits only fucks nice guys once in a blue moon. Some of them wonder if the pity handjob they gave to their male best friend in the twelfth grade counts. Of course, it doesn’t, and if she wasn’t full of mercury, she’d realise this. Predominantly, she’s a fish of the tuna variety, seen on the discovery channel to be enjoying a diet of asshole wherever she can get it. Why do you think she’s full of mercury? Did she spin you that environmental trope about the ocean being contaminated where she swims and little old her’s just “looking for the right ship to come
along?” No, she’s contaminated by all the ships she’s jumped on, and if it is something wrong with the water, then why the fuck does she keep swimming there? What is it that causes this cognitive dissonance in her, the differential leap between her beliefs and actions? This is something the male mind has bewilderingly pondered throughout the passage of time in his dealings with women. You think it now. Your father thought it. Your father’s father thought it. “Well, y’know man, bitches just be cray, ya kno wuh I’m sayin?”

Does she have a lack of introspective self-awareness? Is it some strange gender-ingrained compulsion to hide her sexual strategy accommodated by the all too hilarious, yet nefarious rationalisation hamster? Probably both. Who really knows. Do fish have hamsters for brains? Apparently they do, which would explain the selective memory. What I know is this: A woman, especially a young attractive one, is like a fish. A tasty tuna. A fish who, if it could talk, would say “I hate fisherman who use nets (assholes), I much prefer the responsible pole and line fishermen! (nice guys)” There’s one thing she doesn’t realise though because she’s never tried to catch fish herself. All the fisherman with a pole and line are up against fishermen that swoop up schools of fish in great big nets, and because of that they’re lucky if they ever catch anything (the Pareto principle aka 80/20 rule.) In spite of this, the fish insists that regardless of trying to obtain an effective outcome, pole and line fishing is the way forward for a wayward fisherman! Why? because “nets may work on some fish, but not all fish!”, “real fisherman don’t use nets!” and my personal favourite “speaking as a fish, I don’t like fisherman with nets. They have no respect for fish!”

One day, out on the raft with nothing but his right hand, a lot of fish swimming by, and a solitary pole and line that hasn’t caught a bite since Charlie Sheen was on “Two and A Half Men,” the unsuccessful fisherman begins to angrily complain aloud about his lack of success. He starts wondering if there’s something wrong with the fish, or if he just needs to get better at fishing. Of course the fish become very startled when they hear the angry fishermen, they’re worried he may fuck up the ocean by dumping actual mercury into it. So they pretend to give a fuck, feigning concern for the fisherman’s upset, when really they just want to make sure he doesn’t become a maritime Elliot Rodger. Apprehensive and a little indignant, a fish jumps out of the water and onto the solitary fisherman’s raft. He thinks fortune has smiled graciously upon him, but he quickly realises his hope is in vain as it becomes apparent that in the absence of anything short of a hook in the gullet, said fish doesn’t intend to make herself at home. She’s just going to give an unhelpful holier-than-thou speech full of platitudes and empty asinine bigotry before she fucks off back into the ocean to meet the tangly embrace of another man’s net.

What was the speech the fish gave you ponder? “Don’t worry, gentle fisherman. If you use a pole and line enough you will eventually catch that one fish that you always wanted! You don’t need to try out lots of different fish or even catch many to be a good fisherman, a real fisherman is happy when he finally happens upon that one special fish!” Then ironically, she gives him a stare, bats her eyelids as if she’s a catch, but au contraire, she’s not his catch. “I’m sure the right fish will come along one day!” she exclaims condescendingly. So what is a naive pole and line fisherman to do? He, like many fishermen before him, disadvantaged by the absence of any veteran fisherman to show him the ropes, keeps retardedly fishing with his pole and line until eventually catching a fish that was rejected by one of the net-using fishermen. Of course, a fish caught by a net fisherman has to be kicked
off said fisherman’s ship. It doesn’t swim away of its own accord. In fact it’ll often protest to said fisherman “you’ll regret putting me back in the ocean, you’ll never find a fish as great as I am!” A pole and line fisherman wonders why a fisherman either net or pole would even dream of throwing a fish off his ship, but that’s because Mr. Pole & Line is always thirsty hungry, never full.

Something the fish won’t tell you is that no fish has ever in the history of fishing been caught by a net fisherman only to volunteer a transfer over to the ship raft of the fisherman with a pole and line. All the guys who fish with poles (nice guys) are in a constant state of scarcity because they only get a single fish a year decade, if even that. So when a rejected fish flaps her way onto his deck, he is grateful for the scraps that have been divinely bestowed upon him (oh peace be upon Dagon, God of fish.) The guys who fish with nets (assholes) are in a state of abundance because they’ve got wet fish coming out the ass. They wake up in fish wondering what the stench is only to realise their ship has turned into something of a fish colony (a harem.) Then it strikes them they’re in a fishy kind of daze. In fact sometimes they wonder if some of their fish are beginning to rot and ponder chucking some back in the sea to catch a fresh batch. Their ship is so well-built, and their methods, so well-developed, that their ship is the envy of the ocean. In fact, some fishermen have so many fish they don’t even need to cast their nets any more. Ocean fish smell the other fish on his ship (pre-selection) and jealous of his big beautiful ship they all jump on uninvited desperate to please the fisherman.

So why do fish say they prefers poles when realistically as a fisherman, nets are the way to go? One of the main reasons she says this shit is because all her friends and family (“polite society”) adhere to the tenets of Greenpeace (feminism.) They believe in deep-sea conservation, and swimming willingly into the embrace of nets is in no way conducive to the facilitation of sustainable fishing. It is because of this her reputation depends on voicing a preference for pole (haha), rather than nets. She could never admit to Greenpeace that secretly, the thought of getting swooped up by a big bad environmentally unfriendly net gets her gills giddy. Her whole involvement in Greenpeace is nothing but a duplicitous sham, but she’s regurgitated the party line for so long, she can’t see past it.

No fish is bigger than the boat. If a fish ever gets too big for your boat (physically, or psychologically) then you know what to do. Throw it back in the water, because there are plenty more fish in the sea. Stay frosty.
“Every war when it comes, or before it comes, is represented not as a war but as an act of self-defence against a homicidal maniac.” - George Orwell
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1.) Introduction:

Asking “why do people hate the red pill?” is like asking “why do feminists hate anti-feminists?” it is simple, we are viewed as “the opposing team.” By reading red pill content you become aware of the masculine’s unfiltered societal viewpoint. By agreeing with it, you accept a system of thought which undermines the status quo of feminine primacy. Thus it is
so that through mere act of association with the manosphere, devoutly feminist society deems you sinfully tainted.

The church of feminism will tolerate no blasphemous dissent, for anything that disagrees with feminism is by its own interpretation, misogynistic. By asserting the masculine viewpoint as primary, or even, a valid counterpoint to the feminist viewpoint, you are immediately identified as a misogynist. This means the rabid social justice horde that currently passes for “society” is out to hang your head on a pike merely for having a different set of beliefs. Expressions of thought incongruent with the feminist narrative are so socially unacceptable at present, that they are deemed invalid merely by merit of being non-feminist, let alone anti-feminist.

2.) Controlling The Social Narrative:

It is the job of both feminists and their enablers to prevent unfiltered masculine ideas about gender from “polluting” the mainstream consciousness. The societal hive mind therefore rationalises away anti-feminist argument as “backwardly patriarchal,” meaning: irrelevant, bigoted and outdated. You will then hear at some point among the verbal cacophony that will invariably occur “that people like you are the reason feminism exists.” In reality, the reason young boys and men seek out the manosphere and its wealth of knowledge to begin with is because of the gross negative impact that feminism has had on them, as well as those around them.

Despite the damage feminism has wrought across the developed civilizations of Earth; many an individual has become personally invested in the ideology due to psychiatric problems. Feminism is like any ideological dogma; it creates codependency in the individual as they live by the tenets of the ideology. When a sense of identity is built upon a belief system, removing the ideology the self is built upon causes inordinate psychological problems for the individual. The most radicalised segments of feminism are perverse relationships between an ideology that commands blind obedience, and a mentally unwell individual who needs a platform to grant their hysterical ramblings legitimacy. However, not all believers of the feminist religion are so staunch, dedicated, or ideologically self-aware. There are many who do not self-identify as feminist, but buy into much of the ideology’s belief system due to its cultural ubiquity.

The institutional embodiment of feminism throughout society’s key social infrastructure (education, the workplace, the media, etc) is to blame for the surreptitious invasion of the societal value system. Those of you with a bachelor’s degree or higher in particular have been absolutely drowned in feminist propaganda. The more educated people are, the further from reality they tend to be. This is not because they are stupid or spectacularly unintelligent in any way, but merely because they have spent many years in an institution which unabashedly peddles feminist rhetoric. Effectively, most of the population whether they consciously realise it or not agrees with the idea that the genders are equal. To feminists, all people are equal, but some people are more equal than others. It is with the veneer of equality, that they in somewhat hypocritical fashion, implement laws and social practice which artificially elevate women by giving them special treatment. A privilege that we do not likewise extend to men.
3.) Cultural Marxism - Men as the Bourgeoisie, Women as the Proletariat:

So what’s the reasoning for this unjust disparity in “why some people are more equal than others” you wonder? To be concise; the idea in play is much similar to that of the concept of white guilt. Except we’re dealing with gender, not race, so it’s not exclusively reserved to white men, but rather men as a collective bloc irrespective of race. When it comes to feminism, the race card does not trump the gender card.

The way institutions are biased towards women today stems from the popularised feminist idea that men owe women due to man’s supposed barbarism in the time before feminism. In essence, it’s the falsification and fabrication of the modern historical narrative to give the construction of “male guilt” an air of legitimacy. It is by avenue of said guilt that women get an easy ride in today’s society, with such social inequality justified as a reparation owed to women due to the conduct of our forefathers. This is how feminist society justifies benevolent sexism. That and of course, maintaining the pretense that one of the most privileged class of human beings to ever live is constantly oppressed. This victim narrative is maintained in spite of reality so that the ideology can continue to finance itself and acquire power.

This is why myths such as the pay gap and rape culture are continuously perpetuated and will not go away. It’s not about protecting women; it’s about socially engineering the destruction of the family unit to consolidate power and money for the movement. Essentially, feminism only continues to exist so it can feed itself, segregate the population, and profit various industries eg: divorce lawyers, big business consumerism etc.

To surmise, feminism in its current form is about maintaining double standards stemming from tradition that benefited women; whilst remaining antithetically intent on the destruction of double standards from our past which benefited men. It is ultimately the restriction of male freedoms, expression and sexuality in order to make way for the unrestricted social freedoms of women. This is anti-civilizational in nature.

4.) The Problem With Third/Fourth Wave Feminism:

Instead of helping men and women understand each other better in spite of our differences, feminism encourages and thrives off facilitating decadence. It uses newspeak such as “liberation” to define the decadence it encourages when said “liberty” is really nothing more than a farcical spin on “anarchy.” To these people, the feminist viewpoint must be hegemonic; they don’t care how many young men, girls with “daddy issues” and grown men that feminine primacy run amok adversely effects. As far as they are concerned, the masculine viewpoint is backward, barbaric, misogynistic and unworthy of listening to. They are bigoted, close-minded, and oft have a vested interest in maintaining the narrative of contemporary feminism despite it’s falsifiability. Some are this way through product of having invested so much personal time into the ideology, others due to prevailing business interests. Unfortunately the generations feminism has infected are irreversibly so. Once someone has been indoctrinated into an ideology it’s very hard if not almost entirely inconceivable for all but the most Socratic of thinkers to regain lucidity.
5.) Feminism & Parallels With Rome:

Ancient feminism served as an omen of decline in Roman civilization past its peak and until it's fall. It wasn't the sole reason for the fall (notably, that was due to the Romans hiring a mercenary army they could no longer afford to pay due to tax avoidance.) However, ancient feminism did nevertheless aid in the acceleration of social decay prior to the total disintegration of the civilization. As women were given the right to own property and practice law among other things, divorce became commonplace and the social fabric of the society splintered.

Feminism promoted (and continues to promote today) individualism over collectivism, much to the detriment of the empire then, and likewise the Anglo and European civilizations of today. And so it seems that there appears to be a cycle in which a civilization becomes so prosperous that it can afford to begin to entertain notions such as women’s rights. Notions that in a more primitive civilization, are simply so unworkable that they cannot function for even a brief period of time. This is similar to how in pre-civilization, only patriarchal tribes innovate enough to develop into fully fledged civilizations.

Feminism is built upon the success of patriarchy; it needs it to exist. Not just so it has a bogeyman to scapegoat, but so that society is even prosperous enough to seriously consider the profitability of “empowering women.” Without even a hint of irony however, the precedent of women’s rights has unintended consequences. It gets so out of hand that no amount of “awarded rights” is ever enough, and the excess of freedom awarded to women corrupts their natural deferential femininity. Before you know it, you get the behemoth of radical feminism that we have today pecking at the pillars of civilization.

The sexes begin losing interest in each other as the perversity of women masculinising and men feminising takes hold. Only within the grandiosity of irony do we see the same ideas and sentimental notions that contributed to the downfall of Roman civilization happening to us again today. History does indeed repeat itself.

6.) Society, Single Parents & The Alpha Widow:

One way in which said downfall is characterised is by the lowering of the birth rate. Another is the lack of incentive afforded the typical man to produce a taxable surplus due to a lack of sexual opportunity; as well as a legal and social disincentive to start a family in youth. In its stead, what we see is a return to primitive sexual behaviours; a return to harems. Many men fail to secure regular sexual access in a long-term relationship with a suitably stable female, and thus by extension of that, a chance to ensure their lineage. Concurrently, swathes of women flock to compete over and share the phallus of society’s highest value men. And so they overlook their social equals for the ever aloof apex males they pine for, only to be cast aside, broken, unable to appreciate their sexual equivalents.

Women who have been in this situation, and that is the majority nowadays, harbour resentment toward the sexual equal they are forced to settle with – for he is of lower value than men they have previously slept with. This goes some way in explaining why female infidelity has become as rampant as it is. A relationship with a lesser male is a safety net for a woman to fall back on whilst she explores her true desires elsewhere. In this aspect,
copious mating partners before long-term cohabitation/marriage spoils women. It makes their propensity to commit infidelity a near certainty.

Contemporary women, in their egotism, are prone to mistake the capacity to sleep with a top-tier man with the ability to secure the commitment of such a man. When they fail to do so, being physically and mentally diminished at such a time, they are forced to re-evaluate their value and make a realistic choice out of the options available to them. As such, women are dissatisfied with the irreconcilable difference between the tier of man they are able to sleep with, and the tier of man they are able to secure the commitment of. It is the hubris of women to believe these metrics are identical, when indeed, they are distinct.

As such, our women develop an appetite for higher tier men via frivolous sex in youth, but are unable to ascertain such a man emotionally when they’re “ready to settle down.” If it’s a choice of being independently miserable, or miserable with a man who cannot match up to her spoiled tastes, women oft opt to settle. Misery loves company, and thus the spoiled woman resigned to the idea she cannot acquire the man she truly desires will seek an inadequate male to impart her parasitic misery upon. Once Chad has been tasted, Billy can never hope to satiate her hypergamy.

In healthy civilizations, sexuality is policed for the betterment of the nation-state. Female hypergamy is subdued rather than encouraged. People date and pair off within their league; starting a family with a person of correlating social worth. As an effect of such quelled hypergamy, you get the monogamous nuclear family unit that was quintessential to traditionally Christian Europe and North America.

In healthy societies, women prioritise the needs of the family before their own immediate needs. They are encouraged to have children so that their innate solipsistic selfishness can be channelled into the growth of the child, and subsequently, the caretaking of the family. Men lead these families, women maintain them. In decadent societies such as the contemporary west, men and women prioritise their individualist desires above the collectivist needs of the family. Often this is because they have not come from, or are not members of, intact family units.

7.) Critical Thinking & Dogma:

Feminism is very much concerned with controlling and policing speech. Since its inception as a simple civil rights movement it has metamorphosed into an incredibly Orwellian ideology. By circumventing the feminist monopoly on gender relations, the manosphere is an affront to the dogmatic nature of the politically correct society we live in. You see, it is our discussion of gender differences outside the tightly controlled feminist paradigm that threatens the dogma’s narrative. Dogma is like religion, anything that brings its validity under scrutiny is not tolerated. Scrutiny is not something contemporary feminism fares well under, too much of it exposes its core for the insanity that it is. Contemporary feminism requires blind faith and groupthink, and so like many ideologies is intolerant of having its underlying premise brought into question. Being dogmatic, it is emotion based, not reason based.

To be clear, when I say “the manosphere circumvents the feminist monopoly on gender relations” I don’t just mean through discussion, but likewise through behavioural choices
designed to limit our exposure to feminism. We go about this by **claiming our masculinity and autonomy through hyper-independence.** With social independence and clarity of mind, it is difficult to be controlled. Thus by employing ourselves, improving ourselves and interacting with women on our own terms; we can live our lives sovereign outside the purview of haranguing, henpecking feminist oversight. We are not a movement, we are a personal philosophy. We do not “fight for change” through political activism or a coup d’état, we don’t try to “change society to fit our needs,” but instead we introspect and make improvements to ourselves so that we may thrive in spite of society’s support (or lack thereof.)

Feminism, like many a social ideology, is narcissistic and irrationally arrogant. It is devoid of introspection. It will not allow itself to be undermined at any cost. Of course, like many ideologies which started with a seemingly noble ideal but later morphed into faith-based dogma; if you don’t toe the feminist line you will be ostracised from society. People will say horrendous things about you because they don’t like you or what you stand for. They don’t like you because you are “one of them” and not “one of us.” You are not a person to them. You are an “other.” And as history has taught us, if you are considered “an other” (witch burnings) then you are not welcome in society.

If you tried to build a church in Saudi Arabia, they’d in all likelihood chop your head off or demolish the church. Well being a red pill man in a feminist country is the equivalent of being a Greek Christian in Ottoman-Muslim controlled Constantinople. *Witch hunting* and doxxing abound, reasons for which I never answer questions about my age or what I do for a living. For your own sake, adherents of this philosophy should not post any of their personal information online. Without the internet, a platform such as this wouldn’t even be possible. Your anti-feminist thoughts would be treated like church construction projects in Saudi; they would never see the light of the desert’s day.

**8. The Importance of The Internet:**

Whilst the internet has been effective at spreading feminism, particularly to poorer countries, it has likewise served as a medium for fighting against it. The internet my friends is truly beautiful, and we should all be thankful that we got to live through its prominence first hand; to see what it can do for us as a species. The internet is the best source of free information, and likewise serves as the most superior platform for ridding one’s self of dogma and expressing one’s self. This entire blog is testament to that; such a publication would never have gotten off the ground on any other medium. That is the beauty of the internet.

It is only because of the internet you have the opportunity to read things that fall outside the realm of “political correctness” as fed to you by your corporate media and government schools. The internet gives you the opportunity to question your beliefs and refine them in privacy without demonisation or social ostracisation. With the internet, you are exposed to thinking outside the dogmatic stringently moderated bubble of political correctness that society enforces. You can be free if you so choose, presuming you are strong enough to handle the burdensome consequences that freedom brings.

This essay is probably hate speech in post-modernist Sweden on the sole principle of daring to defy feminist tenets (which in case you didn’t know, has an almost religious ideological
status within Nordic nations.)

Political correctness appears to be a euphemism for “views, opinions, beliefs and language use which fall within a spectrum of pre-determined institutional acceptability.” The recent changes to the language, such as calling normal people “cis,” is perverse ominous nonsense with emphatically Orwellian undertones. Like the fictional language of newspeak, it is what happens when ideology attempts to hijack language in order to make it comply with its narrative. In light of this, one should endeavour to read Nineteen Eighty Four as well as another of Orwell’s texts, Animal Farm. If you read either text before discovering the red pill, read them again for an enhanced perspective.

Orwell’s dystopian fiction warned us that the cultural calamities of today would come to pass; a cursory glance at the moral decay of the Roman empire would likewise have informed us feminism is symptomatic, if not a cause of decline. Orwell’s writings were, and are, incredibly prophetic; which is why as a man who rarely reads fiction, Orwell is one of the few fiction authors I ever recommend to anyone in good faith. As much of the theme of this article is Orwellian in nature, it seems only right to end with another succinct pearl of wisdom from the man himself.

“All animals are equal, but some animals are more equal than others.” – George Orwell

9.) Relevant Reading:

Buy “Nineteen Eighty Four” in the USA
Buy “Nineteen Eighty Four” in the UK
Buy “Nineteen Eighty Four” in Canada
Buy “Animal Farm” in the USA
Buy “Animal Farm” in the UK
Buy “Animal Farm” in Canada

Also, as it is out of print and impossible to buy, check out the PDF of The Fate of Empires and Search for Survival by Sir John Glubb – a brief, but nevertheless compelling read on the life cycle of civilization.
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Preface:

This article is the first in a new series of posts I will be writing called “red pill ramblings.” Thematically, they are based loosely on and expand upon the various articles of the red pill constitution.

Sacrifice & Leadership

Contrary to the popular “woe is me” victim narrative that today’s blue pilled men and women spew, being a man is far more difficult than being a woman. As a man, more is expected. You have nobody to lean on emotionally and your gender can’t be used as a politically correct get out of jail free card. This is the way it has always been, and in today’s age of progressive superficial “egalitarianism,” in spite of all the rhetoric, things are no different. Beneath the surface level that society dedicates itself to reinforcing; we are all the same animals we were a thousand years ago.

For men, relationships are not an exercise in which he attaches himself to another. No, for you see it is he who is latched onto, not she. Men are humanity’s sacrificers. They do the things that nobody really wants to do, but need to be done, like working in waste management plants and getting drafted. Now, men in love are often happy to sacrifice due to
an intrinsically deep-rooted provider instinct. However, it is this very instinct which is often exploited to man’s unenviable self-detriment, and thus it is important for man to recognise his vulnerability and self-regulate it accordingly.

“Happy Wife, Happy Life” has got to be the most idiotic misguided figure of speech to have ever been immortalised in the memetics of the societal consciousness. Happiness flows downwards, not upwards. In order for her to be happy, it is you, the man, who must be happy first and foremost. If you are not happy, you will struggle to make her happy. This means even in sacrifice, for her, or what you consider to be the greater good of the relationship, you must be enthusiastic. You cannot be begrudgingly forced to sacrifice by the parameters set out by the social contract. Your sacrifice for the significant woman in your life must come from a place of altruism and therefore be consensual rather than mandated by law or convention. You see it is laborious sacrifice stemming from obligation rather than love which leads to the growth of contemptuous discontent for your woman.

An indentured leader, the discontent sacrificial labouring lamb, is a bad leader. For truly, in the most candidly lucid judgement of the word “leader” and all it entails, he amounts to anything but such. Most emphatically, he is but a unit of labour resigned to the financial servitude of a discontented woman who enjoys the fruits of his labour, whilst to some degree, detesting him. He foolishly believes that by merit of his labour alone that he is worthy of a woman’s respect, and so by extension, her love. He believes this wrongfully. No matter how much he earns in the material world, such a gentleman will never be perceived by her as a man who is loveable in the immaterial. In the absence of any fabulous wealth on her part, he is but a tolerated personal wallet, the walking ATM, the fabled beta bucks.

It is by his lack of ability to lead that he remains incapable of inspiring her love, and so by extension of that, the respect that genuine female love for a man is based upon. She stays with him because doing so continues to bring her material benefit as mandated by the law of Briffault. For a woman to sustainably love a man with any measure of depth, he cannot solely provide material benefit, but likewise he must provide immaterial benefit. In TRP lingo, that’s the alpha provider. He commands the emotional excitement and lustful longing of the alpha archetype, whilst being able to provide the stability and security of the beta male work drone. Add unconditional loyalty to the equation and this is the epitome of what women seek in the sexual marketplace, the woman’s unicorn, “the knight in shining armour.”

Putting Your Own Needs First:

If you can’t create and manage your own happiness, how can you be expected to inspire hers? A man must look after himself before he takes it upon himself to look after a woman. The express responsibility that comes with romantically associating with a woman all but demands it.

Foolish men in their naivety rally to placate the unending demands of the boundary pushing woman, whilst wise men concentrate first and foremost on pleasing themselves. They do not pedestalise the needs of the woman above their own. A man who is pleased with himself is in the position to give the woman with whom he associates the option to accept how he does things or to take a proverbial hike and take her chances out on the dating market. Often, out of sheer respect for “putting his foot down” and the sensationalism of the tingles that such
assertiveness elicits, she chooses to do things his way. That ladies and gents, is the basis of “make up sex.”

For men, in relation to women, there are few needs other than ensuring a promise of sexual exclusivity that cannot be otherwise provided by an inner circle of male friends. Relational intimacy and emotional closeness with women does indeed have a certain appeal to various men, but it is hardly the necessity for men that it is for women. Rather perhaps much to man’s own romantic disappointment it is simply something to be indulged in from time to time, much like alcohol consumption and recreational drug use. A man who indulges in such vices too often gets irreversibly fucked up. Indulging in too much emotional closeness with a woman is likewise a vice, for it has the propensity to make man weak. This makes him pliable, and from there on we encounter the slippery slope of female contempt for male weakness which begins to manifest and ultimately undermine the health of the relationship. Based on this line of reasoning, such activities should be indulged in sporadically to assure her of your emotional fidelity rather than form the basis of your relationship.

For women, association with men is necessary, for they derive much of their self-worth based on the man (or men) they are publicly associated with. Their life is but one continuing stream of social media updates which pertain to their relationship status. A single woman is an unhappy woman, looking for a new man to fill the void in her insatiable appetite for high value male validation, whilst a single man is simply looking to get his end away and nothing more. For women, emotions come before sex. For men, sex comes before emotions.

**The Centre of Her World:**

As a leader, you are the centre of her world. To be crude, you are the host, not her. You are the basis for the relationship. You must be the rock in her storm. This means that everything stems from you and is centred on your ability to deliver, although in her tirade of demands it will oft seem to onlookers as if it is she who is the focal point rather than you. She isn’t, and if you make the naïve mistake of allowing her to become the focal point you can be rest assured that the relentlessness of her emotions will ravage everything the two of you have built, shredding up your little social contract in the process.

Everything fundamental to the survival of the relationship is based upon you, your strength and the amount of value that you bring to the table. You are the rock in her storm. Any value that she brings is largely, quite secondary and oft perfunctory to that which you bring. In a healthy relationship where you lead, she will be a reflection of your wishes and decisions, she will be malleable; for you are the captain of the ship and she the obliging first mate. This is the natural order; it is the way that things must be in order to ensure some measure of functional cohesion and relational happiness. When people do not have set roles, the ensuing power struggle leads to competition and destroys any chance of social cohesion.

**Briffault & Value Exchange:**

It is Briffault’s Law which states that for the female of the species to engage in continued association with the male, she must be sufficiently convinced that he will continuously provide value. If he could but now cannot, (eg: he became terminally ill) she will “move on” and replace him with a man who can. The implication that can be drawn from this behaviour
is that she relies on you in more saturated concentration than you do her. Anything you rely on her for, at least in the context of a functional and committed union, will be secondary and lesser to that which she relies upon you for. She sucks your dick and makes sure the house is clean. You stabilise her emotions and bring home the bacon. It is this value disparity which ultimately makes male commitment valuable, and likewise highlights why men are the gatekeepers of relationships and not women. As women bring less to the table, their commitment is worth less than man’s. As men expect less from and derive less benefit from continued association with women than vice versa, female commitment is less valuable than man’s.

In matters of continued association, by merit of being female, she is infinitely more selfish than you are. She does not have the provider instinct that you do, and she has far, far more needs than you too. The modern-day rhetoric of “independent women” is nothing but an ironic farce. You see only a group of people who are so utterly dependant on another group, in both their pride and cognitive dissonance assert the opposite as emphatically as possible, hoping that if they repeat it loudly enough it will become true.

You see, in each instance where a woman has brought forth more immaterial benefit than the man, she will over a number of weeks, months or perhaps even years, grow increasingly disgusted by him. She will deem him weak, undesirable, “beneath her,” and as she concludes this, her once burning love fades as it is crushed by the darkness growing out of decadent disrespect. You see, female love as inherently pragmatic and conditional as it is, is based primarily upon respect for power and so by extension of that, value generation.

Where a woman brings forth more material benefit than the man, the man becomes keenly aware of the potential power imbalance her wealth is capable of creating. It is certainly not something that is an asset to the relationship, if anything; it gives the first mate the power to disobey and disrespect the captain even when this is not in the best interest of the relationship. We have established since long in the manosphere that female led relationships are ultimately doomed to failure, and a rich woman’s money grants her the freedom to circumvent your logic and your will should she so choose. It is to this end that high earning women ostracise themselves from men. They activate male aversion by robbing him of his provider role whilst simultaneously undermining their own capacity to love by reducing the significance of his role. You see in dependence there is a certain appreciation, and it is within appreciation of men that women find a fundamental ingredient necessary for love. Appreciation easily becomes admiration.

The Power Struggle of Value Exchange:

Within the dominion of the physical, sexually it is you who acts upon her, but relationally in the domain of the mental, it is she who acts upon you. The “why” pertaining to this dynamic is quite simple. As already mentioned in paragraphs prior she has more needs than you and thus she depends, nay, expects you to fulfil them. As her “significant other” those are the responsibilities that come with unrequited access to her vagina. Of course, should you renege on your responsibilities; you will be framed and shamed as the devil incarnate. Antithetically should she refuse you sexual access? Her body, her choice, the social contract mandates you cannot rape her for not holding up her end of the bargain and so thus you are left powerless.
with no option but to threaten departure.

Sex is truly the female dominion of power and it is in this relational battlefield where sex is constantly weaponized, dangled, implied, used as bait and retracted to solidify and ensure your promise of commitment, whilst her promise of sexual access remains tenable and retractable. Many, many women are conscious of the power they have in simply saying “I’m not in the mood” when they are withholding sex as a mechanism to manipulate their man into bending to her will. Naturally, this is the go to nuclear option that women use to manipulate their partners. The male response should of course be, dread game. Bar any tremendous sexual prowess on your part, it is in the female nature to surreptitiously reduce your sexual access whilst she continues to maximise your level of personal investment into her well-being. Effectively, women use sex or the implication of sex strategically to ensure their self-interest in relationships with men. For her to crave your sex and lose the ability to leverage it over you, you must be able to own her like your name is Christian Grey.

**Women Gain More From Relationships Than Men:**

For self-respecting men, relationships are not exercises in which you burden another with your baggage; likewise they do not lead to economic betterment and social mobility. For men typically marry downwards or across rather than upwards. Any man that’s ever heard other married men talk has surely heard of the “what’s yours is ours” and “what’s hers is hers” double standard.

You see for a man a relationship is a morbid attempt at controlled chaos, an exercise in the most burdensome leadership. It is something society encourages, because society derives benefit from it. Of course society derives benefit from all male sacrifice, which is why of course society has always encouraged men to do things that aren’t necessarily in their best interest. By my use of the word “society” I of course refer to women at large, the female hive mind. So aside from peer pressure, why do we do even do it? Why do men have relationships with women when they can enjoy the best a woman has to offer without making a promise of commitment? Men have their various reasons. For some, it’s a fear of loneliness. For others, it’s the dream of being a patriarch that rules over his own family, a good (high value, well-trained) woman being essential to such an endeavour, rare as they are. For the men still plugged in, it’s based on an archaic idealistic notion of undying love served to you by the societally entrenched meme of “The One™.”

This is why, in part, in contrast to women, as men, we are far more averse to having deep romantic relationships. Women have nothing to lose from securing a man’s commitment, but for a man it is a risk, a calculated risk. Our risk is higher because by merit of having more to give, we have more to lose. This is why it is so that in matters of romantic association with women, the foolish man endures a relationship whilst the wise man indulges one.
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**Preamble:**

I have been made aware that due to my writings, some have begun to naively glamourise the nature of clinical psychopathy in the name of fearlessness, glory and the pursuit of power. The glamorisation of such perversity has ironically, never been neither my goal nor desire. Allow me to be as candid, concise and succinct as possible on my position of psychopathy’s relevance to the red pill framework.
Psychopathy is held up as an exemplar of a clinical disorder which brings about personality traits that facilitate goal acquisition. It is through this lens we look at psychopathy pragmatically as merely a means to an end, a form of self-empowerment. The end is the power and prosperity that psychopathy can facilitate the actualisation of, the means is the ability to cross boundaries and enter action with boldness relatively uninhibited, devoid of either anxiety or uncertainty. These are elements of the psychopathic personality that are pragmatically efficient and thus beneficial to anybody who comes to possess such traits. They are innate characteristics of the psychopath, but they are not characteristics that need be limited to the clinical psychopath. They are qualities that we may learn to emulate, and hence this is why the word psychopathy is mentioned at all, to give an example of, and a frame of reference for, a set of qualities we hope to embody.

Bearing that in mind, my intimate dissection, exploration, analysis and overall thesis of psychopathy is to give an example of that which comes naturally to a minority, to a majority that it does not. We are effectively, cherry-picking the utilitarian aspects of psychopathy to augment the social effectiveness of the non-psychopathic. People hear the word psychopath and they get distracted by the negative connotations of the word. They begin to become lost in their imagination, rather than really read and listen to exactly what it is I am saying. If you follow my voice through what I say in my words and ignore the playfulness of your imagination, you will find what I am saying about psychopathy is markedly different from what you think about psychopathy. In essence, we study and learn from the psychopath by attempting to emulate their strengths as accurately as we can whilst leaving their weaknesses, mainly the dysfunctional parts of their condition, well alone. Luckily for you, as a student, rather than a natural psychopath, these are things you may pick and choose rather than be forced to live with. Allow me to emphasise the point in order to really nail it home once more: the goal of studying psychopathy is not to become psychopathic, but to become quasi-psychopathic.

In light of this, I find it paramount that the fine readership here are educated intimately on the internal struggle and solipsism of the natural psychopath, in effect, as an effort to de-glamourise and debunk the ill-formed and simplistic views of psychopathy the less informed possess, eg: “how cool it would be to be like Al Capone.” It is my observation that those who struggle with self-confidence, anxiety and other debilitating personal afflictions peer into the world of the psychopath and experience a “grass is greener” mentality. They see a huge antithetical chasm between what they are and what they are looking at, and immediately like moths to a flame they become drawn to that which they are not, whilst despising that which they are. Such people hear of how little fucks the psychopathic personality gives, and compare it to their own emotional wreck, perceiving the psychopaths dysfunction to be a state of being superior to their own. However, such a person only sees the perks of psychopathy, not the negatives, because by merit of not being psychopathic, they do not understand everything that being psychopathic entails. They see only the best bits, the theatrics, the highlights. They are not making a like-for-like comparison, but are being mis-sold by their own ignorance what the state of psychopathy truly entails. Such cognitive distortions lead to ill-formed, misguided opinion. In light of this, I shall shine a light on psychopathic solipsism by inviting you into the world of the psychopath’s perspective.
**Introduction to the Paradigm:**

The psychopath contrary to much misguided mainstream thought is incredibly emotionally intelligent, if they weren’t they would be more akin to autists who are inefficient at understanding the emotions of others, let alone manipulating them. Much unlike the autist, the psychopath understands the relationship between emotions very well. They understand the intricate relationships between emotion, which emotions feed into one another, which limit each other, and how to use them tactically to influence people. If you define empathy as an understanding of emotion, then they have empathy. But if you think of empathy as sympathy, as in, a capacity to rationally understand the emotional state of another via logical deconstruction, whilst simultaneously feeling altruistically concerned for another’s well-being, then this is something they fundamentally lack the capacity for. Under these set of definitions, they cannot sympathise, merely empathise.

Psychopaths are by merit of their condition, incredibly lonesome. Psychopaths believe they are the superior focal point of all social interaction that occurs, and it is this view which is accompanied by a sentiment of incredible arrogance. As the psychopath is unable to connect with anyone by merit of the strongly held belief that “they are better than everybody else,” the psychopath oft finds themselves in a quandary between a rock and a hard place when it comes to love, respect and emotional connection.

At their root, psychopaths fundamentally lack a capacity for appreciation, rather than appreciation, psychopaths have dependency, dependency being effectively what appreciation is when you take the emotions away and the subsequent respect that accompanies it. All relations are value judgements to the psychopath, people are dependent on them, and likewise they too are dependent on various people, much to their disdain. Psychopaths like those that they find useful to depend on them for something in order to acquire leverage and by extension, a measure of power over the asset or commodity that said individual represents. Comparatively, they do not like to have to rely or depend on others because anything that falls outside of their direct line of control makes them uncomfortable and paranoid. They do not admire, and they are not admired, as a matter of projection when one does come to admire them, the psychopath becomes suspicious of the admiration, perceiving it as a form of toxic, parasitic dependence. They enjoy the narcissistic supply, but very strong admiration, perhaps better characterised as adoration, repulses them and stirs sensations of immense distrust. Such an attitude towards the imposing feelings of others is a reflexive defence mechanism of the psychopath that is quintessentially symbolic of the paranoid detachment they possess.

Even if a psychopath wanted very much to appreciate another, to feel connected to them, they would struggle immensely, and without drug usage the endeavour would invariably fail. It is due to the insidiousness of this condition that the psychopath feels lonely, because in a state of disconnected superiority and an absence of emotional connection they feel nothing for anyone but themselves. To compound this further, they have such a low opinion of people that they struggle to find value in them, even those who they objectively know to be talented. Psychopaths have a knack for spotting talent, but feeling egotistically threatened by said talent they oft search for or invent some glaring flaw in the talented individual in order to overshadow and vitiate their talent.
When a psychopath sees a talented person who is non-psychopathic, it is like a lion watching a deer that can backflip. “Okay, lovely, nice moves you have there, I respect that, that must have taken you some time to learn, but you’re not a lion, you’re not like me.” Likewise they feel no sympathy for the plight of others, and thus by extension cannot emotionally connect with people by hearing tales of their struggles. Such tales are not a bonding experience for the psychopath like they are for the neurotypical, they are perceived as undue emotional burden, a transgression into the realm of the psychopath’s mental sovereignty. The psychopath may not want to be alone, but they don’t want to take on your burdens to feel connection, they rather cause chaos to feel connected instead. It is for this fundamental reason that male psychopaths are dreadful at maintaining long-term relationships with women who lack the sufficient masochism to counterbalance the male psychopath’s abusive personality.

Logically, the psychopath can relate, but emotionally they cannot connect. They are effectively, a prisoner of their own reality, co-existing with other realities rationally, whilst being completely detached from the emotional and spiritual semantics of said realities. Emotionally, they cannot escape their own reality and are unable to cross into others. The psychopath is trapped in their own emotional solipsism and how they feel about others is always merely a lesser outcome in relation to how they feel about themselves. They don’t feel things for others outside of the context of their own emotional world, so for example if you were to anger a psychopath, they would feel hatred for you; but if you were to have a problem that did not affect them in any way, they would not waste a moment on worrying about you.

To surmise this train of thought: if you do not cause them a problem, you are not their problem. They are incapable of caring about anything independent of themselves, so when you have given them no logically self-interested reason to care, they do not and cannot.

Self-Medication & Dysfunction:

Psychopaths have a propensity to indulge heavily in both alcohol and narcotics. The substance abuse appears to be an attempt to use inebriation to induce an ability to “connect with the common folk” and experience “what it’s like to feel emotionally connected” absent of chaos induction. For the psychopath, it is an alternative way to experiment with emotional connection. Psychopaths by default give no fucks for others, this is not out of malice, but simply out of incapability. Malice is a component of sadism, a different element of the dark tetrad (yes tetrad, not triad) that falls outside the scope of this article.

As people with emotional needs who cannot connect with others sympathetically, the psychopath is unendingly tortured by their own sense of loneliness and thus compelled to engage in chaos in order to create a sense of connection in the absence of illicit substances. It is this need for rewarding emotional connection that forms the basis of the insatiable lust for chaos iconic of the psychopath. The psychopath believes that by engaging in highly emotional situations they will perhaps be able to feel something in context to another, effectively, as perverse as it is, the psychopath attempts to medicate their own emotional quiet via the strongest force they know, negative energy. They push boundaries not just
because they can, but to find out what their boundaries are. They also do this to attempt to feel emotionally connected to another by conjuring up the strongest emotions possible, call it psychopathic experimentation (at your expense.)

As I briefly mentioned in the prior paragraph, psychopaths tend to be lonely. Often the psychopath frequents rooms full of people, and yet, feels no affinity to anybody that is there. The functional psychopaths tend to keep company consistently, but are almost always alone. People are value functions to psychopaths, not emotionally connected personalities who share a spiritual link with them. By nature of having sympathy shut off, they get to avoid discomfort that neurotypical people feel at the expense of having the capacity to form meaningful mutual emotional connections. Functional psychopaths put on a really good outward display of “being on top of their shit,” but fundamentally they are damaged by merit of their inescapable emotional solitude. Psychopaths are not unfeeling people, they have and experience emotion, they merely care exclusively for their own feelings and are totally indifferent to the feelings of others. This assumes of course that the feelings of others are irrelevant to their plans and do not need to be manipulated in order to achieve a goal. If another’s feelings must be maintained or coaxed in a specific manner in order to achieve a personal goal, they will attempt to emulate sympathy and exploit emotion for personal gain.

**Love & Loyalty:**

The closest thing psychopaths experience to “love” or “closeness” is a respect for skill. Psychopaths covet intelligence, and because they are incapable of loyalty, they are perpetually paranoid that those who are in a position to betray them will inevitably do so. This is of course a manifestation of projection. They would abandon you in your hour of need if your value to them was disposable or easily replaceable. Hence they think through the lens of “what they would do” that the same is true of everybody else.

Rather ironically anybody who becomes aware of a psychopath in their life and all that entails would in the absence of abandoning the psychopath outright, quite rationally opt to betray them should a situation demand it. Wielding an understanding of the psychopathic personality reveals that such a person would betray one, so why would one feel loyalty to a person who does not reciprocate? Alas, you see, there is a self-fulfilling prophecy of distrust perpetuated by the psychopath’s inability to trust sufficiently. Psychopathic trust is limited to the confines of a power differential which is unfairly distributed in favour of the psychopath. That is to say, psychopaths need hegemonic leverage and meaningful assurance to exercise any modicum of trust.

Loyalty as wonderful as it is does not flourish if it is not mutual, and the psychopath by merit of their condition is incapable of it, hence loyalty is an element of the human social experience that the psychopath utterly struggles with, much to their detriment. Alliances for psychopaths are tactical partnerships which lack the solidification of emotional bonds, and it is the absence of these emotional bonds which ultimately makes their alliances more fickle, opportunistic, and fleeting. Only a very unintelligent individual is going to be loyal to someone who has no loyalty to them, loyalty between the aware and intelligent being characterised as a reciprocal mutually shared affinity where personal sacrifice and help is guaranteed in case of emergency.
Likewise, psychopaths are terrible at maintaining the pretence that they care, it utterly exhausts them. Again quite ironically and somewhat humorously, due to rather pronounced narcissism and a constant need for stimulation, they struggle to tolerate the only people dumb enough to actually give them any meaningful measure of one way loyalty, the cluelessly stupid. So you see, the natural psychopath suffers from a kind of “trust paradox” (potential future article) which pollutes their life in so much as how it acts as a continuously permeating source of uncertainty.

Psychopaths struggle with trust and loyalty because they are intrinsically, irrationally, distrustful and disloyal. Never trust a psychopath to come and save your life unless your death would deprive the psychopath in question of something significant that they value. In order for them to save you in said hypothetical situation, you’d have to pass a cost-benefit analysis. Trust a psychopath to look out for their own self-interest and attach yourself to that self-interest should you need their assistance.

Psychopaths do not even feel attachment to their parents, much less others. That’s the thing with psychopaths, everything is a game, all of the time. As one would suspect, all this distrust, disloyalty and inability to sympathise makes them very bad long-term partners. Owing to this they have a pronounced tendency to be abusive in relationships because they simply don’t give a fuck about how the other person feels and what their psychological needs are. To a psychopath, the relationship is primarily about them, the other person serves as an accessory whose function is to service the needs of the psychopath. Psychopaths are very effective at picking up women, their short-term sexual strategy is second to none. However in long-term relationships, they absolutely bomb it. It takes a lot of conscious effort and training on the part of a psychopath to raise a somewhat functional family and not fuck it all up with blind rage, sadism and general disconnection towards their partner and offspring.

**Psychopathic Investment:**

Psychopaths only care about people in two ways: what that person can do for them (Briffault’s Law) and how much time they have personally invested into said person. The longer a psychopath knows you, the more they care for you owing to the amount of time they have spent on you.

Don’t mistake “care” for sympathy, I mean “care” as in a rare display of respect, however the respect is a strange kind of respect absent of emotional connectivity. It’s hard to explain, so I’ll put it like this: say you really like your laptop but one day your laptop ceases to work, you become mad because your laptop is broken, but you’re not sad that your laptop is broken. You took for granted something the laptop did for you and you came to like that, but you don’t actually feel an emotional loss for the death of your laptop. Well that’s how psychopaths are with people. Your death would cause them a problem by removing the supply of whatever it is they have come to rely on you for, and that would make them mad. They are mad that your death creates a problem, not upset that you are dead because they miss you or any other emotional reason you can contrive. Notice the subtle nuance there, it is relevant to understanding the nature of the psychopath. That’s “how they care.” Every way in which they like you is related to how you can make them feel within the moment, as well as how stimulating you are. If you were to disappear, they’d simply look for another version of
you to fulfil that role within their lives. Eternally dissatisfied, people are nothing but varying classifications of stimulant to the psychopath.

When you have a psychopath in your life, you have to think differently when you deal with them in order to better relate to them. Being as narcissistic as they are, spending lots of time on you causes them to believe there must be something special about you because they don’t normally give people the time of day. Psychopaths are takers and they thrive on givers, they are parasitic people, and so they tend to place exceptional value on their time rarely doing anything that does not directly benefit them. If you have some trait, quality or use that has allowed you to monopolise much of a psychopaths time, they will ascribe a measure of value to you based proportionately to the amount of time expended on you. In this way, they are quite similar to the neurotypical, except the manifestation of this dynamic is far more ruthless and emphatically pronounced.

Functional relationships with psychopaths generally stem from mutually beneficial outcomes, that is to say, they want to use you for a purpose and likewise, you them. This can be characterised rather simply and innocently, or quite complexly and malevolently. Truly the nature of the quid pro quo transaction depends on the situation you find yourself in. Generalising the machiavellianism of the psychopath is difficult, and so without situational specifics it would be incredibly misrepresentative to attempt generalisation. It takes a certain kind of person to be friends with the psychopath, they are very aloof, uncaring and in need of a consistent stream of stimulation. If you are someone who seeks emotional connectivity, the “strangeness” of the psychopath will alienate you. If you are uninteresting, relatively unintelligent or unremarkable in any way, likewise, you will more than likely be discarded by the psychopath due to a lack of value demonstration.

**Psychopathic Pretence & Exposure:**

If they’re not actively “pretending to care” a psychopath will never wish somebody good luck, well wish or partake in any of the social pleasantries which come naturally to the majority of us. They have no concern for the well-being of others, so they do not express it. When a psychopath does pretend to care, as rare as it is, it is a sign they like you or are trying to convince you they’re normal due to an ulterior motive. Predominantly it is what the psychopath doesn’t do and doesn’t say that outs them as psychopathic.

Psychopaths are very poor at blending in and “seeming like one of the herd” because they’re easily exasperated by fabricating interest in things they fundamentally do not care for. The pretence wears on them and exhausts them. Furthermore, due to their narcissism they don’t want to “seem like others” because they believe they are better than most and “fitting in” would be lowering themselves. The best way to expose a psychopath pretending not to be one is through a war of attrition. They will only last so long at keeping up the façade before deducing the benefit from maintaining the façade is outweighed by the cost and thus opting to drop their mask. Making a psychopath pretend to care is the ultimate shit test and removes some of their autonomy, much to their own intense displeasure.

**In Closing:**

If you weren’t born an unsympathetic psychopath, you won’t become one.
Glamourising dysfunction is pointless because even if you could somehow manage to induce a state of psychopathy, all you’d really be doing is trading one set of problems for another. You will always have to deal with the threat your capacity for sympathy represents whilst the psychopath has to deal with unending loneliness and an intensely paranoid distrust of everybody.

Relevant Reading:

Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in the USA
Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in the UK
Buy “The Wisdom of the Psychopaths” in Canada
Buy “Zero Degrees of Empathy” in the USA
Buy “Zero Degrees of Empathy” in the UK
Buy “Zero Degrees of Empathy” in the Canada
“Many receive advice, only the wise profit from it.” – Harper Lee

Contents:
1.) The Birth of a Machiavellian
   1a.) Machiavellian Scale
2.) The Socialised Machiavellian – “The Advisor”
3.) Stages of Influence
4.) An Untamed Psychopath – “The King”
5.) Master Machiavellian – “The General”
6.) Relevant Reading

1.) The Birth of a Machiavellian:

Some demonstrate manipulative tendency from a young age, be it a pronounced desire to manipulate, a natural aptitude for it, or in exceptional cases, both. For the sake of classification, I characterise individuals who convey both behaviours as “naturals”.

The naturals fall into what I distinguish as two subgroups: kings and generals, with the remainder of Machiavellians designated advisers. Advisers consciously learn to become Machiavellian due to trauma or hardship, but for all intent and purpose were not
naturally predisposed to **Machiavellian thinking**. These people are socialised Machiavellians, the Machiavellians of struggle and necessity, and it is they who make up the final archetype which completes my trifecta of theorised Machiavellian subtypes.

Like most things learned in childhood and to a lesser extent, adolescence, there is a certain intuitive competence acquired from one’s early life experiences. With all the impressionableness and raw aptitude embodied by the cognitive fluidity of youth, the ferocity of necessity clashes with the adaptiveness of trial to give rise to Machiavellian prowess.

This is a universal premise which applies to all crafts, hobbies and arts. The younger the person, the more pronounced the effect of their exposure to an idea; for the young are infinitely more malleable than the old, and unlike the old, need not deprogram and reprogram to learn; the young are tabula rasa, a clean slate. Machiavellianism is in this regard, by no means different from any other field, art or influence. The younger an individual adopts Machiavellian as a philosophy and a vocation, the more likely the art is to seem instinctual rather than abstract.

The development of Machiavellianism often coincides with the redevelopment of “the self.” In childhood, adolescence and early adulthood this process is rather simply “the development of the self.” For older folks, the formation of personality is preceded by deprogramming (unlearning previously learned behaviours and beliefs) which are then supplanted by **mental models** one believes conducive to their environment.

The strategic framework that takes hold in the mind of a budding Machiavellian causes something of a personality shift. This shift occurs as part of the internalisation of a new and rapidly evolving mental **schema**, and thus it is upon the back of an internalised Machiavellian framework that **social competencies** like profound incisive analysis and charismatic persuasion manifest as authentic proficiencies. These are not skills learned for their own sake, but rather, are symptomatic products of one honing their Machiavellianism.

Of course what is being described here is the birth of cunning in all its natural glory, a Machiavellian in the truest sense of the word was always manipulative, however typically it is only with age and experience that one’s rhetoric, sophistry, insight and planning becomes elaborate, nuanced and effective. Machiavellians are in a sense, everything the majority of psychologists fail to be – architects of the mind.

1a.) **Machiavellian Scale:**

For self-aware Machiavellians, the development of their manipulatory prowess is not just a lifestyle choice, but likewise a hobby. To strategise and manipulate is an expression of their creativity, and they enjoy this craft, refining it as the level they play on inevitably rises.

For example, getting a sibling to go to the shop for you is at the bottom of the scale, getting a tired girlfriend to fellate you is a little higher, securing a 6 or 8 figure business contract is even higher, yet even that casts no shadow on what’s in play when the Russian and American presidents sit down to discuss each other’s foreign policy.
A Machiavellian that can cajole people into performing simple errands or making a purchase is not necessarily competent enough to compete at the highest levels, for average people are easily dealt with when one puts even a mild amount of effort into developing their wit. The real test begins when one’s competition is neither average nor gullible, but where battle is with those who are just as, if not more shrewd than they.

Not everybody is “a natural Machiavellian”. Everybody is, to some extent, subconsciously manipulative to one degree or another, capable of disparate Machiavellian gambits such as a guilt trip here or a ploy for sympathy there. However, to behave manipulatively is not the same as being Machiavellian, just as selling an old item of clothing on Ebay hardly makes one an elite salesman.

The difference between the Machiavellian and the average person’s manipulation is the average person’s manipulations are manifestations of innate desire that are primitive, unrefined and predictable in nature. They do not purposely set out to scheme, deceive, dissimulate or ascertain power, they simply act underhandedly reactively and out of instinct.

A Machiavellian on the other hand is consciously tactical in nature. A Machiavellian enjoys manipulating, the development of their lives, business deals and relationships is based on the philosophies of salesmanship, charm, controlling the flow of information and personal self-awareness. Socially acquired Machiavellianism is referred to by academia as a “maladaptive coping mechanism” but in truth is no more than shrewdness.

Essentially, those who are not naturally duplicitous become so in order to thrive in a world where blanket honesty and dishonesty are mutually expensive, whilst masterful executions of both are profitable.

2.) The Socialised Machiavellian – “The Advisor”:

Advisers are more defensive, indirect and tempered rather than aggressive or violent in their schemes. Advisers tend to use aggressive gambits as defensive measures, typically when a king or general calls the bluff of an advisor having noted in analysis of the advisor a lack of psychopathy. Natural Machiavellians fitness test socialised ones to see what mettle lies behind all those well-placed words, well met glances and astute deductions.

The advisor Machiavellian archetype is characterised by those such as myself and the infamous Robert Greene. The advisor, unlike the brutish king or cold general is not a coloniser, but rather a completer of minds. Advisers are sought out for their strategic cunning, incisive psychological insight, powers of deduction and understanding of the mechanisms of power. They do not lead and they do not conquer, they attract and infect for self-preservation, profit and self-gain.

One could say in the absence of brotherly loyalty an advisor is a Machiavellian mercenary, a strategist for sale. Invaluable as they are, this is why they are often in the employ of those more psychopathic in their grasp of power, the kings and the generals; for it is better to have an advisor whispering into your ear rather than your enemies. Likewise being learned, a conscious practitioner and well read on matters of strategy, an advisor’s ability to articulate nuance and explains the mechanisms of power are typically greater than that of the natural.
Kings and generals must form transactional yet emotionally substantive friendships with advisers to ensure loyalty and prevent defection. Advisers are high value assets that provide continuous value to kings and generals if treated accordingly. If a friendship can blossom between any two such Machiavellians, the advisor becomes more than a mental mercenary but instead a trusted friend. Of course trust is delicate and such relations are rare, however I would rate the likelihood of such things as improbable rather than impossible.

Advisers are usually granted a lofty position, considered family, and closely protected, partially out of affinity/respect and partially due to the value of the secrets they possess. Advisers are the most passive of the Machiavellian subtypes due to their lack of direct aggression and absence in executing the elaborately crafted strategies they devise.

The advisor is not a natural Machiavellian, the advisor is a self-taught product of their environment, oft motivated by dire social circumstances eliciting pain and powerlessness. Whilst personal turmoil may cause the amplification and refinement of Machiavellian tendency within naturals, in the case of the advisor it is fundamentally responsible for the emergence of such behaviour to begin with. Where Machiavellianism is not natural, but rather, socialised: the laws of individualised necessity clash with the trial and error of pragmatism to form a new framework for the basis of personality.

Although Machiavellianism doesn’t completely define personality in matters of preference, it largely governs perception and behavioural pattern. Machiavellianism fixates on the transactionality of interaction, thus eliciting awareness of one’s self-interest whilst simultaneously acting as an antenna toward the tastes and needs of others.

When you understand what makes people tick, you can manipulate them, when you understand what makes you tick, you know how you can be manipulated. Machiavellianism is both sword and shield, it can be a reflexively improvised defence, or the core mechanism on which meticulously elaborate schemes are devised. There is not a single war nor battle that escapes the purview of Machiavellianism, for the relevance of Machiavellianism is omnipresent.

The average person is largely unaware of the underlying subtextual dynamics present in their environment, which is why the power-hungry king appreciates the sleeping pawn. Heightened powers of observation are deemed threatening despite being inherently passive in nature. You may not wish to threaten another’s interests, but if the other is aware of your grand observational power they are hard pressed to trust you, fearful in the paranoia your skill could somehow expose them.

It is in light of this that the conscious Machiavellian quickly learns to downplay, disguise and conceal not only their power plays, but likewise their mere capacity for analysis. This is one of many reasons the ability to appear unintelligent is useful and necessary, for it serves as a most effectual form of concealment.

Highly-trained powers of deduction quickly arouse suspicion, eliciting nought but fear and paranoia. And so unless it is your intent to instil such things, one’s analytical capacities should operate invisibly rather than visibly. To employ a metaphor, much like the modern CCTV camera becomes increasingly innocuous, smaller in size with the lens concealed inside
a dome, your mind’s eye must likewise conceal its lens by operating hidden in plain sight.

In the transitional phase of development from average to Machiavellian, a budding Machiavellian is coming to grips with the nature of the game they have unwittingly played but been blind to for their entire lives. They experiment with, and refine methodologies that strengthen their capacity to psychoanalyse and hold social influence, whilst discarding inefficient methodologies. Even within this process of reflection and adaptation, a budding Machiavellian becomes intimately acquainted with the utility of pragmatism.

The Machiavellian student is in a process of learning to fine-tune their intuition and deduction to the minds around them, realising how to assess the strengths and weaknesses of said minds whilst adapting their presentation to fit or defy what is expected.

As mentioned in a paragraph prior, stealth is key. A Machiavellian must first go under the radar and appear non-threatening to the majority (eg: don’t start-up a blog discussing the dark triad) before escalating to cooption. And so it follows that regardless of the Machiavellian subtype one fits, it is imperative to be perceived innocuously, at least until one is so powerful appearing thornless weakens rather than strengthens their image.

3.) Stages of Influence:

One is never instantaneously worshipped without immense preselection or fame. In the absence of such external forces, one will go through numerous stages of favour. There are two stages which grant no power or favour with an individual; they are the stages of “rejection” and “indifference.” There are then three stages which follow on from this which bestow increasing levels of influence with said individual.

A stranger, a person who does not know of you, is for the most part, indifferent. People who know of you that behave as if they are indifferent are not actually indifferent; they have in fact rejected you. The indifference stage is populated exclusively by strangers. There is little difference between rejection and indifference if rejection is not accompanied by penalty or punishment other than the rejection in and of itself. Where rejection causes another to designate you as a threat and to seek to undermine you, they likewise become your threat. No war is one-sided, just because one has not declared it, it does not mean one is not at it. The rejection stage is populated by one’s enemies: spies, saboteurs, haranguers and haters.

Next there is acceptance, acceptance is an absence of negative sentiment or threat designation, characterised best as genuine civil cooperation. At the acceptance stage your existence is acknowledged and accepted, you do not set any alarms off, but likewise you hold little influence. The acceptance stage is populated by colleagues and acquaintances who you have neither gone to war with, nor won the favour of.

Beyond acceptance we reach cooption, cooption is when one deems you favourably to the extent that they will engage in non-consequential (small) personal sacrifices, grant you small favours and show a beyond “familiar” level of respect and admiration. The cooption stage is populated by friends, and people you may not know who are nevertheless enamoured with your reputation.
Finally, we reach the stage of worshipper: a worshipper may or may not be a sycophant, but they are individuals who see you as an incredibly important and integral character in their lives. They will be willing to make large sacrifices, lie for you, protect you, and are sensitive to your wants and needs. The worshipper stage is populated by dear friends, close family members, passionate lovers and groupies.

So how is one to traverse the sequence of stages from stranger to worshipper? By mirroring or at least complementing people well enough for them to feel at ease when you’re around of course, on this note Dale Carnegie’s “How To Make Friends & Influence People” seems relevant.

4.) The King - An Untamed Psychopath:

The king is a great executer and moderate analyst, but comes up short in planning due to his impulsive nature. Kings fail in one of two ways, they either plan but fail to stick to the plan out of impulsivity, or they simply fail to plan at all. I suspect whether planning is even attempted depends on the king in question’s IQ.

Kings are ego dominated psychopaths (narcopaths), the clinical diagnosis being narcissistic personality disorder. This means although not internally emotionally flat like their psychopathic cousins, they appear so externally. A king only feels emotion for anything relevant to him, he is apathetic to anything that doesn’t personally deprive or offend him. I speculate that this again is an IQ dependent variable, with lower IQs being more easily offended, and higher IQs less so, generally speaking, higher IQ individuals exhibit superior impulse control.

The king is the most physically and mentally violent of all the Machiavellian subtypes, he has an intrinsic desire to secure power at all costs and will mercilessly impose his will, brutishly bending people to fit his plans. Kings excel at instilling fear and can even be charming, but are impatient and easily lose their capacity to charm. As such the king is more predisposed to the use of hard power than he is diplomatic soft power.

A king’s charm is built on ridicule, if he wishes to charm somebody and make them feel important, he will ridicule a member of the outgroup whilst refraining from mocking the person he wishes to include. By doing this, an implicit sense of fraternity occurs as mutual mockery of an outgroup target creates a superficial bond. The truth is the king cannot bond, and shallow as it sounds when described so plainly, this is the limit of the king’s charm. Whilst a king is capable of conveying respect where he deems it due, respect and charm are not the same entities.

The king is short on patience, often lacks finesse, and struggles without council to plan elaborately. Kings can think of the long game, but because they’re impulsive and prone to bursts of narcissistic rage they rely far too heavily on improvised short-term strategies. The king is a quick actor and performs excellently when his back is against the wall, but when the adrenaline’s not pumping he’s prone to sloppy egotism and needless perfunctory gaslighting in the pursuit of stimulation.

This is a psychopath who does not meet his potential because he does not optimise his
behaviour or time, and so long as he believes he is elite and in control of the people in his life he has no incentive to escape his self-imposed ego-feeding mediocrity and become better.

Kings don’t like getting their hands dirty and often believe certain conversations or actions are beneath them, and thus delegate undesirable tasks to their groupies and pawns as they spectate and demand to be kept apprised.

By nature of their ego, the king has something of a penchant for wasting time by playing with people’s feelings and pointlessly disrupting people’s alliances rather than working towards an objective.

Fucking with people is not something the king causes inadvertently via collateral damage, no, the king indulges in fucking with people purely to create chaos and feel superior in the midst of other’s distress. Kings can be characterised as having a sadistic disposition, for schadenfreude feeds into their already gargantuan egos. From this it becomes clear just how dominant ego is within the king, and how sadism acts as a mechanism of narcissistic supply for the sustenance of self-majesty.

The king is eager to control, but actively resists the control of others. The king is capable of devising strategy, however due to limited emotional intelligence and abstraction his plans oft fall short versus those of the advisor and general.

5.) The General - Master Machiavellian:

A general dirties his hands where necessary, appearing moral and upright as and when required. Unlike the king who is too grandiose and self-important to demean himself to “the tasks of servants,” a general will do what needs to be done in order to achieve the objective at hand.

No matter how undesirable or distasteful such an action may be, a general knows in matters of necessity he is not above the game, and that should it prove more effective for him to personally dirty his hands, he shall. A general knows when he can trust somebody’s loyalty and competency enough to delegate them a task. Generals are excellent at gauging people’s value, astute in assessment of one’s expertise, reliability and sensitivity.

Generals combine the king’s ability to perform with the advisers rational astuteness, for general’s are the culmination of the other two subtypes personified. Generals are at the very epitome of Machiavellian ability and tend to occupy the apex of power, eg: Vladimir Putin and Donald Trump.

The majority of Machiavellians tend to be the neurotic king subtype or passive advisers. The general is the rarest subtype, a Machiavellian who possesses the capacity to combine the reason and cunning of planning, with the act of charming and intimidating in execution.

Although generals do not require advisers as kings do, they possess a full appreciation for intimately analysing issues deserving of their attention, thus seeking out alternative perspectives by debating with advisers to aid in the construction and refinement of their battle strategy.
A general is the uncommon natural progression of a king who has become aware of his fallibilities, and become successful in mitigating them. A king lacks the training, self-control, experience and expertise of a general. A general is a king who has learned to shed his ego in order to deploy effective strategies, a king of higher IQ who can discipline himself enough to cease indulging his sadistic whims.

Unlike the king who indulges his ego as a matter of self-identity, the general does not see himself as his ego, but has come to realise it as an effective weapon to be selectively applied as a situation calls for it. A general adapts to his environment and slowly changes it to suit him in much the way an advisor does, whilst a king expects his environment to adapt to him, the crude obviousness of this increasing the resistance of those around him.

The general has conditioned himself to be egotistical only when necessary. In a nutshell, a general has enough IQ to discipline and thus better control the behaviours that could expose his nature to wider society. This is why academic studies of psychopathy always tend to fixate on blue-collar crime, but scarcely on white-collar. The difference between blue and white-collar psychopathy is merely a matter of IQ and thus methodology, whilst the lower IQs rob, burgle and use physical violence, the higher IQs, defraud, bribe and use mental violence.

One could characterise a general as not only a king of more disciplined ego, but likewise a more mature and learned king. A king in his 20’s, with some self-awareness, experience and the counsel of an advisor or two could flourish into a general by the time he hits his 30’s or 40’s.

Generals do not have to evolve out of kings, although from my observation it appears this is how they most frequently manifest. Aside high IQ men with NPD, I speculate high IQ men with ASPD (near emotionless psychopaths who are less egocentric) are natural generals in the sense there is no evolutionary process of channelling the ego as one matures for them, but rather they have always simply been emotionally flat.

If the ability to control one’s ego and strategise well is present from a young age, then as unlearned as that Machiavellian may be, he is a young general. If said man cannot strategise as well as an advisor, then he is not a general, but a king in need of an advisor. A general in all simplicity is a fully dark triad man who has learned to curb his lust for sadism as well as mitigate ineffectual narcissism in order to get results. He prioritises the mechanics of the game above his own quirks, he is the ultimate pragmatist, a disciplined hand of amoral efficiency.

6.) Relevant Reading:

Blog:

Machiavellian Maxims
Machiavellian Social Competencies
Machiavellian Thinking Vs. Conventional Logic

Books:
Malignant Self-Love: Narcissism Revisited
The 48 Laws of Power
The 33 Strategies of War
The Craft of Power
1.) Introduction:

Many people seem to think that shit testing is a social device unique to women; whereby a form of social test is employed to determine the social fitness of a male in order to discern if he is a viable sexual option or not. Now whilst this isn’t wrong per se, it is an incredibly limited and rudimentary view of shit testing. Shit tests are a basic yet vitally important part of understanding and applying the red pill philosophy to your life. Even if you don’t agree with red pill philosophy, shit tests still affect you. As a basic social dynamic, shit tests are something so incredibly inextricable that you’re going to want to be able to identify and quash them as a matter of due course. Now without further ado, let us begin.

2.) What Are Shit Tests & What Purpose Do They Serve?:
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6.) In Closing / Relevant Reading
Why are they called shit tests? Well when somebody “gives you shit” and fucks with your head to see how you will react, what you are experiencing is typically a (series of) shit test(s). Everyone has been shit tested, gets shit tested and will continue to be shit tested; It’s an unavoidable part of human interaction. We use shit tests to make value judgements about people, likewise they can be used to determine how people cope under pressure. The underlying mechanism of shit tests is to test your mettle. Hence the name is not only fitting, but likewise, accurate.

Shit tests don’t always have to be questions, they can be blanket assertions that are accusatory or provocative in nature. Such assertions are designed to elicit an emotional response from you, pushing you into a state of reactivity and causing you to reveal information about yourself.

“Ok, I get that, but why not just ask me what you want to know rather than play these silly games?”

The ignorant who have already passed judgement on the topic this essay covers have undoubtedly already thought this. Humans have a propensity to lie and tell people what they think they want to hear. This is especially true of women and the effeminate men who emulate them; both are consensus seeking creatures who crave the approval of the group above all else. This goes some way to explaining why women regardless of social standing indulge in vapid social pleasantries that men of substance have neither the time nor inclination for. They are anti-confrontational to the most sublime degree, but nevertheless, I digress.

On the immediately observable superficial level, the majority of people are concealing their true identity. Thus in order to make accurate deductions about the personalities around us, we challenge one another subtextually and draw conclusions about “what the other person is really like” when gauging their responses. Shit tests can be blatant or they can be covert, how they manifest depends upon the intent and personality of the individual employing the test. The sum potential combination of differing shit test scenarios is so vast that I cannot possibly give an example of each and every possible outcome in this article. Therefore I shall instead bestow you with the knowledge necessary to refine your own analytical capabilities so that you may act accordingly when you find yourself being shit tested.

People have a tendency to exaggerate their own strengths and project a false heightened image of themselves. If you’ve ever been on Facebook you will have seen this first-hand. These people are not showing you who they really are or what they’re really worth, instead they’re showing you “their life’s highlights” and leading you to believe that this is how they live all the time, that “they’re just that awesome.” They want you to believe their social value is higher than it really is. Well, surprise, surprise, people don’t just do this on Facebook, they do this in real life too.

Those who consider themselves “a bullshit free zone,” eg: masculine men will “ball bust” (read: shit test your ass a new one) quite relentlessly to determine “just how much of a man you are.” If you are an effeminate or timid man, you will feel bullied rather than challenged and this tells the group everything they need to know about you.
You will fail to understand that what you are experiencing is a social initiation ritual that all men must go through when they are new to a male-dominated group. You will be relentlessly ridiculed to determine what you’re like and where you belong in the pecking order. If you are too reactive, you will be rejected and exiled from the group, or relegated to the bottom position as the emotional punch bag everybody ridicules for cheap laughs. To avoid finding yourself condemned to such a fate, you must demonstrate you can spar verbally without taking too much to heart.

Shit tests are used to “determine your frame.” Frame is a concept which essentially means “composure and self-control.” If you need a visual metaphor, imagine you are a work of art on a gallery wall. You are kept straight and presentable by the frame you are kept in. If the frame was taken away, your picture would fold and you would fall to the floor. In the physical sense of the metaphor, your canvas folds, and you, the picture, fall to the floor bent out of shape. Psychologically and symbolically, folding means you have “lost control and given up” in the way that a player folds when they surrender in a game of poker.

If you can keep composure/seem unfazed and/or assert your boundaries despite a shit test, generally speaking you will be considered to have passed the shit test. If you get upset, offended, doubt yourself or show weakness in any discernible way when shit tested, it will be generally considered that you failed the test.

I will summarise this section of the article with a valuable conclusion: whilst passing shit tests psychologically raises your perceived social value, failing shit tests psychologically lowers your perceived social value. Pass people’s shit tests to garner popularity and social success, fail them, and you will become an ostracised and unconfident outcast.

3.) Shit Tests & Game:

If a pretty girl says “I bet you say that to all the girls” (a run-of-the-mill standard shit test) and you stand there with your jaw ajar speechless in what to say, you have just failed her shit test. Your silence is not useful because she can see you are not wilfully ignoring her, you’re just stuck for what to say and your mental slowness is blatant. This is a huge faux pas that communicates stark social incompetency.

An example of passing her shit test? The infamous agree and amplify technique. If you were to say “Yeah, but normally I forget their faces” and she follows up with “So what, you’re saying you won’t forget mine?” (another shit test) and you reply with another agree and amplify “Not if you give me a reason not to” in a charismatic tone, then you’ve effectively used game to come out victorious in that round of testing.

You cannot falter in the midst of a shit test. Sometimes they come out of nowhere, completely unexpected and catch you by surprise; which is why being good at conversational improvisation and word association are fundamental tool boxes to being able to destroy any shit test that may come your way.

If you are abstract/metaphorical in your thinking and verbal skills, you will have a lot of fun with shit tests. Men with subpar wit and verbal skills tend to struggle with shit tests. As an aside to men who fall into this category, I suggest you watch more stand-up comedy to
develop your wit and speak more with people to improve your conversational ability. If you get good at “speaking shit” which is essentially freestyle improvisational conversation based upon nothing more than word association, observation and mockery; you will find passing shit tests to be not only easy, but likewise immensely enjoyable.

Shit tests can be passed in a multitude of ways, so even when passing it’s not strictly a matter of “whether you passed or not” but just as important is “how you passed.” For example, people with a good sense of humour tend to accept negative labels and make jokes out of them, we call this “agree and amplify.” Mentally violent people tend to quickly find a flaw in the person attacking them and deflect by associating the shit test with a weakness perceived in the original tester, thus attempting to humiliate them – we call that a pressure flip.

3a.) Shit Test Passed & Shit Test Failed: An Example

I’ll give you an example of a common shit test women use, for the sake of the example let’s pretend your name is Tom: “Haha Tom is one of those player guys, you can tell just by looking at him!” It will sound like a complaint, but it isn’t, it’s a shit test and she wants to see how you respond to her bullshit. She is conjuring up inane accusatory nonsense purely to incite a response and determine your level of confidence. After she says this she will look at you to gauge your body language and get a better read on your frame.

**Strong response:** “Sounds like you’ve got an eye for talent.” Body language wise give her strong “I’m gonna fuck you ‘till I split you like the Grand Canyon” eyes, or be aloof and distant as if to suggest her test is pathetic. Shit test passed, vagina’s beginning to moisten.

**Weak response:** “I would never dream of stringing a girl along!” and then you start idiotically justifying how “you’re not like that” eyes widening, palms are sweaty, wishing you were at home with your mum’s spaghetti. Shit test failed, she’s drying up.

I will make a point of saying here that whilst women will deliberately and consciously shit test you, much of it is entirely subconscious. They do it, but they’re not aware why or even when they do it for the most part. Women who read this blog are probably not indicative of that assessment, as naturally my literature will have elevated their self-awareness beyond that of the average female.

3b.) Examples: Standard Shit Tests Women Use:

- **“Aww, are you upset?!”** – Translation: Are you a beta? Ignore it or agree and amplify. “Yeah I’m going to go home and watch Titanic now.”

- **“You’re such a player aren’t you?!”** – Translation: Are you alpha?! Ignore it, be mysterious/vague “maybe, come find out” or agree and amplify “you don’t know the half of it.”

- **“Buy me a drink!!”** – Translation: Are you a beta? Compliance test. If you buy her shit you’re a chump. The correct response: “No, you buy me a drink.” You communicate you’re more valuable than she is. Only lower value men buy drinks for random women they don’t
know. Unless you’re preselected out the ass (eg: you own the club) in that case you can buy shots for homeless men and nobody gives a fuck. The boss man gets a pass for doing weird and insane shit that would see lesser men condemned.

- “I have a boyfriend!” – Translation: I have Schrödinger’s boyfriend, demonstrate to me you’re high value and I’ll fuck you regardless. It is hilarious when they say this. “What boyfriend, your imaginary one?” – Then laugh in her face. – “Sounds like you’re shit out of luck, I’m going to have to fuck your friend instead, feel free to watch.” Always be prepared to get slapped when you’re running this kind of obnoxious asshole game. Don’t say I didn’t warn you, consider the slap a sign she cares.

- “I don’t date short guys” – Translation: You look like a beta because you’re not physically imposing. Of course only guys who aren’t considered tall by the cultural standard of the country they are in are subject to this shit test. The correct response is to agree and amplify: “Yeah I’m a fucking dwarf even in my heels.” There is nothing worse than a short guy who is all messed up over his lack of height and gets insecure at the first mention of it. Women will shit test you on this if you are short (or even average) height. You have to seem like you don’t give a shit about the fact you’re not considered tall. If you get upset, she’ll think you’re weak because your jimmies were so easily rusted. Be unreactive, no fucks should get given, you can’t change your height so you have to learn to accept it.

- “Do you believe in love at first sight?!” – Translation: Are you a beta? The answer to this is always no. Or if you’re bold and don’t give a shit about being slapped and want to escalate with tension: “I didn’t but then I saw your titties on the way over and I’ve been having deep philosophical reconsiderations ever since.”

- “Can we be -just friends?-“ – Translation: I think you are a beta that should do my bidding. The answer to this is almost always no. Unless of course you don’t want to bang the chick (she’s a uggo) and for whatever reason you think she’d be cool to have around.

- “How many girls have you slept with?” – Translation: Do you get laid a lot or are you a sex starved beta? Saying you have not slept with many girls communicates low value. Exaggerate your number if it’s low. If it’s high give any old number assuming you’ve kept track. Fail-safe responses: “I’ve lost count.” – “What, today? Not many.” – “Pick a number, any number.”

- “Do you have a girlfriend?” – Translation: Are you a beta? (Can you get laid?) – The correct answer is always yes (it increases your preselection.) Women love poaching men from other women, they essentially find whatever is “in demand” to be attractive, that’s what we refer to as “preselection.” Ways to pass this test: “she told me not to tell anyone” – “We’re not Facebook official” – “I don’t cuddle her after sex, so no?”

- “I bet you have a girlfriend!” – Translation: I want to fuck you but I don’t know if other women find you hot. More overt variant of the above which assumes you’re preselected, indicating a higher level of interest. Again, even if you don’t have a girlfriend, you should say you do or otherwise indicate that you do to increase your perceived preselection.

- “Hold my bag for me!” or “Will you go and get me a coffee?” – (substitute
bag/coffee for whatever) – Translation: Are you a complicit beta that will do what I tell you to do? This is a compliance test wrapped up in a power play to see if you are “wrapped around her little finger.” Some variation of “No” or “Hold/get it yourself” does well. Sneer whilst you say it for bonus points.

As you may have noticed from the repertoire of woman’s bog standard run-of-the-mill shit tests, they are incredibly fixated on discerning whether or not you are a beta (guy who doesn’t get laid much, if at all.) If in doubt, err towards being an asshole. Being identified as a beta dries up panties quicker than you can boil an egg in a Sahara sauna. If you show boldness and exude a “I will mockingly bullshit you” kind of attitude, you’ll do just fine.

4.) Shit Test Variation & Severity:

You have three separate themes that shit tests fall under:

- **Dominance**
- **Compliance**
- **Fitness**

A dominance shit test is used to determine how mentally tough you are, eg: “do you always whine like a bitch?” A compliance shit test is used to determine how much influence a person has over you, eg: “get me a coffee.” A fitness shit test is used to determine your social skills/sense of humour eg: “you look hilarious when you’re crying.”

Dominance is an underlying theme behind all shit tests, however dominance has its own classification too. Fitness tests are normally also dominance tests, but a dominance test can be employed purely to test/wrestle for dominance and have no humour determining component attached to it. A fitness test merely wants to determine your ability to banter and endure a verbal onslaught, normally if you fail at fitness tests the tester won’t want much to do with you socially speaking. In light of this, compliance shit tests and fitness shit tests share some overlap with dominance shit tests, consider them more specific sub-categories of dominance.

As a rule of thumb, the more messed up the individual is, the higher the stakes are. Likewise, the higher value the person you’re dealing with, the more severely you will be shit tested.

EG: CEOs will shit test harder and more frequently than office assistants, women with daddy issues will shit test more than women who had stable relationships with their fathers. **BPD women** never stop shit testing.

In further example, interviews are essentially a collection of shit tests. Going for a job? You’re going to get shit tested “to see if you’re worth employing.” Those weird questions you get asked such as “if you had any kind of super power, what would it be and why?” and “name your biggest weakness” are shit tests designed to indirectly determine the strength of your character, creative intelligence and confidence. It’s not only what you respond with that matters, but likewise how quickly and in what manner (are you confident/dominant or unconfident/submissive?)

The “name your biggest weakness” shit test seems to be a question that continuously
protrudes and persists with employers nowadays. It’s as if rather perversely they want to subtly neg you and see how you handle it to determine how you deal with ego violation. I sincerely doubt they care much for your introspective capacity.

In generation narcissist (millennials, but growingly, their generation X parents too) this of course leads to a lot of confusion as well as butthurt: “I don’t know” and “I don’t even... but mummy and daddy told me I was a special snowflake!” As a freebie, my response to this shit test is: “I’m so egotistical I don’t even know what my weaknesses are and find introspection difficult.. so I guess being blind to my own faults would be my weakness.” Now ironically, that statement is introspective, humble and paradoxical, so the answer is something of a head fuck, however most times I have used it in the past it has been accepted as a valid answer.

Be warned however, particularly shrewd/Machiavellian recruiters will probably see this as a red flag. If your instincts tell you the recruiter is highly Machiavellian, ditch this tactic and admit to something asinine such as your constant battle with timekeeping - these people are seeking an honest admission perfection, not the smart ass narcissistic shit I recommended up there.

Bear in mind I use long words and elaborate metaphors as part of my linguistic register in real life, it is natural to me. Using canned lines is bad because it means you lack natural game and need to borrow from another man’s wit. If you are not so wordy, it will look weird if you are not congruently wordy but instead only wordy in the passing of a specific shit test (because it is a line you have read on here or somewhere else.) This will arouse suspicion that you have some sort of script pre-prepared because your answer seems out-of-place in relation with how you would normally talk. So if you don’t talk as elaborately as I, you can shorten it to “I don’t know what my weaknesses are, is that a weakness?” At this point they may try to lead you to “confess a weakness about yourself.” Treat it like a police interrogation where they try to get you to “admit you committed a crime,” which in this context is equivocally: “admit that you have a flaw.”

When you say you don’t know your weaknesses they will ask you a series of questions under the guise of helping you, but in actual fact these are all overt shit tests posing as honest questions “Are you a bad timekeeper? - No.” “Do you suffer from confidence related issues? - No.” “Do you have problems motivating yourself? - No.” Why would you tell an employer that you’re low confidence, poorly motivated and never arrive on time, even if it were true? You want to get an employment contract after all, are they really going to hire you with the knowledge that you’re a bad bet?

If you’re dumb enough to fall for these shit tests, you lack the basic social competency to get yourself a job. It amazes me how self-detrimentally honest people can be when they are subject to even a tiny amount of social pressure from a position of authority. Likewise, going out on a date with a woman is a collection of shit tests “to see if you’re worth having sex with.” Being in a police interrogation room is a collection of shit tests. Being heckled by members of the audience as a comedian is a collection of shit tests. And it goes on and on and on. Shit tests are an inescapable and recurring element of life, so you better get good at handling them.

4a.) Basic Shit Tests - Frame Probing & Word Play:
When most people think of shit tests they’re thinking of basic tests designed to probe your frame (mental stability, congruency and strength) via word play. Basic shit tests normally manifest as insincere questions. An example would be something like “do you always talk to people like that?” They can be played off as a genuine question into the nature of your character, however its true intent is to discern how you cope with being put on the spot. Basic shit tests usually rely on the element of surprise to catch you unaware. An improvised basic shit test is spawned out of a play on words or some other similar facet of word association. The shit tester will take a statement of yours and ask an associated question (or make a statement) which purposely distorts its meaning in a somewhat hostile manner. Here are some examples:

**You:** “I don’t trust women”  
**Them:** “Is that because you find women intimidating?”

**You:** “I like cookies”  
**Them:** “I’ll get you a gastric band for Christmas then”

### 4b.) Advanced Level Shit Tests - Psychological Games:

Advanced level shit tests are subtle but retain plausible deniability. Rather than directly questioning you or challenging you in an overt verbal manner, typically they will opt to challenge you in a covert non-verbal manner. Inspiring jealousy by excluding someone who would typically otherwise be included in something is a shit test. It is a test to see if you care enough to voice your concern, or challenge those who would otherwise opt to exclude you. Naturally, seeming unfazed and **outcome independent** regardless of your contempt for said shit test is the optimum way to handle things.

When people shit test you and it’s a lose-lose situation, opt to ignore them. You only win by not playing. For example, if someone insults you publicly to try to stir up drama (and it is assumed they will benefit from such controversy) your only recourse is to deprive them of the theatrical controversy which they seek. I’ve found that the more successful I’ve become within the various realms of my life, the more I’ve had other socially dominant men try to test my mettle by flagrantly disrespecting me just to see what I’ll do about it. It can be subtle and implied, or overt and explicit. Either way, not playing is oft the only winning move in such a situation. Even if you can come out on top in a battle of wits, you sink a lot of your precious time combating nonsense that you gain nothing from.

When you’re powerful, other people see opportunities in attempting to bring you down a notch or two. Such people will try to get you to react to their inanity merely so they may bolster their reputation by latching onto yours. It is for this reason that the art of silence; ignoring your enemies overtly is a necessary skill set that all men looking to preserve their accumulated power should master and employ with regularity. It is simple, when you feel someone provoking a response from your ego, interject your emotions with the question “is there a way for me to benefit from responding to this?” if the answer is no, replying is pointless. Let reason override emotion, cultivate this skill by refining your self-discipline.

Such shit tests are typically obvious in their intent to put you on the defence. Once you get caught in a web of shit testing, you will often find yourself justifying your choices and
explaining your actions. This lowers your social value, wins you no respect and digs an even deeper hole. Non-Machiavellian logic fails in handling shit tests, people do not respect rationality, they respect only indications of high status. Explaining yourself, no matter how rational your explanation is will be perceived as a demonstration of low status. Do not justify yourself, if you find yourself explaining yourself in the midst of an argument or theatrical device, you’re losing and would be far better off just immediately exiting stage instead.

At the advanced level you find there is a lot of blame shifting, typically in discussion the shit tester will try to convince you that you are somehow responsible for any flaws or weaknesses of theirs. Women particularly seem to habitually blame shift, it’s not only a self-defence mechanism to diffuse feelings of inferiority or guilt but it also acts as a shit test because if you accept the blame, you will be seen less favourably.

You: “Come on you need to pull your weight around here.”
Them: “If I’m lazy it’s because I’m following the stellar example you have set.”

Now of course the dialogue above could be a perfectly healthy part of banter, but bear in mind that an inability to banter has the same effect as failing a shit test within a serious context. Whether pleasurable or not, banter is simply shit testing for the sake of mental stimulation, and like more serious shit testing you still need to be able to respond aptly. If your ability to handle shit tests is poor, head on over to the red pill comedy page and watch how comedians deal with hecklers.

4c.) Nuclear Shit Tests:

A nuclear shit test colloquially referred to as “going nuclear” or “the nuclear option” is when someone does something which violates conventional social boundaries in order to see how you will react. These are a step up from “advanced level shit tests” being more extreme in nature, usually bordering on psychological/emotional abuse. They can be covert (removing all the money from your bank account and feigning ignorance to see how you deal without money) or overt (somebody taking a bite out of your food and then staring at you in the eye.)

Nuclear shit tests are designed to test your reaction not by probing your psyche with words, but by probing your psyche with actions that would typically be expected to offend, hurt, disrespect etc. Say you’re with a girl and you’ve hooked up a few times. She’s a plate pushing for commitment but you haven’t given in to her demands. You’re both out at the club and she starts grinding on another guy. She’s doing this to make you jealous in an attempt to force your hand. She’s using dread game and trying to get you to commit to her by inspiring competition anxiety within you. Dread game when used by women is a nuclear shit test. How do you pass this shit test? Go talk to other girls, when it inevitably comes up later she was grinding respond with “that’s cool” (it signifies you don’t care in a positive manner) or “you can do what you like” etc. Realise she did what she did for your benefit, to test you: it’s all about you. If you weren’t there to see it, she wouldn’t have used another man as an instrument to manipulate you into giving her an offer of exclusivity.

5.) Passing Shit Tests:

There are many mechanisms which one can employ to pass a shit test. Passing a shit test
means you have responded to the test in a way that either neutralises the tester’s challenge or causes them to perceive you as confident, dominant and valued. Before we begin, a note on agree and amplify: agree and amplify seems to be the “shit test buster” of choice for most people. Agree and amplify is really good for making jokes, but if used inappropriately eg: in the presence of potential violence, it could make things worse by actually escalating instead of defusing things. If a violent man walked up to you and said “Do you want me to fuck you up?” (this is a shit test, but he will do it if you fail) and you agree and amplify on him: “Yes in the ass please” instead of being impressed by your wit he is likely to respond: “So you don’t think I’m serious? Let me show you how serious I am” followed by an attempt to beat the hell out of you.

Be aware that not all shit test busters will work in every scenario. You have to use your common sense, calibrate to the situation and determine what shit test solving method should be utilised based upon the context.

Now let’s say you approached a woman and began the conversation with an improvised opener, and she replies: “I bet you use that line on all the girls.” Here are the various ways in which you could pass her shit test. They are plentiful.

**Agree and amplify** is the usage of the logical fallacy reductio ad absurdum (Latin for: reduce to absurdity.) What you do is you take someone’s criticism and nonchalantly imply it is absurd by exacerbating what they have said. So in relation to the shit test at the beginning of this section: “Yeah I literally wake up in the morning covered in bitches it’s that effective.” It is this device which is the bread and butter of Rollo’s theory of Amused Mastery.

**Disagree and amplify** is the same as agree and amplify except you disagree rather than agree with the premise. So in relation to the shit test at the beginning of this section: “No you’re the first girl I’ve ever spoken to, I used to be a mute.”

**A pressure flip** is where you reverse the social pressure put on you back onto the originator of the social pressure. So in relation to the shit test at the beginning of this section: “I bet you think everything’s a line because you’ve got trust issues.”

**Agree and pressure flip** is the same as a pressure flip except you precede the flip with agreement. So in relation to the shit test at the beginning of this section: “Yeah I do, I’m sorry, did you think you were special or something?”

**Disagree and pressure flip** is the same as a pressure flip except you precede the flip with disagreement. So in relation to the shit test at the beginning of this section: “Nah you’re too ugly for me to be dropping lines on.”

**Ignore** - Provide no acknowledgement of the shit test by ignoring it. This is a bad choice when you have just met someone, but once your reputation and/or superiority has been established it is a great way of nonchalantly invalidating the importance of an enquiry. It implies “what you said isn’t even worth addressing.” This is best used on people who are lower in the pecking order than you are or as a response to the manifestation of stupidity. If someone asked you if you liked to eat your own excrement, you could have a joke and agree
and amplify into something about a sewer using your keen knowledge of word association and semantic fields, or rather simply you could ignore the inanity of the question. The choice of style is yours to make and will be contingent on your mood, your relative social positions in relation to one another and what you suspect the shit tester’s intent is.

**Misdirect** – Change the topic of conversation to something else, this invalidates the enquiry by providing no acknowledgement of it. In this sense it is similar to ignoring a shit test. There is a chance however that the tester will become annoyed by your invalidation and will thus retest you until you pass with a more effective method. This works best on people with attention span issues, as they will often forget how they were testing you once distracted, and if they ask you what they were saying you can simply feign ignorance, invalidating their test and condemning it to beyond the grasp of their engrams. In relation to the shit test at the beginning of this section: “Have you farted? It stinks.”

**Ridicule Reframe** – This is major asshole game or what I personally refer to as “Patrice O’Neal Game.” You use this kind of game to bring incredibly narcissistic and angry women off the ego pedestal. Don’t use this on timid sheltered women if you ever want to sleep with them, they’ll get too intimidated to act upon their attraction. Ridicule reframes are particularly helpful in bantering with other guys, who relish in the verbal violence and ensuing laughter it can inspire. In relation to the shit test at the beginning of this section: “I bet you’re single because your face looks like a 9/11 crash site”

**Pseudo-Gaslight** – This one is really simple. You pretend you have no idea what the person shit testing you is talking about and accuse them of making things up. So in relation to the shit test at the beginning of this section: “What line? Got an active imagination have we?”

6.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

I wanted to include dark triad shit tests in here to complete the compendium of shit test related information, however I feel that as the dark triad portion of the site operates as a standalone section; having its own article would make for more optimised archiving and searching should someone specifically want to look up how dark triad individuals shit test people. Not only that, but due to its intricacy this piece has become far longer than I had originally intended and I do not wish to be intentionally terse in my discussion of dark triad shit tests just to keep the word length down. Dark triad shit tests will be the topic of a future article.

This piece has broken down just some of the games that people play and given you a basic understanding of how to be socially resilient. With practice, you will find yourself recognising the subliminal social games others are playing and will learn how to respond and initiate them yourself. If you feel you could do with some more help enhancing your social mastery and popularity, look no further than these books:

**Buy “Games People Play: The Psychology of Human Relationships” in the USA**
**Buy “Games People Play: The Psychology of Human Relationships” in the UK**
**Buy “Games People Play: The Psychology of Human Relationships” in Canada**
**Buy “How to Win Friends and Influence People” in the USA**
**Buy “How to Win Friends and Influence People” in the UK**
Buy “How to Win Friends and Influence People” in Canada
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1.) Introduction:

Recently I was asked this question: “The red pill subreddit seems to be a space for men who have had negative experiences to vent and further their base interests. If you agree, why do you think that is?”

My answer to this question dominates the topic of this article and has been split into sub-sections. My answers and ideas are not all-encompassing, I leave many stones unturned. This is not a thesis. This piece is a general overview that will elucidate some key points pertaining to the contemporary adoption of the feminist political movement. In places, the article is tongue-in-cheek. With that aside, onward!

2.) The Alienation of Male Perspective & The Manosphere As Surrogate:
The majority of modern boys and men have had resoundingly negative experiences with girls and women. Modern women are effectively raised not to view men as human beings with wants or needs. **Modern women are devoid of positive femininity**, instead the majority are cold, narcissistic and uncaring, viewing men as nothing more than a mere means to an end. The feminist ideology outlawed male spaces by using its influence to effectively demonise them as “vehicles for oppression.” An absurd and rather sexist assumption came to be accepted: “if men are excluding women from their social activities it must be because they wish to discuss how they can better oppress them!” Men don’t want to gather in the absence of women because, you know, women are notorious for their nagging. It’s not that men like to talk without worrying people’s women’s feelings are going to get hurt. No, it’s definitely not that. Women are of course infallible creatures who would never drive men away to congregate in respite. It’s definitely that misogynistic oppression thing instead.

With the odd sports team, construction sites and the Freemasons being the last vestiges of male space in the physical world; communities such as The Red Pill Subreddit and Roosh V Forum have stepped in to fill the masculine void that feminist ideology has imposed for the best part of a half-century. By using the power of the internet and relative anonymity, men have managed to effectively recreate and regulate spaces where male-dominated perspectives are welcome. These are spaces where logic, reason and distinctly masculine self-interest dominate over the emotional sentiment and social politics typical of the feminine.

These communities are consciously self-imposed microcosms of male mentality. They communicate thoughts and strategies conducive to rational male self-interest. They cater for not only the male viewpoint of women and society, but likewise the male sexual imperative. These communities are a manifestation of man’s yearning to exercise the freedom to think and converse without the threat of censure from the feminist iron fist. These communities are all too self-aware of how the “masculine way of seeing things” is bigotedly unwelcome in mainstream society. As such, these communities ruthlessly segregate and self-regulate themselves. Unproven outsiders cannot be trusted to understand their viewpoints in an age of all permeating radical feminism. Insular in its nature, the manosphere is steadfast in kicking out feminist sympathisers who attempt to disrupt discourse and peddle rhetorical hogwash. Bearing all these things in mind, I believe the lack of tangible real world male spaces is one of the underlying social issues that led to the creation of the manosphere. However, this is merely a symptom of a far bigger problem, the breakdown of the traditional family.

Single motherhood is detrimental to both sexes, although the absence of a father in childhood is something I believe to be particularly deleterious for young boys. The statistics available out there (increased risk of drug abuse, suicide, committing a violent crime et cetera) seem to back me up on this line of thought [1] [2]. Of course, we (the manosphere) attribute the blame for the normalisation of single motherhood on the destruction of family as championed by feminism. It was feminism and its “class-warfare system” as borrowed from Marxism that led to today’s sociopolitical climate. To better understand the nature of this we need to deconstruct modern history with a red pill lens. By observing feminism’s adoption by society and the wider implications it has since had, we may better understand the butt fuck mess we are in now.
3.) The Square Root of Feminism is Marxism:

It was under the feminist ideological construct that “the bourgeoisie” became “the patriarchy” and “the proletariat” became “oppressed women.” By conning men and women of the then-time with this oppressor-oppressee rhetorical construct, ideological feminism could be normalised via institutionalisation. Institutionalisation is the process in which an ideology becomes a part of the teachings and cultural underpinning of a society. Institutionalisation embeds ideology into the core pillars of societal influence, which are: the family, government social policy, public education and depictions in media. With the combination of these institutions working in tandem to perpetuate the feminist ideological lie, there was a cultural shift from conservatism to liberalism. With such ideological hegemony came the memetic and vacuous reinforcement of feminist principles via peer group pressure: “Like oh my god, Becky, feminism is so ideologically in right now! Let’s call men pigs and burn our bras it’ll be fun!” (refer to the above image.)

The need for civil rights (something the majority of women did not care for or even disagreed with,) was not historically considered to be a human rights issue. Women would enter the workplace only in wartime when there were labour shortages. They worked in factories (eg: Rosie the Riveter) because they had to, not because they wanted to. Have you ever worked in a factory? I suspect not now they're all in China, but needless to say working the production line conveyor belt is infinitely less rewarding than watching your children grow. There was no society-wide systematic oppression of women. Women were simply not required to be tax slaves for the state in the way that men were. Women were under the care and provision of men rather than government (from father, to husband.) Feminist “independence” today, is for many women, especially those at the lower end of the socioeconomic strata, a farce. They are not truly independent, there has simply been a change of hands in who governs them.

Rather than pledge allegiance to a man in the context of common goals, love and family creation, women have instead vacuously pledged their allegiance to ideology. This ideology is then used by government as a tool for power consolidation. Women have effectively been used by government as a demographic of “useful idiots.” Frame something as a woman’s issue and you can get them to agree with anything. Government married itself to feminist ideology because it was an effective way to divide and conquer. It allowed government to better control the population by playing on woman’s instinctual and irrational fear. By doing this and painting all the blame on men, government can justify the subjugation of man by portraying itself as “the protector of women.” Historically feminists were a loud but small minority who did not like the status quo, whilst most women were content with it. Women were not chained up in kitchens, forced to pop out babies and obey the every desire of man in the way that vitriolic feminist rhetoric would have you believe. Such rhetoric is not only farcically and factually incorrect, but likewise deeply disrespectful of our ancestors.

Owning property, working in the factories and voting weren’t things that the women of pre-feminism were really concerned with. They didn’t care about those things. Modern day women indoctrinated by feminism have been taught to want those things, so they assume that women in history did too. They then continue down this slippery slope and deduce men must have oppressed women by denying them these things. If you don’t want to do
something and you don’t have “the legally assured right” to do it, then you’re not going to be bothered that the law doesn’t give you that right.

It’s feminist revisionist history which paints a picture of women on their knees pleading for centuries to get the vote. Such trite could not be any further from the truth. The reality is, as already stated, feminists were a small fringe movement with little traction or support in mainstream society. The majority of women were more concerned with securing a good mate, having children and nurturing their loved ones. Not going to work in the factories or fighting in wars. Feminists/suffragettes have been around since the late 19th century and were predominantly upper middle-class white women allied with a radically misandrist lesbian minority who were perceived by larger society as an obscure subculture. It was the ideological rhetoric peddling that “men are evil so women need civil rights” which acted as a superficial front for the legitimisation of the culturally destabilising movement known as the “woman’s rights movement.”

The majority of women pre-feminism were in loving relationships where they were taken care of by men who worked very hard. These men were vetted rigorously by the young woman’s mother and father to ensure he was of noble character and worldly means. Their fathers were not spousally raping their mothers on a whim and nor were they selling off their daughters to the nearest salacious man for a goat and three oxen. Women were not the sex objects they have become today: the sluts of marketing, the prostitutes of job promotion and the eager cum buckets of wealthy male harems. Instead they were respectable people: mothers, wives and supportive members of their local community. In part this was due to a lack of effective contraception which acted as a natural safeguard in quelling the volatility of the female sexual appetite. Women had consequences biological and sociological for indulging their promiscuity, so giving in to instinct came with harsh disincentives. In essence, men and women were expected to forego vices and defer gratification for what was considered to be the greater good: the betterment of the family.

Women of the-then time commonly enjoyed monogamous commitment/marriage, multiple children/grandchildren and aside domestic chores and child-rearing, had very few significant problems plaguing their everyday lives. Just because women did not go out to factories and get their hands dirty or go and fight on the front lines in wartime, it did not mean society did not value women. In fact I would argue, pre-feminism, that patriarchy treated women far more righteously than feminism has. Women were valued for their femininity and encouraged to embrace their instincts. They were not shamed for their lack of masculinity and encouraged to “be independent from men by becoming more like men.” Women pulled their weight, but in contrast to men: they led simpler lives.

Business, politics, academia, law and making sure the world didn’t implode were all the purview of men. Men built and furthered civilization whilst women helped to maintain it – they worked in tandem. It was not oppressive, it was cooperative. In return for this cooperation, women got to live out their sexual imperative by having children and being a part of a family that cared about them. They were not relegated to corporate wage slavery, cat herding and watching episodes of Sex In The City whilst crying into a bucket of comfort-inducing, waistline-widening Ben & Jerry’s. They were not alone or “left on the shelf” because they got married young. They invested in their families in youth, and in turn their families
invested in them when they reached their elder years.

4.) Family or Career: She Can't Have Both

Women have always had to choose between family or career. Contrary to feminist dogma, women did work before feminism. Pre-feminism, the majority of women prioritised family. Post-feminism, the majority prioritise career and play Russian roulette with their fertility in the process. Pre-feminism, very few women were genetic dead-ends. Even today, in spite of feminist propaganda, settling down and having a family is high on the list of priorities for the majority of women. It is through naivety and indoctrination that women continue to buy into the feminist lie that “they can have it all.” Women do not opt to start families in their peak fertility window anymore (their 20’s.) Instead they indulge in drug-fuelled parties and casual debauchery, leaving the creation of family until their less fertile 30’s. This is a topic with its own Pandora’s box of social issues which go way beyond the intended scope of this article. In light of that I do not wish to digress any further on this tangent.

5.) Creating A Culture of Female-Federal Co-Dependence by Replacing Men with Government:

The destruction of the family unit via the replacement of the father would create a need for a bigger more powerful government. This was the core agenda (and chief political reason) for the endorsement of what once was perceived to be a “wacky, niche social movement.” By emancipating women from men, women would be alone in the world for the first time confused and vulnerable. Effectively they were “abandoned” but it was for their own good “because men are evil pigs anyway!”

It is then that government could present the solution (the welfare state) and step in as the heroes that came to save the day. Even though they were the same assholes who helped to socially engineer the ideology pioneered by the suffragettes. It was they who got on board with the philosophy and convinced the collective masses that there was a “cultural problem” to begin with. You didn’t think feminism was a grass-roots political movement did you? Yes it would quite laughably be the government who would come along and protect women from all those nasty, evil men who had worked oh-so-tirelessly to historically enslave womankind. Even though, you know, the government was predominantly male too. If men are so evil, why trust one set of men over another? Looking after your family and putting your life on the line in case of national conflict in order to vote. Making sure your government represented you and didn’t become tyrannical via political participation. Defending your culture/way of life from foreign invaders. Yes, these things all sound like the psychological make-up of an oppressive demographic of people don’t they? Oh I think not.

In reality the government pitted women against men (a divide and conquer tactic) by making women believe men are intrinsically immoral creatures out to exploit them. Thus in turn it could be said with a straight face that men do not deserve the same level of empathy and that big government is the answer to women’s collective problems. These ideas are what paved the way for providing women with the vote, and with a female voter base government could undermine patriarchal/male power. By using all the feminist-indoctrinated women to outvote men, government could “democratically pass” radical social policies that they knew the men of the then-time would not agree to. Then as feminism became culturally embedded,
men would slowly come around to team feminism only further compounding feminist dominance. All of this has led to today’s dysfunctional socially engineered society where broken homes and poverty are a cultural norm. Having a father around whose balls haven’t been metaphorically cut off? A luxury not afforded to the majority of today’s children.

Feminism was never truly about empowering women. It was about disempowering men. By using the boredom of socially influential and ambitious upper-middle-class white women, the perverse political philosophy of feminism could come to fruition. Of course as so many men die at war and at work in toil to provide for their families, women always have and always will continue to outnumber them. So under “the rules of open democracy” male perspective can be effectively undermined by targeting policy along a gender line. This is incredibly rich and ironic of an ideology which tries to give itself democratic legitimacy by saying “without feminism, society ignores half of the population!” My response to such banality being: “even if society did ignore half the population, which it didn’t, feminism didn’t stop that – it just changed who got a voice.” Of course the more men there are out there willing to sell out their brothers-in-arms for the promise of some paltry pussy, the better! If we have men who will encourage feminist decadence because “it helps them get laid” or whatever, that’s an extra vote for team feminism! You go girl idiots!

With the product of the ideological lie beginning to yield its intended dividends, the size of government could be justifiably increased. This afforded government more control over the nation, more tax receipts, more civil servants etc. Civil liberties could be more easily curbed by promoting safety over liberty to women, who in their instinctual fearfulness of boogeymen (or rather crudely: men,) would obey the system “for their own protection.” Through legal revision and feminist legislative enactment, exclusively female entitlements could be brought into law, effectively turning men into second class citizens via exclusion (see: severity of criminal punishment, divorce law, child custody law etc.) Women are far more easily manipulated than men in matters of fear, and politics are by no means an exception to this phenomenon.

All it takes for a government to control a majority female voter base is some scaremongering and the promise of free handouts. Put this formula into play and women will concede to a predetermined federal agenda like ideological cattle; all whilst being completely self-assured that they are the ones who are in control. Despite having betrayed women with the feminist ideological myth, women are government’s contemporary primary interest. By ideologically ruling the women, government may consolidate power on behalf of the economic elite and subdue the common man (oh how ironically Marxist!) Feminism is not entirely about women; but rather the ideological weaponisation of women against men to destroy the traditional family.

Feminism was used as a way to wage war on a class of men (white European men) who were as a group even at the lowest economic strata, beginning to amass more power than the economic elite were comfortable with. Unfortunately, feminism has got too big for it’s boots stilettos and is completely out of control. Now it’s starting to cause problems for the African american community, the middle class of India and other men and children around the globe, such as those in Argentina. The anglosphere and Europe were just the beginning. No longer is feminism the exclusive problem of the white man, through globalisation it is infecting and
disassembling culture everywhere.

6.) In Closing:

Modern western governments weaponise women against men by selling feminist policy as “a protection in women's best interests.” Government can dominate women by keeping women reliant on government. Government makes women reliant on them by making sure she is kept distrustful of and emancipated from men (thus depriving her of romance, family and a man to provide for her.) Of course with the single mother epidemic having already taken hold (these women being the first generation of women to be “successfully” emancipated from men,) women can now effectively self-regulate their own disdain and distrust of men without the need for government propaganda. We have groupthink and sermons from feminist ideological lieutenants to ensure this cultural disease continues to self-perpetuate itself now. Radical feminism is but the latest in a long line of destructive political dogmas that the world must attempt to cleanse itself of.

7.) Relevant Reading:
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  Buy “Is There Anything Good About Men?: How Cultures Flourish by Exploiting Men” in Canada
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1.) Justification is a Machiavellian Fallacy:

Justification is for the weak, in the game of power nobody respects he who justifies himself. Within a social fabric where the lowest common denominator prevails; where feelings triumph over logic, and likewise grandiosity over humility, honesty is but a virtue bastardised. You see, it is the transparency of justification that makes it powerless. Regardless, many an intellectual man’s instinctual adherence to logical authoritarianism renders him incapable of determining this. Therefore, when he is tested, questioned, scrutinised and cross-examined, his most visceral instinct is to justify himself to his haranguing attacker; woe befalls him.

Little does he know his challenger’s agenda is malicious, and their enquiry, insincere. Such a man haphazardly scrambles to explain himself by demonstrating his thought process. It is in
this moment the **Machiavellian** knows they have won. With widening smile, such a rational yet foolish man can be gamed, intimidated, humiliated and berated. He will be kept on the defence with his own words, for it is they which will be weaponised against him. The more he speaks, the deeper his grave.

As Queen Gertrude said in Hamlet “*The lady doth protest too much, methinks.*” Likewise, he who opts to prove, demonstrate and qualify himself with merely and solely the spoken word is perceived to be dishonest, pathetic. The justification is not seen as transparent or helpful, but rather as persuasive, deceptive, false – even when it isn’t. People have a propensity to distrust that which doesn’t embody an element of **effortlessness**.

With both the playful Machiavellian and the dimwit, a sentiment is shared; the more one protests, the more their guilt is assumed. It is thought if one were not guilty they would feel no need to justify their position. Why? Well because their position would “be obvious” of course; oh the subjective horror! To the idiot and the Machiavellian alike, truth is self-evident; it is organic and therefore shows in one’s actions. The need to have to say anything about an aspect of one’s self robs it of its naturalness, and therefore to the devout Machiavellian, its charismatic credibility.

Honesty destroys mystery, and with it, the attraction of curiosity. The Machiavellian hates the duplicitous more than most, and yet, respectfully appreciates only the cunning. As such, Machiavellians tend to be in a constant flux of love-hate with their peers. When you are understood, you are unattractive. When you try to help people understand you, they lose respect for you, you’re making it too easy. People only value what they work for, be it wages or relationships. Of course the man of reason is oft deficient in the social realm, and therefore he does not fully comprehend the games that people play.

### 2.) Machiavellian Gender Differences:

The minds of rational men are attuned toward deduction and debate, not toward subtextual nuance and psychological warfare. This is why so many men are undervalued if not completely absent in the social game, superficial social popularity does not care how smart you are. Women know this innately, and are thus natural improvisers compelled to manage delicately how others perceive them. Women are sensitively attuned to their reputation in this way, uniquely so, whilst men on the other hand are less innately capable of such façades, finding the effort involved cumbersome and alien.

Rational but socially deficient men attempt foolishly to enhance their social standing with logic, knowledge and shows of intelligence (dare one say, intellectual narcissism) but this serves only to further repel the masses. In the social game it is rhetoric, humorous wit and good feeling that are valued above all. That and of course, matters of the flesh, in which sex appeal is something women possess no short supply of.

Naturally idiots care little for reason, for they cannot grasp it, and as for Machiavellians, the transparency bores them. They despise it because it is boring, and it is boring because it is bereft cunning. There is neither fun nor challenge to be had in the absence of mystique, for the cunning possess a propensity to seek perpetual psychological challenge.
Logic bores the playful Machiavellian, for it is too serious, too predictable and too bland for their social palate, and that which is bland by dismerit of transparency is accordingly disrespected. There are those (such as myself) who can switch between a Machiavellian and logical mode of communication, but this is atypical. Most people are firmly cunning (indirect and subtle), or transparently direct in their dominant mode of communication.

For man, Machiavellianism is predominantly a vocation learned. Few men are naturally equipped with Machiavellian tendency, let alone apt in employing its devices. Some are raised in challenging environments which imbue these traits from a young age, but rest assured, Machiavellianism is a female instinct and a male art form. If man does not pursue Machiavellianism as an art form, a vocation to be learned and practised, he can never hope to be half as cunning as the typical woman. Feminine cunning is a byproduct of female evolutionary development, and thus is oft subconscious rather than premeditated, ergo most women do not lack cunning, most men do.

A manipulative mentality is not a modus operandi for the average man like it is the average woman. Man was given biceps to impose his will, women received the gift of cunning. If man wants to become cunning, he must thus go out of his way to become acquainted with the Machiavellian mode of thinking. In absence of such instinctual proclivity, man must learn to integrate Machiavellian ideas through reading and social practice.

Throughout human existence, women have been the physically weaker sex. As such they have needed to evolve subconscious strategies to covertly manipulate men in ways that benefit their sole needs. When you are (physically) weaker than most of your predators and thus rely on man to protect and support you; you have to get good at exploiting male strength and reason to ensure you are protected and provided for. Remember, female economic independence is a fairly recent trend, for almost all of human history women have depended upon men for their resources.

Naturally, manipulation with and without its sexual connotation is the predominant purview of the feminine. Some men blindly dabble in Machiavellianism out of anger, frustration or a lust for power, but fewer yet vocationally refine their Machiavellian capacity to a degree beyond woman’s ability. Indeed, much the scope of Illimitable Men is aiding one in this endeavour. You see, the majority of men are effectively clueless in matters of Machiavellianism. Women on the other hand are Machiavellian as water is wet. You’d be hard pressed to find a woman who isn’t Machiavellian, female autists come to mind as a possible exception.

The idiotic man is limited most by morality, the intelligent man, by rationalism, and the woman, neither. For women Machiavellianism is the de facto status quo, her natural way of both conscious and subconscious interaction with the world. Things don’t have to “be logically or morally right” for women to believe in an idea or exhibit specific behaviour. Women have been observed to make noble, moral arguments, whilst surreptitiously behaving contrary to the repute of said opinion.

It is in all the “glory” of dissociation that women can easily manipulate themselves into believing falsehoods via pseudo-rationalisation. This makes them incredibly compelling, as it grants them the capacity to bear-faced lie with a seemingly pure conviction; this is
something typical of the feminine, but deemed psychopathic in nature when depicted by the masculine.

In the greater manosphere, we refer to this phenomenon as “the rationalisation hamster”. The typical man thoroughly lacks the capacity to delude himself an entirely false narrative with such potency; therefore in the absence of such competently instinctual self-delusion, man must confront any moral concerns and rational tendencies head-on before he is able to embrace and exemplify the Machiavellian mindset.

3.) The Logician’s Problem:

The rational not only reduces his power by justifying himself, but likewise he alienates others by correcting their logical inconsistencies. Like an autist, the logician’s primary concern is veracity over finesse; naturally this offends, and thus in matters of persuasion is a grave faux pas.

Indeed, it is more difficult for the rational intellectual to socialise and be liked for the fortitude of his character than it is the loveable idiot. For logic is charmless, challenging, and taxing for a largely illogical population. People oft feel threatened by that which they do not understand; intellect beyond their comprehension is of course no exception.

Boundless fear pulsates through the veins of the ignorant and the egotistical, the ignorant fear the unknown and the strongest of egotists are inhabited by a paranoid loathing for anything that could remotely challenge their sense of supremacy. If you have ever been disrespected for sounding intelligent, you were on the brunt end of this. You made the mistake of thinking you were in fair and open-minded company, while indeed you were not.

Unlike the logician, the idiot does not become pre-occupied with their thoughts. The intellectual on the other hand is often immersed deep in abstract thought and thus must “switch into another way of being” to be socially competent. The thought wavelength symptomatic of higher cognitive functions would appear to be incompatible with the social demands of the lower.

As such, the logician must “turn their charm on,” that is to say, subdue the honest and mechanical thinking part of their brain, instead turning on their duplicitous social brain. Idiots have little thinking brain to turn off, they’re always in social mode. Women likewise thrive in social mode as socialising is their bread and butter, that is to say, women tend to be socially focused and group-orientated as they’re more dependant on “the group” than men are. In the ancestral environment where men could hunt and survive alone, a woman would almost certainly perish without tribe acceptance.

As I stated in a previous paragraph, historically women were dependent on men. You don’t survive if you’re a dependant and an introvert; hence it is my theoretical contention that women have evolved biologically to be more extroverted than men on the whole. Their inclination toward excess chatter, and preference for work which is social rather than solitary in nature is indicative of this. Regardless, I find it tangentially relevant at this point to stipulate that introverts have a tendency to be more intellectual than extroverts.
Introverts live to think and innovate, they prioritise solitude. Extroverts live to play and consume, they prioritise company. Naturally the prior is more typical of man, and the latter, of women. The seasoned Machiavellian learns how to switch between his rational brain and his social brain so that he can interact as necessary; this is utilitarian ambiversion.

The merits and demerits of logic are so in-conflict with the merits and demerits of Machiavellian logic that the rational man’s primary mode of thought: “logical reasoning” impedes his ability to be socially effective. One cannot be socially effective without being sufficiently Machiavellian. Not all Machiavellians are strategists in the strictest sense, but all socialites are Machiavellian. When you are logical, you are easy to predict and lack the tools necessary to predict those of a less rational disposition.

Instinctually, Machiavellian logic is counterintuitive to man’s sense of innate, natural logic. I believe this is one of the fundamental reasons many a man struggles to understand the feminine. You see, unlike “raw logic” Machiavellianism is an alternative system of logic; it is the logic of popularity, dominance and duplicity.

As a logician, you are easy to understand because you do not selectively utilise chaos, your rationalism makes you easily read and predictable. The Machiavellian is harder to predict because where it suits him, he will disobey, distort and undermine logic with cunning and poise. The Machiavellian is adept in sophistry, whilst the logician is not.

4.) The Rational Machiavellian:

Machiavellianism is aligned with pragmatism and self-betterment, not truth or a set of ethics. That is to say, Machiavellianism is most concerned with maximising one’s efficiency as far as power acquisition and personal well-being is concerned. You will scarcely find a Machiavellian who is not a pragmatist, but you will find plenty of “rational” idealists.

In many circumstances, logic and fact are an obstruction to the Machiavellian motive; they expose duplicity by contradicting narrative with fact, and so the Machiavellian practices caution with the logical, for they are less easily duped.

People who understand logic but do not obey its authoritative confines will try to exploit your logic. They are what I refer to as “Rational Machiavellians”. They tend to be men blessed with high reasoning faculty, but adept in the ways of cunning, and as such, can switch between rational and Machiavellian modes of thought. Such ability is rare, other than myself, a figure who comes to mind that appears capable of this is journalist Milo Yiannopoulos. This ability is a binary cognitive modality that, in my view, all men looking to build or maintain power should embody.

The rational Machiavellian thinks logically about the challenge they are going to present to you. With their rationalism weaponised, they will predict your potential responses in correlation with what they know of your character. Your potential responses are easily preconceived because running on the assumption you are rational, it is easy to lead to you to certain answers. Your answer will be X or Y in theme (categorically deductive) because you are rational, rationalism makes you easy to predict because you will scarcely say something irrational and hence intellectually spontaneous.
Rational Machiavellians are logical only when necessary. They realise the rules of the social game, and that cunning’s success rate far surpasses logic’s when it comes to social and political matters. Yet the rational Machiavellian also realises the logician is enslaved to logic, and that as such, his source of strength is likewise his most glaring weakness.

Inversely, the rational Machiavellian can weaponise logic where beneficial, he is not confined to the realm of rational thought whilst attempting to actualise his imperative. As such, he can influence the rational and irrational with equal measure, pandering to both the logician’s need to understand and the idiot’s need to belong.

The rational yet socially incompetent man has a mind that operates far differently from that of the common idiot. Yet it is not the intellectual that dictates the rules of the social game, it is the socially Machiavellian, the charmers and the hucksters.

The rational thinks the strong justify, because there is strength in justification. The rational sees justification as a chain of reasoning, the rational believes logic is good. The rational therefore concludes if one can create a chain of reasoning conducive to their opinions, then said justification is strength, virtuous even. To the rational, an inability to support one’s opinions and choices with a traceable succession of chain reasoning is weakness.

Indeed, an inability to support one’s opinion with cogent reason is incompetently fallacious, but this alone is insufficient. The ignorant rationalist, safe in the knowledge he is more logical than his opponent, hastily deduces that he has the upper hand, that he is the superior, and therefore the victor. The fatal flaw in his reasoning of course is conflating logical supremacy with social victory, women for example are of inferior logic, yet they often beat men in arguments. In the social game, being correct does not guarantee you victory, if your opponent is incorrect but more cunning, they will win. Irrationalism wielded correctly is its own strength.

You see, you can be indubitably wrong about all manner of things, you can be unfair, and you can have shitty token reasons for the decisions you make. Yet, if you say it with charm, guile and the expressiveness of passion, with the correct gambits played it does not matter, you will win.

Humans do not reward he who is most logical in social matters, but rather he who is most impressive. Suffice to say, Machiavellian gambits and persuasive rhetoric often triumph over the autistic charmlessness of logic, fact and statistic. Who cares about the logicians or if they’re right?! “Fuck logic, it’s a nuisance!” – words uttered by an arousedly angered ex-girlfriend of mine.

Alas, in victory, where logic benefits one, one utilises it to improve the validity of their argument. Where logic opposes one’s desires, logic is conveniently ignored, omitted from presentation. Instead, the underhandedness of Machiavellianism and its emotional rhetoric peddling is utilised. Rhetoric is convincing in its persuasion because the majority of people are primarily governed by emotion rather than reason; hence when certain emotive responses are triggered, such people are sucked into the asserted viewpoint no matter how factually incorrect it may be.
4a.) Switching Between Logical & Machiavellian Cognitive Modalities:

**People will shit test you** to gauge whether you’re worthy of respect, before even deigning to address your logic. If you can’t hold frame, the socially powerful (who are often stubborn) won’t even get to the stage of disputing your reason. To dispute your reason, one must respect you enough as a person to engage intellectually, therefore those who disrespect you will not dispute your reason, but rather, your character.

Most people argue with logic, or underhanded social Machiavellianism. The best debaters (eg: Milo Yiannopoulos) calibrate to the seriousness of their opponent; if the opponent is being obtuse and offensive, the debater will undermine and ridicule, if the opponent is at least attempting to make a reasoned argument, it will be refuted with cogent counterargument.

Those who use social dominance rather than reason to win their battles will not be taken seriously by the reasonable. If you are autistically logical, people will humiliate you, you will seem clueless, and your appeal will be damaged as you appear socially incompetent. As such, one must be socially (and manipulatively) intelligent enough to pass shit tests, as well as possess cogent reason for formulating an argument that can hold up to scrutiny.

Improper debate such as taunting and reputation smearing almost always precede proper debate. Proper debate is the transparent disputation of theory or decision-making via assertion and counterargument. Although not so deliberately outrageous as Milo Yiannopoulos, another person who achieves the balance of social competence and logical rigour in my opinion would be British politician Nigel Farage.

Argumental effectiveness thus lies in mode-switching between duplicitous and logical communication. It is only through the embodiment of this duality that people looking to see someone get burned will give your reasoning the time it deserves, whilst the nerdy relish in the observation of logic triumphing over dogma.

One must be competently cunning, as well as logical in order to defend their reputation and deliver effective arguments. As one is exposed when unable to sufficiently handle another’s insults, they will likewise meet eventual exposure if all they do is insult absent a capacity to form cogent arguments. If you are not very good in either capacity, you are easy to ridicule/refute; if you are good in one aspect but not the other, you’re an average debater; if you’re good in both aspects, you’re difficult to humiliate or refute with reason and hence a powerful debater.

Of course as institutions of learning do not overtly teach Machiavellianism, most people don’t tap into this vein of knowledge. And those like Milo Yiannopoulos who instinctively understand and behave in accordance with this dynamic thus appear godlike to both idiots and intellectuals alike.

If you attend a debating society or something of the sort, you will come into contact with philosophical models, logical fallacies and the structure of argument. But knowledge pertaining to the rules of the social game, such as how to emotionally endure your opponent, humiliate them and leave the audience in awe is absent; the instruction of sophistry and rhetoric is limited, dominated almost exclusively by a small elite of aristocrats and political
families.

In fact, the well-meaning yet foolish logicians who take centre position in logic and philosophy circles will discourage you from deploying effective Machiavellian social gambits. Effective methodologies for ridiculing the opposition and winning audience approval almost always take the form of logical fallacy. Deliberately misrepresenting them (straw man), insulting them (ad hominem) or pressure flipping (tu quoque) are effective because they shake the opponent’s resolve, but due to their fallacious nature will be penalised rather than encouraged in debating circles. This is the logician’s weakness, by being fixated on the logical incoherence of such manoeuvres he fails to perceive their Machiavellian utility.

Fallacies or not, these methods of sophistry are very effective, and one is wise to employ them where an otherwise sound debate is not possible. People are far more enamoured by the outrageousness of theatre than they are the monotonous recount of reason and statistic. Should you wish to deploy statistic and hit a home run with your argument, it is wise to dazzle your opponent first.

5.) Closing Remarks:

When one works in a position where justification is expected, promoted, or part of the job description – it is still despised. This is why those low on the corporate totem pole are disrespected and often unconfident. The justification inherent of their job demands causes their peers to view them pathetically.

Justification no matter the circumstance is seen as low value behaviour, an admission of guilt, a symptom of inferiority. Even when you are “simply doing your job” or merely wish to engage in an honest informational exchange, if the other is not on your wavelength you will be perceived as: “caring too much” and “trying too hard.” Social calibration is everything.

Social calibration consists of altering your behaviour based upon the level of respect your company has for you. If you’re with an idiot or irrational Machiavellian (this is most people, including women) downplay the importance of logic, duplicity dominates. When you are in open-minded and logical company, you can be less duplicitous. Adjust your style of communication to reflect the disposition of your company, this will allow you to hold the upper hand and ensure you don’t get played.

6.) Relevant Reading:

Blog Material:
Everything in the Dark Triad Portal - (There are numerous articles here)
How Women Argue
Solipsism, Emotion & Arguments

Book(s) on Machiavellianism:
Buy “The 33 Strategies of War” in the USA
Buy “The 33 Strategies of War” in the UK
Buy “The 33 Strategies of War” in Canada
Illimitable Men: The Next Level
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The Origins of Illimitable Men:

Since the beginning of this month it’s been two years since I begun posting on the red pill subreddit. I’m not one of the first members in the community (if I remember correctly, I found it circa the 4-5,000~ mark,) however I am one of the oldest members who stuck around through all the board’s ups-and-downs. So from my perspective, I’m not “one of the originals” but to most of you, I am, as you found the community after I did.

Most unwittingly, since I started this blog in October 2013, the site has garnered a fair measure of popularity. I’ve amassed a following far greater than I had ever hoped or intended for. Truly, this is a most pleasant accident. I really only began this blog as a hobby, and as something of a vault for all my crudely written essay-length Reddit comments. After I first found the red pill community, I was excited, infatuated with the ideas I had been exposed to, and had much additional insight to add to the topics I was reading. My Reddit posts were quite popular, so numerous voices in the red pill Reddit community were telling me I should start a blog. Taking that into consideration, alongside the fear my essay-length comments I had invested so much thought and energy into were going to be left to sequester in the murky depths of Reddit, I started the blog. I had a desire based on passion, I had a healthy level of fear and I had support from the community.

Over time my writing has developed, as has my depth and clarity of thought pertaining to the world we live in. Men have started to look up to me and come to me for advice regularly. My blog has grown steadily, even though I do not post new articles frequently, neither do I
aggressively advertise or pay for marketing. Last month for example, I neither posted nor advertised (apologies for that, you all keep asking me when the next article is coming – I’ll address this further in!) but I still managed a whopping 100,000 pageviews from 40,000 unique visitors. I can but deduce that quality of word alongside quality of thought both speak for themselves in harmonic unison. For a site that updates as infrequently as it does, and gets advertised as little as it does, it’s done well. I can already tell I haven’t tapped into this site’s full potential and – I want to change that, hence this post.

It would seem my little hobby is going from strength-to-strength, as evidenced by the reality that I can neglect this site for a month and it can still show significant growth (don’t worry, I’m not going anywhere – I was merely conducting an “interest/demand experiment.”)

Editing & Enhancing Old Work:

Since I began writing, my style has developed, it has become noticeably better and my grammar isn’t as bad as it once was. Although, to a grammar Nazi, I shall always seem Jewish and thus grammatically imperfect. Be especially astute of my use of commas, colons, semi-colons and periods. Ugh. Terrible, just terrible. To be perfectly honest, a lot of my old stuff wouldn’t make the cut for publishing anymore. That’s how much I’ve raised my writing standards since I first begun to write.

I don’t regret writing that old stuff, it helped me develop into the writer that I am now, and the thinking/knowledge in those articles is still sound, however when you improve at something and look back at your early work, it is something of an embarrassment from an intellectual standpoint. It’s the writer’s equivalent of a bodybuilder seeing an old picture of himself when he was fat. Alas, I intend to go back through all my older work and improve the flow, punctuation, grammar etc. Where I deem it relevant I will add additional insight, perhaps entirely new concepts and trains of thought.

Some articles may benefit from a good few extra paragraphs, some may be re-written entirely. This is of course an ongoing process. As this undergone literary work will be published as revisions to already-published articles, you won’t get an e-mail notification when I update them. To account for this, I will make a new thread in the red pill subreddit when something is remastered. If you’re active there, you’ll see these articles go live as they’re slowly reworked. My highest priority article to rework is “Utilising The Dark Triad - Machiavellianism” which has been bothering me for a while now, and will receive polishing as well as additional content. I also want to better polish The Dark Triad Q&A Part 1 as well as publish a Part 2, I also owe you an article on Dark Triad Shit Tests, but that’s enough of me blabbing on about my intentions.

Writing Style:

I’ve elected to keep rants and informal-sounding posts on Reddit, whilst this blog will house my professionally crafted articles. If I posted rants to the blog I’d post more frequently and give people more content, however rants tend to be of a lower quality and they aren’t so classy as articles I’ve poured my soul into constructing. Alas, all and any such posts are relegated to the fiery depths of the Reddit posting platform. Only the best makes it here.
Frequency of Posting and Post Length:

I am a fixating, obsessive perfectionist when it comes to my writing. I spend far more time on crafting any one article than most writers probably expend on a dozen. That should be immediately obvious from articles like **Law 01 In-Depth**, which would fill 24 industry standard book pages, or **The Shit Test Encyclopedia** which would fill 22. I spent 10+ hours on each of those posts. Without exaggerating, I’ve lost count precisely just how many hours they took to write, but be assured it was no small task. In truth, they don’t take so long to write as they do to edit. I will still do very long posts like this on occasion, although I am going to try capping most articles at around 3,000 words and then splitting them into a series of parts should the word limit of the original piece exceed 4,000 words. That’s not me deliberately holding back content, but rather, I want to be posting articles that people have enough concentration to read, not articles so demanding they act as miniature books.

I am an artist, a craftsman, I consider writing to be an art form. I believe that writing without artistic flair or rational philosophical meditation over the intricacies of what one is exploring is a waste of time. If I want to converse crudely and without refinement, I’ll do so with my voice, informally. When I write, I ask myself “would someone want to make profit off this when it’s out of copyright and I’m dead? – No? Then it’s not worth publishing.”

Truly, anyone can write, we live in an age where literacy is common, but few become writers in the truest sense of the word, a real literary wordsmith, an author. This is a level I aspire to. I don’t just write any old nonsense into a text box and call it writing, anybody can do that, it doesn’t require any talent. I very carefully pick my words and connect up my thoughts, I try to be clear without sacrificing detail. I have a quality over quantity mantra, I **allude to this on the “about page.”**

I shan’t probably ever update any more than 4 or 5 times in one month, simply because I really like to iron out the logic and wording in each article. I do a lot of fine-tuning because I’m a perfectionist. Like I said, to me, writing is a craft and a process that you do with a sophisticated measure of depth. Short and frequent 500 word updates full of copious short paragraphs discussing basic principles at a superficial level aren’t my style, and they never will be. I’m aiming at a more intellectual audience, or at least, people who try to use their brain and genuinely enjoy reading for the sake of reading. When I see lots of short 1-2 line paragraphs on a site I think “this is aimed at stupid people with very low attention spans, this is what magazines and tabloids do.” I strive to put my writings in a class that is completely antithetical to this.

Ideally I want to post once a week, although, due to the bustle of everyday life, this may not always be possible for me. I’ve never committed to a schedule for this site before, in fact since the site begun I have written intermittently on and off, inconsistently. However, as the site has gotten more popular, it would be foolish to pass up on its success. I have a following (that’s you) who want me to provide a certain something they don’t get anywhere else, I aim to continue providing that certain something. I’m taking the site more seriously now, and no longer treating it as a mere hobby. As such, I’m at the point where I think it’s time to commit to a timetable. I will only deviate from said timetable if it is in the interest of artistic integrity to do so, eg: I won’t rush an article just to hit the Friday deadline, but I’ll try not to keep you
hanging as long as I have in the past.


It almost seems like if I don’t release a book, people will be annoyed, save all my articles and make a disjointed PDF out of it as an act of anarcho-Libertarian protest. It would be as if I had broken some cardinal law embedded into the unspoken meta social fabric of the red pill subreddit. Of course, I mock in jest, but there is truth to what I’m saying. I’ve been asked about this countless times, so figured I’d include this within this meta announcement, too. Yes, I’m going to write a book. In fact, I have a rough timetable for 3 different books. I aim to have the first one out by the end of this year which will consist of entirely new material (zero-content copied and pasted from this blog.)

However, let me be clear. This book will be something of a collection of short essays derived from aphorisms that are categorised into different groups, eg: Machiavellianism, Women, Masculinity, Self-Improvement, General Philosophy, that kind of thing. It won’t be marketed as red pill, so if you know a young guy and you want to help him out, you’d hand him this book and he’d have easy-to-access knowledge in his pocket that has none-of-the-taint of our community’s reputation “Ooooh it’s red pill, it’s evil! Surely the book must be full of utter delusional trite!” – “news just in, IllimitableMan’s released a rape manual!” This book will be a different approach from what you’re used to on the blog in the sense that it’ll be easier to pick up and put down. Effectively, it will be more condensed without sacrificing depth. I’m unsure of price point as of yet (open to suggestions in the comments) and I aim to have this out before 2016, hopefully in time for Christmas!

Monetising:

I’ve been writing a long time now for the red pill community for free. I haven’t run any advertisements or done any proper monetisation of the site (just a few Amazon links here and there, which produce pocket change, really.) I’d be pretty stupid not to capitalise on the success of my blog by refusing to monetise it out of some poorly fabricated ruse to seem saintly. Let’s be honest, I write about some pretty fucked up shit (I am alluding to dark triad theory here.) Nobody who reads my site imagines me to be anything close to saintly in the slightest, some even believe I am a psychopath (hilarious, actually) yet they appreciate what I do and enjoy reading what I write. Great, so why shouldn’t I get paid for that? Quid pro quo as the Roman’s said, or in English: “something for something,” indeed, a fair exchange of value. I provide value, I deserve value back.

Speaking of Amazon, I recently added a banner to the bottom of this site that goes to Amazon. If you click it and buy the things you were going to buy anyway, I get paid a commission. If you use Amazon a lot, consider making this a regular habit, if you’re a regular reader, it would help me out a lot.

I have considered running ads on the site, but I don’t really want to clutter the site with advertisements unless it’s the only effective way to monetise. A lot of people use ad blockers anyway, which would only cut into potential revenue. That’s why, as of this announcement, I’ve begun experimenting with crowdfunding my work using a service named Patreon.
Essentially, and this ties into the previous point on posting frequency, every time I post an article I get paid by my most devout fans. The content here will still be freely available to everyone, but those who consider themselves to be the most loyal of readers can pledge a voluntary dollar amount they’re willing to pay for each post I publish. In turn for this, you receive small perks for supporting me. Naturally, you’re not going to be the only one supporting my work, others will be too, so even if it’s only a dollar per article you pledge, it doesn’t matter. With many people doing the same thing, this will build up a sizeable pot. As I gain more and more patrons, the total pot size I get paid for publishing something new rises, acting as an ever-increasing financial incentive for me to post more frequently. Although, please allow me to stress, and I cannot stress this emphatically enough: I will not begin posting banal bullshit with increased frequency simply to get paid. Please refer to what I said above about taking the art of writing and crafting well thought-out articles very seriously. Even this announcement has gone through careful planning. Writing is my art and has been for quite some time, I’m looking to capitalise on that now, but I’m not willing to sell out to do so.

You can find out more about supporting my work via Patreon by checking out my Patreon profile or clicking the link in the “Support IM” widget that’s recently been added to the sidebar.

To conclude:

I want to take Illimitable Men to the next level by turning the heat up a notch. I have hundreds of unpublished drafts at various levels of completion, as well as some exciting projects/concepts under wraps for publication in the future. You’ll be happy to know that one of these projects is finishing my work on the in-depth 48 Laws of Power. Just be patient with me, and I’ll deliver quality. 2015 looks like it’s going to be a great year for Illimitable Men, and I’m glad to have you along for the ride on the wave of success I’ve been enjoying. So thanks for being a reader, and should you choose to support my work, a patron.

– Illimitable Man
“If you want something really important to be done you must not merely satisfy the reason, you must move the heart also.” – Mahatma Gandhi
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1.) A Crude Side by Side Comparison:

Logic as an extrinsic abstract system is objective, whilst emotion as an intrinsic hard-wired system is subjective. Logic is a universal constant that becomes tainted by subjectivity when we utilise it, as in doing so entwines it with the ferocity of our instinctual emotional bias. Neurologically, the neocortex, believed to be responsible for objective logic-based decision-making, cannot reason without being made subject to the influence of the amygdala, which is believed to be responsible for subjective emotional input.

To complicate things further, the amygdala is given priority in the brain to put its point across. Essentially, one feels (and thus has a preconceived opinion) about something both consciously and subconsciously long before they get a chance to think about it rationally. As one tries to process information, their capacity to reason is undermined by the potent subjectivity of their lower brain functions, their feelings. Alas, in all decision-making, no
matter how big or small, there is an inner conflict between what makes one feel good (emotion,) what one deems morally correct (a mixture of emotion and logic,) and what is physically verifiable, or otherwise functional (logical).

Emotion, as wonderful and disastrous as it can be, abruptly contaminates the integrity of our capacity to reason. Emotion undermines our very capacity to reason when present in enough spiritual quantity. Emotion has, in relativity to logic, cognitive command presence, for it embodies a most compelling visceral ferocity. The totality of the mind harbours a kind of innate respect for the visceral, which is why when a sufficient quantity of emotion is present within the mind, the mind prioritises it, permitting it to impact the psyche long before logic is allowed to state its case. Even when one manages to quell their inner emotional storm, the emotion is still there beneath the surface, unruly, trying to permeate one’s powers of reason. One fights to subdue tyrannical emotion with nothing but force of will, as logic alone remains ineffectual in combating emotion. In this respect, meditation is a most excellent tool for ridding the mind of excessive, overwhelming emotion. To meditate is to harness one’s mind into a fine blade, concentrate its consciousness devoid of either logic or emotion, and eviscerate the chaos that contaminates the mind. To meditate is to exercise “will” in order to be free of thought and its associated emotions within a given moment. Through meditation, one thing is learned: to ignore a thought is to attack it, to continuously ignore a persisting thought until it no longer resurfaces is to kill it. We can, with self-awareness, focus, and discipline redirect emotional energy, but we cannot fully wield and possess emotion. Logic does not possess emotion, to believe so is fallacious, for it is emotion that possesses logic. Logic cannot control emotion, but emotion can co-opt logic. Logic is only able to take control when minimal emotion is present.

Emotion is more potent than logic because it is fundamentally chaotic, it is chaotic because we cannot consciously and consensually wield it in quite the same way that we can logic. Emotion is like a screaming child, and as with anything chaotic; it is loud, obnoxious, and blindingly impossible to ignore in absence of stoic meditation. If emotion and logic are to speak conflictingly in unison, emotion will almost always drown out one’s reasoning faculty. When one acts reasonably in the face of deleterious emotion, it is because one’s will of mind has interjected, not because logic has won the psychological tug-of-war. Effectively, a greater quantity and quality of logic is necessary to influence the psyche to the same extent that a lesser quantity of emotion can. It is in this capacity that emotion dominates, it is simply the more potent of the two oft opposing mental faculties.

Reason takes concentration and effort because it is a higher brain function, emotion is effortless and automatic because it is instinctual, a lower brain function. It is only with successful circumstantial emotional alleviation (eg: meditation) that one may, should they choose, allow their logic to speak loudly enough to put its point across to the psyche uninterrupted by the cacophony of emotion; to make calculated rather than reactively brash decisions. In a sense, one could assert emotion is the logic of ego, whilst human logic is proto-scientific, an interpretation of the universe based on powers of observation which yearn devoutly for objective understanding.

Despite emotional contamination vitiating the credibility of one’s logical capacity, logic,
unlike emotion, is abstractly objective, and therefore, more reliable. It is the reliability, consistency and systematic nature inherent to logic that compensates for its lack of visceral potency, allowing for predictions that emotion alone would fail to anticipate. Logic may not be as powerful as emotion in matters of compulsion, but its reliability allows for a more sophisticated understanding of the world and how to manipulate said world. Where emotional intelligence is better suited to manipulating people, a sophisticated sense of logic is necessary for manipulating objects and devising orderly systems.

2.) Pseudo-Logic: Rationalisation & Sophistry:

Unlike emotion, logic as a system endeavours to hold itself accountable to a set of universal rules and principles. Logic embodies a set of standards and verifiable processes; it values explanations that are plausible and which can be reproduced and demonstrated via consistency, repetition, deduction, evidence etc. Emotion cares for none of these things, for its prime directive as an impulse is merely to exist, as well as breed other emotions. In essence, emotion simply “is.”

At its most manipulative, emotion disguises itself as logic by using the language of logic to justify itself. Within the red pill community, this phenomenon is known as the rationalisation hamster, a juvenile term that I use out of necessitation to be understood rather than a firm choice of expression. As I do not as of yet have any writings pertaining to this phenomenon, I will explain this phenomenon briefly. “The rationalisation hamster” alludes to the idea of faulty rationalisation(s) being accepted as a plausible narrative for questionable, rationally uncertain, or otherwise morally disputed behavioural choices. Of course typically when scrutinised, such logic is found to be pertinently faulty, exposing the sheer credulous idiocy of the individual bastardising it.

Logic is bastardised when it is emancipated from “truth” and “sense” but used as a thematic carcass of itself to make compelling arguments devoid of any factual substance. Effectively, bastardised logic is not logic in the truest sense of the word, but a superficial simulacrum of it, a pretentious emulation.

Rationalisation is quintessentially a narrative styled in the theme of logic that is devoid of any of logic’s inherent substance. It is often used to explain events and ideas in a way which makes the person rationalising seem reasonable, but really serves no function other than to act as a disingenuous albeit palatable explanation. Objectively, rationalisation is not typically an honest attempt to explain the intricacies of a situation via limited powers of observation and introspection, but more so a manifestation of sophistry to protect one’s reputation or ego. Sophistry is commonly employed by the narcissist for such purposes, but used by the great majority from time to time with lesser flagrance and frequency.

Sophistry is something that sounds logical to the ear, passing as plausible or reasonable at a glance, but when subjected to greater powers of scrutiny is found to be irredeemably incorrect due to fallaciousness or farcicality. You will observe the manifestation of rationalisation occur in a few ways. One example is the spontaneous improvisation of reasons for behaviour that the rationaliser thinks the listener will find morally agreeable, but isn’t actually the underlying reason for the original behaviour. Another is when someone arbitrarily exempts something from counting towards a criteria of which they will be judged upon.
(known as a tactical omission,) in order to nourish faulty perceptions that are thought to be of benefit. An example of this would be an individual not disclosing their criminal record to a potential employer because “that’s in the past now.”

3.) Women, Logic, Emotion & Intelligence:

Most humans lack a basic self-awareness and sense of disciplined mastery over their emotions regardless of whether their personal preference is for logic or emotion. One could argue that man does effectively wield anger to simultaneously bolster his logical convictions, although this is of course only possible when anger remains anger, a suitable amount of reasoning faculty is present, and anger has not turned to rage.

We often view women, in spite of their education, as less intelligent than men because of their preference for emotion. One could be a genius, but if dominated by emotion, would have their sense of reason so inhibited by the dictates of emotion that such genius would be frivolously wasted, imprisoned even. Such is the observation we see with incredibly intelligent women, how can somebody so smart seem so stupid? Well indeed, a woman is still a woman, and no matter how objectively intelligent IQ tests may claim her to be in matters of logic or numerics, she still shares the emotional preferences and lizard brain of women of lesser intelligence. Indeed, her intelligence does, to an extent, make her less womanly, but it does not stop her from being a woman. One could say intelligence spoils women, for too much intelligence can detract from the very essence of what man considers feminine, whilst simultaneously making her a poor imitation of man.

So regardless of objective IQ (a flawed metric that does not measure the totality of intelligence, no less) we perceive “being logical” as synonymous with “being reasonable,” whilst correlating unreasonableness with “being emotional.” Of course, it is a universal truth where such truth is not dogmatically denied that women have a strong preference for emotion, whilst man, for reason. This is not to say that neither are capable of exhibiting either, but rather simply that, given a choice, women prefer to satiate their feelings whilst men prefer to make conscious, cost-benefit driven decisions. Of course, preferences do not equate to outcomes, but they heavily influence them.

If a high IQ woman is to be consistently unreasonable, this creates the perception of stupidity and indeed undermines not just her own credibility, but the metric of IQ itself. If an average IQ man is to be consistently reasonable, this instinctually conveys a sense of intelligence to our perception. Must one be good at numerics to be logical in the complete sense of the word? I suspect not.

We are a species at odds with its own instincts. Many among humanity are happy to continue living on the animalistic instincts that come so easily to us, devoid of any real clarity of thought, and blissfully unaware as such. This is the easy life, the life of existing simply to exist, and to seek no greater purpose, which is primarily, the discovery of knowledge. The pursuit of such beings is not “to understand that which is currently deemed unfathomable,” but simply to attain happiness by fulfilling one’s instinctual needs. Any degree of understanding such a person develops is therefore purely to maximise their own happiness, it is not for the sake of attaining a degree or depth of wisdom. To state this more simply: such a person’s appreciation of happiness is greater than their appreciation of wisdom’s wonders.
The intellectually self-aware amongst humanity, unlike the great majority, prioritise discovery and clarity of thought above happiness as the prime directive driving their behaviour. In essence, intellectuals try to evolve past what they are in the search of understanding, favouring logic to attain this and despising any conflicting instincts that may inhibit this. Futile this may sound, but earnest it is all the same. The rest of humanity favours the maximisation of happiness, and utilises logic alongside the acquisition of skills as a means of acquiring resources to pursue a state of happiness.

The dim prioritise happiness, whereas the intelligent will sacrifice it if it is to lead to a greater depth of understanding. In a sense, one could say the dim are more emotionally selfish and ego driven whilst the intelligent, more sacrificial and curiosity driven. The dim avoid pain and truth in preservation of happiness, denying truth when it is abjectly apparent, inculcating themselves with lies of their own design. Meanwhile, the intelligent endure the pains of truth to the detriment of the psyche simply so they may acquire and intimately comprehend a depth of knowledge that would otherwise be out of reach. Each of us makes a choice in this life between two self-determining edicts: the pursuit of happiness, or the pursuit of knowledge. Of course one can be happy and knowledgeable, but not without first experiencing great pain.

The dim will pay any price for happiness, whilst the intelligent, any price for clarity of knowledge – particularly that which is verboten or mind-expanding. To be intelligent is to exhibit a curiosity of the world around you; to prioritise cultivating your understanding of reality at the expense of your gratification within it.

4.) In Closing:

I have written far more on this topic than what is seen here, but did mention in a previous announcement that I would keep the length of posts down in order to enable a greater frequency of posting. The remaining content, when polished, will be released in a forthcoming sequel article to this one. If you have any recommendations or have spotted any mistakes in the prose, do not hesitate to get in touch.

5.) Relevant Reading:

How Women Argue
Machiavellian Thinking vs. Conventional Logic
“Morality is judgement to distinguish right and wrong, vision to see the truth, courage to act upon it, dedication to that which is good, and integrity to stand by it at any price.” – Ayn Rand

Contents:
1.) Preface
2.) Philosophical, Metaphysical & Anthropological Arguments
3.) Bro-Knighting
4.) Strategy and Fact is Amoral, Human Behaviour Isn’t
5.) Confusion Between Amorality & Delusion
6.) Trust
7.) The Rationalism of Morality
8.) Sex & Civilization
9.) Incentive v. Principle – A Balancing Act
10.) In Closing
11.) Relevant Reading

1.) Preface:

You can opt not to betray a man you respect if you are a man of principles. You can choose
not to fuck another man’s girl, whether he’s a close friend, or not; purely on matter of principle. For example, perhaps one of the principles you follow in your life is the golden rule:

“I wouldn’t want a guy fucking my girl, so I won’t fuck another guy’s girl.”

Or

“Do unto others as they do unto you.”

Moral principles aren’t blue pill. Thinking that everyone has the same principles as you, and that most people don’t succumb (or even value) incentive over principle, is.

Modern men who prioritise sex and utilitarianism above principles; men who prioritise incentive over the innate sense of justice that we all possess do not want to hear this though. They don’t want to observe another man’s moral code, one that holds that man to a higher standard of behaviour than he subjects himself to. Because for the ruthless Machiavellian, the most emphatic pragmatist, justice is an obstruction to such an individual’s desires. Unless it’s assuaging his own need for justice, naturally.

Such an individual thinks “Does this guy think he’s better than me? Why is he trying to preach his principles like religion or something? The best way is the way that works, he’s naive for having principles. Period.”

These people, the “amoral bandwagon” as I call them, like to prioritise incentive over justice. These people make for poor friends and business partners. Incentive cares about what you get out of it. Justice cares about “what the right thing to do is.” These people violate justice because there is an incentive to do so. That doesn’t make them evil in the satanic meaning of the word, but it does make them prone to immorality. These people know what they’re doing will hurt others, they just don’t care.

“Doesn’t matter, had sex.”

And then without a hint of irony, the same guy who said “doesn’t matter, had sex,” is going to be vexed when he finds out his baby mother just sucked off a guy behind a dumpster. He wants other people to respect his dignity and not violate him, but he doesn’t give a shit if he violates others.

Humans are an emotional people, emotional people follow principles and have certain codes of behaviour they follow. Having one guiding policy “do whatever, and fuck whoever to get what you need” is destructive. Some people are like that. There were always people like that. Fuck it, whatever. That’s their choice. In some situations, we advise that. But do these people really have a moral pedestal to say “you have principles and therefore you’re an idiot who doesn’t understand red pill theory?” – no, they don’t.

You can understand the game of life that we all play and keep your principles if you want to. Just realise that to live up to your principles, you will forego incentives. If you have a particularly strong sense of justice, you will never live red pill philosophy fully. And you’re not meant to, you take what works for you and discard what doesn’t. This isn’t a movement or a
religion, it’s a way of seeing the world for what it is. A way of undressing social pleasantries, peeling back the curtain, and operating from a position of knowledge. A position which grants you social advantages that those not in the know otherwise lack.

To fully live all the aspects of red pill philosophy in your life, you’d have to be incredibly immoral. Immoral to a degree that the vast majority of people are incapable of becoming without severely damaging themselves. Be that their mental health, physical health (drug usage) or both. To be amoral is to be psychopathic, because amorality is neutrality, it is factual, it is absent human emotion. Human action and intent is not amoral, only strategy/knowledge itself is. Do you see the disconnect there? If humans are emotional and amorality focuses on the realm devoid of emotion, then amorality is quite simply not a realm you operate in.

The world is not a fair place. Sometimes unvirtuous behaviour is a question of simple survival, but this needs no glorification. If it’s necessary, and you’re not simply indulging yourself, so be it. There’s a difference between stealing to eat, and stealing because “well, who’s gonna stop me?” Men who get the game, but choose not to steal other people’s girls or scam people out of money in manipulative sales pitches aren’t blue pillers; they simply have stronger moral principles than you do. Maybe they can afford to have those principles and live well, and you can’t. Maybe they enjoy being altruistic more than they enjoy being sadistic, and for you phenomenon is inverted; it is what it is.

Red pill philosophy is here to show you how the game works, not to tell you how to live your life. We give advice when asked, sure, but you live the way that suits you best; you own your choices.

The red pill philosophy is amoral in the sense that it says “it is what it is.”:

Hypergamy? It is what it is.
Branch swinging to the next best thing? It is what it is.
Alpha fucks, beta bucks? It is what it is.
Women have innate value whilst men don’t? It is what it is.

You can’t change these things, you can build a culture designed to subvert these things, but they’re not going anywhere. The reason the modern west is falling apart socially is because we don’t subjugate these things like we used to.

Peel back all the bullshit, and you see women, as well as a lot of men who utilise red pill philosophy, are immoral creatures. I don’t intend that to be a value judgement, but without getting into some nuanced philosophical/metaphysical argument and redefining what good and bad are (people always try to whore up my time with this nonsense,) we all know what good and bad is innately. I’m not going to debate you on technicalities to help you justify the virtue of what is otherwise deemed morally reprehensible.

2.) Philosophical, Metaphysical & Anthropological Arguments:

If you violate someone else’s rights because there is incentive for you (stealing, adultery etc) that’s bad. Some philosophical ideas preach otherwise (Nietzsche’s master-slave
morality and Social Darwinism comes to mind,) however such ideas are not practicable on a daily basis for the majority of people who live and breathe today. They are interpretations of reality from a metaphysical or scientific perspective. They are so abstractly dense, that you could cogently argue such philosophy is technically correct. However, that which is technically correct and that which is socially conducive are not one and the same. You are not mathematics. Burying yourself in abstraction will not immunize you to human instincts. Arguing from a metaphysical perspective on the nature of morality, as did Nietzsche, is all well and good if you’re a philosopher, but it’s not going to be terribly conducive to your mental well-being unless you are a psychopath. For a psychopath, it is conducive. It helps them rationalise their lack of sympathy should it bother them they lack it.

It doesn’t matter if DNA and atoms are amoral, and that you’re a collection of atoms and DNA that is in an amoral competition. The combination of all those things in tandem gave you a sense of justice. You have a revenge instinct. Your sense of justice and need for revenge are the basis for all of universal morality’s guiding principles. You’re part of a game that is not adequately represented by maths and physics. Those things can’t explain morality in a useful manner, because morality is only part logic, the rest is the intangibility of emotion we experience in the human condition.

If a guy doesn’t want a life of ruthless Machiavellianism and unbridled hedonism, that’s his choice. Just like going your own way, becoming a pick-up artist, or being a patriarch with a family is a choice men can make. None of these things are “right choices” in the universal sense but simply are what he believes to be “right” for him. As long as such a man understands that this won’t stop other people from living their lives differently, and that women are for all intent and purpose, immoral, he’s good. If he takes action to defend himself from people who respond only to incentives and disincentives, and ignore moral principles based upon justice/injustice, then he’s good.

3.) Bro-Knighting:

No matter how moral or immoral someone opts to be, people will always debate things to death in order to “demonstrate their superiority.” Most people who advocate for immoral behaviour don’t even have the conviction to call what they’re advocating for immoral. They know it’s immoral, they know fucking someone’s wife and breaking up that family is immoral. But they rather call it amoral and say “well she was going to ruin that marriage anyway.” “If he was alpha enough she wouldn’t be cheating on him, so he deserves it.” “I have no commitment to that other guy, I don’t even know him, so if his girl wants my dick, I’m going to press that.” If that doesn’t sound like bullshit to you, I don’t know what to say. This guy is complicit, he’s an accessory to a whore’s immorality, but because pussy is on offer, he doesn’t care.

When you try to rationalise that as amoral, “it’s all part of the game,” you care, a lot. You don’t want people to think of you as immoral, so you try to say it’s not good or bad but that it just simply “is.” That family falling apart, or a relationship falling apart isn’t your fault. If you give a girl dick who is in monogamy, that’s always immoral, because you violated another man’s rights.

In agreed monogamy, you have rights over exclusive sexual access, when those rights are
breached, immorality has occurred. Now if you have an open relationship going on, and your
girl fucks another guy, then you knew the score. You may be upset, but you weren’t
betrayed. You were complicit. Complicit like the guy who knew he was fucking a taken girl,
but whose horniness overrode any moral principles he may otherwise adhere to. Betrayal is
the key act that evokes a need for revenge. When betrayal occurs, so does immorality.

“Bro-knighting” (a ridiculous term if I’ve ever heard one) is an issue of moral contention
within the red pill subreddit. It is men of different conventional moral principles (and some
without) essentially bickering what the right thing to do is when it comes to fucking a whore
who is currently the sexual property of another man. I’m going to tell you now, I don’t think
this philosophy can tell you what to do in such a situation. You have to figure that out for
yourself. You have to decide whether the sex (the incentive) is worth sacrificing a personal
principle for. Of course, if you have no principles and adhere to an immoral lifestyle that you
describe as amoral, then you don’t have any principles to sacrifice because you’re beyond
caring. This article is probably annoying the hell out of you. Good.

The red pill community can present balanced arguments, we can tell you the benefits of
immorality (incentive) vs. the benefits of morality (principle,) and combined with your own
pain and experiences you can make a choice on how you choose to live your life. Sometimes
you may violate your own principles because you can’t keep your instincts in check, which
you will regret afterwards. That’s to be expected, you’re fallible after all.

4.) Strategy and Fact is Amoral, Human Behaviour Isn’t:

Telling you how to fuck someone over, or otherwise unduly influence someone as a “sexual
strategy” is amoral. Anything I write that provides you with knowledge, no matter how
dubious sounding, is amoral. Because what you do with that knowledge determines its
morality. The supply of knowledge is an amoral act, unless one provides said knowledge with
a malicious intent. Even then, without adequate timing, the ill-intentioned supply of
knowledge (eg: espionage) may not lead to immoral outcomes. Anyhow, I digress and wish to
avoid such dense discussions within this piece. For all practical purposes, knowledge in and
of itself is amoral. Using knowledge to infringe on someone else’s rights and cause them
emotional pain? That is immoral. Every man must decide “do I want strong moral principles
that I want to live by, or do I want to behave however I need to behave to get what I want?”

Neither is red or blue pill. It simply “is.” It is not as simple as “people who operate mostly
on incentive are red pill, whilst people who operate mostly on principle are blue pill.” All
choices and strategies are amoral, it’s the act itself, the intent behind the thinking that goes
into the act (if any) and how it affects others which designates something moral, or immoral.
People who have chosen immoral lifestyles often want to sell it as amoral. This is bullshit, it’s
disingenuous. If you’re going to be immoral, own it, don’t act like folk with moral principles
are “blue pillers” because even though they understand how fucked up the game is, they
want to adhere to certain guiding moral principles in their life.

5.) Confusion Between Amorality & Delusion:

A lot of people in the red pill community confuse amorality with delusion. They are different
things. Amorality is simply stating what works in a scientific and pragmatic manner. Delusion
is believing in something that is not true. If you understand the game, but refuse to adapt to it, you are not “blue pill,” you are simply defiant, stubborn. Perhaps even self-righteous.

Some think that fucking a friend’s girlfriend, sister, or whatever is okay. That is fucked up shit. You don’t deserve a wolf pack when you’re pulling moves like that. Trust is a commodity. It is wisest to adhere to certain moral principles, whilst demanding others live up to the same moral principles. This ensures that the bond of trust is not broken, this is the premise almost all human cooperation is dependent upon. People who are constantly out for themselves end up alone, owing to an emphatic lack of trust on all sides. Minimal trust equates to numerous dysfunctional and fleeting relationships, for prosperity does not occur when everything must be circumspectly analysed.

6.) Trust:

Why do men instinctually almost have close to zero trust for women? Because we know they’re immoral creatures. We know they don’t give a fuck about men’s needs and that their needs are in diametric competition with man’s. Women must be regulated. If you’ve read red pill philosophy, you know women will do whatever is necessary to ensure their own well-being. They don’t have a higher mode of thought, they just run off biological programming and do whatever to “get theirs.” They ruin men without a flinch because hypergamy necessitates they replace the old guy with a shinier upgrade. One who earns more money and is fitter. Women aren’t loyal unless you’re powerful. **Woman’s love is extremely conditional, because unlike man’s it is parasitic rather than sacrificial.**

You can call that amoral if there’s no malice behind it, but regardless, the pain it causes across society is anything but. We used to keep female behaviour in check with man’s sense of justice posing as divinely ordained, imposing this morality on society as a whole. But now men have lost control; female morality runs the show. So plenty of guys are adopting a feminine view of morality to “get ahead.” I learned to think like a Machiavellian because I had to. Not because I wanted to. I write about Machiavellianism to help men who have been where I was. A man with no power is often more contorted than a man with too much. It is important you know how to manoeuvre in the game.

7.) The Rationalism of Morality:

If you think morality is a wholly rational process, it isn’t. Even in the intellectualism of Nietzsche’s master-slave morality, or the Social Darwinism within **Ragnar Redbeard’s “Might is Right,”** you can detect a certain hatred and contempt for weakness. It is the contempt for weakness that inverses traditional morality as we know it. In fact, in a perverse way, I would say it is something akin to natural female morality. It seems all but apparent that **hypergamy is the basis for female morality, that which enriches her being good, and that which doesn’t, bad.** Hypergamy ignores other people’s need for justice and is entirely self-serving. Sound familiar? In a way one could say red pill philosophy is the female moral strategy applied to male interests.

Vice becomes virtue, and virtue becomes vice. Women are without honour unless they are taught and shamed into having some. They don’t possess the natural sense of honour that men do. Scarcely do women have strong moral convictions that don’t mirror those of the
dominant social group influencing her. In this sense, no matter how plausible the typical woman’s convictions sound, they are sophist in nature, they are not hers. She is simply believing in what needs to be believed in to ensure her survival, be that to keep a high value partner, or to fit in with her social group. In this age of emasculation, however, more and more men are taking on female traits to “adapt” and “win.” As I said once before, **Machiavellianism is a female instinct and a male vocation.**

Any good behaviour women show is simply out of respect for the power they perceive you to have. Innately, as people, without being controlled, yes, subject to the control of a higher authority, they are feral. They don’t care about your opinion if they think you’re weak, no matter which charming social representative they send to greet you.

**8.) Sex & Civilization:**

Take a long hard look at the sordid state of affairs we call society today. The dysfunctionalism that runs rampant is the product of female sexuality, unoppressed, run amok. Corrupt the women and the men will follow, because when man loses control over female sexuality on a cultural level, he individually adapts himself to succeed within a feral mating climate.

That is what happens when we say “**stop locking up your daughters and confining sex to marriage, let’s have a mass orgy.**” Sex pushes people towards immorality to get an orgasm and feel powerful. The bonds of family and so by extension civilization are destroyed one adulterous orgasm at a time. Sex is not all about release, at its murkiest, it’s about leverage and controlling another; this is a most potent form of power intoxicating to both sexes.

It is for this reason that religion emphasised limiting the supply of sex. It existed as a means to suppress female hypergamous, and male polygynous instincts. That way, men did not get abandoned when a woman found a superior provider, and women were not abandoned or in receipt of a diminished quantity of resources once a man found it opportune to mate with a woman of superior beauty.

**9.) Incentive v. Principle – A Balancing Act:**

Neither the immoral or the moral guy are really “right” in what they do. The immoral guy is “right” in the sense he optimises his behaviour to obtain the most incentives. Whilst the guy with strong principles is “right” in the sense that optimises his behaviour to cause the least necessary pain in the world. Necessary is highlighted, because if you have to steal or kill to save your own life, then to ensure your own survival such things become an exceptional necessity. These things aren’t absolutes, you will do moral and immoral things throughout your life. Sometimes you will chase incentive, other times you’ll listen to principle.

The sum of your actions, if available in complete list form would detail whether you gravitate towards your principles, or toward incentives. As much as people like to say “good” and “bad” are arbitrary, people who think this tend typically to be autistic or of high analytical intelligence. They are people who are able to think very abstractly in the philosophical sense. Such knowledge is, for all intents and purposes, completely irrelevant to your everyday social relationships. The other group who agree with this notion are the people who realise they lead immoral lifestyles, but are not comfortable with describing their choice of behaviour as
such. Their ego does not permit such labelling, so they try to rationalise that how they live is “amoral, rather than immoral.” Everyone has a disposition toward behaving morally or immorally, don’t be fooled by the nonsense that they don’t. Whoever you meet, do your utmost to discern their leaning, and behave as you deem necessary.

Do I think the guy who leans more towards morality is blue pill or stupid? No. He is a man of principle. Choosing to have principles regardless of reality doesn’t make you blue pill. What makes you blue pill is not understanding the nature of the social paradigm we find ourselves in, and convincing yourself that attitudes and ideas that aren’t efficient, are. To simplify that notion, the blue pill is accepting dogma that does not effectively describe the social paradigm we find ourselves existing in.

If you understand the game and decide you’re going to be an upstanding guy, then as long as you understand what is going on and that other people aren’t necessarily playing the game the way you have chosen to play it, you will be fine. Half the battle is understanding how other people operate. When you know how the most ruthless operate, you don’t need to become them to lead a fruitful life. If you decide “fuck it” and live how you want to live in spite of the nature of the game, you’re not deluded. You understand the game, but simply refuse to become immoral in order to be more successful within it. You value your principles more than financial or sexual success. That is rare, but good for you. In a success driven capitalist culture people will view you as weak for making this choice, but it’s a mature decision most of us must make.

10.) In Closing:

Some of the people who follow this blog to read the more dubious things I write about will think I’m weak for expressing some of the opinions I have here. Respect is lost. Whatever. I don’t care. Screw your respect, I never asked for it, you gave it to me. Allow me to be an example of what I’m talking about. You have to stand up for what you believe in and argue it with as much earnestness and eloquence as you can muster.

The game is fucked up, I know that better than most. And trying to normalise betrayal, deceit and double-crossing as the status quo is indicative of that. It’s cultural regression.

I am blessed in the sense I have enough influence to give my opinions without having them immediately disregarded, because obviously I have “read the sidebar.” If a new guy said what I said, would anybody listen to him? I doubt it, he’d probably get shouted down. But then could he argue his position with the level of finesse that I can? I doubt that, too.

Don’t do everything red pill philosophy tells you to do. Honestly, pick and choose to apply what you read here as well as on the red pill subreddit. Don’t take everything we say as gospel. Yes sexual strategy is amoral in the most abstract, metaphysical and anthropological sense of the word, but don’t let that define your social morality. They are so far-removed from each other, you may as well describe the taste of food with maths; a most disingenuous of grounds to rationalise a position.

As much as dark triad theory helps one acquire incentives for instance, I don’t want to create a cult of sycophant wannabe psychopaths who are trying to medicate their pain and
poverty through ruthlessness. I have had strange e-mails from men in the past who seem to think they can morph into Scarface and “wish to learn the dark arts.” You’ve been watching too much Harry Potter son. That’s not how it works. I typically fluctuate between hearty mocking laughter and passing concern when I receive such messages. If you’re one of those people, you need to seriously check yourself. Psychopathy is something you’re born with that is “cultivated” in your childhood. Narcissism and Machiavellianism on the other hand can be learned, so borrow from them should you wish to internalise aspects of the triad.

As with everything, moderation. Anything taken to its utmost extremity is insane. We’ve seen that with what feminism turned into.

11.) Relevant Reading:

Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in the USA
Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in the UK
Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in Canada
Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in the USA
Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in the UK
Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in Canada
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in the USA
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in the UK
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in Canada
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“When a woman marries again, it is because she detested her first husband. When a man marries again, it is because he adored his first wife. Women try their luck; men risk theirs.”

- Oscar Wilde
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1.) Introduction:

“Women don’t love, they only care for themselves.” This is a comment from a gentleman I came across recently that made me stop to give pause. After some pondering, I came up with the essay you are about to read. I must conclude that I disagree with the statement that inspired this particular piece of literature. I do suspect that the gentleman who said what he said felt it to be true with every inch of his fiber, but I do not believe the assertion to be right. Nevertheless, I am sympathetic to his sentiment, for although he is wrong, he is not entirely. It is, at least among the old guard of the red pill community, an established truth that women do not love men in the way that man wants to be loved.

2.) Irreconcilable Love:

The problem is contingent on not only the way in which man craves to be loved, but likewise the way in which woman is capable of loving. Man desires a sacrificial love, sacrifice implies loyalty and connection. What men want from love, and what woman’s love amounts to is fundamentally irreconcilable.
In matters of love (and not simply lust,) man is an optimistic egalitarian. He loves as he wishes to be loved. In matters of love, when man is young and oblivious to the ways of women, he is a true adherent of **the golden rule**.

The folly of man’s nature lies in the belief that the loyalty quintessential to woman’s maternal instinct will be available within a romantic context. He believes rather foolishly, that as his mother loved him, the idealised girlfriend could. He sees how women love their children, and upon making such an observation concludes that women are capable of great love. This is true, they are. Only sadly, this great love is a love reserved solely for children, it extends not to man. As such, man has an idealisation of woman’s love, not a realisation.

Man desires that which is unattainable to him, unaware the love he desires is maternal in nature, unable to be felt for him. Nature plays a cruel trick on the psychology of man. It gives him a very pure, high quality love in his childhood. It gives him a template for woman’s love that he comes to expect as standard of all women. He is taught by his mother’s love that unconditional loyalty, noble character, gentleness, sacrifice and trust are intrinsic of the feminine essence. And so as he grows from a boy into a man he comes to the rather logical conclusion that if he is “a good man,” he can expect to be loved by his lover in much the same way. His mother, well-meant but quite incorrectly likewise affirms this notion to him. This is a wicked lie, but a man whose heart is yet to be broken does not realise this. He thinks woman’s love is immutable. He knows not that her love for child is different from that of her love for him.

And so man longs to be loved like a child, not realising such a love is reserved for children. Believing that the love he covets is romantic love, when truly it is maternal love. Such a man of course lacks the experience or nuance of mind to make this distinction. And so the tragedy for this man is learning that women do not love men like they love children. The unconditional loyalty inherent to the maternal bond is all but absent from the mating bond. Most men do not realise this. They love wholesomely right up until they are emotionally blindsided by a woman in the most violable of ways, forced to re-evaluate their opinion of female nature. This is not a hypothetical so much as it is an eventuality. If lucky, post-breakup they end up on this blog or elsewhere similar.

From there on, man can learn to re-evaluate his notion of woman’s capacity to love. He will come to learn woman’s love for her mate is of vastly reduced moral and psychological quality than that of her love for her child. How he responds to such powerful knowledge will ultimately shape what kind of man he decides to become. Be it a man going his own way, a disillusioned bachelor looking to use women for nothing but sex, or a patriarch who runs his house like a business, aware of the risk, but acting in all his power to mitigate it.

However cruel as it may seem, women are incapable of reciprocating man’s love. They love differently. There is a hierarchy of love that trickles down. Man sacrifices for woman, and woman, for child. Rarely does the river flow upward. As such, if man is to believe that women can love to the same extent as he, then he is doomed to disappointment and misery when she invariably acts within accordance of her nature rather than his idealisation.

3.) The Caveat:
Most of you have been with me up until this point; some of you aren’t. Earlier I made a point of saying that “he believes rather foolishly that as his mother loved him, the idealised girlfriend could.” This has a double-meaning that very few would have the range of experience or nuance of mind to pick up on should I not be pointing it out. Essentially when read, those of you who had a good mother would have, if not now, at least at some point thought “I hope I can find a girl that’s as sweet and caring as mom.” Then, there are those who had narcissistic, detached, unloving mothers. The mothers who always put on a good public face of being nothing other than wonderful, but due to an affliction of personal defect did not share the love intrinsic to the maternal bond with their son.

I am shocked by the sheer number of men I have spoken to who have had mothers that never really loved them (ergo, my mother was very loving,) but I can’t say knowing what I know now that I am surprised. Men who had mothers that never endowed them with the maternal bond find it easier to swallow the red pill and understand female behaviour as adults. It is a recurring observation of mine that men deprived of maternal love are better adapted for dealing with women as mates in adulthood. The man who grew up as a neglected boy never foolishly believed that a girlfriend would love him as his mother would, he believed she would love him exactly as his mother did; with extreme conditionality.

This is to say, the man who never experienced maternal love as the typical man in boyhood did would not come to idealise female love as a man. Rather perversely, the standard of which such a man holds women to romantically is more in line with their true nature. Unlike most men, he was not taught to expect a sacrificial love from women because he never experienced this love to begin with. His mother didn’t love him like a mother, but like a partner, ergo, he was loved for his utility rather than his essence. And so it stands to reason that man’s frame of reference for the quality of woman’s love is based upon how his mother loved him. A man whose mother did not love him like a child when he was a child is therefore, in adulthood, at a perverse advantage. He has no idealisation to shatter, because his expectations of women in relationships are realistic.

4.) Woman’s Love Defined:

The epitome of a woman’s love is infatuation. To define it, this is a lust for your power and an obsession with how your character makes her feel, secondary to your power. It is put crudely: opportunism and emotional self-appeasement alchemised with lust.

Man oft forgets that love does not flow upward in the sacrificial sense. He makes the mistake of thinking that because he can love a woman without lusting for her, that a woman can do the same. She cannot, because her love is not based on sacrifice, it is based on the appreciation of man’s sacrifice met with lust. The more man sacrifices for a woman, the more likely he is to fall in love with his investment. The more a woman sacrifices for man absent of animal lust, the more repulsion she feels for him, interpreting her need for investment as a shortcoming on his part. And so there it is, unspoken in word but detected in sentiment; woman expects man to love her more than she loves him, reinforcing the hierarchy of love. Female sacrifice is predicated on lust and mental entrapment. Male sacrifice is expected, and freely given.

5.) Love & Female Self-Deception:
A woman who does not lust for you cannot love you as you wish to be loved. Lust is the basis for her love, absent of lust you have “like” rather than “love.” Such a woman can do naught but use you and lie to you both that she is in love when she isn’t. If it is convenient for a woman to be in love, she will convince herself she is in love so that she may convince you of it. Women are masters of self-deception, so one must be extremely cautious in assigning any substance to their convictions. Treat such earnest emotional conviction as sophistry.

Women are generally speaking, emotionally neurotic. Women who become too self-aware can end up hating themselves because they cannot overcome their animal elements. They can’t make themselves love you in the way you want them to, even if they tried to. To do so would ravage them with immeasurable misery. So as unfair as you may think it is that your girlfriend can never love you the same way your mother did, it is likewise unfair to expect her to do so if you wish her happiness. I am of the belief that this is why society has collectively lied to itself for generations. The truth threatens the nuclear family, you only have to look at the “men going their own way” movement to see that. Many men would struggle with the idea of family upon discovering the whole host of red pill truths that are to be found. Ignorance is bliss for a great many, as such the knowledge on this blog is as much powerful as it is dangerous.

6.) In Closing:

Women are what they are; your perception of women no matter what that might be is powerless to change their fundamental nature. You can, with the knowledge you have acquired, learn to accept them, or you may, reject them out of unappeasable disappointment predicated on the idea that “woman’s love just isn’t worth it.” We can argue about what is right for society, what is right for your personal situation and all the rest, as many of you like to do, but ultimately this is a personal choice. It is your choice to make, not mine, not anybody else’s. Once you have this information, that choice cannot be taken from you. The answer will be different for every man depending on where he is at in his life’s journey.

Learning red pill truths exerts incredible impetus on a man to mentally mature and decide what he wants out of women, as well as life. What you want will change with age. A 20-year-old is prone to naively think he’s going to be a bachelor forever. An old divorced man may have resigned himself from what he deems folly. A guy that’s been slaying in bars for the past decade might be worn out and want something with more depth. Thus, as men are prone to do, he returns to the question of how women love, and how he can act on his need to love without effectively destroying himself. The men who do not see a way to love without losing who they are, and what they have gained materially, are the men who reject love.

7.) Relevant Reading:

The German philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer had some great insight on women, which you can sample here.

If anybody knows of a condensed work, as in, a publication which has compiled the entirety of Nietzsche’s views on women, then let me know and I’ll add it here. To my knowledge, Nietzsche’s views on women are sprinkled across numerous works, and as such there is no one single work I could recommend.
“Do not be too moral. You may cheat yourself out of much life so. Aim above morality. Be not simply good, be good for something.” – Henry David Thoreau
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1.) Introduction:

Morals are too emotional to be debated and agreed upon via consensus, rather ironically they must be imposed via a platonic noble lie such as religion. This of course is immoral in a number of ways, but nevertheless it is best characterised as deceit with an altruistic intention. It serves a “greater good,” and thus for those who value ethics or altruistic
Machiavellianism, it can be reasonably justified.

Of course, religion is like any corporation or government; it can be co-opted and corrupted by those who do not wish to serve the public good by submitting to the purpose of the organisation - but who use their position to fulfil their own purposes in spite of the organisation. We call a betrayal of such systemic significance corruption. Corruption in a civilizational context is effectively the sabotage of societal infrastructure for self-gain; in spite of the fact that society is reliant upon such infrastructure, as indeed is the person exploiting it.

Very few want to be martyrs, and those up to the task would, in my cynicism, only be puppeted by those pretending to serve the public good whilst really serving themselves. Ironically, to do good, one must be very competent in the strategies commonly employed by “evil.” If “evil” has anything going for it, it is that it does not leave anything to chance. Such a thing is so rare with “the good” that a man of strong moral convictions adept in the strategies commonly associated with “evil” is scarcely encountered. Thus it is such that very few believe in the moral Machiavellian, although such a thing is not common and the business of power is inherently dirty, it is my contention that such men exist in small numbers.

Naturally, powerful knowledge carries a certain taint. The more you understand about the realm of cunning, the more likely you are to employ such things, for power is inherently irresistible. You probably sought such knowledge due to powerlessness in the first place, and often the powerless are more neurotic than the powerful, but when the powerful know not when to stop - this is incorrect.

Whether one uses their power for altruistic or sadistic purposes effectively defines whether the Machiavellian in question is moral or immoral in character, but as sadism reinforces narcissism, it is my thought that the latter is more typical. If one has guiding principles they consider superior to their ego, they can be considered a moral Machiavellian. Nevertheless, such people must guard such principles from public view, for these principles are the individual’s **Achilles heel** and will be exploited by those who do not share them.

### 2.) Individualism & Social Adaptation:

In terms of ethics, individualism is the root cause of all sadism, which in my view, is the purest form of immorality for it is more predatory than it is pragmatic. In a collectivist society, ignorant women fuck subpar males out of social pressure, this helps civilisation tick over as it incentivises men to produce.

Ignorant men, on the other hand, sacrifice for family and society because they know no better, they are just happy to have mating rights and a life purpose. Everyone sacrifices for the greater good, and the result is modern civilization. Without civilization, you have tribalism. Civilization was built upon the arched back of the nuclear family sweating and toiling, not individualism. Civilization itself is proof of the Aristotelian adage “the total is greater than the sum of its parts.”

In an individualist society, neither party cares for anything but themselves, and so a scarcity of cooperation causes civilization to socially regress until a point that civilization is no more.
Whether this process is slow or quick varies. This is what we mean when we refer to “the decline.”

Individualism promotes Machiavellianism which almost inevitably leads to immorality on a macro-scale. The reason the collapse of the family is so bad for society is because it promotes individualism. This leads to Machiavellianism, which can lead to immorality, which leads to exploitation, sadism and sub-clinical psychopathy. Machiavellianism and Narcissism are socially maladaptive qualities. If you had a family that you cared about and who cared for you, any Machiavellian or Narcissistic quality you showed in spite of this compassion would be biological rather than socialised in its nature. A lack of tribe promotes these qualities, as maladaptive qualities aid survival in the absence of cooperation and loyalty.

Effectively, when one does not have people looking out for them, they feel they have to be more ruthless to be successful. Logically, this feeling makes sense. Those with zero or minimal trustworthy social ties have to be more effective individuals, for they have only themselves to rely on.

The adoption of Machiavellianism as a tool and personal philosophy is, therefore, a rational response to an uncertain world that did not supply the individual with a stable and compassionate family. We can bemoan these things, but we cannot help living in the time that we live. We live in this time, so we must adapt to it.

3.) Matters of Intelligence:

Only intelligent men can really discuss the nuance of ethics and thus, whatever their disposition, cognisantly find a balance between altruism and sadism, principle and incentive. Of course if one is innately sadistic, only the discipline of volition can suppress such a thing.

Stupid men are indoctrinated to be moral. When they see the indoctrination for the inauthenticity that it was, they typically go the complete opposite way and endeavour to become sadistic. There is an absence of mediating force and developed reasoning faculty to temper their decisions, rather, they are completely emotional driven. It takes a smarter man to balance the nuances of his morality in a society powerless to impose a collectively shared moral system.

The idiots value liberty, but they cannot handle it. They simply want the freedom to follow incentive and be sadistic without being called immoral for it. Being called immoral would lead to ostracisation, ostracisation would limit their effectiveness. This is why the immoral care about being called immoral and rather you refer to them as amoral. To make idiots productive in a paradigm where they have considerable liberty, you must impose morality onto them until altruism is their preference.

4.) Reputation Guarding & The Nihilism of Debating Morality:

Just because one is capable of great depravity, it does not mean one should engage in such depravity. And because we lack a collectively imposed and adhered to morality as of current, people will argue subjectivity, redefine meaning, and otherwise be completely disingenuous
about these things. The need to “be correct” is greater than the need to adhere to any system of morality with such people.

The altruistic will sacrifice some element of freedom for the greater good, the sadistic will not unless enticed to do so through incentive or a glitch of volition. Hence there is a necessity that the noble lie is imposed, for most are incentive rather than principally driven without it. The noble lie keeps the sadist in check if he believes in it, if he doesn’t, the noble lie will cause such an individual to be ostracised by the majority who adhere to it.

In moral debates it is common to hear vague wishy-washy dissociative rationalisations that “everyone defines their own morals.” But only the people who know they behave sadistically care enough to debate the amoral root of immoral action. It’s as I said in my previous article on morality, just because cosmic mathematics and survival of the fittest are amoral, it does not mean the average man does not have a choice between altruism and sadism. This is a unique choice that you, as a human, possess.

Humans have a capacity for altruism in spite of the amoral root of existence. Blaming your sadism on social Darwinism is disingenuously absurd. Know what you are and accept it. If you don’t like it, change it. Arguing about it with those who are indoctrinated differently, or have a different genetic makeup for morality than you is ineffectually asinine. The noble lie is the closest thing to a moral consensus that can be achieved. Likewise, I didn’t write this article to convince anyone of anything, but rather because I find an exploration of the topic to be a worthy exercise.

5.) Sadistic Morality & Betrayal:

Free of religious/moral impositions people don’t define or create ethical systems, but rather they pick and choose when and how they will apply pre-established ethics and morals. Some people in peace time are innately sadistic, others are innately altruistic. Consider this a spectrum of personality with some overlap depending on context. For example in wartime, we must all be destructive to survive – all have a capacity for destruction. Necessity however does not constitute enjoyment. There is a difference between the man who is destructive when wartime comes, and the man who cannot wait for war to begin.

Soldiers often refer to the battlefield as being the eighth incarnation of hell, but note the eeriness of the man in the battalion who seemed to revel in the chaos. These are the sadists that embrace their true nature in a socially acceptable environment, where other than the battlefield would acts of barbarity be any better camouflaged?

The assumption of the “amoral” sadist is absurd, it is nought but a projection of one’s own morals (or lack thereof) on to those who are more altruistic in their nature. It is the notion that absent an implicit or explicit threat of force, others will enter your property, pillage it, and rape any vaginal commodity occupying said property should the opportunity present itself. It is the assumption that the only thing that prevents people from doing things which violate your rights is your power, not an altruistic aspect inherent to an individual’s natural volition. But then it is only logical a sadist would think this, for the sadist unknowingly projects, he thinks because he finds exploitation pleasurable than this is a human rather than individualised trait.
One must remember that like a woman the sadist only respects power, and thus has no frame of reference for innate altruism. It is because of this that the sadist completely disregards the notion that one may wish not to do depraved things, because they themselves would do those things if they could get away with them. Morally we are a diverse species, but in a turn of irony, much like the idiotic altruist indoctrinated by the noble lie, the sadist holds everyone to their own moral expectations without considering the nuance of individual differences.

On this tangent, there is an important lesson to be taught. Some people will betray you for lacking power, others will not. Women in matters of romantic relation invariably will, for this is how they are wired. Some men shall, but not all. When you meet a person you should try to ascertain whether they’re predisposed to altruism or sadism. Once you know this, you will be able to deduce whether they will betray you because it brings them pleasure, or would betray only if it were a last resort - eg: as a means to survive.

Sadists are a bad bet because one cannot rely on a sadist to cooperate out of altruistic volition, but rather, one must constantly outsmart the sadist to receive their cooperation. It is a high cost for cooperation, and many would better spend their time with individuals who are not so expensive to maintain an alliance with. As such it stands to reason that if you are a sadist, you are a bad bet to all who know you. In absence of a capacity to change such an element, a sadist will be forced to hide or otherwise suppress such sadism, sex notwithstanding. In fact, I recommend to every sadist that comes upon this text to confine this aspect of their nature to the bedroom. Naturally this is a recommendation, not a command, and ultimately the choice lies with the individual.

6.) Machiavellianism Is Necessary:

No matter your disposition, Machiavellianism is necessary. If you cannot impose an altruistic moral code on everybody, then thoughtless (rather than low risk) altruism is worthless. Note how easy it is to lead any man down a path of incentive, but how one must tell a noble lie to lead him to altruism if it does not come innately. It is because of this that Machiavellianism always comes up trumps, because no matter what morals people consent to, the power of psychology can be used to override their preferences by limiting their options and leveraging their biases.

Altruism is trumped by sadism in tactical matters and altruism only works so long as everyone is being altruistic. All it takes is one sadist to ruin everything and start game playing. Then all the altruists find out they were being played, want to learn how to do what the sadist did to play them, and risk becoming sadists themselves. Don’t be an altruistic idiot, ration your altruism, but don’t expect you will find salvation in unfettered sadism either.

To be frivolously ruthless is almost as inept as to be frivolously altruistic. Always cost-benefit, always analyse, always have a contingency, be altruistic when you can afford to be; it’s therapeutic and it’s great for your reputation.

7.) My Stance:

The altruistic are too easily exploited, the sadistic, too needlessly destructive in their
exploitation. The plausible deniability in writing about such subjects lies in the possibility that such knowledge can be used for altruistic purposes in defence against the sadistic. The fact that the sadistic may use such knowledge more effectively than the altruistic is not my concern.

In a sense, you could say I am a psychological arms dealer. I don’t ask what you do with the arms, so invariably in matters of psychological warfare I will end up arming both sides.

Machiavellianism is not only power, but it is complicit with whatever ideological agenda you possess prior to reading here. I have men, women, Christians, Muslims, self-confessed psychopaths as well as hopeless moralists in the readership. The desire for power is universal, it is how that power is used and with what intent which varies. I do not expect you all to agree with my views, but likewise I do not expect you to read my writings should you prove unable to question your own viewpoint.

I put myself first, I enjoy writing and I enjoy Machiavellianism. So for me, this is a particularly profitable marriage. I don’t take responsibility for what my readers do due to my writings. So am I completely moral by the strictest standards, am I a paragon of virtue? Well no, I am far from perfectly virtuous, but then an absence of saintliness does not necessarily make one predatorily devilish, I’d see myself as somewhere in the middle.

8.) In Closing:

I don’t really like to talk about myself. I am a private man. I realise I have talked about myself more than I would typically, but this is with good reason. I make moral arguments now and again, and then I write about the dark triad. People are mesmerised by this seeming contradiction. I suppose most people are more binary in their morality, whereas I am more fluid. I consider fairly virtuous most of the time, but when I meet people who don’t value altruism, I detect this and suspend my altruism in their company.

Does that make me a sociopath? Those of the strictest morals would claim so, whilst those with the loosest would think the contrary. Perhaps rather simply, knowing what I know about the darker side of humanity means I will not allow myself to be exploited unfavourably. I believe in the balance of power, treat the sadistic sadistically, and the altruistic, altruistically.

9.) Relevant Reading:

If you missed it, read my rather polarising red pill focussed essay on morality.

To the guys who are “too altruistic,” you should read this, it’s a red pill favourite for reforming nice guys:

Buy “No More Mr Nice Guy” in the USA
Buy “No More Mr Nice Guy” in the UK
Buy “No More Mr Nice Guy” in Canada

To carry on with the philosophical book recommendations I made in the previous morality post, check out Schopenhauer’s take on ethics:
The less savoury and more predatory amongst you will love the following book. I haven’t forgotten you. I recommend this book particularly to you. It won’t change your mind, but rather, it will reinforce what you already believe. It argues from a point of social Darwinism how strength is moral and weakness is immoral. In fact, the guys who are too altruistic would do well to read No More Mr Nice Guy, and then read this afterwards for a steroid top-up:

Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in the USA
Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in the UK
Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in Canada

And of course, the philosophy books recommended in the previous morality article are still as relevant as ever:

Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in the USA
Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in the UK
Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in Canada
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in the USA
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in the UK
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in Canada
“Freedom lies in being bold.” – Robert Frost
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1.) Introduction – Summarising The Law:

Law 28 highlights the power of audacity and contrasts it with the ineffectuality of reticence. Confidence creates audacity, whilst timidity creates reticence; audacity is a byproduct of confidence, whereas reticence symbolises its absence.

Reluctance and indecision convey passivity, whilst the speed and affirmation of boldness project power and strength. Passivity is low energy complacence where boldness is high energy proactivity. Be mindful with your boldness and be careful not to get too carried away, for impulsive reactivity is easily weaponised against you.

People will follow a man on the strength of his conviction irrespective of the validity of his argument. Confidently conveyed rhetoric is persuasive irrespective of its truthfulness, whilst the same cannot be said of a cogent albeit less passionate competing argument.

In matters of decision-making, it is better not to move at all than to move with reticence, for a reticent move is deprived the vigorousness of confidence. The “go hard or go home”
colloquialism rings true here.

Where appearing less threatening proves useful, timidity finds its scarce value. For example, say one’s reputation for ruthlessness began to prove disadvantageous, a display of feigned vulnerability may prove beneficial. In general principle, boldness is intrinsically more beneficial than timidity, and less likely to prove deleterious than its counterpart. In light of this, when improvising one should always err on the side of boldness.

As exemplified in “The Shit Test Encyclopedia”, the way to defend against psychological attacks is to exceed the level of audaciousness you are met with. Do not back down unless necessary, as retreat signals weakness and gives your opponent the confidence to attack more aggressively. If the assuredness of boldness is what feeds into power projection, then it stands to reason the reluctance of timidity would siphon from it. The utility of timidity is less vast and requires a more surgical approach, whereas boldness is more universally useful. If in doubt, act bold.

2.) Notes On The Law:

- Boldness makes you seem more powerful with the spectacle of its grandiosity whilst simultaneously obscuring your weaknesses. It is fundamental in illusion because it keeps people distracted, preventing them from finding your thumbscrew. The predatory are always trying to ascertain what your thumbscrew is through deep analysis; continuous spectacle is thus necessary for bogging down their analytical process with misdirection. The less intelligent they are, the easier this is.

- There is boldness in polarisation; an effective way to seem unique and powerful is to undermine the ways of your opponent by nonchalantly disregarding them.

- Following from the previous point, in any scenario where there are two opposing forces, reticence can be the difference between life and death. When you hesitate you give the opposition the confidence to strike, for rightfully or not they assume your uncertainty stems from fear. Confidence feeds bravado, bravado can mask your fears when aptly portrayed.

- Timidity makes you prey, even the weak will become guileful enough to exploit you if they believe you’re a fool. This is a matter of opportunistic disrespect rather than sadistic hate.

- Timidity makes people awkward and is easily detected if not masked by bravado.

- In contrast, boldness can make others feel more comfortable. This is oft why unconfident men are more well-liked when intoxicated than when sober. Such a man has however briefly, become bolder.

- Boldness can be cultivated by the challenges of struggle. If you are comfortable in your life you will grow timid. Healthy paranoia is realising that comfort can be dangerous in excessive amounts. With healthy paranoia, boldness becomes natural, for one is more alert, attuned to their surroundings.

- Reluctance restricts movement whilst boldness allows room for manoeuvre. Reluctance
is oft analysis paralysis, allowing the unending discourse of logic to control your thoughts. Boldness rejects logical perfectionism in favour of goal-orientated motivation. He who is bold knows how to get outside of his head.

- Unannounced boldness keeps the element of surprise on your side. Reluctance gives others a chance to think, allowing them to strategize and weigh up their options.

- Boldness can force the enemy into a state of reactivity.

- Ambush: a pre-emptive swift move allows you to potentially win the game in a single move; you have the upper hand by strategising in advance whilst the competition is not even aware a game is being played. Not until the enemy is feeling the effects of your opening gambit can they strategise.

- The swift energy of boldness does not give spectators the opportunity to doubt or worry, announcements are better made boldly than tempered.

- Boldness is key in seduction, any hesitance creates awareness of your intentions before you can enact them. Boldness literally “sweeps the person off their feet” allowing no such insecurity to form within their mind.

- In seduction, effrontery, temerity and brazenness are key to success. These things are all equivocal to “shameless boldness.” The shameless persistence of pursuing your desire, “knowing what you want and not being afraid to go after it” is incredibly attractive to the opposite sex.

- Boldness gives you presence, it makes you seem more important and special than you inherently are, for all admire the bold. This ties in with law 27 which looks at “playing on people's need to believe.”

- Drawing on the previous point, law 28 ties in well with law 37 which is to “create compelling spectacles.” Law 37 is directly dependent upon the energy of Law 28 in order to function. Unless, in a twist of irony, you are typically so bold that an act of shyness is a spectacle itself.

- Boldness draws attention, attention creates power. “There’s no such thing as bad publicity” is an idiom which comes to mind, thus boldness links in nicely with law 06, “to court attention at all cost.”

- People who form immunity to shaming tactics have an increased capacity to be bold. Shaming tactics seek to limit and impose restraint on one’s power via stigmatisation. Boldness is impervious to such restraints by being indifferent to them.

- In light of the previous bullet point, the bold are freer in their behaviour.

- The higher the stakes the more distracted and awestruck we become by audacity. This is how theatricalism works.

- Theatricalism on stage as well as social and mass media is boldness on a broader scale. With bigger stakes and larger audiences, such things are a narcissistic hotspot. Boldness feeds the attention funnel; attention creates popularity which brings revenue.
• If someone is suspicious of your boldness, become bolder to alleviate their anxiety. They will assume that further boldness makes you true to your word. The assumption is that if you were not legitimate, rather than exemplify your claims, you would back down in fear of imminent exposure. Do not show fear, master the metaphorical poker face and double down.

• Boldness need not always be constant, it can be calculated and deferred. Those who fear your rise to power will look to thwart you. This idea is somewhat similar to “law 01’s don’t outshine the master”. By remaining neutral and showing neither ambition nor discontent (law 03’s - conceal your intentions) when the variables in your environment are most favourable you may strike unexpectedly and achieve your objective. Refer to the bullet point on ambush.

• Negotiation with opposition creates opportunity for the opposition. “Do not negotiate with terrorists.”

• Compromising allows your opposition to have a foot in the door, boldness does not allow for compromise unless absolutely necessary, rather, it crushes the enemy.

• Boldness instills fears in those who doubt and disdain you, whilst winning the love of those who respect and admire the courage of the bold. It is better to be thought of as crazy than it is weak. It is better to be feared than loved.

• When you are small, powerful, unknown - you must attack someone who is known to bring attention to yourself. The bolder the attack, the more you stand out and are admired. Your attack must be tasteful to the audience, humour is the perfect veil for plausibly denying your true intent.

• Voice unspoken fears that infect the group, the expression of shared sentiment is power only the bold can utilise. This is a risky move, but like all risk, if it pays off the rewards are sublime.

• Timidity is often disguised as a concern for the well-being of others, in reality it is oft simply a concern for one’s own well-being born of fear.

• Boldness is the fuel to illusion, when an illusion begins to fade in power, injecting more boldness into it reinforces the status quo of the illusion.

• The bold are admired because their self-confidence infects others.

• The bold are admired because those who are not bold see the freedom and success in boldness and wish to emulate it. The aesthetically bold are seen as role models.

• When you have the opportunity to set a price in the haggling process, say in a job interview or other type of negotiation, open with an unreasonably high price. This is how one begins to practice boldness should such a thing not come naturally.

• Following from the previous point, by not asking for enough, we project to the world that we do not value ourselves much. Always ask for more than you are worth and you will typically get more than you are worth. This sounds absurd, but try it.

• Boldness does not come naturally to most but can be developed as a habit. Social
conditioning may have made you timid, once you aware you are timid you can defeat this negative habit by consciously opposing it. What first takes effort eventually takes none.

- The consequences of timidity are generally far worse than the consequences of boldness. Boldness pays, timidity costs.

- Do not incorporate boldness into all and every action, calculate your boldness, but always incorporate it into your finishing move.

- Boldness is useful but it must be controlled. If you are naturally bold you must be careful not to react without thinking. Boldness must come from within, you must dictate its projection. It cannot be an involuntary reaction to something else. When it is, you’re not in control of your boldness.

- An inability to properly apply boldness causes offence. Realise when boldness is appropriate by understanding the context of your situation. Recklessness will ruin your reputation.

- Timidity can be used as a Venus fly trap gambit by the powerful. Being in power you must feign timidity to make yourself appear less intimidating at times. This is weaponised timidity, not legitimate timidity owing to a lack of power. Do not overuse this gambit, remember what Machiavelli said: “It is better to be feared than loved.”

3.) Relevant Reading:

If you have any additional suggestions for relevant reading, leave a comment.

Buy “The 48 Laws of Power” in the USA
Buy “The 48 Laws of Power” in the UK
Buy “The 48 Laws of Power” in Canada
Buy “The 33 Strategies of War” in the USA
Buy “The 33 Strategies of War” in the UK
Buy “The 33 Strategies of War” in Canada
Buy “The Art of War” in the USA
Buy “The Art of War” in the UK
Buy “The Art of War” in Canada
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in the USA
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in the UK
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in Canada
Buy “The Craft of Power” in the USA
Buy “The Craft of Power” in the UK
Buy “The Craft of Power” in Canada
Buy “The Prince” in the USA
Buy “The Prince” in the UK
Buy “The Prince” in Canada
“But what really matters is not what you believe but the faith and conviction with which you believe...” – Knut Hamsun
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1.) Introduction:

To understand women with at least some degree of competence, one must firstly understand Machiavellianism. Once they understand Machiavellianism, they must come to understand dissociation. After understanding dissociation, the next logical step is to understand dissociation’s relationship with rationalisation, for rationalisation is reason built upon fantasy.
A hoax, but one that can only be identified as such once you have investigated its origin.

Most within the red pill community come to know of rationalisation before dissociation; I suspect many know not what dissociation is in spite of its relation to rationalisation. Without dissociation, the reality removing mechanism on which feminine solipsism is predicated, rationalisation lacks the conviction needed to be convincing. The most compelling of a woman’s performances thus requires dissociation to masquerade as truth. If she did not believe her lies, neither would you.

2.) Dissociative Rationalisation aka Hamstering:

If womankind did not possess an infinite capacity for dissociation, the effectiveness of her manipulations would be greatly vitiated. Such a woman would be unable to leverage her sexuality into attaining commitment once she’d had more than a few partners. Her sexuality would be utilised and disposed of like something to be consumed, as once perceived a whore, she would become her sexuality and deemed to lack essence in absence of it. All too aware of this, dissociation is women’s primary coping mechanism.

If a woman cannot sell herself a false narrative, she cannot manipulate men into holding her in higher regard. Her worthiness of this bothers her not, her only concern is to obtain her ends. Although man is romantic, he does not easily trust or forgive women of dubious history. Such women are objectified in great ubiquity, for no value is seen in a whore outside the physical pleasure her flesh can offer. Some women set out to commodify themselves in this manner, we call them prostitutes.

And yet a prostitute would not be able to engage in the mental gymnastics necessary to forgive herself her promiscuity if she were chained to decision-making in a way that reason absent dissociation necessitates. In order for a woman to opportunistically capitalise on her sexuality, she must be capable of great dissociation. With dissociation, she can avoid consequences for her life choices, enabling her to convince a man she possesses an innocence and chastity she has long lacked.

A woman would get what she deserves, rather than what she wanted or needed if she could not dissociate. Luckily, nature has equipped women with an instinctual proclivity to dissociate. Women have evolved to become humanity’s most competent liars, in spite of themselves, for their own sake. Rather than striving to be better than she is, womankind has become competent in pretending she need not be better because she already is what she isn’t – better.

3.) Mental Gymnastics:

Machiavellianism, dissociation and rationalisation lie at the root and core of female behaviour. Female manipulation is about as natural as much as it is instinctual. It comes easily. Some women are comfortable with this aspect of themselves, others are not. Some may freely admit this to themselves, others may need to see themselves as good; such women seek to maintain a pretence of virtue in order to prop up whatever semblance of sanity they possess. When a woman cannot accept what she is, she lies to herself about who she is until she believes in her lies. A lie told long enough feels like the truth, women know
this truth quite intimately.

Of course, there are women who are at peace with their nature and do not care, their rationalisation merely a method of safeguarding reputation – a neurotic means to a rational end. These women are far more dangerous than their in-denial counterparts, for they are cognisant but seek not to mitigate their nature. This is to say that all women are Machiavellian, but some are so with more zeal and aggression. Effectively, some women value altruism in spite of themselves, so upon introspection deceive themselves about themselves with great conviction. Others do not care, so they do not.

All women are similar, but likewise within that similarity, there is difference as there is with men. The difference may not be as emphatically noticeable as it is within the diversity of man, but it is there. If the rather drawn out discussion on morality we’ve been having has taught you anything recently, it’s that although we all value the ideas discussed by the red pill, each of us will act upon this knowledge differently. Women are much the same with their capacity to manipulate and dissociate. Sometimes they indulge in it and weaponise it, other times they deny reality and live a lie as a means to cope. In spite of how they use it, they all use it.

What one must realise is that woman’s capacity to rationalise away anything she doesn’t like is one of the greatest tools she has in amplifying her manipulative prowess. If women couldn’t dissociate and rationalise to the point she can pass a lie detector test, she’d be far less proficient in manipulating man. And a woman who cannot manipulate a man is a vulnerable woman, for she is completely reliant on the volition and altruism of man rather than possessing any for herself. As such, women are not built to live and hunt alone, but to attach themselves to man. Conversely, man does not need women, but rather he covets her for all her ostentatious adornment and lustful appeal. Woman’s need is greater, but owing to the libido of testosterone, man’s is more pressing.

4.) Dissociation, Her Substitute for Psychopathy:

I find female dissociation to be something tantamount to psychopathy in the absence of psychopathy. Women can do great evil by act of self-compulsion, effectively inculcating themselves to believe the abhorred acts they have engaged in are without dishonour. In this aspect, honour is a uniquely male abstraction that women do not hold themselves to. Even if a woman does believe in honour, she may as well not; for she will find a way to pervert the truth and clutch at any justification necessary to make an act of dishonour seem honourable. They hold onto such clutched straws with a delusional sincerity that belies falsehood. And all this occurs to ensure her interests – at any cost.

I see a utilitarian parallel between female nature and psychopathic moral reasoning, in fact, I see many similarities between the two, but one must be careful not to confuse correlation with causation. It is not that women as a group are psychopathic, not at all, but rather, that dissociation allows them to behave as if they were by completely twisting reality.

The histrionic self-delusion inherent of women is an effective substitution for psychopathy if you need to get something done at any cost, but aren’t actually a psychopath. Man has always been baffled by how someone who feels great sympathy for others can seemingly, as
if by choice, turn off such sympathy without a shred of guilt. This is a behavioural observation unique to women noted by many men in many places. What they are observing is a woman dissociating in order to withdraw sympathy where she once felt it. Even after reading red pill material man does not completely understand this aspect of women, the moral and logical gymnastics native to womankind continues to baffle man because man is a creature of reason and morals more than he is pragmatism. For women, this is not so.

The greatest irony is that man ponders women with a consciousness bound to reason, endeavouring to find the reason for the unreasonableness of the opposite sex, repeatedly failing. In this pursuit he encounters great futility and frustration, for even if the opposite sex did possess the required self-awareness to explain herself, which she does not, she would not be inclined to explain such a thing, for it would not serve her.

5.) Women, Words, Beliefs & Lies:

I don’t assign any real value to what a woman says when she speaks of morals or loyalty or other such topics. This may sound harsh or undue, but I believe it necessary. Knowing someone can dissociate in order to hold incredibly strong convictions and then likewise dispose of said convictions when they are no longer useful means that person will never have any credibility or sway with me. Someone who is too fluid in their views and convictions is someone who does not have strong views or convictions. Because even though these things may seem plausible and compelling in the moment, they are too temporary to carry any real depth. In essence, women have mastered the aesthetics of depth – to seem deep without being deep.

I regard such things to be nothing more than pretty aesthetics, an extension of what she does with her physical appearance manifesting in the mental. The female word is much like the female form, covered by makeup, nothing more than mere pretension, a distorted augmentation of who she really is. Much like man wishes to believe the woman he lusts for would be just as pretty without the makeup, he falls victim to this same line of thinking when assessing her mentality. And so as a man it takes me far too much work to ascertain whether her asserted beliefs are things said to please me, to deceive me or to otherwise please or deceive herself. And I know it is always one of these things, and never not one of these things, because if it were not one of these things, she would be not a woman.

As such one should judge a woman how one would judge any character so flexible as to be scrupulous. Ascertain whether what she says benefits her to be seen and heard saying, or whether her beliefs assist her goals in spite of reputational considerations. If it does not aid her goal, and yet she claims it, it is likely a lie.

For example, if she claimed to be unconditionally loyal, ask yourself if she needs to be loyal to get what she wants? No, you say? You say she ensnared a man who cannot maintain her respect to marry her? You find it likely she would get everything in the divorce? Then she claims what she does to safeguard her reputation or because she is otherwise invested in ignorant self-delusion. The delusion that she is incapable of the betrayal that any man of sound mind knows her to be capable of. Such a woman is not self-aware enough as to be in touch with her nature, but rather she is enamoured with the false image she has created for herself to look at. She believes she is the thing she tells herself she is, rather than the thing
her behaviour tells us she is.

How does she so convincingly dissociate you ask? Women are good at transference, a term I use to refer to “reverse-projection.” Essentially, she believes a man’s loyalty to her is important, and so through cognitive transference can borrow the devoutness of that belief and appear, at least superficially, to hold herself to the same standard. She will temporarily believe she is loyal due to the conviction of her dissociation, much like you would temporarily believe an ugly woman is pretty whilst possessed by bourbon. Dissociation is intoxicating, and whilst under its influence, her shallow nonsense will sound devout.

Women have an innately powerful capacity to be entirely delusional in a self-serving manner, unhindered by logic and aided by dissociation, women are masterful liars. They are so good at lying to themselves, that lying to you is simply a by-product of their own delusion.

6.) Her Fluidity of Truth:

Women blend truth with convenient lies as to be deliberately confusing in a way that is nothing if not self-serving. The less intelligent amongst them forget what the truth really is, because it’s only ever what they need it to be.

Women are poor at rational abstraction, which means “their truth,” like them, is fickle. The more intelligent women can keep up with their own lies, and on some level know they do not entirely believe what they compel themselves to portray. But in spite of such cognisance, such women still possess a prowess in compartmentalising just enough to maintain the deception necessary to ascertain their goals. Women are greatly goal orientated and will jump through huge cognitive hoops to get what they want. Logic, valued by man as sacrosanct, is a sordid obstruction to the mechanics of the utilitarian female mind. When logic is inconvenient to a woman, dissociation takes its place.

And this way of being that possesses women is so innate it is not even calculated. It is a truly remarkable thing to behold, as to be a man, no such method of mind is inherent. Your beliefs, your sense of identity, it is neither so fluid nor so flexible as to constantly complement and adapt to your moment’s desires. You are not so free in your beliefs because your beliefs are not so fickle, they have merit, structure and a root reasoning for existing outside the immediate utilitarian aim that you seek. Again, I see great similarity between female and psychopathic morality. This is not to say all women are psychopaths because that is an incorrect diagnosis, but rather, although through different mechanisms, they equally possess a ruthless pragmatic morality.

7.) In Closing:

It doesn’t matter how much conviction a woman speaks with, for she can delude herself to believe whatever is necessary with uncanny prowess. She can pervert the truth so much so, that any old nonsense she says can speak with the conviction of truth even if it is an absolute perversion of it. This is woman’s greatest power, other than of course, her sexuality. And it is that element unique to women that makes her as effortlessly Machiavellian as she is. As I have said before, women are nature’s Machiavellians.
8.) Relevant Reading:

Buy “The Manipulated Man” in the USA
Buy “The Manipulated Man” in the UK
Buy “The Manipulated Man” in Canada
Buy “The Rational Male” in the USA
Buy “The Rational Male” in the UK
Buy “The Rational Male” in Canada
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in the USA
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in the UK
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in Canada
1.) Introduction

Welcome to Illimitable Men’s first monthly mailbag. My hope is that schedule permitting, to make this a regular fixture each month. What is the monthly mailbag? Essentially, I take questions from the community for the entire month. Then when the end of the month comes, I pile over the mail and pick out which questions to answer and publish.

You could call me an essayist as most of the articles written on Illimitable Men are essays. The mailbag is obviously something a little different, it is a direct interaction with the community, and hence, more conversational in nature.

I believe answering questions in a public manner is a good way to help many people at once. Kind of like approaching a situation with a net rather than a line. It’s also a great time-saving device, if someone asks me a question I’ve already answered, I can point them to the relevant mailbag. Effectively, the mailbag is an agony uncle meets FAQ type deal. Some questions will be meta in nature. Okay, with that out-of-the-way, let us proceed.

2.) “Why do you bother with TRP?”
As a TRP newbie, I’m very grateful for yet surprised by the amount of energy and time you and other TRP veterans are expending to help other people for free. I’m sure you personally have enough knowledge and discipline already to basically do whatever you want to do, so why are you choosing to spend your valuable time on TRP? Is becoming just a tiny bit more knowledgeable yourself worth the time investment, is it charity, is it a hobby, is it a “perfection in all things” philosophy, something else?

Men are in pain. If I had the knowledge I have now when I was 15 or even 18 my life would have taken a far different direction. A lot of us had to learn the hard way so that you can learn the easy way. I remember what it’s like growing up clueless and without guidance. By forming my blog, I can give the guidance I never had.

When you don’t have a blog, and you care about this stuff, you know, the state of boys and men, the health of masculinity - you’re better off having a blog to communicate your ideas to as many people as possible. Otherwise, you have lots of 1-on-1 conversations over private message, and the impact you have is far more localised. One article that gets 10,000 views has a greater impact on the collective than 200 individual private message consultations.

I think the red pill is a very important space for boys and men, young and old. Male spaces are lacking in real life, almost everywhere you go is dominated by a strong whiff of estrogen. Being stuck in the corporate rat race is no good for a guy, frankly, in my opinion, it’s emasculating. Men aren’t free to be men anymore, men must tone down their nature as not to be ostracised.

Political correctness is more a natural sensibility of the feminine than it is conducive to the masculine. Men tend to prefer communicating directly, that’s when they’re happiest and working at their best. Sanitised language which does not overtly offend is part of the “greet you with a smile whilst stabbing your jugular” ethic quintessential of women.

If you don’t do a sport in the real world, or work on a building site, you probably don’t have a place to shoot the shit. You have to be politically correct and police yourself, joking around or discussing serious topics from an exclusively male viewpoint is scarcely an option.

Not all your friends are going to be red pill, or really care about discussing the things that we as a community enjoy discussing. You may want to have a deep discussion about something, but you have friends who avoid “deep talk” and are chronic fun seekers. They’re not in the mood for politics, or whatever deep thing it is you want to discuss, so where do you go? An internet forum – to meet people who have the same problem as you. The community is special in the way that it provides an outlet for masculine expression (at all levels of depth) in a time and place where such expression is taboo.

Likewise, I take great joy in writing, I love to write. There isn’t really anything else for me to learn from the community, all one can do is master the implementation of the knowledge taught through practice. There comes a point where discussion is redundant but is done for
the sake of itself, as well as for helping the guys who weren’t there for all the prior discussions. If we don’t keep the torch lit, it’ll go out. Watch how quickly things dilute and fall into obscurity if all the big names just decided to up and leave – it would be tragic. TRP is a community of many built on the broad backs of the few. Plenty of guys “don’t get it enough” and plenty of guys who do get it “don’t give enough fucks to help anybody out.”

If I wanted to disappear, lift weights and drink an unhealthy amount of whiskey (fuck, I love bourbon) I could do that. But I find writing and helping men out to be a fulfilling task – so I do that. For as long as I find such things fulfilling, I will continue to do them. TRP helped me out when I was in a tough spot, and for that it has my eternal gratitude. However, one should note that TRP isn’t a magical fix-all for your problems.

TRP will give you the tools necessary to help you fix yourself, but TRP can’t force you to get off your ass. Reading TRP isn’t going to magically fix your life for you, it’s going to tell you how to fix your life so you can do the fixing. You could read TRP for eternity, but if that’s all you did, you’d continue to be the loser you were before you found TRP.

3.) “I don’t know what to do after college”

“I graduated college this past spring semester and ever since then I have been worrying about life. I feel like I experienced all there is to experience in terms of women, getting laid, and having fun/partying. In a way, I feel very jaded and feel as if there is nothing for me in the future. Never in my life will I be around an abundance of hot girls, have an easy time making friends, and so much free time on my hands.

Now I feel like I have experienced all that the game has to offer me now. I feel like at this point, I will be pushing myself and fighting for scraps because so many of the hot girls I knew in college are married and have degraded in looks throughout the 4 years I was there. A part of me feels like there is nothing the world can offer me now that will rival my amazing experience in college and I just feel so jaded about it. So many of these days I have felt like just getting married and having kids as soon as I get a stable career going.

What is the best thing for men in my situation to do? Do I just go into monk mode and find other hobbies? Do I go down the marriage route?”

You have not experienced even a quarter of what life has to offer. You have not had kids, travelled the world, bought a house, run your own business or whatever. Sure, not everyone wants to or is going to do all these things, but to deny they are life changing milestones would be foolish. You possess a childish outlook on life where women and partying are the focal point. Unable to see beyond that, you see what comes after that as being inferior. You don’t want the party to end, because you live for the party. If you had a passion, an ambition or vision distinct from “having fun” you’d be more excited about your future, not mourning the past.
Men with focus are strong and stable because working towards one’s ambitions brings confidence and a sense of direction, which in turn brings about success that further fuels your empire. Sure, unwind, have a few drinks, whatever. But realise “fun” is the side dish to life, not the meaning of life.

People who live to have fun are idiots that need to grow up. They don’t realise that once you find your groove - a passion you can hone and monetise - that this is a whole new form of productive fun in and of itself. If you are always unwinding, eg: watching Netflix/hanging with friends/playing Xbox, you are going to be one of life’s losers. These things should be done in moderation to let off steam, but they should not be the canvas of your life.

**Read monk mode and reprogram yourself.** You should have a focus. That focus should be to build up your empire. You are your empire, you are your own project - you are the project nobody else will give a shit about unless you make yourself worth a fuck. Making your #1 motive “to get hot blonde college chicks” or whatever obsession it is some men have “with the college life” is completely neurotic. You will never be fulfilled in yourself if this is your #1 purpose and wish in life. Ever see that movie *Van Wilder*? You’ll end up like Van Wilder, a loser in his late 20’s/early 30’s clinging on to the college hype because he was too scared to move on.

You built your self-esteem on your social circles. You are addicted to the social game, probably hyper-extroverted and sit around talking nonsense with other people who are just as directionless as you are. Because naturally, they share the same priority that you do – to be a popular socialite swimming in sexual partners. Now the party is over you don’t know what to do with yourself. The answer is in the previous paragraphs, build your empire. Build you.

You are pondering marriage as a potential remedy, to give your post-college life some sort of purpose; of all the things – marriage?! Marriage is not the answer. You lack an empire mindset and have a party mindset, if you keep that up you are destined to be average – at best. And average is essentially synonymous with loser. Fearing the future is no way to live. Find that passion, hone it, become it, live it, monetise it, and fun will be but a by-product of your success. Don’t chase fun, build success, and fun will be an option rather than this thing you chase just to be content.

And for the love of god, do not get married. Not only does marriage take all your financial and social power and surrender it unilaterally to whatever random vagina you become enamoured with, but you, yourself, are not mature enough for such commitments. You’re still mourning the end of your college experience. Marriage, if it was ever part of the equation, is about a million miles away from “I miss all the fun I had at college.”

Marriage is not a magic fix-all that will give you purpose in life, a committed relationship with a woman will destroy you at your level of maturity. You aren’t ready for that. You need to create your own purpose. That purpose should be your future empire. I think you knew that monk mode is something you need to do – but were just looking for an affirmation. Stop doing this. Act on your own volition.

Make these things regular habits: meditating, lifting, reading, doing your passion (whatever
that is) and networking. You should do these things when you’re not working, and your passion, ideally, is something you can eventually leverage into a fulfilling job. If you find yourself with free time, you don’t know how to live properly. Fill the time, pick up a book, hit the gym, do anything but be stagnant. Maintain momentum, being inert is the worst; it’s a first class ticket to misery, and that’s exactly what most people are – miserable.

4.) “How do you write about the dark triad and then write about morality?”

“You’ve written extensively on the importance of Machiavellianism and the Dark Triad concept for RP people. Articles about its nature, how it works and how we can and should try to incorporate aspects of it in our daily lives.

But at the same you have also written quite a lot about morality and immorality, which seems to be mutually exclusive with DT & Machiavellianism.

How do you manage this dichotomy? Is the DT & M aspect purely theoretical and the moral aspect your personal conviction? Do you draw a line based on some moral principles?”

I think it is important to note that one does not necessarily need to be a psychopath in order to superficially emulate, have an interest in, or understand psychopathy. After all, psychopathy is a fascinating topic. And psychopaths tend to be people who like reading about psychopathy, rather than writing about it.

Both the dark triad and the discussions on morality (1) (2) are theoretical aspects independent of each other that one can choose to live by should they wish. I present the reader with both extremes without coming out and saying “this one is better than the other.” As saying that is entirely subjective. Likewise, what is best for one is not necessarily the best for another. Most people fail to understand this because they do not approach life with the holistic/abstract outlook that I do, but rather, their reasoning is built upon the limits of their personal experience – it is solipsistic logic.

The psychopath, in his eternal solipsism, thinks it’s foolish and pathetic to be anything but what he is, cunning, ruthless, apathetic. He sees all sentimental kindness as weak if not a glib calculation, because he has no frame of reference for what baseless altruism is. Others agree on the value of ruthlessness, but do not value it in the absolutist state that psychopaths do (this is universal in those with an intact amygdala.) This is where morality enters the stage. I don’t take a stance either way, although I will write things that make you think I have a stance, because you will interpret the text as a subjective projection of my own thoughts and feelings, rather than an abstract piece of art I have written to disseminate a framework.

You can be all out for yourself and burn everything around you regardless of everything. Or you can be out for yourself but help society when it does not hurt you to be altruistic. Effectively, I don’t tell anyone what they should or should not be.
Two mutually exclusive things can be true, and one can acknowledge these truths without necessarily subscribing to both or either truth. When I talk about how morality affects civilization, I do believe a lack of altruism will hinder civilization. Stating that does not make me an idealistic altruistic idiot, rather, it is a simple maxim that civilization is built on altruism and crumbles without it.

You can be a psychopath and logic yourself to this conclusion even though you do not sentimentally care, eg: “if everybody was like me, we probably wouldn’t have running water and electricity as there’d be constant war and nobody easy to manipulate.” It’s akin to a world full of wolves without any sheep to feed on. The wolf, as superior as he feels, is dependent on the very sheep he loathes. It doesn’t matter where you are in the food chain, if the ecosystem collapses, you starve.

When I talk about how I think psychopaths operate, and what benefits/handicaps that comes with, I believe in that too. But this isn’t a diary blog, I don’t invite you into my life. I am not a character, I am not selling you feelings or bravado. This is the blog of an essayist and thinker who writes to communicate a view purely for its instructional value. There is, in my opinion, value in discussing the dark triad. And likewise, in my view, there is value in discussing how morality shapes civilization. If I did not believe either thing to be of value, I would not waste my time exploring them. In that sense, neither topic is mutually exclusive in the sense that discussing one topic means the other cannot be discussed.

I could discuss the benefits of sadism in one essay, and the benefits of altruism in another without personally adhering to either text. It is an exercise in abstract reasoning. You need not be something or personally subscribe to something to write about it.

As you will see if you read this blog for any sufficient amount of time; I’m more about knowledge and thought process, not gimmicks and manipulating my audience into feeling good so I can cash in on their positive feelings. This blog is substantive, not superficial.

This is the kind of blog where the reader takes the writings and decides for themselves what they want to do with the knowledge. Who the reader is greatly affects how or if the knowledge is utilised. Readers have a tendency to think you write specifically for them and their views, especially the narcissists. But this is not so. I do not write to cater to a specific view. I write to make men think with a depth of reasoning they may otherwise find difficult to access in order to help them properly understand something. I am teaching things I believe to be helpful, not leading men down a path complicit with my personal politics.

I have no real interest in proselytising any specific kind of morality (or lack thereof) to anybody. The only real kind of ideology that has managed to seep into the blog is anti-feminism. This site is about putting men first and helping men put themselves first by cultivating their masculinity. In light of that, anti-feminism is a rational aspect of the blog, not a preordained political agenda.

5.) “If you could recommend 10 books for personal growth, what would they be?”
This is a very simple question with a not so simple answer. Naturally, any answer I give is going to be biased. My personal top 10 would probably be the 48 Laws of Power followed by 9 philosophy books. But that is more a reflection of who I am and how my mind works than it is something beneficial to the majority. As such, this list isn’t so much a personal top 10 as it is “ten books I think can help the boys and men of TRP.” So with that clarified, in no particular order, my recommendations are as follows:

1. **The 48 Laws of Power** by Robert Greene

Psychology, strategy and Machiavellianism. Discusses strategic gambits on an interpersonal level by presenting psychological insights illustrated through historical anecdotes.

2. **Meditations** by Marcus Aurelius

Diary written by an introspective and inquisitive long-dead Roman emperor with a strong grip on Stoic philosophy. The most authoritative text in this niche to survive from antiquity. Helpful as a spiritual guide to dealing with, and perceiving life.

3. **The Art of Worldly Wisdom** by Baltasar Gracian

Book of incredibly insightful social observations from the keen mind of a middle age Spanish philosopher. The proverbs are spectacular and still relevant. It’s a great little book, very affordable, and as each proverb is self-contained and takes up only half or a single page, the book is easily picked up and put down. A great complement to the 48 Laws of Power, The 48 Laws of Power is rumoured to have been loosely based upon this text.

4. **Antifragile: Things that Gain from Disorder** by Nassim Nicholas Taleb

This book is great for encouraging fearlessness and a love of struggle. Effectively the book is based on the philosophy and idea of antifragility, that by subjecting yourself to stress, you can become incredibly powerful.

5. **How To Win Friends & Influence People** by Dale Carnegie

This book teaches you how to become someone who is liked, it answers the question: “how do I charm people to make myself popular?” Many, many men could benefit from this book, in a sense it is teaching social skills. Be careful to balance the methods given in this book with the Machiavellian tenets outlined in The 48 Laws of Power. Do not be frivolously charming, your charms should serve you rather than enslave you into the nice guy role. When you charm to appease rather than to control, your charm loses its power as it becomes your crutch. Where charm is necessary, use charm. Charm, like ego, should be seen as a tool – not a way of being.

6. **Mastery** by Robert Greene

This is “the book of monk mode.” Robert Greene discusses what it takes to master
something and looks at various masters and how they became masters in their respective fields. The gist of the book is: put 10,000 hours into something, identify a master in the field you’re working in and attempt to have him mentor you. This book is about applying yourself to an art to reap success.

7. The Rational Male by Rollo Tomassi

The only book out there which has compiled the ideas under the TRP umbrella and explained them in-depth. This is “the red pill in book form.” Think a guy needs help, want him to take the red pill, but don’t want to risk your reputation? Buy him a copy of The Rational Male. If he hates it and doesn’t see the value in it, at least you tried. You have the plausible deniability of saying you were misled by the Amazon reviews. You don’t have that when you show a guy the TRP message board. Rollo’s book is the perfect way to introduce someone to the red pill without risking a friendship.

8. Starting Strength by Mark Rippetoe

“I don’t know how to lift! How do I lift? Even if I join a gym and pay for a personal trainer, how do I know I can trust them to give me good advice?”

You can’t, and your personal trainer will probably be a don’t give a fuck steroid injecting salesman, not someone who has your interest at heart. Don’t waste your money on a personal trainer, buy this book instead. Read it inside out, take yourself down to a gym, practice your form with the bar and begin weightlifting. It will take you courage to start working out, but this book will tell you everything you need to know to get you there. Alternatively, if you have the space and money, you can set up the necessary equipment in your home. Mark Rippetoe is a master in his field. With this book, you are in good hands.

9. The Way of Men by Jack Donovan

This book talks about how to be good with other men, what it takes to really “be a man.” This book is about the nature of man and what makes an effective man. Any male young or old interested in the cultivation of his masculinity should, as such, find this to be a compelling read.

10. No More Mr Nice Guy by Robert Glover

I was never a chronic nice guy, so did not need a book to teach me how to “stop being too nice.” However, I repeatedly hear glowing reviews about this book from former nice guys. If you are someone who is “too nice” this book will probably change your life and make you less of a doormat. If “being too kind” is not something that’s ever plagued you, give this one a miss. This is the book for spineless guys looking to reclaim their spine. If you are a pussy with too much pride to be honest with yourself about yourself, buy this anyway.

6.) “How do I use ego productively?”
“Hi IM, I’ve read a lot of Manosphere over the past year or so, and I’ve noticed that you speak on perhaps a deeper, more complicated level about things. A real dissection of the concepts. So in that regard, what is your thoughts on ego, validation and how to use them to your advantage with respect to the red pill, and life in general? It’s something I’ve recently been grappling with after watching a lot of Alan Watts.”

Ah, the topic of narcissism, an important yet nuanced and diverse topic. This answer isn’t going to be a wholesome thesis on the topic, but will tackle your question specifically.

Narcissistic ego is the sword easily fell on. It has a lot of power because it is a dissociative coping mechanism. For example, say a kid is bullied at school. One day he begins to dissociate “I am the shit, I am the shit, I am the shit” and he just inculcates himself with this fake it until you make it mantra: “I am the shit, I am the shit, I am the shit.” The kid is, in a crude manner, brainwashing himself by asserting his desire as truth via repetition. Why? Because he was getting bullied and couldn’t handle his life, he dissociated to cope with the mental pain. He deluded himself into a new identity.

Eventually, said kid dissociates to the point he believes he is a bad ass for no reason other than he willed himself to believe it. He starts acting bad ass, the bullies challenge him for standing up for himself and he destroys them mentally. Where did that power come from? Dissociation. What did he have to sacrifice to get that power? Sanity, logic, reality. He believed in a lie until his brain accepted that lie and manifested it in reality. With that manifestation in reality, his lie is no longer a lie – he became what he needed to become. He stood up to the bullies. What started as a lie became truth, the kid effectively willed his lie into existence through the process of dissociation.

That is the power of ego, the ability to overcome what you otherwise couldn’t overcome. By believing in yourself you gain immense power over your surroundings. You can hold frame. The problem lies not with believing in one’s self - the problem lies with how one comes to believe in themselves, the methodology. If it is rational for a person to believe in themselves, it will be proven through cause and effect, eg: self-improvement. If it is dissociative, it is confidence built on a lie, propped up by the validation of others who help will the narrative into existence. These are the co-dependent enablers and the hero pedestalising sycophants.

The problem with ego is how living a lie blinds your senses and, rather ironically, makes you vulnerable in a new way. Egotistical people are very bad at taking criticism, very sensitive to any perceived slight (easily offended, although they may act unfazed to save face) and are generally speaking: hyper-sensitive.

In all its perverse irony, through the grandiosity of the narcissist there is an intolerance to even the slightest negative remark directed at them. Like bullets being dodged via slow motion in the matrix, they will not allow anything to stick. The narcissist refuses to acknowledge or accept anything they do not like regardless of its merit, they will simply dissociate to a preferred version of events. That is narcissism, that is when a person has become their ego.
And often the egotist will try to compensate for their inability to handle criticism by doubling down on the critic, by insulting the critic, by bringing in a sycophant to back them up (validate them.) They will do anything to hold onto ego because they identify themselves as their ego. They see no distinction between themselves and elitism/grandiosity/confidence. Their ego is their power, and without it, they have nothing. Because of this they cling to the ego like the world’s been flooded and their ego is the last parcel of land.

Exude bravado in the company of narcissists or people who you want to impress (women, recruiters, etc.) Demonstrate superficial egotism without really taking it to heart. Watch how an egotist behaves, learn to emulate their behaviour but do not believe in the glib nonsense, merely become good at mimicking its affectation. Say it with conviction to convince those around you, but assign no depth to the words you speak. Speak in this manner to communicate status and control perception, but do not mistake your lies for truth. They are just words, words designed to deceive – and this deception is necessary for you to achieve your goals. This deception must fool others, but you must remain grounded and be careful not to inadvertently fool yourself. If you fool yourself and become your ego, you will ruin yourself.

Realise ego is a tool that can be used for your benefit independent of the rest of the mind. This can be difficult to master, as the validation that comes from acting like an egotist is a honey pot, it is addictive. And so it will tempt you into taking on the alter ego as your de facto personal identity. This is bad because quieting logic to live off validation means that if you are to lose validation, you will lose your foundation for being. You will lose your sense of self. You will have a huge gaping vulnerability, a constant need to be acknowledged, appreciated and respected. Behind the bravado, this makes you weak. You will become compelled to seek power simply to feel like you exist, being eternally dissatisfied by an insatiable ego.

When the honey pot goes sour, you will start losing control and acting crazy to try to get that indomitable godlike feeling back. You behave like a druggie chasing a high he can never get back.

By using ego as a tool, but not becoming it, you retain reason. This means you are stronger than the clinically narcissistic, because when your ego is attacked you can perceive the attacks on your ego for what they are and thus separate yourself from the ego. This is necessary for being formless. Ego will transform you from nothing to something, but it is logic that will save you from imploding on yourself when the ego reaches critical mass. Where logic limited your capacity to succeed in the example with the bully, (you can’t be logical and dissociate) in this scenario, it saves you.

By rationally deconstructing the attack on your ego, you immediately see yourself as distinct from your ego. Why? Because your ego is solipsistic and cannot rationally deconstruct an attack upon itself as an observer. It can only react to a threat personally and within the moment. It cannot “take a step back,” so to speak.

By using reason to analyse rather than reacting with ego, you separate your mind from your ego. And then you will see clearly. You will see the attack as a strike against your reputation, a strategic move which can be countered. Not an intense emotional tussle which taxes your
senses and makes you dependent on winning just to “feel normal.” When one who is reasonable strategises, they are in control, a player. One who reacts with their feelings is being played, reactions can be anticipated and encouraged, effectively pawning the individual via their ego.

The manipulation of ego is what makes the otherwise powerful, manipulable. An ego is like a great big castle wall that isn’t really there, if you touch it, you’ll go straight through it. You expected something solid to be there, like a reason or something substantive, but there was nothing. The whole thing was a bluff. Smoke and mirrors make for some compelling illusions.

Ego is good for quick reaction and performance in the moment, but it is poor at planning. Ego benefits improvisation and performance, it’s a good short-term tool, but it is poor for strategising. I recommend learning to code switch into an egotistical frame of mind, but not being bound to that frame. Ego should be wielded like a tool, picked up and put down. Enjoyed for it uses, but sparingly as necessary.

7.) In Closing:

I had many messages and e-mails, obviously only a handful made the cut. If I featured every message here, we’d be at well over 20,000 words and that would be far too long. Seeing as this is the first mailbag, I’d appreciate any feedback in the comments. Thanks for reading, I hope you enjoyed it, and I look forward to answering July’s end of the month mailbag.
“Knowledge is indivisible. When people grow wise in one direction, they are sure to make it easier for themselves to grow wise in other directions as well. On the other hand, when they split up knowledge, concentrate on their own field, and scorn and ignore other fields, they grow less wise — even in their own field.” – Isaac Asimov
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1.) Introduction:

The maxims that comprise the bulk of this article are designed to educate men on the nature of women, as well as the nature of themselves in relation to women. Being a loose collection of maxims, the article is easy-to-read by merit of its broken down format. I’ve likewise adopted brevity here in the hope that the most prominent points will stick more easily.

The maxims listed are inclusive, but not exhaustive. As such, these maxims do not compromise the totality of wisdom available on this topic. There is far more. With time, I may add additional maxims or pen a follow-up article.
2.) The Maxims:

**IM MAXIM #1:** “The tougher the men around her, the softer she is. The softer the men around her, the tougher she is. The toughest woman is the fatherless woman, for the fatherless woman seeks a surrogate by whoring herself.” [See here for more.]

**IM MAXIM #2:** “A woman never wants you to need her, only to want her. The moment your want becomes need – she no longer wants you.”

**IM MAXIM #3:** “Women’s love is admiration built upon respect. Women are drawn to men of experience and power. Man’s love is respect built upon desire. Men are drawn to women of innocence and vulnerability. When a woman no longer admires, and a man no longer sacrifices, love is lost. It is a delicate balance, for respect is lost when either fails in their capacity. Man sacrifices, woman admires, that is love.” [See here for more.]

**IM MAXIM #4:** “Women love children how men love women.” [See here for more.]

**IM MAXIM #5:** “The feminine wants a guardian and the masculine wants to guard. The problem is, neither can happen without trust. The sexes have always found it difficult to trust one another, but courtesy of feminism, they have never trusted each other less.”

**IM MAXIM #6:** “There is an immutable animosity between the sexes that serves as the conduit for all distrust. This animosity flows from the inability of the sexes to reconcile their fundamentally opposed sexual strategies. For a man’s optimal sexual strategy to thrive, the woman’s must suffer. For a woman’s optimal sexual strategy to thrive, the man’s must suffer. Each sex is determined not to suffer, and so both inflict suffering on the other in a perverse determination not to suffer themselves; this is the battle of the sexes, this is reproductive war.”

**IM MAXIM #7:** “The sexes desire to trust one another, but they wish to actualise their sexual imperatives far more. As such, trust is predicated on the degree of one’s control far more than it is any sense of blind loyalty.”

**IM MAXIM #8:** “Women are followers, not leaders; they follow trends, status and power, not a sense of innate loyalty.”

**IM MAXIM #9:** “The average man is ignorant and misled. His mental construct of women is far greater than anything the typical woman aspires to. This is not his fault for his biology deceives him and society lies to him, as such the deck of deception is stacked. Nevertheless, the reality remains.”

**IM MAXIM #10:** “You conflate her beauty with good character. These things are distinct, but mesmerised by beauty, you think they are identical.”

**IM MAXIM #11:** “You have been lied to about the nature of women all your life, disregard what you think you know because it’s probably wrong. Ignore the top-down preaching that society espouses, reconstruct your understanding from the bottom-up.”

**IM MAXIM #12:** “Cultures have always had a preferred sex. In some eras, men are
celebrated; in others, it is women. There is no equality in prosperous cultures, only a cooperation where one sex recognises the superiority of the other. To realise which culture you live in, ask yourself who it is more acceptable to criticise. The sex it is least acceptable to criticise is that culture’s preferred sex.”

**IM MAXIM #13:** “Women aren’t loyal to you, they’re loyal to your power.”

**IM MAXIM #14:** “Conventional loyalty implies honour. Honour is a male abstraction. Female loyalty is predicated entirely on the belief you are powerful, we will call this opportunistic loyalty. Man can be loyal in the female sense (opportunistically) or he can be loyal in the truest sense of the word – sacrificially. In matters of men, women are capable only of the prior, the latter is reserved for her children.”

**IM MAXIM #15:** “Sacrificial loyalty is not predicated on the potency of one’s power, opportunistic loyalty is fixated on it.”

**IM MAXIM #16:** “Female loyalty is not loyalty in the truest sense of the word, for it is far too conditional to be considered such a thing. The conventional understanding of loyalty demands a bond beyond an enamour with power.”

**IM MAXIM #17:** “Opportunistic loyalty is an instrument of pragmatism, sacrificial loyalty is typically not. Therefore in contrast to sacrificial loyalty, opportunistic loyalty is something akin to “half-loyalty.”

**IM MAXIM #18:** “It is precisely how women love which vitiates their capacity for loyalty to that of bastardised half-loyalty. A loyalty dictated by hypergamy rather than honour. A Machiavellian self-serving loyalty, yes. A noble one, most definitely not; this is reality, accept it.”

**IM MAXIM #19:** “All past sacrifice is null and void if your continued association does not provide her with a tangible benefit. To simplify: if you cannot help her now, she does not care if you helped her before.” [See Briffault’s Law] Refer to Maxims #16-18.

**IM MAXIM #20:** “Your mother is the only woman who will love you for you, rather than your power. Corollary: if your mother was a heartless narcissist, you have never known and shall never know a woman’s least conditional love.”

**IM MAXIM #21:** “If you compare a potential love interest to your mother, your love interest will disappoint you. Corollary: unless your mother was a narcissist, in which case you will get exactly what you expect.”

**IM MAXIM #22:** “Women don’t care about your struggles, only your successes.”

**IM MAXIM #23:** “Women want the final product, but successful men value a woman who was there for the journey. Women detest risk, so they have the propensity to hold back ambitious men with their petulant insecurities. Should he become too powerful, she fears she will lose her monopoly over him. She sabotages him to secure him, for the crab bucket mentality is intrinsic to women.” Refer to Maxim #22.
IM MAXIM #24: “As her control increases, her attraction and respect decreases. As her control decreases, her attraction and respect increases. If a woman is with a submissive man trying to become dominant, she will utterly oppose him. She has accepted he is submissive and so she revels in the power her control gives her. If he becomes dominant, she loses the power and resources her monopoly granted her. And she will never forget his old ways, she will never really believe he is a worthy leader.”

IM MAXIM #25: “The optimised female sexual strategy compartmentalises the roles of men. We call this female sexual plurality. Women have a dual nature to control and be controlled, for their fluidity permits great perversity. With the dominant, she can satiate her masochism. With the submissive, she can satiate her sadism. In this way she indulges her lust for power with the submissive man, and her lust to feel feminine with the dominant.”

IM MAXIM #26: “If she is with a submissive man, she prioritises her happiness. If she is with a dominant man, she prioritises his. With the dominant man, making him happy makes her happy. The submissive man’s happiness has no such effect, so she deems it irrelevant.”

IM MAXIM #27: “Women will not go backwards in commitment, men will not go backwards sexually. Corollary: unless the man or woman in question has no better options, in which case they will, with misery.”

IM MAXIM #28: “Women bargain for control of a man’s commitment, men bargain for control of a woman’s body.”

IM MAXIM #29: “Work on the presumption that the women you date are promiscuous. Your inclination will be to assume her innocence, but you are wiser to assume her guilt.”

IM MAXIM #30: “It is not so much a question of if she is a whore, but rather, a question of if she is not.” Refer to Maxim #29.

IM MAXIM #31: “Prudence necessitates one requires evidence of womanly innocence rather than assuming the existence of such. The assumption that innocence is an intrinsic feminine quality is an almost universal tragedy that has cost many men a great deal.”

IM MAXIM #32: “A woman’s truth is whatever she needs it to be. If the abstract truth does not serve her psyche, a dissociative one will be manufactured in its place.” [See here for more.]

IM MAXIM #33: “Feminism didn’t make women something that they weren’t, patriarchy and religion did. Man’s governance made women better, not just for the sake of men, but likewise, for themselves. Feminism is female self-governance. Such self-governance has revealed the nature of women to lack a non-superficial civility. By removing the societal shaming mechanisms that nurture women to be noble, feminism has exposed the feral nature of women. Everything that is negative about the female disposition is thus doubly so under the fist of feminism.”

IM MAXIM #34: “Men must become powerful to be loved; women and children need only exist.”
IM MAXIM #35: “Men remember being boys. Man has a lucid perspective in comparing the diminished affection of his adulthood to the greater bounty of his childhood. Women do not experience such a significant loss of affection. As such, man is forced to realise he will never again be loved so profusely, for the boy gets his fill, but man loves the most to be loved the least. The profundity of maternal love is longed for, but forever gone. A girlfriend cannot provide that, and is loath to do so should a weak man demand it. This is perhaps the bitterest of all the pills.”

IM MAXIM #36: “Marriage is for women and the lined pockets of divorce lawyers, not husbands.”

IM MAXIM #37: “Marriage is security for women at the expense of man’s freedom. Traditionally man was given certain powers to compensate him for the increased burden and loss of freedom. He no longer is.”

IM MAXIM #38: “Marriage is the only legal contract in existence that permits a person to violate contractual terms and then subsequently penalise the party who upheld said terms.”

IM MAXIM #39: “Woman, much unlike man, does not see marriage as a legal contract or responsibility. She sees it as security, and the celebration itself, the actualisation of a childhood fantasy.”

IM MAXIM #40: “Some believe marriage is necessary to properly raise children. In a bygone era, it was. Times have changed. Feminist legal politics have transmuted what was traditionally an asset into a liability.”

IM MAXIM #41: “Divorce destroys children. You can’t ruin your kids with divorce if you never get married to begin with.”

IM MAXIM #42: “Women want to get married because, in the majority of circumstances, they have everything to gain and nothing to lose. For you, this is the opposite. Ultra high-net-worth women are perhaps the exception, that should reveal all it needs to.”

IM MAXIM #43: “Security and commitment is the female end-game. Marriage provides this. Marriage fulfils the feminine imperative by providing a woman her highest desire. The equivalent end-game for the male imperative is a harem of beautiful women.

IM MAXIM #44: “If you’re (ever) in an elite social class that necessitates political marriage, keep the bulk of your assets secure in a trust fund. This is your security. What isn’t technically yours cannot be taken from you.”

IM MAXIM #45: “Women are Machiavellian as water is wet.” [See here for more.]

IM MAXIM #46: “Women weaponise sex, for it is their trump card, and often, their only card.”

IM MAXIM #47: “It is inextricably womanlike to control the attractive man with sex. When libido wins, she fucks for pleasure. When a lust for power wins, sex is rationed like a drug and used to condition a man with Pavlovian precision”
IM MAXIM #48: “When a woman manipulates a man she does not find attractive, she does so through feigned frigidity and sex appeal rather than through sexual act.”

IM MAXIM #49: “It is in a woman’s interest to give deliberately mixed signals. There is great power in even a potential for sex. As such, it is in woman’s interest to have men believe they have a chance. For as long as he believes this, she exercises power over him.”

IM MAXIM #50: “If you try to debate with someone whose mind prefers emotion to reason, you will engage in a grand exercise of futility that exhausts the patience. As such, do not argue with women. It is pointless. You cannot argue with feelings, you can only manipulate them.” [See here for more.]

3.) In Closing:

Some things may seem obvious, others, not so. The seeming obviousness of something is an incredibly subjective phenomenon, and is based primarily on your experience (or lack thereof.) As such, some things may click, others may not. I only ask that if something is not immediately obvious, that you re-read the maxim a couple of times to better consider it’s meaning. If you still don’t understand a point, feel free to ask in the comments.

UPDATE: An article with a further 50 maxims has been published. You can check it out here.

4.) Relevant Reading:

Buy “The Art of Seduction” in the USA
Buy “The Art of Seduction” in the UK
Buy “The Art of Seduction” in Canada
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in the USA
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in the UK
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in Canada
Buy “The Rational Male” in the USA
Buy “The Rational Male” in the UK
Buy “The Rational Male” in Canada
"The saddest aspect of life right now is that science gathers knowledge faster than society gathers wisdom." – Isaac Asimov
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1.) Introduction:

Much was covered in the article preceding this, Fifty Shades of Red. However, I remember thinking when writing the piece that there was much more to say. In light of that, as well as the resoundingly positive response the previous article received, I thought it only apt to pen a follow-up.

2.) The Maxims:

IM MAXIM #51 – “Women are mercenary. They do whatever it takes to win. They will switch sides or outright lie to secure the man they deem their best option. That’s what you are to a woman. An option.” Refer to Maxim #45.
IM MAXIM #52 - “Society claims a woman shown your deepest fears will appreciate “your true essence.” This is a myth, a grandiose lie. The average man naively expects a woman to treasure his vulnerability in much the way he does hers. She cannot. Presented with such a burden, a woman will plan her exit. Your vulnerability will not be tolerated. Such a man’s error is conflating his innate attraction to female vulnerability with a reciprocal attitude. There is no reciprocal attraction. Pre-sexual revolution, men knew this acutely.”

IM MAXIM #53 - “Superficial vulnerability from a position of power is attractive to women, this is what it means to “open up.” Substantive vulnerability, eg: being insecure, is not.” Refer to Maxim #52.

IM MAXIM #54 - “You think sharing your weakness demonstrates trust and love. You believe you can bond over your pain. You believe wrongly. All she sees is the repulsiveness of your weakness. She does not respect your weakness, your pain, or how difficult it was for you to share your pain with her. Women do not care. They can admire your persistence in the face of such, but not your need to express it.” Refer to Maxim #52 and #53.

IM MAXIM #55 - “Money on a man looks like makeup on a woman. Money is makeup for men.”

IM MAXIM #56 - “Money is more important than women. Chase money, not women. You are more likely to get women chasing money than you are to get money chasing women. Without money or godlike genetics, you’re playing on hard mode. Money makes everything better, the quality of woman you can get is the epitome of such, not the exception.” Refer to Maxim #55

IM MAXIM #57 - “Men control an interaction by being nonreactive; women control an interaction by being emotionally intense.”

IM MAXIM #58 - “Women feed off excess emotion, men tire from it, with the exception of anger indulgence. Woman’s emotional nature thus makes her highly histrionic. Corollary: men with cluster B personality disorders are histrionic and thrive on emotion. In this way, they are similar to women. You will see many similarities between women and dark triad men (particularly narcissists) if you look closely enough.”

IM MAXIM #59 - “Women thrive on drama, it allows them to weaponise emotion and push an agenda. Starve them of emotion, and they have nothing to fight with. A woman starved of emotion will become desperate to sustain her psychological onslaught. As such, she will attempt to pry it from the dead, exaggerating observations and manufacturing issues in order to sustain the indignance necessary to maintain her psychological assault.” Refer to Maxim #57.

IM MAXIM #60 - “Women are psychologically violent.” Refer to Maxim #45, #57, #58 and #59.

IM MAXIM #61 - “Effeminate men and masculine women are undesirable. We are programmed to help women and respect men, not the reverse. Women get social power from being pitied, men get respect (and thus social power) from being powerful. The reverse is not
true.”

IM MAXIM #62 - “Women are the biggest potential threat to your long-term happiness. In the words of Nietzsche: “she is the most dangerous plaything.” Always be guarded. Many of history’s greatest men fought in wars, beat poverty and built vast commercial empires. What is the one thing that unites the undoing of such glorious men? Women.”

IM MAXIM #63 - “Always protect the core of your essence, should you choose to let her in, never let her in completely. See yourself as a castle, let her into the castle, but do not give her the key to the heaviest door. She will notice the door is closed. She will ask you what’s behind the door and if “you can let her in?” Ignore her protests and manipulations. Never open that door. Not a woman alive other than perhaps your mother is worth opening this door for. If you believe love entails “sharing everything,” you don’t understand love.” [See here for more.] Refer to Maxim #50, #51 and #62.

IM MAXIM #64 - “Women lead double lives. She will project a strong outward good girl facade whilst engaging in acts of depravity in secret. We know whoring reduces a woman’s value. They know this too. But rather than simply not whore, they would prefer to deceive.”

IM MAXIM #65 - “The more sexual partners she’s had, the more mentally damaged she is. Women who have slept with lots of men dehumanise and objectify men through sex. Such women are poor relationship prospects. Aware this damages their value and in a bid to have men take them seriously, they distort their past by playing down their number.” Refer to Maxim #64 and #67

IM MAXIM #66 - “If you really want to know a woman’s notch count (number of partners), feign non-judgement. Indicate you have slept with hundreds of women. From comfort, follows truth.”

IM MAXIM #67 - “The majority of women would rather improve their capacity to deceive than change anything non-superficial about themselves.”

IM MAXIM #68 - “Women’s interest in the field of academic psychology is nothing more than a manifestation of her innate Machiavellian disposition seeking to enhance its efficacy.” Refer to Maxim #45, #64 and #67.

IM MAXIM #69 - “Women hold men to a higher standard of morality than they hold themselves. As such, they are prone to adopting the moral high ground in an attempt to “appear clean” whilst manipulating another. Never supplicate.” Refer to Maxim #64.

IM MAXIM #70 - “A woman’s mistakes never count, a man’s are never forgotten.” Refer to Maxim #32 and #60.

IM MAXIM #71 - “A man raised fatherless, or to a weak father, has a high chance of becoming effeminate. A woman raised fatherless, or to a weak father, has a high chance of becoming masculine. Poorly raised children make for dysfunctional adults. Such individuals can undergo self-improvement and reprogram themselves over a period of time, but such things are rare and far from optimal. If you are a parent: do right by your kids. Men, be
manlier, less lenient. Women: you are not more important than your family. You are nothing without them. Betray your children and their father at your peril.”

**IM MAXIM #72** - “If you’re **not where you want to be in life**, do not have serious relationships with women. Her perception of you will remain rooted in the former version of yourself and her needs/issues will hinder your progress. Whilst you’re trying to build your business and body, she will whine, spread negative energy, and burden you with her problems. Her negativity will infect you, hindering your growth. If you’re not where you want to be aspirationally, you have no need for a serious relationship.”

**IM MAXIM #73** - “Rarely are women an asset, they are a responsibility and thus a liability. Women are a black hole for money, time, and all other valuable resources you possess. This is why your time/commitment has value. Do not squander it, do not let it be appropriated. Be selective in your associations.”

**IM MAXIM #74** - “Women are entitled. Assume all are, because even if some aren’t, most are. It’s not a question of “is she entitled?” but rather a question of “is she not?” Scarcely does a woman show appreciation for the labour of man. Is there a problem your woman wants you to fix? It’s not a request, it’s a demand. In her eyes, it’s is your obligation rather than your choice to help her. You don’t get respect, credit or appreciation for helping entitled women because their narcissistic natures find them inherently deserving. A woman can be conditioned out of this behaviour, but if she isn’t, she will default to it.”

**IM MAXIM #75** - “Women scarcely appreciate and commonly expect.” Refer to Maxim #74

**IM MAXIM #76** - “Women are solipsistic, not abstractive. They do not care about things that do not affect them. If you want a woman to care about something, you have to show her how it affects her on a personal level. Otherwise, she will be disinterested and indifferent.”

**IM MAXIM #77** - “Solipsism means women do not perceive the world as an abstract entity, but merely as a stimulus that they experience. As such, their view of reality does not perceive independent of themselves, but strictly in relation to themselves.”

**IM MAXIM #78** - “Women are highly susceptible to groupthink and herd consensus. Women do not like to stick out, they strive to be “seen as normal.” This is likewise true to a degree with men; however, with women, the effect is far more pronounced.”

**IM MAXIM #79** - “The majority of women define themselves by their beauty, and so never become anything greater than their bodies. Women without beauty who define themselves by their intellect are often jealous of women who have beauty because they resent having to work harder to achieve similar or lesser social success.”

**IM MAXIM #80** - “If you are not in the top 20% of men, you do not exist. Whenever women talk about how men have it easier, they refer to the top 20% of men. Women are so privileged they do not even stop to notice the struggles of the great swath of men beneath them. These men are “the invisibles,” by merit of hypergamy they do not exist, not even as a blip on her radar. Should such a man become a blip, he is a creep to be shunned, shamed
and shooed.”

**IM MAXIM #81** - “Never enter relationships you can’t leave. If you catch yourself forming dependence, it’s time to leave.”

**IM MAXIM #82** - “Women are fickle, do not depend on them. More generally speaking, you should depend on people for specific functions, but segregate such functions. Therefore, if one domino falls, the rest are unaffected. This allows you to be outcome independent and replace people who stop performing a role. Epitomise this attitude in your interactions with women for a noticeable boost in game.”

**IM MAXIM #83** - Reputation is everything to women. It is more important to her than any moral concern, rule or abstract principle. Refer to Maxim #45 and #51. **[See here for more.]**

**IM MAXIM #84** - “Women detest criticism and judgement in any form. Even when intended constructively, they will misperceive an attack upon their reputation. Women can’t handle criticism. They ask for the truth out of ego and self-importance, but they cannot handle it. Hence why people tend to use baby talk with women and sugar-coat things rather than “telling it like it is.” Refer to Maxim #83

**IM MAXIM #85** - “Ignore what she says, watch what she does. Women lie with incredible frequency. Combine this with solipsism devoid of self-awareness, and you do not have someone whose words bear any relation to reality. **Corollary:** don’t mention the red pill to women, just practice it. They will hate the ideas, but love the effects.”

**IM MAXIM #86** - “Women are obsessed with claiming they/their gender has a mastery over qualities that they scarcely possess. Eg: logic, maturity, thoughtfulness, introspective self-awareness etc.”

**IM MAXIM #87** - “Women are perpetual adolescents. Women mistake confidence and preferences with maturity, but such things are neither. Assertiveness is not maturity. Maturity is measured by the level of responsibility one can assume, as well as the capacity to sufficiently cope with the pressure that said responsibility entails. Women perform poorly on both metrics in comparison to their male counterparts.”

**IM MAXIM #88** - “A woman scarcely matures past 18. She simply becomes pickier and more entitled with age, mistaking self-aggrandisement for enlightenment, although such is the contrary. Likewise, women infinitely obsess over the maturity of individuals, using it as a point of contention to manipulate people. And so it is with profound deadpan irony that **women shit test men** on their maturity, deeming male behaviour they disagree with as boylike. Women mature faster than men, but they do not mature for as long as men. As such, they mature less.” Refer to Maxim #87

**IM MAXIM #89** - “The feminine is, by its nature, attention seeking, histrionic, whiny, tearful, prone to delusion and weak at introspection. Traits we would typically associate with children. It is therefore not unfair to say that women do not mature as much as men, but rather, unfair to say that they do.” Refer to Maxim #87 and #88.
IM MAXIM #90 - “Women play games. Women say they do not play games and hate those that do. This is part of their game.” Refer to Maxim #45

IM MAXIM #91 - “A woman’s lower brain will eventually trump her higher brain, assuming it does not do so instantly. The underlying mechanisms which govern female behaviour are universal, rather than unique. Furthermore, such mechanisms trump higher reason in matters of female decision-making. This is what we mean by “AWALT.” People who mistake “AWALT” as an assertion that the more superficial aspects of women are identical have missed the point.”

IM MAXIM #92 - “A man’s manhood is deduced from the likeability of his actions, a woman’s womanhood is simply assumed by merit of her age. In a reversal of how women deem male behaviour they disapprove of to be boylike, women will distinguish between girls and women to dismiss negative criticism about women. For example, your typical woman would rationalise the wisdom here doesn’t describe her because these maxims are true of girls, not women. And naturally, a woman idiotic enough to engage in such a rationalisation will always see herself as the woman, never the girl.” Refer to Maxim #87 and 88.

IM MAXIM #93 - “If a woman is attainable, but you believe she is out of your league, she is. Self-fulfilling prophecy.“

IM MAXIM #94 - “Depth to men lies in logical complexity and philosophy. Depth to women is the process of interpreting and examining the meaning of her emotions.”

IM MAXIM #95 - “The more beautiful a woman is, the more men will accept or even enable the most contrived nonsense from her. You would do better not to accept it at all.”

IM MAXIM #96 - “A man who commits easily and gives attention freely is the male equivalent of a slut to women. He will be used, but by nature of his availability and the ease of which his emotional intimacy is available, never desired. This one-sided dynamic is that which constitutes the fabled friend zone.”

IM MAXIM #97 - “Women need and crave masculinity in their lives. If you are in a relationship, but not sufficiently masculine, your woman will cheat on you. It’s not so much a matter of ‘if’ as it is a matter of ‘when.’ As such, a relationship’s success is your primary responsibility, not hers.” Refer to Maxim #72.

IM MAXIM #98 - “If you’re not a man who is comfortably masculine, women will emotionally abuse you until you finally learn to be masculine. Their nature, although unintended, perversely serves in much the manner that tough love does. How she hurts you will give you the impetus necessary to become a better man. It is women who drive men to the red pill.”

IM MAXIM #99 - “Men are inherently distrustful of women because their logical inconsistency vitiates their credibility. Women are inherently distrustful of men because they fear his physical desire absent of a willingness to commit.”

IM MAXIM #100 - “The low value man can do nothing right, the high value man can do nothing wrong. The higher your social value, the less the rules apply.”
3.) In Closing:

So that’s part 2 finished, and a 100 maxims penned. What are your favourite maxims? Do you think one can be improved? Spotted a mistake? Share your thoughts in the comments.

4.) Relevant Reading:

Buy “The Art of Seduction” in the USA
Buy “The Art of Seduction” in the UK
Buy “The Art of Seduction” in Canada
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in the USA
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in the UK
Buy “The Art of Wordly Wisdom” in Canada
Buy “The Manipulated Man” in the USA
Buy “The Manipulated Man” in the UK
Buy “The Manipulated Man” in Canada
Buy “The Rational Male” in the USA
Buy “The Rational Male” in the UK
Buy “The Rational Male” in Canada
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in the USA
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in the UK
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in Canada
“Any woman who is sure of her own wits, is a match, at any time, for a man who is not sure of his own temper.” – Wilkie Collins
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1.) Introduction:

You do not argue with women when you wish for them to comprehend, comply or agree. You cannot argue against woman’s feelings, only manipulate them. Argument necessitates reason, but reason is ineffectual in conflict with women. In non-political matters, where a man will yield to superior logic, a woman will not. And so man must manipulate woman’s emotions in a way that makes her cooperative, or he should not engage her at all.

If a woman is so entitled or indignant that you find yourself unable to escape her compulsion to argue, you would be wise to engage her as a Machiavellian rather than a
**Logician.** Man must remember that when lured into argument with a woman, he is at battle. The dispute at hand is Machiavellian, not rational; a game, not a civilised debate. The man who believes the argument is about mutual cooperation via the discovery of truth rather than the assuagement of the involved woman’s emotional state, operates on a doomed axiom. A man’s desire to problem solve is fundamentally incompatible with a woman’s desire for catharsis.

2.) Male Ignorance:

Men are quite wrongfully taught they should placate women’s emotions, or engage in mind-numbingly futile attempts to reason with them. To do either is to forfeit power before conflict even begins. Such strategies are losing propositions. Man should neither placate nor reason with a distressed woman. But rather, he should be charming enough to keep conflict superficial. When argument cannot be avoided, he need be **Machiavellian enough** to belittle her. He should not under any uncertain circumstance argue back-and-forth with any degree of seriousness, for arguing against a woman’s emotional state is as foolish as it is masochistic.

If conflict is unavoidable and reason impenetrable, all that is left is to assert dominance. This is man’s only recourse when a woman is trying to dominate him psychologically with her emotions. Once her emotions have settled, it is wise to explain your reasoning and expectations as a way of guiding the woman, should you care for her. But only outside the confines of argument, never within the heat of it. Naturally, if the woman in question is insignificant, such paternal patience is unnecessary. Aftercare is discretionary.

3.) Insecurity: A Basis for Feminine Indignance:

When an argument begins, a woman’s emotions ensure her uncooperativeness. When a woman stands on the precipice of dissatisfaction, her imperviousness to reason makes the mere concept of argument inane. The key to cooperation therefore lies in keeping her emotional state positive. Just as one would not build a dam for water in a volcano, they would be wise not to attempt reasoning with a distressed woman.

And yet a woman’s feelings are quick to sour. Even the tamest critiques and concerns can result in ill feeling, largely by merit of woman’s inability to handle such things. And so the trap of arguing with a woman is always there, should a man express himself without filtering himself. Often a man knows not how such benign comments result in such grave offence. But such unsophisticated sensitivity is intrinsic to femininity.

One would not be mistaken for thinking I am describing the insecure, rather than women per se, but then it would be disingenuous to assert that the vast majority of women are anything but insecure. So are these things traits of women, or traits of the insecure? I would say both. But then I would also assert that women are intrinsically insecure, and that many arguments take place because a woman is demanding her insecurity be assuaged in spite of the overwhelming importance of the issue at hand. Men who exhibit similar behaviours are likewise womanlike in their mental frailty.

4.) Cause & Effect vs Solipsistic Blame Attribution:
When you argue against a woman’s feelings, you enter her frame by tacitly accepting the validity of her emotion’s premise. Acknowledgement is all it takes to give the irrationality of her emotion credence, and therefore such acknowledgement should be avoided.

Much to our mutual annoyance, a woman’s feelings are typically anything but valid. You see, to a woman, whatever she feels – in spite of why she feels it – is valid. Women care not for “the why” behind their feelings, but simply the fact that they are feeling. As such, the presence of a feeling is proof enough of its validity to a woman, in a sort of infinite solipsistic loop she intuits “the feeling exists, therefore, it is valid.”

If she feels a negative feeling, regardless of the reasonableness of your position, she will blame you for it. In this manner she disregards the importance of cause and effect, because such things are irrelevant to her emotion’s solipsism. As cause and effect take place outside of the female mind, it is irrelevant to her. Solipsism cares not for abstraction.

Now while one could posit that blame qualifies as an investigation into the “why” of how she feels what she does, it really isn’t. Because the blame given is entirely arbitrary by merit of its solipsistic nature. Owing to a lack of abstraction, it is simple blame attribution and affirmation for the self-perpetuation of her emotional state. It is not investigative in the cogent sense of the word.

If she were truly interested in “the why,” she feels what she does, she would look beyond blame, analyse her actions for wrong-doing and come to a reasoned judgement on if her feelings were a reasonable or unreasonable response. If she found them to be unreasonable, she would disregard them and show interest in solving the initial issue. She would do this, rather than allow her feelings to take precedence over the issue which triggered them. Of course, this is not how women work. It is the feeling born of the issue that takes priority, not the issue itself. A minority of women can do this retroactively, but I have known not a woman who can do this in the moment. Dare I say, none can.

5.) The Invalidity of Female Emotion & It’s Frustrative Affectation:

Say a female colleague is making grave errors in her work and you give her suggestions on how to improve her technique. All too commonly, if suggestions were not given with great euphemism and diplomacy, you would cause offence. As such, you can see how easily the premise for a woman’s feelings is flawed. Because it is not difficult to offend a woman, and neither does she need a logical reason to be offended, feeling bad is offence enough. And intolerant to stress as women are, it is a laborious inadvertence that occurs with great frequency.

And so it is the woman’s nature to constantly misdirect the man away from his criticisms and concerns, and rather, to vilify him for daring to infringe on the sanctity of her emotional well-being. Where man will endeavour to make his original point, stick to the point, have the point recognised and come to an arrangement over his concern; the woman cares only about how his point made her feel, not the point itself. Man doubles down on his reasoning, provoking more negative feeling in the woman; who in turn doubles down on the importance of her emotional state.
And so the woman will neither address the point, nor give the point much thought, much to the complete torture of the well-intentioned man. Naturally, this leads to endless frustration and only serves to further alienate the two parties. Women are quick to offend, quick to anger, and slow to reason even in the absence of hostility. Indeed, it is such traits that are often the cause of hostility. Whilst man wants to pursue what he believes to be a problem that needs addressing, the only problem worthy of addressal in a woman’s mind is the maintenance of a positive emotional state. Whilst the man continues to attempt fixing the original issue, the woman becomes more annoyed her emotions are being ignored.

And so at such a crossroads, male and female nature is at odds. Man wants to pursue what he believes to be “the truth,” or “correct.” Whilst a woman wishes to maintain her emotional well-being at any cost. It is for these reasons we refer to women as “the most responsible teenager in the house.” They cannot cope with stress in the way that men can, and so they can neither reason nor argue as well as men can. Remember, one need not be the superior logician to win an argument, as the prowess in which women argue with stands testament, you merely need be the more psychologically dominant.

An upset woman will dominate the frame of an interaction by maintaining your mutual focus on an indignant investigation of her feelings; particularly, the source of her feelings. And of course, in argument, it is you who is the undisputed stimulus for her negative feelings. In this frame of mind, absolutely nothing matters to a woman other than her need to understand her feelings and receive validation of their legitimacy. I am repeating this point with great frequency, but it is important it is internalised: your point is irrelevant to her if it elicits emotional discomfort.

6.) Emotional Endurance:

A woman does not care if she is “in the wrong,” has disobeyed or betrayed, for a creature who does not excel at logic is neither cogent nor appreciative of such a thing when upset. Even at the best of times, women struggle to balance reason with emotion. That’s when they’re trying. In argument, they’re not even trying. She will not give in, solipsism sees to it that women are stubborn.

Arguments nourish women, they feed her emotionally. Bar the histrionic man, argument absolutely exhausts men. Not only that, but being the party far more privy to the realm of reason, it is likelier you will give in than it is she. Her indignance will out-endure not only your reason, but likewise, your desire to even advocate for yourself.

If you get angry, your anger will be used to immediately invalidate your disagreement whilst simultaneously validating the credibility of her histrionics. Your anger will be turned against you, you will be painted as the oppressor, and her, the victimised. You will be made to feel guilty for your anger. And then following from this premise, your anger will be used to retroactively scapegoat you for her unacceptable decorum.

The narrative put forth will be that it’s your fault she’s upset, even if it isn’t. Even if you know with your full faculty of reason that such a thing is ridiculous; women do not care.

7.) In Closing:
It is not in your interest to work against her emotions, but rather, you should work in tandem with them. Leverage her emotions, change them so that they are conducive to rather than defiant of your goals. Know how to make her feel good, and her agreement will be yours. Argue against her emotions, and no matter how grand and well articulated your point, she will never agree. Equity and reasonableness are of minor relevance to a woman's emotional self-satisfaction. Women do not sacrifice their emotional well-being to do what is morally or reasonably right, but rather, they sacrifice what is morally or reasonably right as to fulfil their emotional needs.

By manipulating her feelings to something more beneficial to yourself, you can change her frame, or even pull her into yours. This is why when receptive, amused mastery is excellent. Arguing a woman's emotions with reason, as is man's predilection, is a losing proposition. For her emotions are far too visceral to be swayed by the passionlessness of reason, the heart cares not what the head thinks, and a truer thing could not be said for women.
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“Civilization is like a thin layer of ice upon a deep ocean of chaos and darkness.” – Werner Herzog
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1.) Introduction:

As is typical, I was browsing the red pill forum when a gentleman's question caught my eye:

Monogamy isn’t the norm in the animal kingdom, by far. So why do we so hungrily desire this form of relationship?

The questioner is, as is quite common, falling victim to the appeal to nature fallacy. The fallacy is the assumption that because something is natural, it is optimum. In this case: “promiscuity comes naturally to humans, therefore, promiscuity is a good thing.” Of course, such thinking is not only fallacious but solipsistic.
It appears a given that the average mind conflates naturality to be synonymous with “good.” Such thinking is used to great effect in marketing to give the word “natural” a positive connotation. Objectively the word is neither negative nor positive, merely neutral. Therefore the ubiquity of the assumption that “natural” can be equated with “good” is nothing more than a culturally programmed memetic infused into the collective consciousness. We typically associate the word “nature” and its derivative forms with health, enchanting trees and lush green lawns. But such an association is an inaccurate synonymity for “good,” as cancer, manure and vomit are as equally natural – if not quite so appealing.

To briefly demonstrate the irrationality of such an idea, consider you use a computerised device to read this. Computers are incredibly useful, but they are anything but natural. So why do we use computers if they’re unnatural creations that aren’t the norm in the animal kingdom? Well of course because computers, like all technology, confer benefits upon human lifestyle we would not otherwise reap. The unnaturalness of computers is considered, on the whole, to be a net positive, not negative. As such, computers have become a bedrock of civilization. They do not need to be natural to enhance our quality of life. They merely need be the most efficient in performing the duties assigned to them. In this regard, monogamy and computers have a lot in common.

2.) Individuals, Families & Civilization:

The institution of family does for social dynamics what computers do for electronics. Both inventions revolutionise and dominate their respective spheres. Property rights, law, marriage – all these things were invented to stabilise civilization by exerting environmental pressure on human instincts. Without such things, we revert to a base tribalism: violence and petty territorial barbarianism.

Although one may not see it, for an idea, social grouping or principle is less tangible than a computer, the family unit is a prerequisite for the functioning of more complex social order. One cannot have committees, courts, institutions, panels, religions or even nations without first establishing family.

As the individual bonds with the family, the family bonds with the civilization it inhabits. But individuals deprived the bonds of family by outcome of immutable social factors are often at odds with civilization. Such individuals give up on community, opting for a more parasitic survival strategy. They are the shameless narcissists, the angry barbarians and each and every shade of dysfunction there between. Scarcely do such people care for civilization. And how can we expect them to care for something as grand and abstract as civilization when such individuals were never fully subject to the bonds of family? How does one come to love something as grand as nation when they had not even the love of kin?

Far from statesmen interested in the public good, vagabonds and the estranged are typically apathetic to the plight of civilization. Make no mistake in thinking it is only the estranged who behave in such a manner, indeed, entire families have pillaged civilizations in pursuit of internal interests. However, I think this more an affectation of excessive power rather than a quirk of family. As such, this contention is a generalisation rather than an absolutism.

Familial estrangement manufactures apathy. This is how promiscuity and divorce undermine
social progress, and in turn, civilizational progress. The effects of such action cause pain, which in turn, promotes excessive individualism and a disdain for collectivism. And so the cosmic recurrence that is a need for balance is tipped too far in one direction. That is, an obsession with the self (individualism, narcissism) and a disregard for the whole (collectivism, abstraction.)

Naturally, this is bad for family. And what is bad for family is in turn bad for civilization. Each family represents a building block in the construction of civilization. Families (in the traditional sense of the word) contribute more value to society than lone individuals. Generally speaking, they have better mental health, a higher sense of civic duty, are more productive, and pay more taxes than broken homes or one person households. And this seems only rational. Family is bound by blood, civilization forms around the desires and needs of such bonds. People work harder and produce more when they care for and are cared for by others.

Familial social pressure urges individuals to excel, to make the family proud, not to disappoint. Of course, there are always exceptions. There are highly motivated self starters devoid of family married to nothing but narcissism and money, but such individuals are the exception rather than the rule. In general, the prevailing notion is that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts, that families achieve more as units than they would if their members were autonomously estranged. This doesn’t mean that family life is suited to all; it simply “is.”

3.) Freedom & Human Instinct:

Rebels have always been attractive, as truth be told it is the not-so-secret desire of human nature to defy social order and do whatever, whenever. To have one’s cake, and eat it – to relish in the destructive aspects of human instinct without suffering consequentially at the hands of civilization. Civilization does not punish the individual out of sadism, but rather, it punishes destructive behaviour because that behaviour threatens the social order necessary to sustain civilization. Now of course, I realise in my statement of this that we endure a contemporary exception to this maxim. That is, the normalisation of adultery via the feminist spearheaded collapse of the traditional family, but I digress.

It is human nature to be infatuated with freedom in spite of considerations pertaining to the stability of such. And so, the minority who manage to stylishly defy society and get away with it are near universally idolised by the masses who are less free. Rock stars, rappers and social butterflies looking to make a name for themselves all encapsulate such attitudes.

In truth, if all enjoyed the near absolute freedom of the few, social order would break down. Civilization would be but a shadow of its former self. And then those left would quickly call for order and more conservative social mores. Indeed, boom and bust, rise and decline, the attitudes and social mores of a civilization’s people appears quite cyclical. It appears that with prosperity, comes the rise of the feminine. Like children with access to the cookie jar, this leads to excessive freedom, which in turn leads to destruction and general apathy. Then when collapse comes, the masculine takes over – leading to order, conservatism, creation and empathy.
Civilization is a process of domestication, without it, we are more beastlike than man. For humans evolved far longer in a pre-civilizational state than in a civilizational one. One need only look at cases of feral children to see how without civil domestication a human becomes a beast. Your ability to indulge your curiosity and intellect to exponential heights, to grow, to expand your mind and to travel vast distances – these things are possible only by the discoveries and sustenance of civilization. As such, to enjoy the furnishings of higher civilization, we are required to, for better or worse, forgo some of our more primitive aspects. Unfettered hedonism is just one of these aspects, although it is popular to think this is a piece of the proverbial cake that can be eaten and enjoyed without consequence.

4.) Promiscuity Threatens Civilization:

I would hazard a guess in asserting that promiscuity costs our civilization dearly. Indeed, in the pursuit of orgasmic pleasure, we have a higher national debt (welfare,) a burgeoning divorce industry, lost boys and girls growing up fatherless, increased mental illness, higher rates of crime etc. I could go on, but I think the point has been sufficiently made. This is more a statement of reality than it is a judgement on the behaviour of those who contribute to the decline. It is what it is and so what will be, will be.

And even in spite of moral considerations, it is most apparent that promiscuity diminishes the quality of a civilization by merit of its societal consequences. Should promiscuity not undermine family it would be all well and good. And so it appears that families cannot insulate themselves with an open-door sexual policy, just as nations cannot insulate themselves with an open-door immigration policy. Civilizations that do not protect their culture lose their culture. In truth, a family is a micro-civilization. It has its own rules, customs, politics and opinions distinct from the larger culture. A strong family, much like a strong nation, is therefore selective rather than liberal in who it allows into its domain.

And this is the incredible thing about the social engineers who compose much the intelligentsia of western civilization. They ignore the history of human social development in favour of pursuing ever-evolving obscurities dreamt up in the solitary detachedness of the ivory tower.

A man’s innate power is in his bodily strength and logic, a woman’s, in her bodily beauty and cunning. The social engineers ignore such immutable human intricacies in their egalitarian idealism. The social contract is the set of social rules that makes civilization possible, social engineers create and perpetuate ideologies which alter the terms of said contract, damaging civilization by swapping what works with what is desired to work. Swapping what is functional if imperfect, with what is dysfunctional and even less perfect. Then, quite satirically, it labels this regression progress.

5.) Religion Subjugates Promiscuity:

Almost every religious institution to ever dominate the hearts and minds of a society has preached quite mightily the importance of monogamy. Religion as untrue as it appears, is therefore not only a pre-science way of explaining reality, but likewise a civilizational mechanism for social order. It is the imposition of order on creatures capable of order, but lacking the self-discipline to exercise such order without theological arguments permeating
the hive mind. Human instinct is not without fault, and thus by merit of its destructive aspects will undo civilization if left unchecked. Religion inherently acknowledges the flawed nature of the human character and so brainwashes humanity in an effort to reconcile human flaw with human ingenuity.

Civilization is a construction that balances on the fragile precipice between human instinct and human imagination. Civilizational progress is therefore contingent on the balance of conflict between our instinct to seek what we momentarily desire, and the loftier pursuits of what our minds envisage. The trade-off’s one must make in the pursuit of either is a warring battlefield, one that permeates the root and core of all that we do. Civilization demands imagination, whilst instinct, the mediocrity of self-gratification. Without the subjugation and noblest oppression of the prior, the freedom-seeking of the latter has a propensity to win. And with that victory, civilization falls.

6.) In Closing:

From time to time I like to diverge from the chatter of Machiavellianism and evolutionary psychological explanations of female behaviour to explore the grander picture. Indeed, the state of civilization aka “the decline” is of great interest to me. These pieces tend not to be popular because they imply judgement, self-sacrifice and collectivism. Excessive selfishness and apathy is the spirit of the time. And yet in spite of that, I think such pieces necessary for stimulating a more nuanced worldview. As such, I hope the article compelled you to think, which for better or worse, is characteristically the intent of this blog. In addition, I kindly ask the reader to note their opinion in the enclosed poll. Criticism is as ever, welcomed in the comments.

Take Our Poll

7.) Relevant Reading:

**Fate of Empires** (out of print and very hard to get hold of, so I’ve linked the PDF)
**Guns, Germs and Steel**
**Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Survive**
**The Testosterone Hypothesis: How Hormones Regulate the Life Cycles of Civilization**
“A picture held us captive. And we could not get outside it, for it lay in our language and language seemed to repeat it to us inexorably.” – Ludwig Wittgenstein
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1.) Introduction:

Women conflate histrionics with characteristic depth, because to women, depth is defined by interweaving hues of diverse emotional experience and how they relate to one another rather than an understanding of the abstract. Conversely, man defines depth by struggle, knowledge and a capacity for the abstract thought necessary to think critically.

The masculine does not view the incessant cataloguing and processing of one’s emotional history to be particularly interesting or deep. However, this propensity is an intrinsic fundamental of the solipsistic rationalisation process native to women. It is this process by which women build their self-perception. Naturally, the flaw of this process is the dominance of the catalogued emotional narrative and an absence of introspection in regard to it.

The distinction between introspection and solipsism lies in that introspection assumes the
external world is the root, attempting to understand where the individual fits in relation to said world. Solipsism assumes the individual is the root, and attempts to understand how the external world fits in with relation to the self. “What I think” becomes “I think that made me feel because…” And so whilst a woman considers it enlightenment to explore every nuance of her emotional palette, men view such fixation as nothing more than infantile self-absorption.

Antithetically, what man views as immature behaviour, woman perceives as mature. To a woman there is nothing more interesting and mature than “understanding herself.” Whilst man desires to understand the world, a woman desires to understand herself. When a woman declares “she needs to find herself,” other than riding a train of exotic men to accomplish the task, what she means to communicate is “I’m leaving to seek nuanced emotional experiences I haven’t felt before.” Eliciting the further unspoken implication “…and I don’t think you can provide those experiences.”

By nature of solipsism, women deem the abstract obtuse and the solipsistic reasonable, whilst man, the contrary; the solipsistic obtuse and the abstract, reasonable. Within the sexual differences into what constitutes human depth, we merely scratch the surface in elucidating how distinct the psychological perceptions of men and women are.

2.) The Pause In Priority:

Free a woman of material dependence, and any polite sensibility or sense of self-constraint flees in an unending pursuit of new emotional luxury. When surviving is no longer an issue, the pursuit of rich and nuanced emotional experiences come to the forefront of a woman’s wants.

Really, a woman’s need for resources is nothing more than an unwelcome interruption of her primary psychological drive, emotional self-discovery. And so the gratitude of a desperate woman provides the perfect guise for solipsistic selfishness, it will make her seem like a good woman; one who cares for others more than herself. But the mere act of provisioning shifts her priorities, for she must no longer behave deferentially to have her material needs met.

Her pursuit of intense emotion is only paused by the urgency of her material needs, it is never vanquished. No wonder then that a woman’s directive is to first seek out a man who can provide, only to later seek a man who can induce emotional intensity should the prior be incapable, or no longer capable of providing it. The boring sycophantic domesticated male is a necessity of bated breath for the woman without wealth, but truly it is the detached, ever alluring, but never quite attainable alpha she truly longs for.

Romance and sex, as distinct as they are, are the culminating opiates of emotional experience, fear and power but the aphrodisiac to wetten the feminine emotional appetite. Therefore in the pursual of unending solipsistic self-discovery, it seems only natural that women would be most permanently drawn to such things, for their ability to provide the most compelling fantastical emotion is unchallenged. It is female nature to learn about herself via the emotional roller coaster, so what better way is there for a woman to research herself other than to pursue romance?
The fixation with romance is not solely part of her biological imperative to produce offspring, but likewise a window into the feminine soul, the need to indulge her most visceral emotivity. And this inclination refuses to cease even when a woman has reproduced countless times. This suggests its presence within the feminine is not a clear-cut evolutionary psychological benefit we can deduce to be a simple manifestation of woman’s biological need to seek out optimum genetic material. Because if it were, a craving for romance, the opiate of solipsism, would diminish if not vanish in women who have birthed multiple children. Instead, we note its persevering intrinsicality.

A 60-year-old woman with 5 children is no less solipsistic and longing for romance than a 20-year-old with zero. She may be less optimistic of the endeavour, but nevertheless it is something she shall crave should she lack it. And I think it not that romance is a solipsistic determiner for commitment and provisioning; as the most sought after romance is always that which is unabashedly obsessed with the woman, not any children she has. Likewise for good measure, such romance is forbidden, often sexually depraved and absent the mundanity of everyday life. Indeed then, the pursuit of emotional intensity is a goal unto itself, one that surpasses all else. Female solipsism goes far beyond a woman’s role as a mother, and if too pervasive, actually undermines her capacity in this role.

3.) Communication, Abstraction & Solipsism:

Much unlike man, who searches for understanding in the external world, a woman’s quest for understanding lies within the emotion of the internal word. Women are not so interested in the quirks and qualities of the abstract world in so much as they are ever perplexed by their emotions.

Where a man’s curiosity lies in how the external world functions and how he can best manipulate it, a woman’s curiosity lies in how her internal world functions and how she can best utilise the external world to manipulate her well-being. Essentially, men are knowledge focused whilst women are self-knowledge focused. Men are curious of the abstract, women are curious of the fluidity and sentiment of the self. Man defines himself in relation to what his observations conclude, woman defines herself in relation to how her observations make her feel.

Women are near constantly preoccupied with their emotions in response to external stimuli. This inhibits external analysis, focussing it internally. Women will communicate how they felt from memory, eliciting further feelings, leading to word-by-word disseminations of how she believes her feelings define her – as she feels them. And so there is this continuous cycle of feelings eliciting further feelings, which a woman then needs to factor in to her overall view of herself. Only with a conclusion rationalised to be emotively acceptable does she find relief. Such a conclusion is rarely ever THE truth, but rather, HER rationalised, chosen truth. A truth that reconciles negative with positive emotion to bring about an internal balance that is completely unconcerned with the abstraction that is objectivity.

As such, the solipsism of women appears to be not just a limitation, but an addiction. An addiction man finds psychologically arduous should he find himself in the not so pretty situation of playing therapist to the ever dissatisfied self-discovering woman. When a woman talks about her feelings, she is defining them as they are brought to the surface and
expressed. Women need to talk about how they feel, because although their focus is internal, their process is external. As such, they address external problems from the position of their emotions without even so much a hint of desire to remove said emotional filter. This is the core of what we mean by “women are solipsistic.”

Sanity to man lies in understanding the world, a woman’s sanity lies in understanding herself. A woman who cannot understand herself is fraught with distress, compelled only to seek further self-understanding. Man experiences a similar distress in an inability to understand the world rather than himself, in this we note the similarity yet complete distinctiveness of the sexes. Much unlike the self however, surroundings can be replaced. The self can be influenced, but it is ineludible. As such, a woman cannot escape herself, for she is always herself. The craziest woman is therefore the woman who has no outlet to process her emotions, for her relative sanity is entirely dependent on the process of emoting.

So despite women being stuck in their heads (or should I say hearts?) they speak loquaciously. To process her emotion there is talking, lots of talking. So why does a man stuck in his head tend to focus outwardly and process his observations inwardly, whilst a woman focuses inwardly but processes her observations outwardly, namely, with voluble chatter?

It is a most quirky irony that in a quest to comprehend herself, a woman will speak constantly. It is by merit of solipsism and this constant need for emotional self-discovery that every woman considers herself an expert on herself, and as such, is inclined to talk at great length about herself. In terms of attraction, there is nothing a woman loves more than for a newly acquainted man to tell her something she considers true about herself. A man who seems to know a woman on the emotional level without that woman having to express herself exudes his own enchanting intrigue. By being able to communicate with women on this level, man creates his presence within her solipsistic world. “He just, like, totally gets me!”

This is oft mistaken for narcissism, but should she lack narcissism, such a quality still persists. For not only is self-obsession a product of narcissism, but likewise a product of solipsism. Therefore being that solipsism is intrinsic to women, self-obsession is an unavoidable by-product. Indeed a woman’s most profound hobby is that of her self-interest, chiefly, the catalogued history of emotions she has experienced, how they shape who she is, and which ones are desirable enough to be pursued for re-creation.

To summarise this section:

The emotional world is solipsistic, for it is singularly distinct from individual to individual, like a series of unconnected universes existing simultaneously. The abstract world on the other hand is a shared constant, external, one we all operate and cohabit within. To women, there is no distinction between the emotional and the abstract, for she believes the emotional is abstract. Her instinct is that her inner-world is an abstract world she must constantly process and seek to understand via external communication. To men, the inner world is a solipsistic world. Both men and women have an inner emotional world, but men have less interest in processing the nuances of this world and live their lives mentally more in the abstract world.
4.) Struggle:

Few women play the male game, that is, that depth is a product of hardship, study and self-awareness. To women, self-awareness amounts to nothing more than solipsistic indulgence; this is to experience strong emotion and to then process that emotion via further emoting. The reason women constantly communicate and address their emotion, is because they seek to understand past emotion. And then by understanding past emotion, they experience the sensation of discovery. To experience emotion and process emotion is what a woman considers growth.

Histrionic solipsism is a female simulacrum for depth. Where genuine struggle is not achieved, it will be manufactured. The modern woman believes experiencing a wide range of emotion is what makes her deep and worldly. Women have a propensity for histrionics, because it is through drama and subsequent emotional reflection that a woman evaluates herself as a person. The female mind is characterised by its solipsistic nature, therefore it stands to reason that women intuit their self-awareness rather than deduce it.

5.) In Closing:

The emotional narrative on which a woman’s solipsism is predicated is so disjointed in nature, so very non-sequitur to all but her, that an element of the purpose in a woman’s communication of her feelings appears to be a need for her narrative to be externally corroborated. If we assume this principle is true, it further elucidates women’s need to be understood no matter how unintelligible her line of reasoning.

6.) Relevant Reading:

Exploring Logic & Emotion (Part 1)
Solipsism, Emotion & Arguments
“Women are considered deep - why? Because one can never discover any bottom to them. **Women are not even shallow.**” - *Friedrich Nietzsche*
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1.) The Disappointment:

Education neither imbues a woman with reason nor surgically eviscerates her vapidity. The educated woman is just as vapid as the uneducated, for vapidity is *symptomatic of solipsism*. Women’s reputation for petty gossip is the most accurate cultural memetic highlighting the vapidity of the feminine.

And yet it is oft thought that an educated woman is an intellectual woman, and that by merit of such intellect, such women are not vapid. Of course, this notion falls flat on its face when we discover that education does not give the unreasonable, reason, or the unintellectual, intellect. At its best, education makes philosophers out of thinkers and artists out of drawers. The philosopher may draw, but he will never be an artist. The artist may think, but he will never be a philosopher. And so we must resign ourselves to a most immutable conclusion: education cultivates latent talent, it does not imbue absent talent.
If personal experience teaches anything, it is that although men expect educated women to be less vapid than uneducated ones, such expectation yields little but disappointment. Only in the most fortuitous of circumstances will such an expectation be fulfilled. I’ve known many a man to frequent the company of erudite women, some even more learned than he. And yet, a common complaint pervades - “these women are well-educated, yet somehow they lack self-awareness and appear dense.” Her level of education deceptively led the man to expect greater intellect, yet in spite of her education, she disappointed the expectation.

And so to an intellectual man, the educated woman is a most curious creature. She is educated, yet comparatively dim. Who naturally associates education with knowledge bereft of self-awareness, or erudition devoid reason and intellectual curiosity? Aren’t such things the root of all knowledge? Indeed they are. And yet, via rote memorisation knowledge can be passed on without a more than superficial understanding of it. The fundamentals of intellectualism are necessary only for innovation, not repetition. A fast learner is not necessarily a good thinker, one need only look at the Chinese to see emulation rather than innovation; women, Chinese or not, are much the same.

Man’s folly lies in his conflation of education with intellectualism. Intelligent men infer that education can only be obtained if one is rational, analytical, and above all, intellectually curious. As such, these men wrongfully assume educated woman possess these qualities for they think it impossible to succeed without them.

Of course, this line of reasoning is false. Even the humblest of experience will quickly reveal that the majority of educated women are nothing more than adequate rote learners. Well versed in the memorisation of how complex processes work, but quite unable to reason independently of what they were taught. And so it appears dedication and memory supersede intellect in matters of educational attainment, for if they didn’t, we wouldn’t have the number of highly educated women that we do.

If education demanded independent thought, there would be a degree shortage, and the number of women graduating? It would plummet. There’s a reason women make great accountants; accountants memorise processes to balance assets and liabilities, there is marginal innovation at best.

2.) The Hypergamy of Academia at a Glance:

For all the prior stipulated reasons, men who expect educated women to be more interesting and rational will find naught but disappointment. It matters not how much you educate a woman, her lack of logical rigour and vapid obsession with the petty will remain. Pettiness being a symptom of solipsism, it is wise to consider it an immutable element of female nature.

When a woman’s hypergamy speaks, it sounds like this: “why should I have to lower my standards for anyone?” Women typically seek education to acquire status and increase their access to high status men, rather than to indulge any sense of innate intellectual curiosity. With the acquisition of education, a woman’s already high expectations become ever higher. Quite wrongfully, she believes her education increases her attractiveness to men because being an indicator of status, she finds it attractive in men. This is of course no more than
projection confused for reality, a common hiccup among the solipsistic (people poor at abstraction) and the deludedly narcissistic (people who have no rational basis for their elitism.)

**IM MAXIM 101:**

Education and status acquisition increase male dating options, but decrease females’. The reason for this is women date up or across, whilst men date down or across. If you are hypergamous, you’re only attracted to people better than you. If you reach the top-level as a woman, only the men at the apex will do. If you reach the top-level as a man, you have all the women beneath you to choose from. As a function of both hypergamy and sexual economics at the macro level; as women’s collective hypergamic need increases, the pool of subsequent men capable of satisfying this need decreases.

And so in an age where men of intellectual disposition avoid university, and even the most inanely vapid women are ushered in by the insanity of affirmative action, the quirks of hypergamy begin to surface.

If a woman can’t find a suitable mate at university, she will still graduate. Only, undergraduate men will no longer seem quite so attractive. Why? Because she’s an undergraduate too. Undergraduate men could only satisfy her need to upgrade when she perceived them as superior. Now she doesn’t, only men with higher calibre white-collar degrees (eg: doctors, lawyers etc) will do. And should such a woman obtain a master’s degree and fail to meet a suitable partner? The process repeats with even higher stakes until such a woman effectively prices herself out of the market, condemned to decrying men as intimidated by her financial independence rather than repulsed by it.

Repulsion you say, why would a real man™ be repulsed? Well the more educated a woman, the greater her standards and entitlement, and thus in turn, the lesser her attractiveness. Higher status makes people behave more narcissistically, now whilst narcissism is a suit well-worn on a man, it is one ill-fitting for a woman. Whilst women are inherently drawn to male narcissism as overconfidence is the linchpin of good masculine game, female narcissism is unattractive to the majority of men. In women it manifests as bratty, spoiled “hot girl behaviour” and men, especially top-tier men, don’t want to feel like they’re babysitting an overgrown child.

Men seek **polarity and femininity in long-term relationships.** And so women seeking a misguided sense of equality through education only harm their chances at attracting top-tier men. A woman who thinks she’s the equal of men she dates solely due to their greater status is thus, at least psychologically, an unattractive idiot.

This is the inevitable stupidity that occurs when a woman takes a “different but equal” approach to men rather than a more traditional perspective that better complements reality. When a woman reaches the heights of professional status, such heights no longer seem all that attractive. The balcony looks more impressive when seen from the street than when stood on, if she can’t look up to him, he can’t (with some benevolence) look down on her. Without that dynamic, **there is no attraction and thus no love.**
Summarising this chapter:

Better educated women means more dissatisfied women. By employing a male strategy and seeking prestige rather than cultivating femininity, women quite literally price themselves out of the market. Why would a sane, successful man wish to endure the insufferableness of a self-important female academic? When society’s women become more educated than it’s men, the male aversion to hypergamy-fuelled narcissism is heightened in unison with the feminine reluctance to date down. The result? Spinsters and a lot of animosity.

3.) Vapidity, Depth & Understanding Female Intelligence:

More than anything, I believe if there were something that could destroy female vapidity it would be education. Education gives women the most potential to develop an intellectual curiosity into the mechanisms behind life’s curtain. And yet such qualities are so incredibly rare amongst women it leaves me questioning what exactly education does to women.

Vapidity is likewise a product of sloppy or poorly thought out notions (normally rattling off however one feels, making superfluous observations etc) rather than original thought or scepticism stemming from curiosity and enquiry. Vapidity being an effect of solipsism, this makes sense. Education does not override solipsism.

Education instils women with knowledge to create a simulacrum of intellect, but this knowledge seems all but divorced of any innate intellectual curiosity. And it is these basic women who deem themselves the intellectual superiors of men who possess no degree, although many such men possess the innate intellectual curiosity that the majority of degree holding women lack. An incredible perversity if there ever was one; stupid educated women and intelligent uneducated men, how about that?

There are more women than men in higher education nowadays, and yet I would argue with an emphatic conviction that your average uneducated man is more cognisant and intellectually curious than his better educated female counterparts. It is simple: woman’s innate fixation with the social, a herd mentality and a need to be liked/accepted is what drives vapidity, and no amount of education seems to eradicate it. Ergo, if a woman is not vapid, it is probably more an effect of her natural biological makeup (eg: she’s an autist) rather than a product of formal education.

And yet, despite the educational achievements of today’s women, said success seems to have had minimal effect on female hobbies and interests. Education hasn’t made women interesting. Education hasn’t given women hobbies distinct from the uneducated, nor has it imbued any sense of noblesse oblige. Education hasn’t disconnected women from the social hive mind and given them any real intellectual autonomy, it doesn’t seem to expand the female mind, but rather, it just fills it. And that is sad, because in an era where “everything is a social construct,” if anything could manage that, it’d be education.

It seems counterintuitive that the average woman with a law or biology degree would even give two remote fucks about Kim Kardashian or whittle on with infantile fascination about shoes, whilst having close to zero passion for more important and intellectually stimulating topics such as philosophy or politics, but there you go. Much about women
is counterintuitive at a glance, counterintuitivity runs through their veins. If it didn’t, there would be a less dire need for the red pill.

There will always be a woman who will pipe up and say she hates Kim Kardashian and loves Nietzsche, and I’m sure such a woman exists, but she is atypical rather than typical. To not realise she is an outlier, and to make such a solipsistic assertion as a counter-argument in attempting to disprove my sentiment, there is great short-sightedness if not disingenuity. We are after all talking about the predilections of women at large, not the impassioned snowflake who’s read all of Nietzsche and prefers to meaningfully debate abstract topics with men rather than gossip with women. I suspect the female readers of Illimitable Men lean more toward the latter, but perhaps not. I can only speculate.

Women tend not to be intellectual people at their cores, but rather they possess the necessary IQ to go through the motions, to rote learn and pass tests – and many do exactly this in order to access men with higher earning potential (as outlined in section 2.) Thus a woman can look great on paper, but remain entirely dull as an effect of absent intellectual curiosity. The core nature of women would appear to persist in spite of any educational programming. Simply put, in matters of the mind – education does not make women more like men; it imbues neither additional reason nor curiosity, only knowledge.

You would be surprised just how many women are “educated” and yet lack an intellectual bone or original thought in their entire body. They are expert learners, clearly focused, disciplined and “smart” in so much they can grasp ideas and processes, but they manage to achieve all this without any semblance of intellectual curiosity or original thought; a fascinating phenomenon. I liken it to the transmission of knowledge into a non-aware robot, intelligent, synoptic, but by its very nature devoid of self-awareness. It expertly follows instructions, repeats what it is taught and emulates what it is shown. But if you stop giving it knowledge, it stops looking for knowledge; it never becomes anything more than it is. It never learns to think for itself and do so with any degree of accuracy or credibility.

It is with a certain earnestness that I believe men would be ecstatic if education made women more interesting or innately curious – it’s not that I want these assertions to be true – but rather, that my experience and observation suggests it simply is. It is easy to read literature such as this and fall under the impression that the intent is to simply talk women down. In earnest, my only intention is to decipher how women so smart can appear so stupid and then explain this disconnect to men. The sentiment is one of realism rather than pessimism, although I am privy to how the two can appear synonymous.

4.) In Closing:

The majority of women are vapid, vapidity being a symptom of solipsism and thus a core sentiment of AWALT. This is something men have to learn to accept. Wishing they weren’t is futile, for it changes not the reality. Women are unwise to try to convince us otherwise, for we have both eyes and ears.

Rather matter-of-factly, the vast majority of women are passionless, vapid and devoid any real hobby or interest beyond socialising and shopping.
Where more socially driven men find women’s impulsive self-absorbed quirks cute and exhilarating, the intellectual man is bored, despondent and underwhelmed. As much as women, even educated women, find intellectual men who have not immersed themselves in the *study of game* to be dull, such men find the banality and phatic social-driven conversation of women to be equally boring.

The rational man is, sex notwithstanding, bored with women as an effect of the great intellectual chasm between his depth and her lack thereof. The educated woman is rarely an intellectual in the truest sense; a woman of both reason and curiosity. And so men are wise to seek intellectual stimulation and social connection from male company, for it is there they will find greater wealth.

An educated woman as such confers no additional benefits to a man by merit of her education alone. If anything, her education fortifies her narcissism at the expense of her personality. Not quite what the intellectual man looking for “an intellectual equal” expects, truth be told he’d have better luck discovering Santa’s grotto. An intellectual connection is not what women excel at, sex is.
How To Be Happy
by IM | October 22, 2015 | Link

“Happiness is when what you think, what you say, and what you do are in harmony.” — Mahatma Gandhi

If somebody had told me what I’m about to tell you when I was a teenager, my life could have gone down a completely different path. Recently I received a message where I felt it necessary to reveal some of my life’s struggles in order to help nail home some serious points. My response became lengthy in an effort to address the question, and resultantly, this article was born.

Question: “How do I become happy?”

Happiness comes from earning (and it must be earned) the privilege of thinking positively about yourself. People are oft unhappy because they are mad at themselves for being undisciplined, or because they aren’t succeeding as much or as quickly as they believe they should (an ambition-success mismatch).

I’ve been depressed on and off numerous times in my life and the root of said misery derived from two core character flaws:

- A lack of self-discipline:

Self-discipline never came easily to me because my attention span sucked and I didn’t have a strict upbringing. By being allowed to do what the hell I wanted as a kid, I formed into an adult with an ingrained lack of self-discipline. My training (or lack of it) meant I’d almost
always default to the path of least resistance.

Of course parents who don’t provide an orderly upbringing suck, but blaming their inadequate parenting for your faults doesn’t achieve anything actionable. As an adult, you have to take responsibility for disciplining yourself.

**Why is discipline so important?**

Self-discipline is essential if you want to be somebody worth a fuck. If you lack it, this should be the very first thing you work on. Nothing else can fall into place without it.

There are a million and one bullshit seminars and books out there looking to make money out of your insecurities by promising to make you confident. 99.9% are nonsense. As P.T Barnum said “there’s a sucker born every minute.” (the relevant law of power can be found here.)

**The truth: only you can make you confident.**

Disciplined people are confident people (not necessarily egotistical) because they’re proud of what they do. When you know you’re putting the work in, a by-product of your efforts will be pride. Pride translates into self-confidence, confidence translates into charm, and it’s an upward spiral from there on. But everything starts with discipline - everything. Discipline is the root of success as much as 3 is the root of 9. If you are not someone blessed with a natural irrational confidence, this is how you get confident.

**- Being overly analytical:**

I’m naturally prone to analysis paralysis because I have an analytical nature. Once you achieve a reasonable amount of self-discipline, you can catch yourself in the act of procrastination and force yourself to act.

Other than procrastinating, the other problem with being overly analytical is it allows you to see all the negatives in the world (there are many, everywhere, daily) and the sheer volume can will bog you down if you’re not careful.

If you are intellectual, your analytical faculty will apply a negative filter to life because you are prone to cynicism, over-thinking, and in turn, inaction. These traits are a hotbed for depression, and depression destroys productivity. I think I just described every intelligent underachiever that ever lived – knowing so much, yet doing so little.

I had to find my own way in life like most dudes who didn’t have a firm hand to guide them in their youth. I was devoid organisation, impulsive. I’d cram my studies in near the deadline instead of starting 3 weeks in advance and going at a comfortable pace. I’d bum around with “friends” (other directionless “average people” looking to fill their time) instead of taking up meaningful hobbies: a sport, instrument, foreign language or martial art. This is a mistake I will never let my own kids make.
I had to waste a lot of time to figure out it was precious, because when you’re a directionless loser you don’t value yourself nor your time. You’re always trying to find new ways to squander it on meaningless crap because you have no goals. And if you have goals, you lack the drive that comes from discipline to stick with the regime needed to make them reality.

I was one of those guys who dreamt big, but held myself back. And through repetitive complacency, a most irrational fear took root. Inaction would breed fear until I had lost all momentum. And without momentum, you’re at risk of depression. In the words of Einstein:

“Life is like riding a bicycle. To keep your balance, you must keep moving.”

I’ve always known what I’ve had to do, come to think of it nobody has actually ever told me I’m stupid, but intelligence isn’t enough. Intelligence doesn’t make you immune to character flaws, it doesn’t guarantee work ethic (discipline does) and it threatens happiness (stimulus overload.) An idiot who attacks life reaps more of its rewards than an idle intellect spectating from the sidelines.

My laziness made me unhappy; I had become my comfort zone’s prisoner.

Upon introspection, I eventually came to realise everything I’ve just said. The analytical ability came in useful for something, it allowed me to psychoanalyse myself and determine cause and effect. My weakness became a strength, alongside what I learned from the red pill, it allowed me to make the mindset shift necessary to reprogram myself.

I was unhappy because I knew I wasn’t living up to my potential. The source of my unhappiness stemmed from the anger and discontent I harboured for being less than my best. The chasm between who I was and who I thought I should be was vast. But for a long time I wasn’t cognisant enough to realise that this was the source of all my woes, including brief bouts of depression.

It’s great that you’ve found the red pill, but if you’re stuck in your head and you lack discipline, you’ll never go beyond reading. And when your life doesn’t improve, if you’re not self-aware of why it hasn’t, you’ll blame the red pill for your lack of success rather than take responsibility for your own (lack of) success.

The red pill will not fix your life, it is just a tool. How you use it will determine if you manage to refashion your life into something you can be proud of. How does the saying go? “A good workman never blames his tools.” The red pill is only a tool. Knowing isn’t enough, you must do. And where you fail, you must take responsibility for your failures. If the red pill isn’t working for you because you haven’t changed your approach to life, that’s your fault, nobody else’s.

To get ripped, you actually have to lift. To earn more money, you actually have to work your butt off. To get girls, you actually have to approach (or put pictures of yourself ripped on Tinder.) But you get my point. Knowledge is pointless without application, if you have to repeat one phrase from the entire article to yourself, it should be this. If you are too scared to do new things, you’re a prisoner of your comfort zone like I was. And if the timid body language I spot in my day-to-day is indicative of anything, I think a lot of you are in this
situation. You’re just silently ashamed of it.

So how did I find happiness? I accepted myself in spite of myself. And this is how people who realise they’ve fucked up find happiness. The problem with unhappiness is it destroys your productivity and sociability. Miserable people are nihilists that don’t see a point in doing anything. They don’t attract people who could improve their lives because their negative energy acts as a repellent.

If you are depressed, you don’t sleep well and you don’t have the energy to do anything. You don’t want to socialise and you bomb social interactions because your energy level is in the gutter; the whole world feels like a chore. And when the world feels like a chore, you can’t build the life you want to have for yourself.

I found this first step crucial to overcoming unhappiness. Let me say it again:

I accepted myself in spite of myself. I stopped beating myself up for being a loser and started praising myself for doing what I could to build myself.

Even if I don’t have the level of success/stature the ridiculously high standards of my ambition demand of me, I accept what I have and who I am as long as I do my best. Because your best is all you’ve got, to demand more than that is to dangle yourself a carrot that is constantly snatched away.

I enjoy the journey of becoming slightly less shit everyday, I enjoy the grind, the struggle, the hustle. You have to in order to get anywhere. And if my best isn’t enough, so be it. I will try something else. I’m fine with being imperfect.

I accept failure as an inevitable part of life, it’s better to fail because you’re not good enough than fail because you’re scared you won’t be good enough. Anything is better than giving up. To quote Winston Churchill:

“Never give in–never, never, never, in nothing great or small, large or petty, never give in except to convictions of honour and good sense. Never yield to force; never yield to the apparently overwhelming might of the enemy.”

Ambition is useless if it serves to depress you for not achieving it. Ambition (goals) need incentive (to avoid being a loser.) Most people think that the goal will bring happiness. And it does when you first achieve it. But that doesn’t last. Lasting happiness lies in self-acceptance, all other forms of happiness are fleeting.

A clever thing I did was turn my fear against itself. The fear that used to imprison me is now the same thing that drives me. I never got rid of my fear, I just inverted it. Rather than let my fear of leaving my comfort zone destroy my potential, I used my fear of being a loser to motivate myself and start taking action where I was once avoidant. I’m far more scared to be a loser than enter conflict or experience an awkward social situation. Making fear work for me, works for me.
Most people are unhappy for one of two reasons (possibly both):

- They’re slobs squandering their best resource, their time. If you slob it up for a month you may be happy because you enjoy the moment’s pleasures. But when a year passes, then two, and you catch even a moment to look back and compare yourself now with who you were then – and you’re not better than that guy – you’re the same guy or worse yet, you’re inferior to him, that shit is going to hit you like a ton of bricks. You are going to be miserable because you’ve let yourself down.

- Their ambitions far exceed their stature and their lack of status causes them to put so much pressure on themselves that they can’t even breathe and just enjoy the simple things. The sun on their face, the air on their nose etc.

I was afflicted by both. You may be afflicted by either. If you are afflicted by neither, yet you’re still unhappy, you’re either surrounded by toxic people or lonely.

If you’re unhappy but you’re not a loser:

If you are successful yet still unhappy, there’s a good chance you’re an overachiever who feels like nothing is ever enough. Your ambitions are undoing you. Your dissatisfaction means you’re always in a hurry, instead of enjoying the grind.

The problem with that is once you get “there,” it won’t be enough. Because you haven’t learned to be happy, you’ve only learned to be successful. If you can have money, independence, a decent body, high IQ/skills and a good job yet still are miserable – it’s because you haven’t learned to accept yourself. Success isn’t the problem, you have plenty of it, a lack of self-acceptance is at fault.

One has to accept their efforts, that they’re doing what they can. That doesn’t mean get lazy. You’re “only” human, not every minute of every day is going to be 100% productive. You are not perfect, just because you are successful, you’re not perfect. If you hold yourself to impossible inhuman standards, you will always hate yourself (whether you realise that or not) and as such you will be unhappy at your core. Forgive yourself for your weaknesses and work to overcome them rather than hating yourself for having them.

If you’re successful and comfortable with yourself, yet still unhappy, you’re probably lonely or surrounded by terrible people.

Look for good friends, they make life less shitty. Everything is better with good company, loneliness can be just as debilitating as laziness. If you are prone to loneliness, I’d caution against going full monk mode, it will only make you worse. Take 2 days off a week to socialise and recharge.

Many men waste their life looking for the right woman, but whilst good friends can last a lifetime, women rarely do. True friends look out for your interests, women look out for their own. True friends are rare, as most are only interested in what they can get from you or use you for. A true friend is a family member who doesn’t share your blood, is loyal, cares about your progress, and is there for you in tough times.
Do they care about your problems? Do they make time for you in your time of need? No? Not a friend. Everybody else is an acquaintance regardless of what they call themselves.

Relevant Reading:

- Monk Mode
- Books For Men
- Discipline Equals Freedom
- Extreme Ownership

SIDE NOTE: I keep getting asked to list the books on my “Books For Men” page in order of importance. I can’t do that because the order of importance depends on the individual person’s weaknesses.

You need to be able to identify your weak points, and prioritise improving on them first.

For example, should you be exceptionally scrawny or fat, you should buy Starting Strength. If problems at work are getting you down, The 48 Laws of Power is what you want. If you are a timid guy who doesn’t know how to assert himself, you’ll want No More Mr. Nice Guy.
Understanding The Dark Triad - The Second Overview
by IM | November 18, 2015 | Link

"Cunning is the art of concealing our own defects, and discovering other people's weaknesses." - William Hazlitt
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1.) Preface:

The dark triad is often incorrectly perceived to be one specific personality type, this is wrong. The dark triad is the culmination of three distinct intersecting personality traits present in one individual. As such, ‘dark triad’ is a blanket term alluding to a comorbidity of psychological traits typically associated with empathy and attachment disorders, not a trait in and of itself.

I expect this to sound somewhat pedantic or obscure to the uninitiated, but nevertheless, to dispel any ignorant confusion surrounding “what the dark triad is,” I feel this distinction important to emphasise.
If you have taken the test on the war and power page, you will have a crude understanding of what the dark triad entails. If you are already confused as early into the article as you are, I urge you to read the initial overview as well as the dark triad Q & A, each describes the dark triad at the simplest level I am able to communicate.

2.) Breakdown of the Three Core Traits:

Machiavellianism is the puppeteer’s hand pulling the strings. Sometimes perceived but often not, it is the cunning which directs and sets the agenda. Narcissism is a heart of self-obsession and vanity which manifests as an aggressive concoction of indomitable boldness and unyielding confidence at its most extreme. Psychopathy is the enigmatic silence, the absence of inhibition, an effortless fearlessness mired in a nihilistic and amoral calm.

2a.) Machiavellianism:

Machiavellianism is perception, misdirection, strategic insight, cunning and concealment. Machiavellianism like all strategy is amoral, it can be used altruistically or predatorily. The boundaries of Machiavellianism are determined by the moral code of the practitioner, Machiavellianism itself knows no boundaries, prioritising efficiency with a penchant for concealment.

At its crudest, Machiavellianism is calculated thinking applied to social strategy as a means of survival, at it’s most beautiful, it is the beating heart of a studious enquiry into the art of power.

One who cannot master a Machiavellian competency will never gain power, and should power find them, it will be tasted only so briefly as to escape the bestowed. The unwily man who inherits power intuits he is quick prey, outclassed by those covetous of the trappings of a position he knows not how to defend. Vulnerable to predation, paranoid of it, unable to stop it, the unworthy man loses his power to the more competently cunning; be that a rival, or as is more typical, a beautiful woman.

Individuals only possess a position they are strategically competent enough to defend, therefore it stands to reason that regardless of the aestheticism of one’s morality, individuals in positions of great power are highly Machiavellian. Power draws attack from all directions, as such where one was not sufficiently Machiavellian, power would escape them. Power respects the ruthless and despises the clumsy, it clings to the cunning and evades the obtuse.

Machiavellianism is socially maladaptive, this means it can be learned subconsciously as an effect of psychological conflict, consciously via voracious erudition, or both.

The people who read this blog will be at differing levels of competency, some will possess relatively little natural cunning and hope to teach themselves, others will possess a natural cunning they seek to better understand.

The main benefit for the incompetent is obvious, obtain competence. The main benefit for
naturals lies in developing a conscious understanding of their ability. By putting words to something that is otherwise just unconscious behaviour, deeper self-understanding can be achieved leading to a greater degree of mastery. As an aside, I have it on good authority that the cunning harbour an habitual liking for the study of power.

2b.) Narcissism & Psychopathy:

Narcissism is ego, a projection of confidence, self-importance and grandiosity. Histrionic theatricism is optional, not necessarily present, but oft prevalent. The positives of grandiose narcissism consist of relentless ambition, entitlement, high motivation, strong mental resilience and an unwavering sense of conviction. Grandiose narcissists demand the very best that life has to offer, they are quality rather than quantity focused and embody the compulsion of a perfectionist.

Everybody is narcissistic to a degree, some more than others, but not everybody is a narcissist. Even among the highly narcissistic there is separation between the mere egotistical, and those without empathy as an effect of a neurologically ingrained superiority complex. The latter is more a narcissistic shade of psychopath, or a ‘narcopath’, the prior simply has an over-inflated sense of self-importance.

The distinction between the strong personification of narcissistic qualities, and the pathological psychopathy which is an implicit by-product of narcissistic personality disorder warrants recognition. The narcopath has an attachment disorder, the narcissist is simply an unruly ego.

A powerful ego is not equivalent to an empathy/attachment disorder, although it would be identified as narcissism which is deemed an empathy/attachment disorder. On the other hand, the narcissistic shade of psychopathy comes with all the ego inherent to the empathy capable narcissist, and as such people are easily confused by the overlap between narcopathy and narcissism.

Narcopathy is narcissism enmeshed with psychopathy, narcissism alone is bereft the detachment of psychopathy despite being typically associated with it by layman and clinician alike. Within nuance is distinction, not all narcissists are narcopaths, but most make no distinction between a narcopath and a narcissist and hence conflate them as being one and the same.

To clarify my point clearly: narcopathy is an egotistical form of psychopathy, narcissism is just a very strong ego. A narcissist is an unruly ego, whilst the narcopath, an egotistical psychopath who seeks narcissistic supply via social domination.

Psychopathy absent narcissism and egotism is what distinguishes a psychopath from a narcopath. Imagine an autist capable of neurotypical social mimicry who understands other’s emotions, but is unable to feel pity or form personal attachment. That’s a psychopath. There is much overlap between narcopathy and psychopathy, so it is difficult to talk about one without alluding to the other.

Psychopathy and narcopathy are both empathy deficient, that is, incapable of feeling
empathy for another. In their moral moments they can rationalise empathy, but they do not feel it as a visceral impulse. In my piece the psychopathic paradigm, I cemented this distinction by labelling sympathy as “emotional empathy” and empathy as “logical empathy.” The autism researcher Professor Simon Baron-Cohen prefers the terms “affective empathy” and “cognitive empathy” respectively.

Whether an individual becomes a narcopath or a psychopath due to upbringing depends on the coping mechanism intuitively adopted by the child to handle their mental distress.

Where a male child is met with unprecedented rejection and neglect, especially by the mother, they become a narcopath. A female child will become a borderline, which is effectively narcopathy with vulnerable rather than grandiose narcissism. Pathological narcissism forms as a replacement for the praise and affirmation absent in an individual’s developmental years.

Effectively a child develops narcissism when it is spoiled too much, and narcissistic or borderline personality disorder when unloved/rejected by its parents.

Where a child is abused or harmed physically, should they not kill themselves owing to the inability of their brain’s empathy circuits to short, said circuits will short and they will become a psychopath. Where narcopathy is a mixture of nature and nurture, psychopathy can be nature, ‘nurture’ or both.

There are accounts of psychopathy in individuals who suffered no ill upbringing whatsoever, such instances lend credence to a nature hypothesis for psychopathy, that some individuals are effectively pre-determined to be psychopaths from birth rather than ‘cultivated’ into becoming so.

3.) A Spectrum, Not An Absolutism:

Perceive the dark triad as a spectrum, everybody possesses Machiavellian, narcissistic and psychopathic qualities in varying ratios, but mere presence of trait does not make an individual a personification of the qualities they scantily possess. If this were the case everybody would be dark triad, in reality, few are.

A degree of narcissism is indicative of healthy confidence, a degree of Machiavellianism is necessary to navigate a transactional world and a degree of psychopathy is necessary to confront fear-inducing stimuli. It is only when one of the traits becomes prominent enough to be deemed ‘clinical’ that the individual can be accurately identified by the label. It is when an individual possesses all three traits in high amounts they are considered dark triad.

4.) The Difference Between Machiavellianism & The Other 2/3’s of The Triad:

Most can ascertain 2/3 of the traits, Machiavellianism and narcissism. Narcopathy is developmental, whilst psychopathy can be either genetic or developmental. If you are an adult it is improbable you will acquire either narcopathy or psychopathy as your brain is less plastic. I’ve been told psychopathy can be cultivated through meditation, but this remains an unsubstantiated theoretical contention I have not seen in practice and thus cannot endorse.
If you score highly in psychopathy and narcissism, you will in all likelihood possess an empathy disorder of some sort, you would not feel sincere pity for others, you would not care you lack this sense of pity and you would not form attachments to anybody. If you scored highly in narcissism, you will think you are special or somehow different from everybody else whether this is necessarily true or otherwise. Essentially, the presence of both or either these traits in a large concentration confers automatic competence.

The same cannot be said of Machiavellianism. You can score highly in Machiavellianism by merit of possessing a strategic mind, but if you are analytic without particularly strong narcissism or psychopathy, you will end up being no more than a logician. This means in spite of a high Machiavellian score, you are not very socially Machiavellian. To be competently socially Machiavellian, relatively low anxiety and a high degree of acting ability are necessary.

As such, to be analytical and possess a desire to be devious is all one needs to score highly in Machiavellianism on the dark triad test. A high Machiavellian score does not confer instant competence in the way the presence of the other two traits does. Machiavellianism is typically an affectation of psychopathy and narcissism, but can exist single-handedly as a predilection for analysis and strategy.

Machiavellianism is at its most rudimentary the refinement of cunning, a vocation anybody can learn. In the contemporary age of ever creeping moral decay, the amorality of Machiavellianism becomes ever alluring. Be you a powerless individual seeking to survive in an increasingly cold world; a powerful individual looking to safeguard their assets, or a social predator looking to appease their sadistic urges. Machiavellianism is highly adaptable based on the individual’s needs for it is an art form, and thus like all art, fluid in application.

5.) How Do You Become Machiavellian?:

Analyse behaviour and body language, it will aid you in tuning into the subtleties of subtext. People watching is the primary activity for building on this ability. Sit somewhere, say a public bench or an outdoor area of a coffee shop and predict people’s relationships, emotional states and inclinations from observance. The more you do this, the better you’ll get and the more accurate your predictions will become. The book linked at the beginning of this paragraph will give you a head start, but cultivating intuition from repeated observance will take practice.

Likewise one must become proficient at interpreting subtext. Subtext is unspoken communication, the underlying theme of an interaction. The subtext is what lies between the lines of communication, being able to interpret it demands an ability to pluck out what is meant from what is said even when intent and disposition are deliberately obfuscated.

Subtext often uses reference to metaphor, entendre or innuendo to communicate opinion or intent without explicitly stating it. By doing this, opinions can be expressed without being weaponised against the holder. Should the response to an opinion communicated in this manner be deemed undesirable, the plausible deniability of its ambiguity can be invoked as a shield.
One should also learn to act, to behave as if you are happy when unhappy or calm when angry. An acting class where improvisation is practised and method taught can assist in this. Acting consists much of being able to summon an emotion and mental image in your mind’s eye that isn’t reflective of how you feel, yet depicts with a certain unspoken truthfulness that what is portrayed is a reflection of what is felt.

Vocational skills aside Machiavellianism is theory intense, and so any aspiring Machiavellian should read books on military strategy, leadership, power, statecraft, rhetoric, propaganda and on rare occasion, philosophy. These texts are Machiavellian at their core, but will of course not be marketed as such. As I’ve yet to form an official reading list of relevant texts, I will list a brief yet non-exhaustive compendium here:

- **The 48 Laws of Power**
- **The Prince**
- **The Art of War**
- **The Art of Worldly Wisdom**
- **The 33 Strategies of War**
- **The Craft of Power**

What you will find with texts on power is they outline strategies, distil certain aspects of power and give historic examples of implementation. There is not a contemporary step-by-step guide on how one can apply element of powers or specific military strategies to daily life.

These are books that require intelligence and imagination, they describe power but they do not methodically instruct one on how to obtain it. The books thereby require somebody with a refined sense of logic to take a principle from a historic context and make it fit their personal situation. If you are unable to do that, you will be unable to utilise power despite developing an understanding of it, application demands imagination.

The immutable implication of power is that it is not to be wielded by the unworthy. If you’re not creative enough to know how to make the theory fit, you won’t be sharp enough to fend off future threats to your power base. Books can only communicate how to defend power via theory, they cannot through act of clairvoyance predict what will befall you and instruct you specifically on how to defend yourself.

When it comes to power, initiative and intelligence are rewarded if not outright necessary. Therefore instruction manuals designed for idiots make little sense, for whatever power an idiot is permitted per the advice of another man will surely be lost when the idiot’s mental dullness sees that same power pissed away.

Going by the feedback I’ve seen online surrounding The 48 Laws of Power, it seems many are incapable of applying the theory to their everyday lives and so there is a demand for “a precise and contemporary manual on the application of power.” If you ever want to be a force to be reckoned with, persevering until you can adapt the theories you read to your own circumstances is essential, not optional.

I can depict power in a more relatable context, but I cannot write a “how to” guide. If you are
stupid enough to need one, you are not cut out for power. That is not an insult in so much as it is a statement of truth. I have considered writing such articles for my Patreon subscribers, although it would be quite some time away as I’m inundated with projects. In regard to this idea, I welcome your speculation in the comments.

6.) How Do You Become Narcissistic?:

People who are elite in some manner become narcissistic due to success, this creates self-belief, feeding into success, fuelling further confidence in a self-perpetuating cycle. Narcissism is based on a consistent supply of affirmation, success, and one’s acceptance and belief of their success.

Positive feedback loops form from success as well as other’s respect and desire for you. Narcissism is in effect, a natural by-product of high value. The value can be given (highly attractive, great genetics) or earned (worked hard, became the champion) narcissism doesn’t care how you became successful, simply that you are.

People who are successful receive a constant stream of compliments and have to put effort into being humble. Otherwise, narcissistic supply overwhelms the ego and the individual becomes incapable of thinking or behaving outside a solipsistic frame of reference. If you are good at a sport, a video game, or anything where others perceive you as superior, you have a line of narcissistic supply.

Attractive women are an example of narcissism brought about desire rather than ability. Many beautiful women are narcissists because they are universally desired, being drunk on the power of beauty is an effortless and intoxicating form of narcissism. In this way, one could see cosmetic surgery and makeup as a way of maintaining not only social influence, but narcissistic supply.

If you lack confidence you must set up infrastructure to provide yourself with regular ego boosts; there are many ways to do this. A self-sustaining one would be the gym, you see gains, you get high off your gains, you work harder and then you see more gains. This is a positive feedback loop, it’s why men who get into the habit of working out become more narcissistic.

Where such a man previously may have had no line of narcissistic supply, he is now in possession of one. With men who were really insecure about their weight, working out in particular kills two birds with one stone as a negative feedback loop is being destroyed whilst a positive one is erected in its place. For example, a fat man who works out is a lot more confident than a fat man who doesn’t.

This form of ego acquisition is self-affirming, not external nor automated. If you were to stop working out, you would lose your narcissistic supply. For a man who derives his sense of narcissism from his physique, the need to work out is as much a craving for endorphins and testosterone as it is a need to maintain self-worth.

Lifting starts as purely self-affirming and for many remains exactly that, but should weightlifting make an ugly man handsome, your fitness efforts will likewise garner external
validation in the same way feminine beauty does.

Any online platform where you are the centre of attention provides narcissistic supply. For instance whether I want it to be or not, this very blog acts in said capacity because people compliment my work, thank me for my efforts and tell me how much I've changed their lives etc.

Women use social networks as a funnel for narcissistic supply, this is somewhat common knowledge in the sphere but bears mention. People who manage a social media account actively maintain a line of narcissistic supply, as such becoming popular on social media is another way to increase narcissism.

Above I describe rational ways in which narcissism is attained. Alternatively there is the delusional repetitive method, although I heavily suspect the readership here’s far too grounded in reality to successfully apply such a method.

The method is as such: dissociate from reality and live a lie. Tell yourself what you want to believe until you brainwash yourself into believing what you’re telling yourself.

This is the basis on which narcopaths develop narcissistic personality disorder as children, the only difference being they had the highly plastic and suggestible minds of children when dissociating, and you are in all likelihood an adult man far too logical to effectively dupe himself. In light of this, “fake it until you make it” is unlikely to work for you.

7.) In Closing:

Theory learning from books is necessary should you wish to not only understand, but diversify your ability to project power. It should likewise go without saying that the vocational application of what you learn is necessary, a lack of practice makes for crude awareness and pitiful competence.

Wherever reputation matters and money flows, there is politics. Analyse the politics at not only your place of work, but likewise your place of play. Understand socialising is a game of chess, not an organic randomness in which you are passive and acted upon. Some games have higher stakes than others, but the principles remain the same – this is a game.
“All opinions are not equal. Some are a very great deal more robust, sophisticated and well supported in logic and argument than others.“ – **Douglas Adams**
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1.) Introduction:

The red pill is not infallible, rather it is a male-centric analysis into the nature of men and women. It ignores moral considerations because morality impinges on the capacity to discover truth, but disrespect for virtuousness in pursuit of truth does not mean an unvirtuous life is being advised. It is not ruled out, but neither is it advised. It is up to you, a reader of red pill philosophy, to make that choice; the philosophy cannot make that choice for you.

Moral arguments cannot be dismissed as much as they can be rebutted, anybody can say “X is wrong” but what they really mean is “X doesn’t work for me.” I am incredibly capable of listening to entire counterarguments, I will even agree with many of an argument’s pointed critique of my views, but ultimately nine times out of ten I will still retain my stance in spite of
an enhanced understanding of the opposing viewpoint. Arguments (**proper debates, not Machiavellian point scoring**) are a great way to learn from others, so if you enjoy listening to logic as well as learning, they’re a wholly pleasurable activity in and of themselves.

Great minds often pick holes in one another’s views, come to understand one another better, but do not change their position. To shift position, a view has to be demonstrated to be fundamentally incorrect. One’s preferences for particular kinds of conduct do not disprove a line of reasoning, they merely ignore them in favour of something intuited to be more preferable, often, that means self-serving. However, and this is important to emphasise: one man’s best move can be another man’s worst. The reason for this? Not all men have equal capabilities, and therefore, equal options conferring mutually beneficial outcomes.

This is exactly why the red pill is more a philosophy (or praxeology) than it is a movement or religion. Movements and religions confer little liberty in regard to individualist morality coexisting within their framework, they command and state in a rather absolutist manner. This provides security and well-being to the less intellectually endowed seeking comfort within reality; it allows them to feel as if they “have figured everything out” and thereby live functionally in a manner conducive to clean mental health. But naturally, to the more intellectually curious, this falls short.

This blog consists of my opinions, the matter-of-fact articulation doesn’t make any of it irrefutably infallible perfect fact.

In all things the truth lies somewhere in the middle, unless we are talking mathematics there is no “all” and there is no “never”, merely there are varying degrees of probability which measure the likelihood of a specific outcome. Generally, when we use the word “never” we mean “almost never” and by “always” we mean “almost always”, it is a by-product of ego that we often omit such clarification as we believe the fact it is ‘almost always’ or ‘almost never’ should be self-apparent. Of course, to the less knowledgeable among us, this is typically not the case.

2.) **Leave Her Better Than You Found Her...?**

The manospherian adage “leave her better than you found her” is not something I would expect a guy who had to endure a horrible, detached mother in childhood to listen to or respect. He will always, in his own way, be raging against women as a result of the impact his rather callous monstrosity of a mother had upon him.

His experiences leave him unable to take utility from the adage, he may scoff or be outright offended by the notion and declare it nonsensical; this is an outcome of the experience which shapes his individual morality. He’ll hear this adage and think “that’s so blue pill, if I want to face fuck barely legal girls in abandoned barns, I will.” But just because raging against women works well for him, and to accept this adage would fundamentally undermine his effectiveness, it does not mean it would work well and bolster the effectiveness of all men.

Men raised in a climate of hate will be more comfortable with hate, just as men raised in a climate of care will be more comfortable with care. Adult conduct is no more than a social
adaptation to childhood experience, varying experiences means varying views.

Men who are otherwise less psychologically violent raised by kinder mothers are not going to agree with the gentleman that had a terrible childhood; in reference to the adage they’ll think “that sounds good, no point making enemies unless absolutely necessary, if I leave on a positive that relationship could yield further fruit down the line.”

If I had led my whole life preying on people to great effect, and I read an article quite cogently articulating how this is undesirable, even if I agreed rationally this was wrong, emotionally I would not. Morality requires the heart to be moved in order to change. I would intellectually agree with the argument whilst simultaneously exempting myself from its conclusion. Hypocritical? Surely, but that’s what people are; they do what works for them in spite of what their intellect compels them to recognise as right.

If you have found a way to live that works for you, you can agree on principle with someone else’s views even when said views undermine how you choose to live your life. The logic can be wonderful, you can enjoy their thought process, but ultimately it is not going to change one bit how you live because how you live is what you’re comfortable with.

And this is what people who become contorted do to survive, they consciously choose predation because predation was deemed their only chance to survive. People are a reflection of their life experiences more than they’ll ever be a reflection of what they read on a blog. Of course there’s a difference between a man who does what has to be done regardless of whether he enjoys or even agrees with it, and a man who enthusiastically enjoys active predation. I believe I stated something to this effect in a previous piece, although the precise quote and essay eludes me. Nevertheless, this much is clear: what’s good for the goose is not necessarily good for the gander.

3.) The Predatory Minority:

Natural dark triads are intraspecies apex predators by presence of attachment disorder and a proclivity for violence, be that physical or mental. Such individuals are a minority specifically because society would cease to function should they be a majority. Therefore it is folly to teach the ways of predators to everybody, and furthermore expect them all to transform into predators.

I specifically write about the dark triad because I believe it’s important knowledge, it is not a recommendation nor an endorsement. At no point do I give instruction, I elucidate with insight and no more. I believe in your right to knowledge no matter how seemingly distasteful or verboten it is in character, but ultimately what you do with that knowledge is your choice.

A society full of predators does not last long, in any flourishing ecosystem there are always fewer predators than there is prey. The number of prey available directly affects the number of predators which can be sustained, the less prey there is, the less predators there are. Not everybody can be dark triad, but everybody can glean great knowledge and therefore increased personal power from studying it.

Predators always look down on prey, but predators are reliant on prey for their survival. In
this way there is a perverse co-dependency in spite of the in-group/out-group psychology which philosophically polarises the morality of predators with the morality of prey. The morality of predators is “exploit wherever possible whilst preventing reprisal”, the morality of prey is “do unto others as they do unto you”.

4.) Take What Works, Discard What Doesn’t:

For every person mindlessly hanging onto every word I write, there is another who rejects much, yet still appreciates the line of reasoning and way of articulation in which the words are presented. Audiences are diverse, in fact one of the men kind enough to financially support my writing informed me he disagrees with much I say - yet appreciates it enough to fund it. You have answer seekers who want you to think for them, and then you have people who simply enjoy exposing themselves to a cogent chain of thought. The disagreeable conclusion matters less when one enjoys the process in which it is reached.

I share this appreciation, for example I disagree with much popular Youtuber Stefan Molyneux says, specifically in reference to his views on virtue, women, and the use of corporal punishment, but nevertheless I still very much enjoy his reasoning process, and therefore respect him as a thinker in spite of our differences in opinion.

When it comes to the red pill or anything for that matter, you should take what works and discard what doesn’t. Realise that whenever you read something, even if its backed by scientific data that specifically supports the argument, the data used to support an argument has almost always been hand-picked with that argument in mind. Scientific studies are no more infallible than the agenda of the funding source (the study’s reason for existing) as well as how results are interpreted and applied. Science is easily corrupted or obfuscated, any funding for specific desire of outcome, or any social politics which infect academia easily undermine the neutrality, and therefore applicability of the results.

Not all opinions are equal, some are closer to truth than others, some are better thought and better articulated than others, but opinions are no more than opinions. This blog is a collection of opinions. I was once asked “how I can be so sure about what I say when not everything I say can surely be fact?”. This blog is the sum of my opinions; I am sure of what I say because I find no superior alternative, I accept my conclusions are not perfect truth in so much as they are superior albeit flawed renditions of it.

It is your duty to yourself to adopt opinions you believe and discover will benefit you, whilst respectfully disagreeing with those that are no help and outright discarding those that would hinder you. The quest for truth and the quest for happiness are mutually exclusive, rightfully as the bible asserts “for with much wisdom come much sorrow”, and therefore if happiness is your goal, bias towards a way of being which promotes self-happiness becomes unavoidable.

Remember, you only left wonderland because wonderland failed to keep you happy. Had it kept you happy, you’d still be there. Not because you couldn’t escape if you put your mind to it, but because when a dream is enjoyable, one wishes not to open their eyes.

5.) In Closing:
Amongst the discussion had by red pill readers and writers, somewhere in the middle of it all is a perfect truth in reference to the nature of women. However this truth, even if we could grasp it, is so nuanced, intangible and inconceivably complex that it defies measurement and summation. One should not search for perfect truth, because there is no such thing present within the limits of human understanding. As such, one would do well to understand that the red pill is not a perfect truth in so much as it is a sufficient one.

Realise people are shaped by the sum of their life experiences, and this in turn dictates their personal morality. It is due to the experiences of many thousands of men that the red pill has been able to uncover the threads of truth pertaining to the relationship between men and women. Truly, no one man could ever hope to develop such an advanced understanding by himself. Your application of this knowledge is a choice only you can make, use what works, discard what doesn't, and come to your own conclusions. Toe-a-line or toe no line, the red pill doesn’t care.

6.) Relevant Reading:

The spiritual predecessor to the article pre-dating this one can be found here - I wholly recommend it.

Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in the USA
Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in the UK
Buy “Might is Right or Survival of the Fittest” in Canada
Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in the USA
Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in the UK
Buy “Beyond Good and Evil” in Canada
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in the USA
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in the UK
Buy “On the Genealogy of Morals” in Canada
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“We often confuse what we wish for with what is.” - Neil Gaiman
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1.) Introduction:

What is AWALT? Superficially, it’s an acronym that stands for “all women are like that.” Psychologically, it’s a heuristic for evaluating female mating behaviours. How is a heuristic defined? Well according to “the free dictionary” it’s:

“a usually speculative formulation serving as a guide in the investigation or solution of a problem”
This is exactly what AWALT is, a speculative formation serving as a guide in the investigation of female behaviour. The pseudo-intellectual takes immediate issue with the word “all”, and in their grand pedanticism, immediately ceases investigating the utility of the heuristic.

AWALT does not claim that “all women are the same”, this is patently false, and is as such an absurd claim to make. Rather, AWALT presupposes that women are collectively governed by a set of underlying principles which drives their behaviour. It then alludes to the principles, as well as the behaviours which result from said principles whenever they become relevant in discussion.

For example, hypergamy, solipsism, Machiavellianism and immaturity are principles which make up the AWALT umbrella. Behaviours resulting from those principles would be branch swinging, blame shifting and emotional impulsiveness, among others.

This does not mean all women act on these behavioural drivers in the same way, or that said behaviours manifest to the same degree or frequency. The degree to which, and the frequency of which AWALT traits manifest certainly differs from woman to woman, but that is all that differs, the degree and frequency of behaviour, not the type of behaviour.

So while women may be different in personality or hobby, they are still women, and therefore in matters of mating, prone to specific behaviours. For example, one woman may branch swing often, another may branch swing rarely, but both will at some point, branch swing. This is just something women do. AWALT identifies this and accepts this. AWALT broken down to the most basic level is simple acknowledgement of aspects relating to female nature, no more, no less.

When a red pill man says “women branch swing, AWALT” what does he mean? He means women don’t leave relationships until they have a new one lined up. Just because one woman has had ten relationships in the past two years, and another has had two relationships in the past ten years, the difference in frequency of behaviour does not alter the underlying nature which causes the behaviour to manifest. A woman is a woman whether she is very hypergamous, or a little hypergamous, consciously Machiavellian, or subconsciously Machiavellian.

People who believe NAWALT (not all women are like that) reject the notion there is any such thing as “female nature”, and that such a nature dictates women’s mating behaviour. They would for example, point to a woman who has been in a relationship for the past five years and say “see, she doesn’t branch swing, NAWALT!”

Not only is she the exception that proves the rule, but were she to look for another relationship, she would in all likelihood cease to be the exception. If she didn’t branch swing on that one occasion, she may on another. If she never branch swings, she merely becomes the exception in regard to one aspect of AWALT. A woman consistently refuting one aspect of AWALT does not refute it in all aspects, she only refutes the aspect of the heuristic she does not represent.

A woman who refutes all aspects of AWALT is known as a unicorn, mythologically named, because such things do not exist. Just as mythology is fiction, so is the woman who refutes all
aspects of AWALT. Outlier women and self-aware women who work to mitigate their nature will behaviourally refute some aspects of AWALT, but most women will refute none.

2.) Degrees of AWALT:

Humanity is diverse, so inevitably there’s going to be an exception in some form or another which disproves a certain aspect of the AWALT contention. And yet despite human diversity, there is incredible similarity among women. So much so that, we can qualitatively outline the “operating system of female behaviour” and to differing degrees, find conformity to the arguments made by AWALT.

Sure not all women are gold diggers who will only date millionaires, but many won’t date a man of equal or lesser net worth. Sure some women date poorer men, but such a man is likely to be highly popular or attractive. However you cut it, AWALT will contend women are hypergamous. Will hypergamy always manifest in one exact manner? No, of course not, it is not that “women are all the same” it’s more a case of “women all have the same instincts and are therefore predisposed to specific kinds of behaviour.”

Hypergamy can manifest as a desire for resources, superior genes, social status – any of these things. People tend to get caught up on the material when thinking of hypergamy, but to really distil it down to its fulcrum, hypergamy means “a woman will only date someone she believes to be superior to her”.

So the fact a woman dates a man poorer than her does not mean she isn’t hypergamous, he has something else going on either physically, socially or psychologically that makes her believe he is superior, if this wasn’t the case, she wouldn’t be with him. However you cut it, non-hypergamous women do not exist – hence AWALT.

3.) Defying One Element of AWALT Doesn’t Make A NAWALT:

In section 1 I used the example of branch swinging to show how defying one aspect of AWALT does not mean a woman is a NAWALT. In this section I will elucidate that point further as it is this point in particular which allows some people to rationalise NAWALT as a truism.

You may know a woman who often takes responsibility for her actions, but AWALT claims women are notorious blame shifters. That specific woman thus defies AWALT in this one aspect. This does not mean she doesn’t branch swing, isn't hypergamous, or doesn’t friend zone men so she can enjoy boyfriend level commitment without actually dating. This one woman who defies this one aspect of AWALT does not disprove AWALT, she is merely the exception to one aspect of it.

Whilst different women may defy different aspects of AWALT, no woman defies all aspects of it. This woman is known by the mythical term ‘unicorn’ precisely because she doesn’t exist. A unicorn is effectively the idealised woman who has none of the negative qualities we identify women as having. A “good woman”, such as one of those over at red pill women tries to suppress the aspects of her nature inherent to AWALT, the fact she need to suppress these aspects at all demonstrates the point – all women are like that. If they weren’t, there would be nothing for aware women to actively work to suppress.
No veteran in the online men’s community believes in NAWALT, a NAWALT (meaning not all women are like that) implies there is a woman out there who behaves in none of the ways central to which AWALT claims. That is the unicorn, and the unicorn is a lie – an idealised mythological remnant of blue pill programming. The idea that a woman who is not hypergamous, Machiavellian, immature, solipsistic and all the rest exists out there. Think of the NAWALT unicorn as El Dorado, you’ve heard all about it, a buddy of yours may have even been on an expedition to go and find it, but neither you nor anybody you know has ever found it.

AWALT doesn’t mean women can’t learn to be better partners given the right instruction, it means if they don’t receive and happily abide by such instruction, they will showcase the very worst aspects of AWALT (extreme hypergamy, immaturity, disloyalty etc). A woman in her natural, unsculpted state is prone to the very worst of AWALT, because women of substance are made not born.

4.) Why AWALT Denial Is Pandemic:

Women have negative aspects to their nature, but most men don’t want to believe in these negative aspects. Omnipresent blue pill programming exacerbates the instinct to ignore female wrong-doing by socialising men to pedestalise women. Men have a hard-wired cognitive bias to overlook, or even deny the negative aspects of female nature. Nature is afraid if men see women for what they truly are, that they will fail to reproduce.

If you knew a man who was solipsistic, blame shifting and immature, you’d hate him, cuss him out, mock him and probably cease association with him. But women get a free pass for exhibiting these traits, on some innate level it is known these rather deplorable traits are part of the feminine package, and as such, are tolerated when exhibited by women.

No matter how terrible women can be, men want to enjoy them in spite of themselves, they’re driven to, for men are the true romantics. Men may not love as easily as women, but when they do, they do so more deeply. It is out of this desire to be happy with a woman that men will deny AWALT, or exempt a particular woman from it. This is why psychologically, love is a particularly risky proposition for man, for he is prone to lose his sanity in order to drink from the poisoned chalice of fantasy.

5.) Bitterness & Accepting AWALT:

A subset of high value men who don’t commit beyond sex, have a very rosy-perception of women because they’ve got their game down enough not to face too much difficulty getting laid.

These men enjoy the best of what women have to offer without being subject to any of the bullshit attached to it; this gives them a positively skewed bias. They go around thinking “hey women are great, I love fucking and flirting with ‘em, those dudes saying AWALT on TRP are just bitter!”

Perhaps some men are bitter, but bitter rarely means wrong, if anything, bitterness is the unwelcome by-product of a hard learned lesson, it is neither unwarranted nor devoid of
wisdom. This is not to encourage bitterness, but rather to give credit where credit is due.

This is why many hate the AWALT heuristic in spite knowing in their heart of hearts it’s true. Instinct obscures truth when it comes to the study of women, men are overridden by idealism, lust and paternalism and feel if they accept the nature of women then they have to hate women and won’t be able to enjoy them. Therefore a man is prone to retain the myth of the idealised women rather than accept AWALT, because he wrongly believes acceptance of AWALT is tantamount to an inability to enjoy women.

This is not true at all, sometimes one has to accept reality is not what they want it to be, that women are not angelic as so many men were wrongly taught, but that in fact women are far more flawed than even they. It’s about a recalibration of expectations to complement reality, rather than continuing to worship the unicorn myth that society has so deeply ingrained.

In spite of this realisation, you have to make a commitment to your happiness and make the best out of the flawed creatures that are women. If you can’t or won’t do that, you’re going to go your own way and prove nature right: you need illusions to see women as investable. This is not meant to shame your life choice if you are MGTOW, it is merely a statement of fact in relation to it.

The inability to grasp and accept AWALT, instead choosing to reject AWALT, indicates the person in question has to deceive themselves about the nature of women in order to be capable of enjoying them. Such a person is not at the stage where they can enjoy women, whilst accepting how immensely flawed their nature is. It is my contention that salvation lies in accepting and working in accordance with AWALT, rather than in denying it. I do not believe the majority of men will be happy going their own way, but for those that can make it work for them, great.

6.) In Closing:

I know this knowledge can prove painful and that’s why many men struggle with this, but your struggle doesn’t alter her nature. You can sit on Reddit until you pass out debating pedantic little points in regard to AWALT, but AWALT will remain a truism that persists and women in your life will hurt and disappoint you until you concede to reason - all women are like that.

7.) Relevant Reading:

Buy “The Rational Male” in the USA
Buy “The Rational Male” in the UK
Buy “The Rational Male” in Canada
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in the USA
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in the UK
Buy “The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine” in Canada
“If an injury has to be done to a man it should be so severe that his vengeance need not be feared.” – Niccolo Machiavelli
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1.) Introduction:

Rather than my usual dense and lengthy prose, I treat you to the insights of a Machiavellian. Originally written as reminders for myself rather than as an essay for the consumption of my readers, they can be likened to the Machiavellian’s equivalent of Marcus Aurelius’ meditations. Enjoy.

2.) The Maxims:

1. – Any and all weaknesses can be used against you, and in conflict, will be. As such, weaponise your weaknesses by making them known; hide them in plain sight. Wear your weaknesses like armour, flaunt them, and you deprive your opponents the use of ammunition that would otherwise discredit you.

2. – If weakness is speculated, deny it. If weakness is known, spin it. If it is directly observed, dismiss it. Should it look profitable, leverage it for status in the victimhood hierarchy.

3. – Justification can only exist in respectful exchanges. When you are disliked, justifications are deemed excuses, your guilt, pre-determined.
4. – Do not defend against your attackers, attack them; justification is a Machiavellian fallacy. Do not justify, stipulate. [More Here]

5. – People are like stocks, acquire assets, avoid/drop liabilities and ignore market rumours; acquire insider information wherever possible.

6. – The only difference between the toxic and the unlucky is the unlucky bring you down inadvertently, avoid both.

7. – Attacks reveal intent, defence reveals priority. You don’t defend the unimportant. You don’t attack allies unless it’s a decoy, this simple concept can be extrapolated to any situation.

8. – The battle of the sexes is the only war where crushing the opposition isn’t victory. No, a man must avoid checkmate and stalemate, by continuously putting his woman in check. This and only this is victory for the union.

9. – Everything is war in a different set of clothing. Love, business, politics, wherever there are competing interests there is a battlefield, and wherever there is a battlefield, there is war.

10. – When things fall apart, be ready for total war.

11. – Don’t insult the king in the throne room. If you must insult him, do so only amongst those you are confident share a mutual disdain. Lèse-majesté is dangerous, in this context a king is anyone you rely on socially, politically, economically etc.

12. – Lust of all kinds begets deceit, desire is good until it isn’t.

13. – Machiavellianism is the art of wielding power, how it’s wielded is determined by the wielder’s morality or lack thereof. Don’t blame the strategy, blame the soul of its employer. [Read more here.]

14. – Machiavellianism does not determine one’s morals, one’s morals determine the use of Machiavellianism. He who believes he is too moral for Machiavellianism is no more moral than he is an idiot.

15. – When people don’t like you, their questions are attacks. Sometimes these attacks are disguised as concerns, other times they are blatant. Whenever you’re asked a question, gauge the legitimacy of the question. Insincere questions must be met with insincere answers, if any answer at all.

16. – Do not trust those who overwhelm you with questions. They may simply be very curious, but it is more likely they are searching for dents in your armour. The line between curiosity and interrogation is thin, and people do not wear uniforms.

17. – Doubling down on your position or ignoring the challenge usually trumps an apology.

18. – Ignore your ignorer. To ignore your ignorer is to enter a war of most silent attrition.
Who will speak first when silence is golden? Whoever speaks first loses. Whoever speaks first admits they need the other more, no matter what plausible deniability they may retroactively invoke to disguise the fact.

19. – Ignoring is a non-response response; no response is a neutral response. Lots of neutral responses hint at a negative underlying sentiment, for people who like you struggle to ignore you.

20. – Where bullying fails, charm succeeds and where charm fails, bullying succeeds. One should substitute in hard power when soft power fails and vice versa.

21. – People are enticed by the allure of circumvention, operating outside the rules carries its own thrill. People feel good when they get away with things.

22. – The trick to dealing with psychopaths lies in possessing a full awareness of the conditionality of the transaction, for they are scant in sentiment.

23. – Not knowing what a psychopath wants from you is equivalent to operating within a perpetually detonating flashbang. If you cannot discern what they want, cease dealings.

24. – Being charming is the result of happiness or success, not of virtue. It is amusing that people oft fail to make this distinction, they conflate charm with virtue. As a matter of prudence, the more charming, the more dangerous.

25. – Whether you realise it or not, the powerful are always testing, always evaluating. They yield milligrams of respect only to those who consistently pass their evaluations; a fluke of success will not earn you their respect, it’ll get you a glance.

26. – Real victims suffer in silence, posers pretending to be victims do so to gain money and status. Be wary of “loud victims” they are almost always playacting.

27. – People don’t want to be betrayed, but most will betray if it suits them to; the standard of morality people demand of others is higher than that which they demand of themselves. The coldest psychopath will demand the deepest altruism and the most devout loyalty, beware cultishness then.

28. – Interpretation is always perverted to suit the agenda of the interpreter, whoever controls the flow of interpretation dominates.

29. – Trust the average woman as much as you trust your government, occasionally there’s a good candidate, most aren’t worth your vote.

30. – Strong personalities hate the weak and distrust the strong. A man who considers himself a king rarely wants to share the room with another.

31. – Never hesitate to work on your verbal dexterity, vocabulary and comprehension. Debate lots with people who don’t matter. Strong articulation is a form of soft power.

32. – There’s a lot of freedom in stupidity, playing dumb is oft profitable.
33. – Too much perception can niggle a person’s paranoia, perceptiveness is threatening to those aware of their ill-nature. In suspicious company, appear less perceptive.

34. – Appraise a rule by its worth. Do not defy a rule for the sake of defiance. Some rules protect the ruled, others protect rulers – distinguish.

35. – We’re all players in a game. You’re a player or a piece on the board, you move or you’re moved. You play the game, or the game plays you.

36. – You can’t not play the game. You don’t beat the game by denying the game; death’s the only escape from the game. Until then, play well to live well.

37. – Beware the encroacher, an individual characterised by ubiquitous and uninvited insertion of their person into your social affairs. Out of a need to be noticed in the desire for social elevation, whilst his status is inferior he will extend his hand with a smile. Once he moves past you, he will forget you, his intentions for you are not sincere, you are merely a piece in his ascent to success.

38. – The encroacher targets your popularity in an attempt to siphon it through association.

39. – The encroacher gives themselves away by either A: absence of pleasantry B: lacing their pleasantry with subtle and sporadic undermining. Do not be an encroacher, the quickest way to garner the favour of the powerful is to befriend them, not to irritate them with persistent public exhibitions of your self-ordained superiority.

40. – Charm trumps more aggressive manipulations when dealing with the perceptive. The perceptive like being charmed, their awareness of the seduction does not negate its effect.

41. – Always appeal to incentive, never to mercy.

42. – Too much perception is threatening, even intimidating, people distrust you when they realise you are as perceptive as you are, even if you mean them no ill will. When people know you have the potential to destroy them, like nuclear material, they quarantine you.

43. – Legitimate concern is rare, more often than not displayed concern is a means to an end, a foot in the door to seize the moral high ground.

44. – Anything you say can be twisted to make you look bad, and it will be, because that’s power. It’s how hearts and minds are won, politicians and the mass media do it for a living – neither is starving.

45. – If you have a firm grip on Machiavellianism, it will be difficult for women to exploit you. On the flip, they’ll be harder to love too.

46. – Narcissism is antifragile in the sense it makes no distinction between love & hate, only attention and inattention.

47. – The secretiveness of privacy drives people mad, even if there is nothing to hide, the reluctance to reveal creates suspicion. To ensure the safety of a secret, the existence of the
secret must be kept secret. As soon as somebody becomes aware of a secret they know not the nature of, they will be compelled to unearth it at any cost, thus threatening the secret.

48. - The difference between an interview and an interrogation is merely a matter of perception, all interviews are a collection of shit tests.

49. - When you are being interrogated and don’t realise it, the topic will rapidly change in order to determine what you’re most uncomfortable with. This topic will then be focused on, I call this vulnerability reconnaissance.

50. - You nearly always learn more about somebody in an informal setting than you would a formal one. Paranoia and thus mental defences are greater in formal settings, to truly get to know somebody you must mingle informally. Of course, as much as this opens them up, it opens you up too.

51. - Advice that wasn’t asked for is rarely appreciated, let alone followed. Don’t give advice that isn’t asked for, don’t advise everybody who asks for your insight, only advise those you think worthy. An “I don’t know” will keep things civil without forcing you to waste time.

52. - When you advise people you reveal more about yourself than you perhaps realise, after all, your advice reflects the core of who you are, it reveals the why and how rather than merely the what. What’s are easy to change, why’s and how’s aren’t, they’re more identifying.

53. - If you want someone to implement your ideas, it’s better to make them think your idea is theirs. Plant the seed, give them credit for your thinking, and they’ll believe their repetition of your idea makes it their creation.

54. - The quickest way to gain people’s trust is to help them.

55. - Liking animals and being religious creates an appearance of uprightness, people of ill-nature wear these appearances to disarm through disguise.

56. - People don’t dislike being tricked, they hate realising they were tricked. Tell lies that cannot or will not be investigated, compulsive lying is the purview of the histrionic fool.

57. - Beauty oft conceals bad intentions.

58. - Be magnanimous to friends, civil to strangers and ruthless to foes; furthermore, know who’s who.

3.) Relevant Reading / In Closing:

If you’re interested in consulting, click here. If you enjoyed these maxims, take a look at the following.

Blog:

Machiavellian Maxims (Part 1)
Machiavellian Maxims (Part 2)
Machiavellian Maxims (Part 3)
Machiavellian Maxims (Part 4)

Books:

Rochefoucauld’s Maxims
The Art of War
The Art of Worldly Wisdom
The Prince
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“The feminist movement taught women to see themselves as victims of an oppressive patriarchy. Self-imposed victimhood is not a recipe for happiness.” - Phyllis Schlafly
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1.) Introduction:
Recently I received a message from a feminist asking me some basic questions about the red pill. I figured the amount of explaining required to articulate a quality response would necessitate the writing of an essay. Here’s the thing though, I don’t write individualised
essays; it’s a poor allocation of a finite and unearnable resource: one’s time.

Not only that, but I believe it would be a shame if only one fellow got to enjoy such a rich and detailed response. As such, if I find myself penning a lengthy response to someone, there’s a good chance I’ll just make it into an article. After all, if one person is asking these questions, others probably share similar curiosities.

Anybody curious about the red pill, or struggling to grasp it due to an inability to reconcile it with feminist or egalitarian beliefs should start here; this one’s for you. I should warn you, this is one of my more lengthier posts, so you may want to go and grab a cup of coffee before you get right into the thick of things.

2.) Gender Equality is a Myth:

**Question:** “To you, what is the central tenet of the red pill position?”

The core of the philosophy is built on the idea that gender equality is a myth. Men are required by women to be superior in order to be attractive, women don’t find equality sexy, even if they claim the contrary.

Women don’t make it easy for men, most are not fully cognisant of what they want and will *not tell lost boys how to be men*, even if they themselves have some sort of idea of what “being a man” entails. Let’s assume a magical woman exists who knows everything about being a man and is fit to educate men in the ways of manhood (humour me); the act of this woman teaching the clueless man how to be masculine would be the very thing that makes him undesirable, assuming there was some kind of physical attraction to begin with.

A man can be attracted to a woman whose femininity he is cultivating, but the reverse is not so. A woman doesn’t want to cultivate a man’s masculinity, she wants to find a man who’s already generously endowed with it. Sure, women will try to rehabilitate bad boys due to their primal attraction to *psychopathy*, but a “bad boy” has masculinity even if it’s of the negative type; domesticating the desirable and building up the undesirable are entirely disparate phenomena. Women will more than gladly engage in the former, but scarcely if ever the latter.

2a.) Women’s Advice Damages Men:

Women’s advice to men is not fit for purpose, even when they mean well, their *inextricable solipsism* leaves them unable to give actionable advice that will yield lasting and tangible benefit. A woman’s solipsism dictates her inability to understand how she becomes attracted, to her, attraction is “mysteriously magical”, and as such, a form of incomprehensible magnetism that a man either has or hasn’t.

One of the reasons many women have a simultaneous disgust and intrigue for the red pill, is because among other reasons, it teaches unattractive men how to be attractive. And the mere idea that attraction is teachable implies it is mundane and mechanical, rather than mysterious and magical as a woman’s fantasy prone emotions would drive her to believe.
Rather than tell clueless men they need to be dominant, put her in place and act like more of a jerk, women will oft opt for the non-confrontational bullshit approach: “be kind and understanding, listen to her problems, and she’ll realise what a great guy you are!” In fact rather than help a man, a woman will often use misinformation as a filtering mechanism to benefit her own sexual strategy.

Women will tell men to be kind, sweet, supplicating and deferential, and if he’s idiotic enough to take the advice, she’ll reject him precisely because he did what she said. Many men have had their hearts crushed in youth because they were clueless, listened to the thoroughly unhelpful girl interpretation of what constitutes an attractive male, and ended up with nothing but rejection dressed in the clothing of compliments.

**For example:**

“You’re so nice, you’re like a brother to me – I don’t want to ruin that!”

As well as condescending platitudes such as

“You’re a real catch, I know there’s a really great woman out there for you, you’ll find her some day I just know it!”

Completely disregarding the fact that, this man doesn’t want “the great women out there”, but in fact desires the woman telling him to fuck off romantically in the kindest yet least helpful way possible.

Whoever thought such flattering words could harbour such condemning frustration? Who among man knew rejection could sound so goddamn complimenting? These are the very phrases a man never wishes to hear from a woman, rejection is something men can process and learn from, but rejection disguised as encouragement simply fucks up a young and impressionable man’s mind.

A lot of red pill men were raised by feminist women, followed feminist advice, and found nothing but misery. As soon as they discarded the notion of gender equality as an operative social model, focused on themselves and became more behaviourally dominant, their relationships with women both sexually and platonically begun improving dramatically.

2b.) Women’s Need for Male Superiority:

The feminine need for men to be better than them is the reason nice guys finish last and “those jerks” get all the women, nice guys behave in a manner which communicates submission and inferiority, whilst jerks behave in a manner that communicates dominance and superiority. Social dominance is important to women, in fact it is probably the most significant attraction cue in a woman’s determination of whether a man is desirable or not, although thanks to feminism, you’ll scarcely hear a woman (or even man) tell you that in this day and age.

Women are attracted to men they perceive to be superior, equals and inferiors are invisible to women. The equals and inferiors are “the creeps” if they’re ugly, and brother zoned as a
marriage backup for when she hits 29 if they’re attractive. The red pill refers to the female desire for male superiority as hypergamy, hypergamy is the fulcrum on which female attraction operates: is the man more dominant than her? If yes, he’s attractive, if not, he isn’t.

This handy flow chart pretty much summarises female attraction in a nutshell:

![Flow Chart](http://illimitablemen.com)

2c.) Infantile Narcissism as the Basis for Feminism:

The reason women oft say “I believe men and women should be equal” and actually believe their own nonsense is because of the fragile feminine ego. Many women are uncomfortable with the idea that they are the second sex. The childish insecurity quintessential of the feminine is exploited by feminism, encouraging women to compete with rather than complement the masculine.

The fruits of this very successful, yet deleterious propaganda has created successive generations of women who are not entirely cognisant of, and undervalue the importance inherent to their “inferior position” - the species dependence on their nurturing of the young. This is a woman’s calling as much as a man’s is to protect and provide, and yet feminists, like spoiled children who think they deserve better, reject their biological destiny in a quest to feel like they’re the primary sex.

Men are the primary sex because they build civilization, women are the second sex because they have added and continue to add very little to civilization. But still, even in the secondary position, there is a great deal of importance in women’s role. Nurturing the species is no small feat, and women being taught to disdain rather than embrace this role are doing not
just themselves, but the species an indomitable disservice.

Only the most lesbianic feminist could see motherhood, domestic life and complementary subservience to a benevolent patriarach as “oppressive”. Quite the contrary, permitting women to deploy their sexual strategies so that they may reproduce in security is anything but oppressive.

2d.) Equality, Superiority, Feminism – A Summary:

When a woman says “men and women are equal” it’s only ever in regard to something in which men are objectively superior, never in an aspect in which women are regarded superior. Wherever a woman is regarded as inferior, culture will be blamed rather than biology. For example, women are inferior to men at mathematics – feminism will blame “lad culture” and the prevalence of “old white men in the sciences” rather than admit women have less logical and systematising brains than men.

Women have inferior musculature to men (less muscle mass) and again, the feminist approach will always idiotically take a 100% nurture position, attributing blame entirely to socialisation. Feminists ignore the differences in the male and female brain in matters of mathematical and scientific ability, and likewise do the same in athletic matters, ignoring the anabolic nature of testosterone, a hormone men have ten times more of than women.

Now if you asked a woman who believes in gender equality which sex is better with children, almost all will say “women are better”. So when women are actually inferior, you get this equality nonsense (because feminine infantile narcissism feels unimportant when admitting inferiority), but where women excel, you get female superiority (feminine infantile narcissism likes feeling important). Essentially, feminists reframe male supremacy as equality, whilst allowing and even encouraging female supremacy to flourish under the same guise.

This is why anybody worth their salt quite rightly identifies contemporary third wave feminism as a misguided female supremacy movement, rather than one of egalitarianism. But, just for the record and to clarify the point here, even if third wave feminism were egalitarianism like first wave feminism was, red pill philosophy would still disagree with it. The red pill believes in traditional gender roles, of which egalitarianism infringes upon.

Women need men to be superior to them to be attracted to them, but out of ego do not wish to admit inferiority. This is why you have this strange compartmentalisation where women only pursue men of superior genes, wealth and status to them, but then claim equality in all aspects in which they are inferior. If women truly believed in gender equality as an absolute, they would be attracted to men who are objectively inferior to them. As they don’t, we can deduce that women (even feminists) don’t really believe in gender equality, but merely use it as a tool of no real defined shape, which in all its fluidity, is utilised for no purpose other than to provide women with short-term benefit.

2e.) The Masculine Burden of Performance:

Of course the necessitation of male superiority in order to elicit female attraction has far wider implications than simply displeasing the feminine ego. It means men have a far greater
burden of performance, that men are innately insufficient, and that it is their contemporary
capacity to perform which determines their sufficiency. This is why you will hear “he’s not a
real man” but never “she’s not a real woman”; manhood is precarious, earned each day,
womanhood is a certainty, conferred by menstruation.

Women do not have the burden of performance that men do, women are valuable by merit of
their existence, whereas men are valuable only when they can perform or produce, eg:
ammass wealth or behave dominantly. As soon as a man can no longer do these things
(particularly the latter), he is no longer considered a man.

This is why many men who lost their jobs in the 2008 economic depression found their wives
divorcing them, some killing themselves after the fact as a gentle nod to Darwin; whilst their
unremarkable middle of the bell curve ex-wives survived by simply remarrying. Because
men must invest more, men find it harder to move on, because women are provided for
and invested into, they don’t. A woman will almost always take the one thing she invests
most into with her, the children; a man loses everything he invested into.

This is the masculine burden of performance, and it is this constant unending need for men to
perform which makes masculinity precarious. Just because a man is considered a man today,
it does not mean he will be tomorrow. A man who stops behaving dominantly is not
considered a “real man” by either his fellow men or women; manhood is contingent on
ability, whereas womanhood is contingent on fertility and motherhood.

A woman can behave however she likes, earn as much or as little as she likes, and she will
not lose her gender identity to her inability to perform, women have freedom that men do
not, the freedom to fail. So yes, women may be the second sex, but that position of
diminished responsibility confers a privilege men will never know. Of course, a childish
narcissist could never know that.

3.) Feminism is a Siege on Masculinity:

Question: “Are men, contrary to popular opinion, worse off in today’s society than women?”

I think feminism made the entire institution of family (and thus boys as well as girls) worse off
than they were pre-feminism. However, I think boys are affected far more markedly than girls
are by father absence, because boys need their fathers around in order to emulate them and
actualise their masculinity. Deprive a boy his paternal connection, and you do catastrophic
damage to his psyche.

Boys and men need sufficient exposure to the masculine existential viewpoint, but the
contemporary feminist dominated society we have in the west does its best to prevent men
from accessing their own genders viewpoint; how it accomplishes this is by constantly
injecting the feminine viewpoint into everything as to silence the male voice. And this
“feminine viewpoint” feminism espouses isn’t even a healthy form of femininity, it’s a toxic,
lesbianic man hating one. It teaches girls combativeness, and boys self-flagellation (the very
thing they eschew for women).

This is harmful to both sexes, for it encourages androgyny and confusion, it induces
femininity wherever masculinity is needed, and masculinity wherever femininity is needed. Feminism is about the destruction of gender identities. Rather than accepting the biological elements of binary masculinity and femininity, it reduces them to mere social constructs, and then does irreparable psychological harm by confusing men and women alike.

Although feminism misleads both sexes, it only attacks and vilifies one of them, men. Although feminism misleads both sexes, it only deprives one of them their same-sex parent, boys. So while I wouldn’t perhaps characterise the plight of the modern man as “being worse off in relation to women”, I would say the modern man has far less support than the modern woman does. I’d then use this argument to further contend that the reason the red pill is as popular as it is, is precisely because there are no alternatives.

Feminism declares war upon the hairy, sweating and arched back which holds up humanity, declares it evil, and self-righteously prods it until it falls, leaving nothing but chaos in its wake. Feminism is toxic gynocentrism which reframes the male existential viewpoint as the point of all evil, so it cares not for men, nor masculinity, feminism has very little interest in the masculine outside of exploiting and undermining it, for masculinity is the feminist enemy on which war has been declared.

4.) Women Are the Second Sex Because They’re Needier:

**Question:** “Do you consider yourself sexist or think of yourself as hating women?”

Yes to sexist (because I recognise the differences between men and women) but no to hating them as a result of that. I don’t respect women simply for being women, they have to earn my respect with good character. Cultivating a pleasing appearance earns lust, not respect. Most women don’t realise this, because beauty is power and feminism encourages narcissism, modern women believe they’re entitled to respect merely by merit of being female, doubly so if they’re attractive – this is not so.

Feminism teaches that women are entitled to respect regardless of character, this leads to a lot of reprehensible women believing they are intrinsically entitled to something they haven’t earned. Again, this can be explained by childish narcissism.

Imagine a movement which defined parents as oppressive of their children, and that children deserve the right to make their own decisions without their parents denying them “independence” and “autonomy”. Sounds crazy, right? Well this is how I see feminism.

Women need men a lot more than vice versa, it is in women’s interest to have a man take care of them. If women could take care of themselves, they wouldn’t rely on the federal threat of force to redistribute the tax dollars of productive working age men to unemployed single mothers, furthermore they wouldn’t need an ideology to legally enforce such a process.

If women were equal or even superior to men, they wouldn’t need an ideology to state the obvious, everybody would intuit that women were superior and would therefore not need institutional inculcation to ingrain the notion. The reason we keep hearing men and women are equal is precisely because they’re not; it is customary of infantile narcissism to cope with
a reality it doesn’t like by profusely denying it, denying it to the point that the lie becomes
the new reality - that women are in fact equal to men.

In fact, much of modern women’s strides in the economy come from the death of femininity, supplanted by women’s adoption of masculine behaviours. Truth be told, even when women emulate male dominance as commanded by their feminist overlords, they’re still unable to compete with men economically without a political lobby artificially holding them up. And they’re not meant to compete with men, they’re meant to complement them – that’s the entire point, feminism is unnecessarily segregational.

Free markets are meritocratic, there is no affirmative action or benevolent sexism. Even if we disregard economic concerns and focus purely on the psychological, few women are truly happy if single. The vast majority of women need to be in a relationship with a man they respect to feel satisfied and successful. Likewise, most women do not want a relationship with a man that makes significantly less than them, so they’re not going to have a lot of desire for a man who does.

However you cut it, whichever angle you wish to poke and prod, however you wish to analyse the relationship between men and women by desperately trying to force the feminist puzzle piece to fit, women are the indisputable second sex. And when they’re artificially put into a position of power, dominance and leadership, rarely is such a woman content.

A resounding difference between men and women is that, although humans in general are power-hungry, only men fully enjoy the fruits of power. Men cope with power better, and are happier for having it. Give a woman the highest position available, and you create a miserable woman, a woman who has shrunk her dating pool of eligible bachelors to almost zero, who grows disdain daily for the burdens that encumber her. Women are happier when they’re following because it’s less stressful and there’s less accountability involved. Feminism makes them think they need to beat men at everything to be successful women, when the reality couldn’t be further from the truth.

Men have never, and will never need women to take care of them, the reverse is untrue. Men took care of women for tens of thousands of years, this is the unwritten social contract, men provide and protect, women nurture – this is a natural balance that works just fine.

Then a political movement comes along and says “hey, you know those guys paying the bills, putting the food on the table and going to war to protect you from men who would rape you? Yeah those men are evil, they’re oppressing you.” – it is diabolical to me that given the opportunity to free themselves of any responsibility, even the pitiful responsibility of running a house, women threw the baby out with the bathwater. They exchanged service to men personally invested in them for service to men with no personal investment in them (corporations and big government).

Why the hell would you want to go and work the arduous jobs men work when you can stay at home, raise your children you adore, and not have to worry about deadlines and work politics? Feminism lies, it acts as if women were strictly prohibited from working before its inception with dramatic imagery of women locked up in kitchens. Women had jobs before feminism, it just wasn’t common because most had the luxury of not needing to work.
Modern women don’t have that luxury, all thanks to feminism.

Work is not a privilege, it’s a responsibility, and so it humours me that women were duped into perceiving additional responsibility as additional privilege, simply because it was wrapped up in a banner of independence which played into their narcissistic status anxiety.

5.) In Closing:

As an addendum and before I forget, if you’re a young man looking for some mentoring, /u/tizenkotoko (the gentleman who made that pretty flow chart for me) is a father looking to take a young red piller under his wing. Get in touch with him if this sounds like something you’d be interested in, and before you ask, no, sorry, I’m not open to mentoring at this time.

Any questions or insights? Leave a comment.

UPDATE: Tizen is no longer available for mentoring.

6.) Relevant Reading:

The Empress Is Naked
The Manipulated Man
The Rational Male
The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine
The War Against Boys: How Misguided Feminism Is Harming Our Young Men
The Way of Men
I’ve been blogging (almost constantly, but not quite) since November 2013, and in the entirety of that time, I’ve never been as excited about what I’m doing with Illimitable Men as I am now. So what’s changed since I first begun?

My writing isn’t as bad as it used to be, the secret to good writing (well at least what I believe to be the strength of my writing in particular), is logical and clearly explained thinking articulated with explanatory yet concise prose. This means I don’t spend as much time editing as I used to, and I find it easier (and thus quicker) to produce a higher standard of quality. As the saying goes, practices makes perfect, if anything is testament to that, it’s this blog.

I had important things to say when I began blogging back in 2013, if I didn’t, I would not have begun blogging to begin with. However, the difference between now and then is that I find saying what I want to say with the clarity I want to say it with far more effortless. I don’t really get brain fog when writing anymore, it all flows clearly for me, but when I begun, it wasn’t like that, it was a real slog at times. I’ve missed workouts and been up to the early
hours before perfecting posts – such is the extent of my dedication.

What used to take me 10 hours I can now create in roughly half that, and with greater polish. I know my grammar’s not perfect, but I don’t care, I know it’s good enough to go into print as the complaints I used to get to have all but dried up.

In fact, editing my old work is why my book is taking so long to come out, I could release it in a couple of weeks with the original grammar if I wanted a fast buck, but, quality, integrity and credibility of the Illimitable Men name is more important to me than a financial event that’ll yield a couple thousand, possibly tens of thousands of dollars. Yes I like money, but not at the expense of the quality I hope you’ve come to associate with this publication.

It probably took me a solid year and a half to “perfect” my writing. As I’m sure you’re all aware, the internet is full of grammar nazis, and it is by embracing their ruthless scrutiny I’ve managed to enhance my grammar considerably. I am the bastard student of the internet’s grammar nazis, and for that dear internet, I thank you profusely.

I’m starting to make more than negligible amounts of money, I don’t want to reveal exactly how much (it isn’t really your business), although if you are nosy and care enough my Patreon income is easily calculated as it is public. Simply multiply the average given at the top of my profile page by the number of articles produced in any one month and you have a rough figure of what I made from Patreon that month. Of course, that’s not my only revenue stream, but it gives you a low-end estimate of what I’m making at the moment.

I didn’t start this blog to make money, but, I’m not going to bust ass for years on end producing the calibre of content that I do if there’s nothing in it. I blog for three reasons:

1. I really enjoy writing, philosophising and articulating my thoughts
2. I want to make money
3. I want to connect with interesting and influential people

I’m not going to bullshit you with the whole “hey I just love writing so much and I’m so rich anyway that money doesn’t matter to me” as so many on the internet do in a righteous affront to your intelligence, because that’d be lying and I’m candid enough to treat my readers with the respect they deserve. Wanting to make money isn’t a dirty sin I feel I need to hide.

The entrepreneur in me believes not monetising would be a crime even if I were inordinately rich. There is nothing noble about demanding no payment for your work, in fact, there’s an argument to be made it is evil as it perpetuates the notion others less well off should likewise not demand money for their work simply because a richer person in their field can afford to work for free.

If people see it is okay for a blogger at my modest yet far from beginner level to make money from their blog (although bear in mind I wrote for over a year before monetising), then smaller bloggers won’t feel guilty for wanting to make a buck from their hard work either.
this way, I hope to set a precedent – it’s perfectly fine to monetise your work so long as you
don’t sacrifice its quality. Of course, if you suck, don’t expect anybody to hand you their
precious dollars.

Don’t believe any blogger who says they don’t care if they make any money from their blog
or not, especially if they work really hard at it. Some people get into blogging precisely to
make money or meet powerful people, others don’t, but once they see they’re getting 14,000
views in a day (which is what I managed a few days back when I released ‘Instruction For
A Polite Feminist’) then very few people out there wouldn’t look to monetise that sort of
audience. If you don’t monetise, you’re either inordinately rich and thus can’t be bothered, or
you’re an idiot.

I have purposely avoided the implementation of video or banner advertisements on Illimitable
Men, although I get advertisers e-mailing me from time to time offering to help make my
website significantly uglier and more annoying for an amount that probably barely scratches
$1,000 a month. No thanks, making money without annoying my readers is precisely
why I use Patreon.

Money is not evil, and neither is earning from one’s efforts, you wouldn’t work for free so I
don’t know why anybody would expect me to. To be honest, I think people who believe the
world owes them something and that everything they want should be free are lazy losers who
are simply unwilling to work harder to get what they want. Scarcity mindset is being frugal,
abundance is growing your earning and social power, which is how I use this blog to provide
me value whilst simultaneously providing value to my readers. I work hard, so I expect
rewards, it’s that simple, however I digress.

I’m making contacts, I’m connecting with some very interesting/valuable people I’d probably
never have met had it not been for this blog, so for that I’m extremely grateful. I don’t want
to go into too much detail about that as I respect the privacy of the gentlemen who message
me, but alas, this metric bears inclusion in my enthusiasm for my continued work. I intend to
meet with a handful of my readers later in the year.

If you’re thinking of starting a blog, I recommend you do so for the reasons I have, and if
networking in particular is important to you, put quality over quantity should you wish to
attract the attention of people worth knowing. Anyhow, I’ve expended far more words than
expected merely outlining why I’m so enthused by my work here, so onto the meat of the
post – my plans for the blog this year!

---

The Illimitable Men Book – When’s It Coming?

In the passage above I briefly mentioned my as yet unreleased upcoming book, I know
you’ve been waiting awhile, but you’ll thank me when on launch day you receive a text that
is well formatted, readable and low on if not absent of mistakes. My sense of perfectionism
will ensure you get a quality product, and I hope because of that, my text will contain the
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professionalism necessary to be enthusiastically purchased and gifted.

My timeline at present is the March/April window, I really don’t want to leave it any later than that. My main focus right now is on setting up my private dark triad forum and continuing to produce new content. If you wish to buy the book on release (99% sure I’ll retail for $14.99 – £9.99), register your interest here and you’ll be e-mailed a week before the book comes out notifying you of its impending release.

When my book comes out, my top 5 patrons (assuming they are fine with giving me their mailing addresses) will be sent a signed copy of my book and a hand written thank you note as a token of my gratitude for their support. I have no plans to sign books for anybody else in the near future, that’s a little something I want to reserve for my biggest supporters. I will Patreon message my top 5 supporters nearer to the release of the book, letting them know they’re eligible for a free signed copy as a token of my gratitude.

I am going to commission somebody to create a book cover for me (as I lack the skills necessary to create my own), however I have a one-off proposition for anybody up to the task. If you create a book cover I want to use, I will give you lifetime access to the dark triad board. Why do you care about that, what does lifetime access to the dark triad board actually mean and why would you want that? More on that in the next section. If nobody is up to the task, that’s fine, I have an Eastern European gentleman who’ll do it for $15, but the offer’s there should any of you be up to the task.

---

**The Dark Triad Forum**

I’m going to dedicate a lot of space to this section because the details I’ve released thus far have been scant, and I want to answer some of the questions publicly that keep popping up in my inbox. I mentioned in the Machiavellian Maxims post that I’d detail more about the nature of the dark triad forum later on, well here it is.

**What will the dark triad forum discuss, and what are the benefits of being a member?**

- Zero morality environment, we are strategy rather than morality based. If it’s effective to the user, it’s valid. I will kick people out who undermine strategy with moral arguments.

- The community and I will help your strategise your predicament, be that work politics, a rival, a business partner or whatever. You will have a small group of highly intelligent men to convene with.

- We will discuss and encourage texts conducive to enhancing one’s understanding of narcissism, psychopathy and strategy, among others.

- I/we will share and discuss scientific studies relevant to psychopathy and the dark triad.

- Topics will include: political strategy/statecraft (eg: The Prince), propaganda, advertising &
PR, psychopathy, narcissism, rhetoric/sophistry and military strategy among others.

– I will write exclusive articles for the community from time to time, most will be blueprints or strategies for maneuvering within organisations, similar to RibbonFarm’s stuff but more specific, basically, blueprints for more aggressive uses of Machiavellianism. I will at some point probably pen pieces on how to use The 48 Laws of Power in the workplace too.

– Tightly regulated/exclusive, good degree of privacy. As the community is private and the barrier to entry is moderately high, troublesome users are easily banned, and search engine bots won’t be able to feed our conversations into search engines.

This is all I’m willing to reveal about the nature of the community to anybody who isn’t a part of it.

**You said that $5 patrons get access to the board, but can I get access after a single donation?**

Short answer, no. The community is a token of thanks to my patrons, not donators. If you become a patron for a month and then retract, you lose access when you retract your support. 2 major reasons for working things like this:

**1** - I want to reward the people who fund my literature with something that brings them additional value, if I give it to donators then that shits on the guys who have already supported my writing for 6+ months. I know many of my patrons don’t support my writing solely for access to the dark triad forum, but I still want them to have something that is just for them.

**2** - It ensures the community stays high value because only people serious enough about the subject matter are going to bother investing money to be part of it. Most people won’t be willing to pay to be part of a community, but a minority will, and I’m banking on that to keep forum growth steady, yet humble and thus exclusive. If I got too much interest I’d have to rethink how I funnelled in new members, maybe up the price or give current members a limited number of invites or something.

Minimum access at present is $5 per article for a minimum of 3 articles a month, that’s $15 per month or £10 in my money. It’s a bit costlier than Netflix, just far more useful. The $5 package on my Patreon is limited to 50 slots, when those 50 slots fill up it will double to the $10 package, meaning $30 or £20 a month. If a slot frees up (eg: someone stops pledging support) someone quick enough and lucky enough would be able to get in on the $5 50 slots package.

I’m not really willing to bust ass or put in the effort for $5 some dude sent me a year ago, that’s not really incentive. I know to some of you this will sound expensive, and for those of you who think that – you’re not my target audience.

I will release a Machiavellian/dark triad book eventually (not any time soon), so if you don’t have that kind of disposable income then don’t worry, save your money and get the book later on. Don’t feel like you’re left out, because I’m still going to be writing plenty here
(including on the dark triad) and that doesn’t cost you a dime. If you’re tight for cash, please keep it, I don’t want your money.

I intend to open the dark triad forum later in the month (at the latest early next month) so you have until the end of this month to become a patron if you wish to have access to the community from the day it opens. You can become a patron by clicking here, or using the orange button in the top right corner of each page.

Podcasting:

Does IllimitableMan sound like a whiny teenage neckbeard whose balls haven’t dropped? I’m sure at some point in your reading this has been something you’ve pondered, for you know me only in the voice you read with, not the one I actually speak with.

I’ve been requested numerous times to start a podcast, or at least go on other peoples as people want to get a read on what my personality’s like and hear what I sound like. I’m down for this, however my connection where I live now isn’t great. Once I’ve moved house and acquired a connection that doesn’t lead to random words being omitted from the Skype call (this is what happened when we experimented with a pilot podcast a few months back), you will get to hear me.

What will the podcast be about? In all honesty, we’re probably just going to chat a whole bunch of shit. Relationship advice, ridiculing the lunacy of feminists, talking about self-improvement and work ethic, that kind of thing. When will this come out? Probably later in the year. My immediate priority is the dark triad forum, then getting the book out, so this will come after that. We’re looking June-July time at the earliest, probably later, not really a priority, but want you to know it’s in the eventual pipeline.

A Shout-out To Ed Latimore

Seeing as this is a meta post and it’s not often I make posts directly addressing my readers like this, I want to conclude this post with a shout out to up and coming self-improvement blogger, heavyweight boxer and physicist Ed Latimore of http://edlatimore.com/.

Ed is a great guy, and were it not for this blog, he is one of the great men I would not have had the pleasure of connecting with. If you like candid no-nonsense introspection and life advice from a guy on top of his shit, check Ed out, he doesn't just talk the talk but he walks the walk too. Ed is definitely one to watch, and I’m nothing but happy to send him some additional readers.

To conclude:

As you can see, 2016’s a busy year, I’m juggling all the aforementioned alongside the penning of new articles. Thank you all for your readership, and here’s to a great 2016.
– Illimitable Man
“When one is in love, one always begins by deceiving one’s self, and one always ends by deceiving others. That is what the world calls a romance.” – Oscar Wilde
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1.) Introduction:

If anybody needed the red pill, it was Ben. The tale of Ben is a cautionary tale, for men like Ben are the reason the red pill exists. Ben is, much to his detriment, a man completely clueless in matters of women. Ben’s tale highlights how a woman’s slow pervasive intrusion into a man’s emotional inner sanctum can prove deadly, especially so for men absent red pill awareness.

Ben’s ignorance to reality cost him an otherwise effortless and affable charm, his sense of well-being, money, time and the prospect of a good future. But let us not allow Ben’s suffering to be in vain, using Ben’s experiences, we can look at the relational dynamics between a blue pill man and his girlfriend, explicating how red pill principles play their
part in, and ultimately define the success or failure of a relationship.

With Ben’s story in hand, my humble analysis, and your sharing of this article, maybe, just maybe, we’ll save a few more men from becoming Ben. Okay, enough of my talking, you haven’t even heard the story yet, so on we go.

2.) Ben's Story, IM’s Analysis:

I have a friend (we’ll call him Ben) who was a stay-at-home dad. We knew each other since high school. In high school Ben was independent and fairly assertive, yet likewise he was one of the kindest people you’d know. Ben was very upstanding, everybody liked him. He wasn’t your stereotypical alpha, but he was the leader of his friends.

In high school, Ben met a girl called Julia. They dated, and were really into one another. Ben found it easy to get girls because of his easygoing personality, Julia was attracted to Ben's popularity, so she asked Ben to be her boyfriend. Looking back I think that’s where things started to go wrong. It was his first girlfriend and he really, really loved her. He and I stopped going out together, and on the rare occasions we did go out, he would be worried his girlfriend was missing him so he’d incessantly text and call her.

I loved Ben to the core at the time, but it became unbearable to stay near him anymore. As a result, we ended up growing distant from one another.

Our tale starts with that of an extroverted young alpha male in a classic boy meets girl scenario. A tale so recognisable, it’s a cliched trope repeated in countless movies. Boy is popular, girl falls in love with boy’s popularity, so boy dates girl and quickly falls in love with her, only for girl to end up thinking he’s a loser when school’s over and the popularity that made him situationally attractive has evaporated.

Also note Ben’s constant need to check in with his woman, this is a classic beta male trait: anti-dread. Dread is the heightening and elicitation of attraction in a woman via a combination of emotional withdrawal, and an implicit or explicit demonstration of social power. For example, being seen with another high status person (particularly an attractive woman) whilst simultaneously dialling down the degree and frequency of emotional validation a man gives his woman constitutes dread.

Both alpha and **dark triad men** use dread as a tool to keep their woman’s narcissism in check. Dread plays on a woman’s jealous disposition and group status anxiety to keep her ego in check and attraction high, dread communicates to a woman’s hypergamy “this man is hot”. Likewise, whether a woman is aware or unaware of the dynamic at hand has no bearing on the efficacy of this social mechanism, for it is immutable.

Naturally, anti-dread is the opposite of dread. Anti-dread is the constant validation of a woman’s concerns, be they Pettily baseless or accurately rooted in reality. Anti-dread is the
constant assuagement of a women’s ever-changing insecurity, addressing every little concern she has with servile like efficiency; it is the constant need to “make sure everything is ok” and is in general, a passive, pandering, supplicate behaviour which prioritises comfort and paranoia placation over attraction.

Where dread harnesses a woman’s paranoia and discomfort to create attraction, anti-dread looks only to assuage it, making the man in question appear boring, and thus in turn, unchallenging and unattractive. Women are not attracted to men who give them an easy life, they’re attracted to the jealousy of uncertainty and competition. Assuaging a woman once she teeters on the precipice of romantic uncertainty almost ensures a strong, passionate relationship.

Effectively for a woman to appreciate a man, she has to believe she can lose him. Anti-dread ensures high levels of comfort, which in turn cultivate a hubris so firm she believes her man to be incapable of leaving her. When a woman does not believe she needs to please a man in order to keep him, she cannot respect him, and thus in turn, cannot love him in the way a romantic partner should.

Fast forward a couple of years and Ben got Julia pregnant. She had the baby just after graduation, but her family didn’t accept it so they kicked her out of the house. Ben found a poorly paid job at a logistics firm, gave up on his dreams of college, left his family and went to live with her in the worst house you can imagine.

Already this early into the story we can see the painstaking decisions that will eventually lead to the demise of Ben. What is Ben’s crucial life-altering faux pas? He gave up his future for a girl. A man always needs a mission other than his woman, to put this mission first, and to entertain women solely as an accompaniment, never a goal.

A good woman is one who will not jeopardise the mission, an exemplary woman is one who will support it. A woman who expects to be treated with more importance than her man’s mission unwittingly condemns them both to a most sordid misery, for a woman’s conceit will destroy the relationship should it not be kept in check.

When a man has no mission other than to meet the needs of his woman, rest assured the woman in question will seek a man with a mission of his own. You see, women are so clueless and out of touch with what’s really good for them, that left to lead they will ruin every relationship with every man they ever have. The success of a relationship thus relies almost solely on how a man harnesses his ingenuity to safeguard the relational arrangement from the vacillation of his woman’s emotional impulses.

If you allow a woman to dictate the course of your life, she will, and no matter her demands beforehand, she’ll hate you for it. A woman is a creature who pesters, nags, undermines, demands and sabotages her man in a petty quest for power born of insecurity, and should you yield to her attempts of usurpation, she will hate you. This is nothing but a test to see if you’re “a real man”, a behaviour almost all women compulsively exhibit without self-awareness or malice, yet nevertheless agitating and troublesome for man.
A woman hates a man who won’t give her what she wants, but she absolutely detests a man who does, and without a fight. You see the typical woman spends all her time ensuring a man sees her as the most important thing in his life, and as soon as he behaves as if she is, she becomes “suffocated”, moving on unflinchingly. Women think they want to be worshipped, but they do not, they want to be dominated absent the insecurity of disrespect; few woman are self-aware enough to realise this, even fewer dare to admit it.

Ben worked 8 hours per day, whilst Julia went to college (college here is free, so she only had to study to enter). Ben paid the neighbour to look after their child whilst he worked and she studied. As Julia had no income, she was reliant on Ben as he paid both the rent and her college expenses. When Ben was home, Julia would be studying so he’d take more care of the child than she would. Ben’s family would assist them with money and childcare when Ben’s money ran out at the end of each month.

I didn’t know what was happening because we’d lost contact at the time, otherwise I would have helped him as much as possible. This insane routine went on for about 3 years, until Julia got a proper job at the end of college. She got an internship in a prestigious consulting firm, and as she used to say “got hired straight after college because she was too good.” Once she got this job, she was making 3 times what Ben made working the same number of hours.

Ben always hated leaving his child to be taken care of by a stranger, so he spoke with Julia and they agreed it would be better if he stayed home and looked after their daughter whilst she worked. This worked to begin with, and Ben was happy. He contacted me and a few others at this time, and begun keeping in touch. He had changed a lot physically, it was shocking, he was pale, tired looking and appeared 10 years older than he was. I assumed this was because of the shitty job he had worked over the years, but nevertheless he was still noble, one of the greatest people I’ve ever known.

Without Ben, Julia would be a single mother. As a single mother, she would have very little opportunity to educate herself. Ben covering the bills whilst she studied was the fulcrum on which her study depended. Thus it stands to reason that were it not for Ben, Julia would not have had the opportunity to economically elevate herself. And so it appears by this point Ben slipped from the position of schoolboy alpha to that of beta provider, a transition so insidious I doubt he entirely realised it himself.

The moment Julia got her job at the consultancy and was no longer reliant on Ben’s income was the moment Ben became obsolescent. At this point he was neither the alpha that provided excitement, nor the beta providing resources and security – he was redundant.

Perversely, Ben gave up his academic aspirations because he was becoming a father, yet his girlfriend who was actually conceiving the child did not. To ensure a fruitful and more lasting relationship, it would have made much more sense for Ben to have gone to college whilst his
girlfriend stayed home and looked after the child, I will give you my reasoning in 4 words:

**Briffault’s Law** and **Hypergamy**

A man who arches his back to enable a woman to step onto it and climb higher, creates a woman who will look down on him once her ascension has been realised. The naive, romantic man expecting to have his loyalty honoured will extend his hand from below, clapping at the heel of her shoe in expectation she will reward his efforts – but she will not. She will kick him down, and scoff with nothing but disgust for what she views as inferior neediness.

In a miraculous state of compartmentalisation, she will forget everything the man did to assist her ascension, attributing all credit for her accomplishments to herself whilst allocating blame for her imperfections to her man. Just as a woman will only take responsibility for your victories and not your losses, she will likewise refuse to deign a man she sees as inferior with credit for her victories. This is precisely why an out of control female ego is so deleterious to a relationship, an egotistical woman believes she is above her man, and it is via this belief that her attraction wanes and ushers in an era of relational failure.

As we can see above, Ben’s lack of dominance allowed Julia’s hubris to become so strong that she began to believe in her innate superiority to Ben, illogically and deludely believing she had gotten to where she was single-handedly, rather than on the back of Ben’s selfless sacrifice.

Why does a woman suddenly betray the father of her child, the very man who worked tirelessly to give her a better life? Hypergamy, and more specifically, Briffault’s Law. Ben’s value was as a provider, the minute he enabled Julia to provide for herself more efficiently, he removed her dependency and thus became obsolete.

Had Ben been the one to go to college whilst Julia worked a job and stayed home with the child, Ben and Julia would still be together. Why? Because Ben would have the status and income of a better job that Julia would not have for herself, this in turn would allow Ben to satiate Julia’s hypergamy. By facilitating Julia’s social mobility at the expense of his own, Ben not only deprived himself economic opportunities, but has all but certainly ensured his love interest will lose interest in him.

---

Fast forward 2 years and Ben’s girlfriend Julia admitted to having an affair with her co-worker. (IM’s interjection: Who didn’t see that one coming?!) She told Ben she didn’t want to be with him anymore because she couldn’t live with herself for betraying him, after this they separated. Ben went back to his family’s house, he searched for a job, and after a few months he found one. He asked to live with me for a while because I lived closer to where he worked, naturally I obliged and we lived together for a few months.

The old “it’s not you, it’s me” rejection. As objective in tone as I endeavour to be in the penning of this literature, I’m at a point where I find it all but impossible not to laugh at how insanely ludicrous this gambit was. Here, Julia tries to save face (maintain her reputation
as a wholesome woman and mother) by feigning she is so wrought with guilt for her disloyalty that she should leave as she is unworthy of Ben.

Of course being the wrongful party, it is not down to her to decide what the consequences for her actions should be, such a decision would rightfully belong to the injured party, Ben. However, just as naturally as she took control of the relationship, she took control of the breakup.

If Ben had been on top of things, the consequences and punishment for her behaviour would not be in her hands, but in his. Of course Julia didn’t respect Ben, which is the cause of her waning attraction and thus decision to cheat to begin with. This disrespect continues as she smears herself in a veneer of inauthentic righteousness, claiming her exit to be the self-imposed punishment she deserves rather than what it really is: convenient abandonment, a branch swing.

Here we see a woman’s Machiavellianism at its finest as she superficially condemns herself, only to suffer no real punishment as she simultaneously executes her whim’s desire. From one Machiavellian to another, I must say disguising an exit strategy as an unwanted but necessary exile is something of a stroke of genius – this is definitely something that would head fuck a lesser man, and I can say with almost unshakable veracity it would have been something that wrought monumental chaos on Ben’s young and fragile mind.

Meanwhile, Julia moved to her coworker’s house and took their daughter with her. Ben can’t have guardianship of the girl because his job was unstable and he did not have a home. Julia made it difficult for him to see his daughter because seeing him reminded her of her betrayal. He lawyered up, and was permitted to see his daughter just once every 15 days.

Ben’s situation while living with me was as bad as you can imagine. He had no degree, a low paying and unstable job, little contact with his daughter, no future prospects, no wife and none of his classic charisma. He barely talked when he lived with me. I was paying for his lawyer because he wanted nothing more than to see his daughter. I offered him a psychologist, but he refused. I requested he went to college and offered to pay, but he refused me; I’m sure he was depressed. He moved out after a while and got his own shitty place as this would increase his chances of getting custody of his daughter.

Julia went insane when he did this. She tried to stop him from having contact with his daughter altogether. She poisoned his daughter and turned her against him. She filed false allegations to the police, claiming Ben had threatened her, invaded her home and tried to beat her; she made at least 30 of these complaints to the police. As a result, police enquiries begun and Ben had to get a better lawyer to defend himself from her accusations.

He had to sell his house, and once again went back to live with his family. He didn’t
want to come and live with me again because I think his pride had been hurt and he was embarrassed. After one of Julia’s false allegations, the police made Ben wear an electronic tag around his ankle. When his boss saw his ankle tag, he lost his job and his life was destroyed in every way conceivable.

I have said it before but it bears saying again, when a woman leaves she takes everything that matters to her, possessions and children alike. Ben’s attempt to dispute what Julia rightfully believed to be hers (their daughter) resulted in her upping the ante. To defend her property, she went on the offensive, and as predictable as finding sand in a desert, leveraged the authorities to successfully criminalise her opponent in the absence of any sufficient evidence of wrongdoing.

The weaponisation of the state against Ben served two primary functions, the first being to ensure his continued prohibition of access to his daughter, the second being an economic attack upon his resources, to tie him up in so much legal trouble that whatever money he did have would dry up. Julia held all the trump cards, she had a much greater income (which if you remember, is the very income Ben was crucial in her acquisition of), her partner’s income, and the default assumed innocence and benefit of the doubt that comes with being female.

This continued legal pressure complemented the mental poisoning she had conducted upon their daughter, and would ensure Ben was firmly out of the picture once and for all.

The electronic tag was the final nail in the coffin, having the unintended yet tactically pleasant effect of causing Ben to lose his job, thus financially starving him and removing his ability to fight for custody of his child. At this point, Julia won, being penniless and thus powerless to fight back, Julia would automatically retain custody.

I do not believe these were the actions of a dark triad woman, but rather that of a representatively average woman in a state of scorn. If a man loves a woman too much, fails to maintain social dominance, and underestimates her purely on the superficial pleasantry of her femininity, like Ben he can be assured swift acquaintance with a world of most heinous pain.

3.) Ben’s Fate:

Last week Ben tried to kill himself by drinking cleaning products and pills in a hotel. The lady who cleaned his room found him, and he was taken to the hospital. He had his stomach pumped, he may survive but his interior was badly damaged, he is still in the hospital.

4.) In Closing / Lessons Learned:

- You should not rely on a woman’s moral compass (haha!) or emotions to override her hypergamous programming. If Ben is an example of anything, he’s an example of man’s total disposability should he allow himself to become obsolescent emotionally or financially. As
such, a man must fight obsolescence by maintaining relevance.

- If you allow a woman’s motherly nature and good looks to conceal the great mental cruelty she is capable of, you will be in for a most revolting awakening the eve she opts to betray you.

- You may be unable to trust a woman, but you can trust her hypergamy – act accordingly.

- If you treat a woman too well, she will reward you with enough pain and betrayal to make suicide seem like a viable option – do not love too much.

- It is a man’s responsibility to ensure he maintains dominance in the relationship, he should employ dread to humble his woman and prevent an unchecked ego from encroaching on the stability of the relationship.

- Women are practical lovers by nature, whereas men are idealistic. As a man, your love should thus be better guarded, more scantily awarded and more quickly revoked. If a man loves too much and too wholly, he may find himself in a situation as dire as Ben’s.

- Never elevate a woman beyond your station, should you help a woman to improve herself, ensure it is not to the extent she surpasses you. Ben supported Julia with money for childcare, food and lodging whilst she studied. Without Ben, Julia would not be a professional earning three times what Ben does. As the late and great Patrice O’Neal would fondly assert, a king can make a woman queen, but a queen cannot make a king. Even as esteemed as the position of queen is, it’s still beneath that of king, and this dynamic plays out universally in male-female relationships.

- Being a weak and passive man is dangerous, it could cost you everything you hold dear, including your sanity. Next time you feel even a tinge of guilt for being a jerk to a woman, remember Ben. Remember how devoid of sympathy hypergamy is when a man is beneath rather than above it. If you are going to remember anything, remember this: don’t be like Ben, be anything but Ben, Ben is the ultimate example of what not to be. Ask yourself “what would Ben do?”, then do the opposite.

- Dedicating your life to making a woman happy is a recipe for disaster. Women may say in their hubris that this is a commendable and advisable thing to do, but this line of thought is folly based on nothing but feminine conceit. As such, I will forever recommend against this. Have a mission, do not base your life on a woman.

Don’t forget you can sign-up for notification of the book release here and learn about the upcoming dark triad forum here.

5.) Relevant Reading:

If you identify with Ben, or know somebody like Ben, I recommend you/they absorb the following materials in the order listed:

**No More Mr. Nice Guy**

**The 48 Laws of Power**
The Rational Male: Preventive Medicine

The Rational Male
The Choice
by IM | January 22, 2016 | Link

“The great danger for family life, in the midst of any society whose idols are pleasure, comfort and independence, lies in the fact that people close their hearts and become selfish.”
- Pope John Paul II
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1.) The Male Perspective - A Quandary:

To enjoy the decline, or to start a family, that is the question. And of course this is a problem unique to man, particularly those conscious and critical of the paradigm we occupy, for it is not a consideration that even crosses the threshold of consciousness in the archetypal drone. And yet unlike the drone who knows no quandary, who idly autopilots his way into an unremarkable five to fifteen year marriage that yields two point one children, the more enlightened man finds himself in the pivotal yet privileged position of making an informed choice about his future’s course.
Such a man is free to direct his fate absent the demands of religious indoctrination or self-serving women. After all, should one of the most important decisions of a man’s life be made by anyone other than the man himself? Does a man pressured and cajoled into starting a family do so on his own terms, or on the terms of those with a plan for him? With both reason of mind and heart of soul, the man free of spells and delusions can exercise his mental sovereignty by weighing up the risks and rewards of the lifestyle choices available to him, be that the life of a patriarch, or the life of a bachelor.

A self-respecting, free thinking and proud man should not be bullied into marrying, by his religion, his family, nor the woman manoeuvring to get a ring on her finger. A man should make this decision free of external devices and with full mental clarity, for a man should establish a serious relationship in much the way he would seek to maintain it. Therefore it stands to reason that should a man be cajoled or duped into marriage and babies, that although it may initially fill the dissimulating woman with nought but estrogenic rejoice and maternal glee, such shadowy foundations do not bode well for their relationship’s longevity.

A strong man does not respond to shame, he acknowledges it for the manipulative transgression that it is, disregards it as folly, and continues to forge his path absent the mechanisations of such duplicity.

The free man wonders which lifestyle choice would be in his best interest, and is he, no matter what he does, condemned to an unforgivable degree of heartache either way? If marriage leads to divorce, and bachelorhood leads to childless loneliness, what is a man to do? After all, a choice between misery or loneliness hardly seems like much of a choice at all.

1a.) The Patriarch’s Problem:

If a man is to marry, there is reasonable fear the fresh legal supremacy his woman enjoys will disrupt the balance of power that previously maintained their relationship. The informed man is all too aware the legal privilege of the modern wife can be used to force him into domestic servitude, and that legally speaking, the marriage hangs on a thread tied to a hovering sword that follows him wherever he goes.

From the moment he has said “I do”, a dangling sword of Damocles stalks him, scrutinising his every action, primed to strike. Too many mistakes, and the sword falls, divorce initiated, financial and emotional chaos wrought.

Now of course there is an imbecilic, ignorant argument to be made that “not all women are like that“, and indeed this is true, not all women will whimsically detonate a divorce bomb. And yet a wise man in his prudence must ask himself “is my woman like that?” and then follow up this question with “if my woman is not like that, what is the likelihood she could become like that?” to which the answer in all earnestness is a most pertinent “easily”.

If too much comfort is indulged, if too much is neglected or too much left to chance – the ruination of marital union is all but a certainty. A marriage is like a car hanging off a cliff, it requires the man driving to accelerate now and again to ensure the car does not tilt and fall into the ocean below. Just as it was in courting, in marriage the burden of performance is man’s to bear.
If man fails in his capacity as husband, or is at least perceived to have failed, he loses everything, by contrast if his woman is an abysmal failure of a wife, she gets a pay day and a fresh chance. In today’s society a woman’s marriage risk is minimal, and of course, this comes at the expense of man’s being astronomical. Women do not fear marriage because they have no reason to, men do because they have every reason to.

A marriage’s odds of success are merely improved, but still mightily unfavourable for man even when the potential wife is of considerable quality. And so although it is not impossible to become a patriarch, it is a dangerous affair regardless of who is involved. This danger is neither explicitly the man nor the woman involved’s fault, but rather, the fault of a judicial system that makes marriage so costly to men.

The success of a marriage is of course dependent solely on the parties involved, but what was once merely a monumental investment on the part of man has been perverted by the misandry of feminism into a monumental gamble. A sensible man is not a gambling man, he does not wager half his assets and his emotional stability on the odds of a woman’s whim remaining pretty. No matter who is involved, this aspect remains the same: a man has no assurances nor protection from the state, in a worst case scenario, the woman is protected and the man is left to rot. Idiots will marry blindly and gamblers will marry brazenly, whilst sensible men will abstain and the intelligent romantically delay.

As such, it is a lazy and ill-cultured wife’s prerogative to “cash in” the marriage whenever she deems fit, for if she and her husband are at odds, and it is too difficult, too cumbersome and too taxing for her to compromise, she can force the man to leave, keep the home he laboured for, and make off with much his present and future wealth.

1b.) The Bachelor’s Problem:

The opposing side of the quandary is of course the lust for family and lineage, for one to not die childless and alone. The informed man wishes not to be ravaged by the effects of feminist marriage, and yet neither does he wish to be wrecked by the absence of companionship or children in his elder years.

Where the patriarch fears divorce, the bachelor fears childlessness and loneliness. Although men are not as dependent on family as women for sanity, success and happiness, they still value family. The reluctance to marry is as such a synthesis of a distrust in women married to a contempt for a misandric legal system.

The bachelor is a man who values his freedom more than most, and thus the constraints, demands and expectations inappreciatively thrust upon him by a wife hold no appeal. This does not mean such a man would not enjoy being a father, but rather that, becoming one would mean giving up an inordinate degree of freedom to the mother.

For the bachelor, a rat pack is his family replacement. Through the formation of a rat pack, a bachelor can assuage his loneliness and need for tribe. A rat pack is a small tribe of cohabiting, single and childless men. Such an arrangement allows the group to fully indulge in the wealth and freedom of childless singledom without any of its accompanying loneliness. Nonetheless, the desire to reproduce is not so easily assuaged.
Men sensitive to, and aware of the nature of evolutionary biology feel they have a genetic imperative to reproduce, and thus the quandary presents itself: is a man to enter an institution hostile to him so that he may build a family, or is he to enjoy the full succulence of his fruits and yet leave no worldly legacy behind? The artistic man may leave his creations, the academic man his research, but what of the layman, and are achievements acceptable substitutes for legacy in the absence of reproduction?

This is a choice all informed men must make, and there is no right or wrong answer. It is my presupposition that most informed men will take full advantage of their extended fertility window and opt to settle down with a younger woman in middle-age. I believe most informed men are willing to risk divorce in their elder years if it means they got to lead a good life before becoming a father.

2.) The Female Perspective - A Prize:

Women do not face the quandary that idiotic men shirk and informed men face. Women’s marriage risk is minimal, and her fertility window is short. The nature of a woman’s limited fertility is precisely why once women have decided they want to settle down, they’re frenetic to do so. This is in stark opposition to men, who are happy to take their time and vet their mate more rigorously, particularly when dating older women, who are circumspect by merit of their availability. The quaint poetry here of course is that the older the woman, the greater her sense of urgency, and the older the man, the more reluctant his urge to commit.

Of course, fertility is only part of the equation, men hold the keys to commitment, women to sex. If commitment, attention and provision is what women value most, then men are the gatekeepers to womanly wants, and marriage is a jackpot in which she is bestowed an endless supply of these things.

If a 50-year-old woman had the charm, sex appeal and mental stability of her 20-year-old self, she’d be as leisurely and lackadaisical about the speed the relationship progresses at as the men her age are. Yet whether a woman can admit it to herself or not, she is intuitively aware that as she ages, her capacity to attract a top-tier mate decreases. A woman’s power erodes with each passing year, and thus like anybody all too aware of their depreciation, the cleverest attempt to leverage their power at its peak.

The question of marriage is always a no-brainer for a woman, as I previously stated, this quandary lies solely in the jurisdiction of man. If a woman asked me, “IM, should I get married?” I’d say “Yes, as soon as you can, and ideally no later than 26” because marriage is a really good deal for women. For women, marriage represents something it scarcely does for men – financial security and psychological sanity.

And although I do not write much in a manner conducive to a woman’s viewpoint or need, it does not mean I don’t understand the importance of marriage and babies to women. It is the life goal of all intelligent and sensible women to become wives and mothers, for scarcely can a woman achieve the happiness in business her man can, as to be a mother buzzing in the embrace of family is her highest calling. Family is where women derive emotional nourishment, for it gives them a sense of internal completion, and to honour her husband whilst suckling her young, is in and of itself, a most noble of goals.
3.) The Differences Between Men & Women In Summary:

Men get purpose from art and business, whereas women get purpose from the family, not all men and not all women, but generally speaking. This doesn’t mean men don’t want family, merely that they need it less, and a longer fertility window permits them to sensibly delay patriarchy.

Testosterone needs challenge, estrogen needs comfort. This is why women are more relationship orientated than men, for it provides the apex of their happiness, their very reason for being; to be desired, and feel integrally vital in a family rich in love and abundance.

Family is important to men, but so are aspects irrespective of it. A man’s priorities are more evenly weighted than a woman’s. If his family does not have an immediate need, rather than manufacture a need to fill (as a woman wanting to feel relevant will do) he will busy himself with commerce (resource acquisition) or art (an outlet for his masculine creativity that the wonderful yet splendid mundanity of family life does not provide).

A woman on the other hand is lost without family, no matter how much she attempts to fill the void with art, business, or pets, she cannot help but feel a most profound sense of absence strike the core of her being. Whether she knows it or not, her very fiber yearns to be a wife and mother, and no matter her opinion of that, she is powerless to escape this most visceral of compulsion.

4.) The Civilizational Perspective – A Crisis:

The salvation of a crumbling civilization, the very thing it needs to persist and replenish itself morally, intellectually and socially is the very thing that has been poisoned to disincentivise man, the family. Deprive a nation of the nuclear family, and eventually, you deprive a nation of its very existence.

And it is the poisoning of women by feminism in tandem with the hostility of family law that is encouraging men to embrace the playboy lifestyle in record numbers, in an accelerating social breakdown, cocaine, whiskey and hookers can seem like a smart choice to the live hard opportunist.

We cannot blame the men who shy away from their responsibility as men, Christians, or whatever, for not indulging the burden of patriarchy when said burden has been contorted to ensure man’s life will almost certainly become a living hell should he be anything but perfect.

When men conduct a cost-benefit analysis of the potential for marriage, and rightfully deduce the chance of success is not in their favour, and that a painless exit is all but unattainable, we cannot blame their aversion. It is easy to mount the entirety of blame on men, and accuse them of immaturity and commitment phobia. But I believe many men are, at heart, family men. They are socially smart for avoiding marriage, but evolutionarily dumb for not reproducing. Many things in life are a trade-off, and this is by far one of the greatest a
man will ever contemplate.

The more men begin to put their own interests ahead of women’s, the fewer the number of children to be born and the quicker our civilization collapses. So really, who is abetting civilization? The bachelor who hastens its decline, or the patriarch who slows it?

Is there a way to reverse rather than merely slow the decline? Yes, I believe a reversion of family law to a pre-feminist state would be a great start. If the religions can take back marriage from the clutches of feminists, the corrupt family courts and the parasitic divorce industry, then the family unit may yet be saved. But unless such judicial change takes place and gives men the peace of mind they need to functionally marry, I believe for better or worse, the decline of civilization and the bedrock it is built upon will continue at rapid pace.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

Without judicial reconciliation between what is in man’s best interests and what is in woman’s, men will continue to shun marriage and society will, family by family, shrink and deteriorate with increasing pace. Give men incentive and legal assurances, and many more will be willing to take up the mantle of responsibility in what is already a thanklessly rewarding, yet toilsome endeavour.
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1.) Introduction:

The claim that woman’s capacity for reason matches man’s is humorous, and yet be it espoused by radical feminists or well-intentioned humanists, the “equality of reason” myth persists.

It was only the other week I observed two men debating woman’s logical capacity, one man insisted women were less reasonable, whilst the other disagreed whilst conceding “all women are like that”. Yet in spite of this concession, said man went to the lengthy effort of recalling instances where he had observed women exercising reason. It was as if this particular man wasn’t quite willing to accept women are the less reasonable sex, which ironically is an unreasonable position in and of itself.

There is of course a discrepancy here, a gentle person can get angry and a frugal man can make a large purchase in the same way that an unreasonable person can demonstrate logic; a capacity for something does not equate to a propensity for it. The man who could not believe women are less reasonable is naive, the claim was not that women never make logical decisions, even a broken clock is right twice per day, the claim was that women are governed so strongly by emotion that their capacity and proclivity for reason is greatly vitiated, ergo, their reason is inferior to man’s.

Even in the comments section of this very publication, the notion women are just as logical as men is oft dispelled, for women are quick to offend and be offended by nature of their volatile reactivity. Now of course the same principle applies to man, an angry man cannot reason too well either, but here is my contention: the average woman becomes emotional far more easily than the average man, and thus whatever reason she does possess is quickly lost when even a modicum of pressure is applied.

I believe less intelligent women are simply incapable of reasoning to any elaborate degree, whilst smarter women can only do so whilst their emotions are in check, eg: they have managed to encounter something unsettling without taking offence to it. Nevertheless, I do not believe smarter women are any less emotional than their lower IQ counterparts, but only that they have better impulse control. This is why although smart women can exercise
reason, they often do so with less frequency than even the average man.

2.) My Philosophical Position:

In my analysis of women's behaviour I try to minimise my sexism as much as possible, for I do not wish my weaker expectations of women to sustain an untrue personal delusion, but rather, I wish for my view of man as the primary sex to be grounded in sound observation and empirical evidence. For example, I observe men making sounder judgements more often than women, debating better, **skewing more to the right on the IQ bell curve**, as well as making the majority of discoveries and inventions that elevated us out of the stone age.

In my inquiry into male and female differences I have discovered women's sole biological reason for existing is to reproduce and nurture the young, whilst man's is to reproduce, protect his mate (oft dying in wars in an attempt to do so) and contributing to the grand project known as civilization.

In case any wish to contest the point on civilization, do so bearing in mind you contend the point with a machine invented by a man, using a power source discovered and refined by a man, in a house designed and built by a man. As women are and have historically been preoccupied with child rearing and maintaining social ties, the elevation of the human condition can thus be credited almost solely to man.

Even since half a century of woman's emancipation, women have done little but accrue more money, in terms of major intellectual and civilizational achievements, few have achieved anything of significance. Yes, women have entered highly prestigious professions such as medicine and law, but do the majority of women make major contributions to their fields, or do they just teach and practice the work of men who came before them, rather than endeavouring to truly excel in, innovate and push the boundaries of their chosen disciplines?

In case it is not clear, my intent is to make a philosophical inquiry into man and woman's complementing nature as to allow for the refinement of my view, the goal is not to arbitrarily denounce one sex whilst heralding the other. If women are thereby described as being secondary or lesser in some form, it is because this is what reality is indicating to me, not because I want it to be so.

3.) How Female Emotivity Manifests In Disagreement:

As somebody who likes to be proven wrong by reason and empiricism (because I can learn from this) it is disappointing but nevertheless predictable the majority of comments women have made in my time writing have been subpar. If it is disjointed emotional babbling, I hastily remove it to prevent an explosion of vitriolic derailment from occurring in the comments section.

Despite my desire for an open forum and strong ethical appreciation for freedom of speech, not all speech is equal in its reason or value and thus I do not permit the dregs of human thought to manifest and take root within my comments section, censorship be damned. Offending comments are not removed on the basis of whether they agree or disagree, but rather, whether they are well argued or not. If you disagree but make a compelling argument,
I won’t remove a comment. But if the person knows no better than to try to play mind games with me on my own blog, I will vibrantly dispose of their trite.

The women who are offended and disagree with the content here oft do so on a profusely emotional basis, with typically little in the way of cogent reasoning in their attempts at refutation. I imagine due to the choice of topic and depth of language, my comments section attracts a higher IQ female than average, and even from this pool of women, 3 kinds of comment tend to be made:

– “I agree with what you’re saying because I’m a traditional woman (usually she is Christian or highly conservative) and my emotions/upbringing agree with your world view. I arrived at similar conclusions I couldn’t verbalise, reading what you’ve deduced has confirmed my intuitive beliefs and suspicions.”

– “I disagree with what you’re saying because I cling to the interpretations of reality indoctrinated into me by feminism, your criticism of women is misogynistic and what you say represents everything that is wrong with society.”

– “I disagree with what you’re saying because my solipsistic point of reference is more valid to me than your reason, I don’t fit neatly into your world view because I’m different from most women and thus your world view cannot possibly apply to most women, you must be wrong.”

A woman who makes a very well-reasoned comment is a rarity, but when it happens it is a welcomed delight regardless of whether there is consensus, nevertheless, such a thing is rare enough that one does not hold their breath waiting for it to occur.

If Illimitable Men was contingent on women making reasonable comments for sound discourse and new topic ideas, as a platform for unorthodox ideas it’d die with much haste. Now I am not going out of my way to be offensive here, but I am emphasising a point: women just aren’t all that reasonable, logic is not their primary mode of function and this shows emphatically in their contributions.

In case you think this site is read exclusively by men, you would be mistaken, I receive enough page views that if even a meagre percentage of my readers are female, that’s a good few thousand women.

4.) How Women Form Opinion:

Time and time again, be it a televised debate, a private argument or even in universities where the female IQ skews higher, I see little in the way of reason espoused by women. This does not mean women do not say correct or truthful things, but rather that they do not rationally deduce truth so much as they intuit it, intuition being the vague sensation that something feels or sounds right.

Likewise women will hold untrue and irrational beliefs because said irrational thing feels good to believe. You should begin to see a pattern emerging here, whether a woman holds an opinion based in truth or an opinion that isn’t, this opinion is almost always held because it
feels good to believe, or her peer group believes it and thus she adopts their view. Scarcely does she hold a view because she has rigorously investigated a topic with reason and come to a conclusion she believes to be true; this is not impossible but I believe it improbable.

Often when the veracity of a woman’s viewpoint is being challenged, if she believes her opinion to be true out of no more than an intuitive emotional conviction, she feels the validity of her emotion is being disputed rather than the credibility of her reasoning.

When a woman’s reasoning is disputed, she oft perceives this as the invalidation of her emotion, the deprivation of her “right to feel” because her opinion and its hasty conclusion is oft founded upon an instinct or feeling rather than a deduction or investigation.

Women have a tendency to defensively double down on their position when they feel bad, employing Machiavellian fallacy such as shaming (eg: *reductio ad absurdum*) rather than opening themselves to greater scrutiny and taking the time to step back and re-evaluate their opinion.

Essentially, women trust their emotions far too much, they act on their emotions almost entirely without restraint, and often fail to question, analyse, check and hold their emotions to account. For a woman if it feels right then it is right, a woman does not consider that perhaps although some things feel good to hear or believe, they may be logically unsound, false, outright incorrect or otherwise verifiably false.

One can make such discernments by comparing how men and women back up their arguments, for example, an incorrect man is generally able to devise a chain of reasoning to explain his thinking, whilst a woman is scarcely capable of producing any such evidence of reasoning. Why? Because even when a man is wrong he’s thinking in a way that is logically congruent even should his conclusion prove to be false. A woman on the other hand merely felt the thing to be true, so has no cogent basis for communicating why she believes her opinion to be correct, “*it just is!*”.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

It appears to me that women just hold opinions, and that they have these opinions because they feel intuitively correct, and if anybody presents them with evidence counter to what they feel to be correct, rather than accept the evidence presented to them and adopt a world view more aligned with reality, they lash out and refuse to internalise the uncomfortable truth.

Women would appear prone to correcting emotional inconsistencies rather than logical ones, that is rather, women are better adapted to coping with things than understanding them. Of course woman can understand things, it would be idiotic to claim otherwise, but an underlying ability to understand does not always translate to a desire to understand. Generally, a woman won’t even make the attempt to understand something if she believes the truthfulness pertaining to it will upset her emotionally.

In accordance with AWALT theory, I believe this to be true of all women but to differing frequencies, that is to say, some women are like this most of the time, whilst others are only
some of the time. I’m not saying men are infallible and do not do blunder or even indulge in the exact same ignorance either, I believe they do, just with less frequency, reckless abandon and fervour than do women.

I have a lot of thoughts on this topic, so in part 2 expect me to explain how conformity, shame and female evolutionary psychology almost compel women into Machiavellian/emotive responses rather than honest or logical ones. It should be noted this article has been designed as an introductory piece for a more substantive follow-up, which can be found here.
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1.) Introduction:

In part 1 I speculated on the way women reason and adopt opinions, concluding they typically form conclusions based upon intuition (“what feels right”) and mimicry (copying others) rather than deduction (analysis). I highly recommend reading part 1 before getting into the meat of this article, so if you haven’t done that, please do before proceeding.

2.) Herd Dynamics - Needily Conformist:

Women are innately Machiavellian and thus superficially concerned with “fitting in” and appearing agreeable in order to be liked enough to enjoy the fruits of the groups they occupy. There are perfectly sound evolutionary arguments for why this is so (which I will get into later) but nevertheless to begin I shall explore “the what” rather than “the why.”
A woman’s most pressing concern in spite of what she says to the contrary, is how she is perceived and how this translates into whether she holds favour or not. Being liked and desired is far more important to women than it is to men, men requiring respect rather than intimate emotion validation to function.

In fact, acceptance from others is so vitally important to women that they will change an entire wardrobe, religion, sexual or political orientation in order to be and feel accepted. If you observe rates of religious conversion (from one religion to another) you will find women will convert from one religion to another more often than men.

As we say on the red pill, fickleness is a strong trait of the feminine, and it manifests in all matters of importance from apostasy to divorce. The most common reason for religious conversion is to marry a man of another religion (and thus be accepted and enjoy his economic resources) whilst the most common reason for shedding religion is to find a socially acceptable way to be promiscuous (basically denounce one’s faith and become a fertility-negative atheist-feminist.)

In the UK this is native British women converting to Islam so they can have more victim credibility, as well as a politically correct reason to be feminine rather than feminist. It also serves as a way to increase the perception of their purity and respectability, as Muslim women are not reputed for promiscuity in the way that atheist and Christian women are. When one realises this, it becomes obvious why many western women embrace Islam so enthusiastically.

In the US this is Mormon and Christian girls becoming atheist via feminist support groups so they can whore it up in their prime without feeling retroactively impure. These women are almost always completely insane because they do not entirely remove their religious programming, yet in spite of this they conflict themselves by attempting to supplant the religion they were taught as a child with a fundamentally irreconcilable belief system. This, quite predictably, leads to a spiritually dysfunctional individual torn between two conflicting sets of dogma.

Nevertheless, they appear to be able to defy the religion they were raised with so long as they have a gaggle of feminist whores to cheer them on and validate their poor life decisions. Again, this is the female proclivity for groupthink and a desire to be validated overriding incisive and cogent analysis.

Women in and of themselves rarely stand for something because they have deduced it to be true and correct, but rather they believe what they do due to prolonged proximity. So they believe what their teacher believes, or what their mother believes, or what their friends believe, rather than really analyse something and see if it is true with their own minds.

No, it seems a woman’s instinctual need to be accepted is so strong that she indulges conformity rather than ingenuity to scratch the irksome validation itch, and that so long as this itch is scratched, she is content enough to submit to authority and not ask questions.

3.) Evolutionary Theory of Feminine Emotional Dominance:
So why are women like this? Why do women care more about approval, attention, validation, fitting-in and being liked, whereas men like these things, but do not crave nor depend on them so emphatically to healthily function? It is my speculative contention that in the ancestral environment women were dependent on the herd for their provisioning, and that a woman cast out of the herd would in all likelihood – die.

Women have less stamina, less muscle mass and are physically less capable of successfully hunting animals equipped with any sufficient defence, thus they make for poor hunters. Without a tribe’s hunters sharing their food (and weapons to hunt for food) with a group in which women were members, said women would in all likelihood subsist on berries, or perish.

Assuming this is the case, it partially explains women’s strong herd-orientation and extroversion, because ensuring acceptance by the group is what a woman’s maternal ancestors had to do to survive. I believe it is because of this that women have developed a keen social intuition based on “feelings” and “vibes” that allows them to better detect whether somebody likes or dislikes them.

If one’s survival is contingent on successfully hunting animals for nourishment (men were the hunters), it makes sense one would develop a propensity for deduction. Whereas if one’s survival is more dependent on being liked than it is being innovative, it makes sense one would develop a sensitivity toward the mood and disposition of others.

I believe female emotional dominance to be no more than a survival instinct, an instinct oft so strong it dominates the feminine consciousness utterly. It would appear woman’s instincts in tandem with menstruation thus greatly inhibit her ability to think abstractly. This idea, particularly that of hormones, perhaps gives credence to the idea that the most rational of womankind tend to be post, rather than pre-menopausal.

Seeing as a post-menopausal woman is no longer an evolutionary asset (either already having served her purpose of having children, or being a dead-end) the sensitive neuroticism typical of younger females may quell the “sensitive need to be accepted instinct” enough to permit a strong preference for rationality.

3a.) Logic vs. Emotion Based Interpretations of Good & Bad:

Good to a man is that which sounds truthful and reasonable, bad to a man is that which sounds untruthful or unreasonable. Reasonability to a man is based on plausibility and deduction, reasonability to a woman is based on whether something provides or punishes. Rather simplistically, good to a woman is what feels good, bad to a woman is what feels bad.

A woman’s definition of good and bad bear little logical merit, for a woman rather be told pretty lies that charm her than be saved from colossal error that rouses ill-feeling. In fact if you give women wisdom that will save them, should it happen to feel bad they will opt to ignore it, hate you for eliciting negative feeling, and defy you in the hasty deduction you’re an enemy.

Women are not known for living harmoniously with reality, they have a propensity to weave and work with delusion because they have a blind trust for emotion and value the
convenience that such rapidly attained certainty provides. Of course, the cunning can easily manipulate emotion for less than noble purposes, are pick-up artists not the perfect proof of this?

So if women are so impervious to logic and reasoned discussion, how do you persuade them into a particular course of action? Well of course, one must speak in the language of emotion, of which there are two primary mechanisms of influence: shame/guilt and approval/validation.

Whatever is validated, approved of and praised is that which “feels right” to women, regardless of whether the thing being promoted or praised is a toxic value of a declining and degenerate culture. Toxic here is not meant as a value judgement, but is rather meant in the sense “sure that feels good right now, indulge it, go right ahead, but in the long run you will regret what you just did, it will make you feel horrible, and you won’t be able to take it back because it’s done and all you’re left with is self-delusion in an attempt to cope.”

4.) Herd Dynamics – Shame & Approval:

A women’s beliefs and behaviours are like water, they reflect whatever the culture and immediate group around her tell her. Women do not defy, they conform. Today’s unruly women who defy men do not do so because they are mavericks of great ingenuity and critical thinking defying the natural order, no, they defy man to conform with the pervasive feminist indoctrination that dominates our public institutions, contemporary academia being of particular note.

Even traditional women, women who value house and child over corporations and careers are under constant attack from shrill feminist harpies, shamed and derided for their maternal instinct and bombarded by ideological vomit such as “you’ve internalised the patriarchy’s misogyny!”. These women are the real mavericks going against the grain, those who follow in the footsteps of their grand mothers and their mothers before them. Yet the vast majority of today’s women are neither traditional nor respectful of men, and I will tell you why.

She cannot see through the deception because she needs approval more than the truth. She defies man because she was told to, not because she can think for herself and has deduced after much philosophising that denouncing men is in her best interest (hint: it isn’t). She does not possess a reasoning faculty strong enough to ascertain whether the denunciations of man she was inculcated with are fact, the sexual sabotage of women with dried up ovaries, or nothing more than fictional lesbianic hate porn designed to convince heterosexual women to service the lusting loins of aposomatic lesbian predators.

No, she absorbs it all hook, line and sinker. High status female celebrities such as Beyonce are feminists, her college professors are feminists, her mother is probably a feminist, who after fucking around in the slutty 70’s & 80’s settled down in the 80’s or 90’s with a less than top-tier man so devoid of masculine energy that nobody in the house respects him, her mother and brother included.

So is today’s woman really a freethinker, an ideological maverick, an innovator, or inventor? Of course not, and it is the grand and perverse irony of feminism that women have become
lesser rather than greater in their misguided quest for emancipation from men.

Scarcely has any woman ever been a maverick or inventor, for they are the conformists, even the bulk of them vote for socialists, open your eyes! This is why matters of ingenuity have always been the almost sole purview of man, being that the faculty of reason comes more easily to man, and that the primitive instincts we know as emotion do not compel man quite so emphatically as they do women. Man is not infallible, no, but he is far less sensitive to the vast array of conceivable emotional manipulations one can be targeted by.

There’s a reason marketers target women and not men, they’re more profitable because despite their Machiavellianism, their lack of reason and need for approval makes them more manipulable. Women’s self-conscious preoccupation with appearing “clean” and “pure” is an instinctual need not apparent in men. This is perhaps not rooted solely in evolutionary psychology, but could be an intuitive observation of social market value, the inarticulate emotional knowledge that a woman’s power is eroded rather than enhanced by promiscuity and ageing.

5.) On Solipsism:

The reason feminism even exists is because men possess the capacity to emphasise with the female viewpoint at the sacrifice of their own, did feminism not come to power by appealing to the sympathies of reasonable and loving men rather than through a bloody coup? Well of course, for women could never win a direct military conflict against the sex evolved for combat.

Of course being a man my viewpoint is biased, and it would be easy to egotistically dismiss my philosophising on the basis of said fallibility, however I believe as imperfect as my views are, that among my speculation there is a spirit of truth to be gleaned. For as biased as man can be, a logician such as I can at least abstract into the female viewpoint in an attempt to comprehend what they cannot even articulate.

For those unfamiliar with what solipsism is, explained in the simplest way it’s women’s tendency to see things solely from a personal/feminine viewpoint, and an inability to detach and abstractly comprehend something they haven’t personally felt or experienced. As such, they struggle to understand things that run contrary to their personal experience.

The capacity for feminism to understand the plight of men is impossible, for gynocentrism is inherently devoid of abstraction by merit of its collective solipsism. Feminism is thus no more than a resoundingly negative variant of female solipsism repackaged at the ideological level.

Realise a woman’s solipsism is why she makes no sense in saying whatever the fuck it is she wants when you ask her, and why you always have to make the decisions. Said solipsism manifests politically on the macro scale, as even feminists are oft unable to interpret their monotheistic dogma in the same way. This is the problem with feelings and emotions you see, they are not objective, verifiable or empirical, everyone just sort of “does feminism” in whatever way “feels right” to them.

Because women have different degrees of sentimentality attached to situations which
produce a specific emotion, when a question is asked that rouses said emotion, they all have a different answer. And this lack of consistency only further serves to reduce the credibility of women, reinforcing the belief that women are less logical. Weak logic means no corroboration meaning no credibility, I think the only group taken less seriously than women are feminists, for at least some women make an effort to combat their solipsistic disposition, whereas feminists are entirely reliant on the wishy-washy lunacy of emotive subjectivity in order to prop up their narrative.

Feminism embodies the very worst of female instinct and is an abhorrent weaponisation of all the feminine’s worst qualities, I believe with the right cultivation a woman can be far more enlightened than a feminist, albeit, not more so than an erudite man.

Women think they want to lead but hate when they have to, they fear being powerless but cannot handle power. Women are man’s burden, a constant storm that needs grounding. Her infantile narcissistic need to be treated with the respect of a man, yet simultaneous need to be led means she’s conflicted in “what she wants”, this swirling chaos of self-centred indecisive confusion embodying the very spirit indicative of the female mind – solipsism.

6.) Distinguishing Logical Ability From Logical Propensity:

A capacity for logic and being logical are distinct. Men have a capacity for emotion, but because most men prefer to (and often do) act on reason instead of emotion, they are considered logical, not emotional.

To be emotional 10% of the time is not to be an emotional person, it is to be a person who is capable of emotion that is rational the majority of the time. Just because men are more rational, does not mean they are robots incapable of emotion. People see a very black/white pluralism toward emotion and logic, that a logical person is never emotional (men) and that an emotional person is never logical (women).

Most men will act upon logic more often than women, so men as a group are seen as logical. For women, it’s the opposite, a capacity for logic but with a preference for emotion, and hence a propensity to act upon emotional volition. Women will act on emotion more often than men, so women as a group are seen as emotional. Maxims don’t need to be “perfectly true” to be correct, they need only be “accurate most of the time.”

One need not be right all the time, for it is wiser to operate from generalisations that lead one to be right most of the time than it is to reject said generalisation on the basis it is wrong some of the time. The prior believes in an imperfect statement on the basis it is usually right, the latter rejects an imperfect statement on the basis it is fallible. Rejecting the veracity of something on the basis it is fallible and not correct 100% of the time has to be one of the grandest forms of ignorance conceivable, yet sadly it is fairly common.

Women have a capacity for logic, but because most of the time they cannot segregate emotion from logic, their capacity for logic does not equate to possession of a logical nature. A person that possess logic who is ill-equipped to segregate it from emotion is not as logical as someone who possess the same logic but can better segregate it from their
emotion.

Having a capacity for something does not make you the thing you can sometimes do, to be characterised as something, that part of yourself has to be dominant, a capacity preferred and used often. On the logic-emotion spectrum, you have to err more towards logic than you do emotion to be considered logical, the fact you possess an ability to think logically doesn’t matter if you’re oft overridden by the visceral impulses we know as emotion.

Don’t cling to the idea that just because a woman can have a logical thought, that she is a logical being ruled by logic, this is a false equivalency. If women were logical rather than emotional beings, it would be glaringly obvious, so obvious this essay would probably not exist. Hence pointing to women’s capacity for logic and then saying they are just as logical as men is a preposterous if not idealistic notion that cherry picks only what it wants to see.

7.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

The rationalisation hamster may be good at speaking the language of logic, for the well-trained hamster is an eloquent sophist. It is believed you should “ignore what they say and watch what they do” because women, particularly the higher IQ ones, are great at speaking the language of logic without actually operating by it. They can adorn it, wear its clothes, and go into verbal combat waving its flag all without actually changing their innate decision-making processes.

They’ll act emotively, and then rationalise the reason for behaving emotionally with something that is plausible yet factually false. Some women are so proficient in doublethink (is this intelligence or a lack of self-awareness? I’m undecided) that they actually believe they’re logical because they deludedly believe their own rationalisations!

Women use logic to rationalise emotional decisions, and occasionally they make choices based on logic, but their preference and mechanism for action is overwhelmingly emotional in nature. To believe otherwise is not merely naive, but resoundingly idiotic.
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1.) Introduction – Defining A Negotiation:

Negotiation is a Machiavellian ordeal and yet many devoid of honed Machiavellian ability are required to engage in it, for the avoidance of negotiation is untenable in a world of finite resources and competing wills. Sure, one could go out of their way to avoid negotiations and survive, but survive is about all they’d manage as inept negotiation is a trait of the weak, not the powerful.

What is the nature of a negotiation? A negotiation is effectively a **guid pro quo** trade discussion where two or more parties dispute terms until each is satisfied with the position of the other. Anybody with even rudimentary Law study under their belt knows this comprises the essence of a contract.
The objective of any contract is to come to a deal, a deal is a mutually beneficial arrangement consciously enacted within an agreed upon framework. Most deals at the individual rather than corporate level occur between two people, when larger organisations are involved the number of people party to the deal expectedly increases.

A successful deal in the truest sense of the word is no less than two or more distinct parties (be they people representing themselves or organisations) who believe they’re getting what they want on terms deemed equitable rather than injurious.

This is in contrast to a heavily biased deal (better characterised as blackmail, although often euphemised as a “deal”) which is an agreement that takes place under the enforcement of economic duress, leverage or aggressive inequitable ironclad legal bullying. So what is Machiavellian negotiation? It’s the optimum way to obtain the most resources and best conditions with as little capital, risk and responsibility as possible.

2.) Perceptions In Negotiation – Friend or Foe?:

Negotiation is fundamentally a dispute of disparate desires dictated by the perception of what constitutes fairness. Each party attempts to manage the perceptions of the other in order to come to an agreement both deem sufficiently equitable. Although in negotiation it is the acquisition of specific objectives that underpins the reason for negotiation, perception is equally important in affecting what kind of deal is struck, or if one is even struck at all.

For example say you have two men, one’s named Harry and the other’s called Bill. Harry grows an exotic grape that only he can source in the continent, his client Bill has no commodity, but has deep pockets. Money is not as scarce as Harry’s grapes, assuming enough wineries and consumers value his grapes. This is a seller’s market, so Harry can charge whatever he likes as long as his price to the customer works out cheaper than importation of the grape via freight from overseas.

When Harry goes into a negotiation, he knows his buyer Bill needs his grapes more than he needs Bill’s money, Bill is not his only client, and clients prefer local produce rather than waiting for things to arrive on a plane which may be damaged in transit. Harry knows if the other person cannot provide a sufficient sum of money or otherwise incentivise him, that failing to come to a deal with Bill would not harm him. In a seller’s market, the pool of customers (buyers) demanding a specific quality is plentiful, whilst the pool of sellers able to provide said quality is minimal.

Conversely in a buyer’s market, Harry’s produce would not be worth much because he either has so many competitors he has to sell cheaply and operate at a loss (market saturation), or simply nobody is interested in what Harry’s selling and thus there’s no viable business operation to be had.

In our fictional scenario here, we’re in a seller’s market. This means Harry has tighter control over his pricing and can force the consumer to cough up higher sums without damaging his business’ profitability. Harry used to sell a vine of grapes for £0.90 each to his customers, but since the local competition went out of business he hiked his prices to £1.80, selling a marginally lower volume than he used to at a more profitable operating cost.
In simpler language: Harry sells less quantity but makes more money because his price per unit has increased enough to offset the reduction in sales volume the price hike caused. If Harry’s sales dropped to the point where the price per unit did not offset the reduction in volume, he’d have to decrease his prices in order to increase volume to a profitable margin. In this scenario, Harry would be experimenting with price points in order to find “the profitable zone”, the perfect price where the highest price per unit is found, the precipice on which a subsequent price increase results in overpricing as indicated by a sharp decline in sales.

Harry finds his perfect price, and thus begins to make so much extra money that he can afford to keep his “grape bubble” inflated whilst still giving some of his favourite customers the old £0.90 rate. Being in a strong position, Harry is able to economically implement his prejudice into his pricing system. Friends and old clients he has favourable relationships with get the £0.90 rate, strangers get the £1.80 rate, and he is able to outright refuse to sell to those he doesn’t like.

In a seller’s market the buyer has the privilege of buying, the seller is not privileged to sell because demand for the seller’s goods are high. Simplistically, in a seller’s market the seller is the most valuable party, in a buyer’s market the buyer is most valuable.

Bill on the other hand is a winemaker and desperately needs Harry’s rare locally sourced organic grapes to help him make a very expensive wine. Bill was a charming Machiavellian and befriended Harry awhile back by taking him out to dinner and paying for his food, gaining favour with Harry whilst he was satiated by steak and slightly inebriated on the very wine Bill needed Harry to source grapes for. Bill was clever, figuratively as well as literally giving Harry a taste of the business he was in.

As they got along so well, Harry begun selling Bill grapes at the “friend rate” of £0.90 per vine, increasing the profitability of Bill’s winery. Bill was satisfied with himself that all those restaurant dinners and well-timed jokes had paid off. However, disaster struck. One time Harry brought his daughter along to the restaurant not realising Bill was a sexually predacious yet shredded 45-year-old pick-up artist. Harry’s daughter full of daddy issues because he’s a workaholic, later matches with Bill on Tinder. From here she begins enthusiastically fucking Daddy’s “totally hot and rich” business associate as a textbook act of sordid female rebellion.

Eventually she falls for Bill, but because he failed to commit to her, she in her inevitable upset tells her father of their liaisons. Upon discovery of Bill’s adultery with his daughter, Harry refuses to continue selling Bill the grapes he sorely needs for his company’s leading product. Bill desperate for the grapes then offers Harry £10.00 per vine, far above the inflated market value Harry usually commands, yet Harry refuses to accept. Why? Because at this point Harry is more interested in hurting Bill than in making a profit from him. The perception of the other party has become so negative that a want for destruction has become greater than a love of profit.

Moral of the story: It doesn’t matter if two people want something from one another if either party disdains the other too greatly. In the absence of respect, a desperate party accepts extremely inequitable terms, or it’s simply impossible to reach consensus. In the presence of
hatred or a need for revenge, otherwise logical and desirable outcomes are rejected in favour of schadenfreude. Secondary lesson: do not shit where you eat, girls related to high-value business interests aren’t worth the hassle they can cause, income is more important than sex.

3.) The Narcissism of Negotiation:

Feelings of entitlement heavily influence the outcome of a negotiation, a person with a strong sense of pride or entitlement will get as much as, or more than they’re worth; whilst a person with low self-esteem (and thus sense of entitlement) will get as much as, or less than they’re worth.

People with low self-esteem are exploited by people with high-esteem for profit, those with high self-esteem are so compelling in their conviction to those with low self-esteem, that in awe of the egotist’s confidence the one with low self-esteem will pay extra, do more work, or generally agree to a predacious deal.

In a self-perpetuating feedback cycle, this reaffirms to the narcissist they’re worth more than they really are because they’re good at making weak people agree to bad deals, and this reaffirms to the unconfident that they aren’t worth much because they’re not very good at getting what they deserve. The ancient Chinese philosopher Confucius said “Whether you think you can or think you can’t, you’re right.”

Confucius was right. If you don’t value yourself or believe you deserve adequate compensation for your work, you will be a poor negotiator who is not adequately compensated. In feeling this way you unwittingly and disadvantageously assign higher value to the other party, causing you to give them more than they deserve, or to accept less than you deserve.

Somebody who value themselves excessively (a grandiose narcissist) is the opposite, they assign less value to the other party by actively devaluing them, and if said person accepts this devaluation the narcissist exploits this weakness and leverages it for everything it’s worth. The highly narcissistic are as such prone to giving people less than they deserve, because their intrinsic devaluation of others means they’re always undervaluing people, making them great hagglers.

Often a successful businessman is simply a person with high self-esteem that is skilled at finding people with money and low self-esteem, insecurity being an incredibly profitable emotion.

An example of such a relationship would be a ripped personal trainer on steroids in San Francisco targeting obese silicon valley programmers and basement dwelling World of Warcraft players. All the trainer needs to do is convince a loser to sign a contract to get his juicy commission.

He knows the loser is throwing their money away because they won’t even turn up to workout, but as far as he’s concerned if these people want to bootstrap his lifestyle by subsidising his gym and increasing his income, that’s their loss and his gain, he feels no guilt
at all. He will gravitate between this demographic and any other low self-esteem and lazy demography, such as the over 50’s cat lady who wishes to feel like she’s doing something about her weight without actually putting the effort in.

When you have two people with low self-perceived value negotiating, the people will get what they’re worth and negotiations won’t last long. When you have two people with high self-perceived value negotiating, the people will get what they’re worth but negotiations will be more aggressive, there will be more shit testing (eg: narcissistic dismissals, negs and pressure flips) and things will last a little longer.

Whoever fails a shit test loses credibility, and this is leveraged by the winning party for better terms. If nobody fails a shit test then narcissistic party A has won the respect of narcissistic party B, and party B will feel like party A is worthy of what he actually deserves, rather than the lesser amount he normally assigns through his default devaluations.

Know the other person’s options, do they have alternatives, are they dependent on you? If they have no alternatives, you can ask for whatever you want and extract as much as they can feasibly afford. If they do have alternatives, you can tell them the alternatives are inferior and play to their ego by telling them if an inferior service is what they’re after, they can save a buck and visit your competitor!

By referring them to the competitor you subtextually communicate you’re in a seller’s market, demonstrating your elite status and lack of neediness in one fell swoop. This lets them know you’re not dependent on their custom and thus dispels the common “entitled customer mindset”, in turn increasing their likelihood to purchase at the highest possible price point on the terms most agreeable to yourself.

This reverse psychology will likewise lightly offend anybody who considers their need or problem serious, and thus is likely to convince them it worth paying more to get a quality of service equal to the seriousness of their problem, after all, big problems require elite solutions.

4.) The Discount Generosity Gambit – Retention, “Fairness” & Discount:

If they pay up but cannot afford your services in the future, offer a tactical discount in an attempt to retain their business (say 10%, no more than 20%). Do not offer a steep discount as it damages the perception you provide an elite service, elite services are not cheap services, everybody innately knows this. In fact, people often become suspicious of self-touting elite brands that go on sale, as it harms the perception of their value to the point people believe the sale items are bogus, inauthentic or otherwise somehow diminished in quality.

If you offer the correct discount, you may not only retain the custom of your client as your service is now within budget, but they’ll feel special they get a discounted rate and perceive it to be charity because you usually charge so much. Your tactical generosity plays on their ego, and increases their affinity for you.

If you are in a position to set your own rates, this is of course nonsense as your rate is what
you’re willing to accept intersected with what the market is willing to pay, there is no “rate set in stone” because you pull the figure out of your ass after morning coffee. When one sets their own rate, they do so by being in a seller’s market (or at least leading the buyer to believe it’s a seller market), getting as much as they can via the exploitation of said mechanism.

When a customer is about to walk (honestly or as a bluff) the idea is to re-entice them into continuing their business with you for the new maximum amount they’re comfortable with. You deploy the discount gambit to feed their ego, feeling warm, fuzzy and proud of themselves, they like you more and keep doing business at the newer marginally reduced rate. This makes sense to a seller in a buyer’s market, as new buyers are difficult to acquire and the profit sacrificed from the loss of a customer is greater than the amount lost from lowering price.

A customer who keeps trying to get discounts is an administrative pest, only offer the discount if you’re in a buyer’s market, if you’re in a seller’s market you can easily replace the customer and thus there’s little point in trying to retain them.

5.) Opening Offers:

If they make the first offer, do not try to renegotiate for the highest price possible if they open with an amount you are happy to receive. Likewise if the other party is incredibly narcissistic, this is a risky endeavour that can easily backfire. The reason for this is if you try to get more, they may feel you are being unreasonable, get outraged you are trying to rip them off and then lower their initial opening offer, or even refuse to do business with you. This is of course not a probable outcome when dealing with the low self-esteem, but should be considered when dealing with the powerful.

If you don’t particularly covet their opening offer or are highly confident you can get more, you should haggle. If you’re happy with their offer, indulging greed risks a devaluation of the opening offer making it is wiser to accept rather than haggle. People who are serious about wanting your product or service will make a strong opening offer, the exact kind of customer you don’t want is the one who tries to nickel and dime you, as one must consider the opportunity cost incurred from all the administrative back and forth.

Exemption: if the person you’re dealing with is very powerful, agree to do something for free and be owed a favour (be overt you’d prefer a favour later, no covert contracts). If they refuse to owe you a favour, give it to them cheaply so you can leverage your generosity later on. When dealing with the powerful, it is better to be paid in favour rather than money, as their favour is more effective at getting you out of a tight spot than their money. You can get money from anybody, but it’s not everyday you have the opportunity to gain favour from the powerful. Favour with the powerful always trumps money as even losers have money, even if it’s not much, they still have some!

A lot of people will want you to make the first offer because they want to see how much you value your services, this is basically a probe to see how narcissistic you are and how much they can lower your price. To get the maximum amount, you must always demonstrate you value yourself highly. Start with a very high price and they will offer you the highest price
they are willing to pay.

Generally speaking, people like to offer you 50-75% of what you asked for to feel like they got a bargain, so you can pre-empt this expectation with your opening offer. Ask for 3 times what you value yourself, if you value yourself at $50 an hour/or product ask for $150. Then if they offer half at $75 an hour you got 50% more than what you value you or your product at. If they offer $100, you got 100% more than you value you or your product at.

Of course the other party don’t know what you really value yourself at, this is what they’re trying to ascertain whilst refusing to make an offer until you state an opening figure. When you are asked to “go first”, the other is trying to undercut you, overvaluing yourself makes you immune to this as it conceals this crucial information, and overwhelmed by the exorbitant amount you quote, they offer the most they can afford, which is a typically generous yet far lower sum than the astronomical figure you quoted.

6.) General Maxims:

If you are surprised someone has made you a really great offer, do not let on. Hide your excitement, act entitled, even slightly offended to see if you cannot squeeze the other party for a little more. Should faux offence not gain you more, drop it and retain a decorum of entitled agreement, eg: “Yes, I find this agreeable” sounds far more composed than “that’s so awesome!” Adopt the decorum of the prior rather than the latter.

If you feel you are taking more than you deserve, do not let on. Hide your guilt, remain stern, but be friendly. Remember Confucius, those who think they can’t, can’t, meaning those who think they do not deserve – don’t.

7.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

As you have probably intuited in your reading, buyer/seller marketing principles can be transferred to dating. Always remember negotiating is psychological, the rates, the time allotted, whether a deal is made, and whether it will be repeat or one-off is almost entirely psychological. There are no firm rules, everything is open to the manipulation of perception in the quest to get the most favourable terms. Work out if you’re at an advantage or not by deducing if you’re in a buyer’s or seller’s market, then calculate the external party’s degree of narcissism and negotiate accordingly.
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1.) Introduction – Narcissistic Personality Disorder:

All people with narcissistic personality disorder are narcissists, but not all narcissists have a personality disorder. A healthy dose of narcissism is a performance-enhancer, for it improves one’s effectiveness by amplifying their self-love, confidence and boldness. However, it seems to be a common misconception that the promotion of narcissism is tantamount to the promotion of narcissistic personality disorder. This is false, and nought but an ignorant layman’s understanding of narcissism fallaciously manifesting as a false equivalence.

Narcissistic personality disorder is a coping mechanism developed in childhood to deal with neglect, rejection or cruelty (eg: bullying) from one’s parents. Narcissistic personality disorder is superlative to the nth degree, the most extreme version of narcissism, rather than the healthy self-assured confidence that comes as a by-product of talent and achievement.
Narcissistic personality disorder (NPD) is a developmental disorder ingrained into a child by the inability of a parent to validate them, or reward their accomplishments. Everything the child does is scrutinised and rejected, the child is constantly berated and denied their basic need for love.

The child’s accomplishments are typically deemed insufficient, for example if the child achieves a perfect score on an exam or comes first place in a race, this perfection is apathetically expected rather than emotionally rewarded. In a narcopath’s childhood achievement was met by indifference, with anything other than exceptionalism being seized by the parent as an opportunity to degrade them. The parental approval and joy quintessential to achievement was absent, whilst degradation and indifference reigned supreme – this is the crucible in which a narcopath is forged.

This is further exacerbated when the narcopath has a sibling who is incessantly rewarded whilst they are incessantly punished, this is narcopathy on the part of the parent exercising this behaviour, an NPD strategy known as triangulation.

What sets the NPD apart from the narcissist is that the rejection caused by the parent at a young age leaves them incapable of forming pair-bonds, this inability to pair-bond from there on becomes an empathy disorder dressed in ego. The narcopath is effectively a synthetic psychopath, narcopathy is always socialised. Had their parents been good people, they would not have developed an empathy disorder, which is really no more than a coping mechanism developed by a helpless creature that the needs the resources of an abusive one.

2.) Rational Narcissism aka Achievement-Based Narcissism:

Achievement-based narcissism is distinct from narcissistic personality disorder in much the way stoicism is distinct from psychopathy. Although a stoic and a psychopath may both seem cold, one can pair bond and the other cannot. Likewise despite the NPD and narcissist demonstrating a penchant for egotism, one can pair bond whilst the other cannot.

Successful people with the self-esteem that comes with it, are to one degree or another, narcissistic. And it is precisely this which distinguishes them from NPDs, they are narcissistic by degree - not in totality. If one attained a ridiculous amount of success, it is feasible they could become as narcissistic as the NPD – but this is uncommon and thus unrepresentative of achievement-based narcissism.

Unlike the NPD, your typical narcissist does not deify themselves as infallible, indubitable or indissoluble, but rather, they see themselves as above average, superior. And if they earn more than most people, are smarter than most people, and are in better health than most people, is this not true? Narcissism and elitism go hand in hand, for narcissism is a natural byproduct of success.

Much unlike the NPD, the successful are narcissistic because they have worked intelligently, and by the trial of their mettle they have achieved. NPDs are delusional individuals who deified themselves to cope with the onslaught of emotional abuse they received from their parents in childhood. Already now you should be beginning to understand the different shades of narcissism; you have the tangibly successful who are narcissistic by recognition of
their superiority, and the delusionally damaged who have lived in a self-inculcated fantasy since youth.

Achievement-based narcissism is healthy and comes from a positive place, whilst narcissistic personality disorder is a coping mechanism born from a negative place. Unlike the achievement-based narcissist, the NPD is oft sadistic. The power that comes from sadistic exploitation is quick and dirty junk food for the insatiable vacuum that represents the NPD’s horrible childhood.

People like to use the term “narcissist” as a throwaway insult, but know this – not all narcissism is equal. Some is healthy, born of superior performance and achievement, the other is dysfunctional, born of a terrible and abusive childhood. To combine these distinctions under one umbrella would be to disingenuously misrepresent the spectrum of narcissism, and anybody interested in narcissism would as such do well to ingrain this distinction into their cranium.

3.) The Birth of The Narcopath:

The NPD constructs a false sense of self to counteract the heartbreaking treatment they received from their parent. In truth the NPD is a victim, but a dangerous one at that. It is unwise to show the NPD the pity and sympathy customarily doted to a victim, for the NPD will see this as weakness and exploit it duly.

The vacuum left by unbetrothed love in the NPD’s formative years is insatiable and unfillable. NPDs tend to be the offspring of other NPDs, or individuals with affective empathy disorders (of which there is a numerous and colourful range of diagnoses). Any love or sympathy the NPD receives as an adult serves merely as a form of ego validation, it is not sentimentally received or appreciated in the way the empath intended.

An NPD is a narcopath (a comorbid psychopathic grandiose narcissist), narcopathes do not feel empathy. A narcissist on the other hand merely has an elevated sense of self, a lack of humility if you will, but this alone does not signify an inability to sympathise. I refer to NPDs as narcopathes, for the absence of empathy customary to the NPD is tantamount to psychopathy, albeit, an egotistical variation on the phenomenon. All narcopathes are egotists, but not all psychopathes are egotists.

The narcopath cannot love for they bare no sentimental appreciation for vulnerability, perceiving only weakness in that which they cannot emote. Like a destructive child they cannot enjoy the flutter of a butterfly, but rather, the butterfly drawing people’s attention away from them would cause anger, compelling them to crush it.

And yet if you were to tell the narcopath they could not love, you would be met by nothing but narcissistic injury. Indignance, histrionics, victim playing and gaslighting, a grand display of anger where they highlight their best points whilst contrasting them with your worst. The narcopath is not above bringing out their highlight reel with your skeleton closet, making comparisons, and then trying to sell this as a fair and accurate interpretation of reality.

The narcopath would deny their inability to love, because to tell a narcopath they are
incapable of something is to harm the very pride they subsist on. Narcopaths are broken people due to the mental abuse inflicted on them by their parent(s), yet at the same time they are dangerous people – I will repeat myself for clarity’s sake: narcopaths do not sentimentally appreciate sympathy, they desire it only so they can use it as a way to malignantly exploit the sucker naive enough to care.

4.) Dealing With A Narcopath:

Narcopaths are very unemotional and unconcerned with others, their emotional capacity is restricted to a solipsistic viewpoint.

For example, they do not feel concern for others – but rather they become bothered if someone useful to them is unavailable. To be concerned would be to emotionally care for the missing person, to be bothered is to be annoyed by the absence of a person. This is a subtle yet distinct variation, and people uneducated in these matters oft mistake this bothersomeness for caring, which the narcopath predictably exploits in their feeble attempt to appear empathic. Narcopaths are emotional people, but only when they are bothered by something, not when you are.

Typically the narcopath is angry, or feeding their narcissistic supply by ridiculing people. Narcopaths can be funny people, and this makes sense in so much as humour is based upon the ridicule and degradation of an out-group in order to amuse an audience. You will see here on a non-sexual level that this penchant for schadenfreude is a form of soft-sadism (and is typically, likewise mirrored in the bedroom).

Ridicule makes the narcopath feel superior to the out-group whilst feeding them the validation of the in-group, further bolstering feelings of superiority. Because the narcopath is conflict-seeking rather than conflict averse, they are destructive personalities that feed on the chaos and misery of others, again a manifestation of their latent sadism.

Realise when dealing with a narcopath that everything goes through a filter of ego – this is both the narcopath’s greatest strength and weakness – a double-edged sword if you will. The narcopath is psychologically high in attack, but low in defence. Unlike a stoic who is immovable, the narcopath is easily moved – although they will typically attempt to shut you down before you can damage them too much.

If you were to observe a battlefield with a narcopathic combatant, you would see their strategy is to achieve a quick victory by overwhelming their adversary. By merit of their strong attack they often manage this, although it should be noted this strategy is as much a form of defence as it is an attack. If you mirror the narcopath’s strategy by overwhelming them, they will lose all sense of sanity and allow themselves to be carried off by childish rage rather than maintain the elitist decorum typical of a well-fed narcopath.

Unlike psychopaths, narcopaths excel at destroying but are inept at enduring, such is their achille’s heel – their susceptibility to narcissistic injury. The propensity for lèse-majesté in the narcopath is pronounced and profound. Narcopaths do not respond to reason once the ego fires up, although they have no qualms with exploiting yours.
The best way to deal with a narcopath in their manic phase is to insult and undermine them, amplify their thirst for conflict, question their credibility, mock them and generally degrade their very essence. Although this sounds extreme, literally nothing else will allow you to permeate the raw power of their childish stubbornness.

To get through to them you must resort to narcissistically injuring them. They won’t like you for this, but they probably don’t really like you anyway – so who cares? And although they may not like you for this, they will respect it, and perversely what a narcopath can respect, they can like. If you cannot offend a narcopath, they cannot respect you. This is extreme yet necessary, as at their core these individuals are bullies, and the only way to win the respect of a bully is to degrade them by showing them you’re better at being them than they are.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

Curious to see how narcissistic you are? You can take this test to get a rough idea. A high narcissism score on this test is not indicative of narcopathy, merely narcissism, but a high narcissism score combined with a high psychopathy score is. This test does not seek to measure sadism, but if you get a high psychopathy and narcissism score, I can infer with 99% confidence that due to comorbidity you are sadistic.

Do you wish to talk with me and my humble followers on this topic in a private and exclusive space? There are currently 4 slots remaining for entry into the dark triad forum. More slots will be added in time, but if you subscribe after the 29th you will have to wait until early April to get access – access is not instant, but granted between the 3rd and the 6th of each month.
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1.) Introduction:

When I wrote monk mode, my intent was to communicate on a practical level to losers “how to stop being a loser”. I used to be a loser, I personally devised and tested monk mode, and it helped me massively, so I shared my findings with others.
Now there is some controversy surrounding monk mode, mainly concerning “when one should use monk mode” and “if monk mode is being used by introverts as an excuse not to socialise”. Although I will address these questions and concerns eventually, they fall outside the purview of this article.

If you are broke and have no friends, your first port of call is not to make friends. It’s to get enough to discipline to master a hobby, and then flip this skill into making some money – this is monk mode. You can’t focus on others when you need to build yourself up from nothing. People who aren’t losers and rely on networking to do business don’t understand this, but monk mode was never written with them in mind – it was written for losers.

**If you lack discipline, don’t have much going for yourself, and are distracted by nonsense social activities rather than building yourself, I highly recommend monk mode.**

That being said, monk mode is not for everyone. Monk mode is life support for losers who need to prevent themselves from drowning in an abyss devoid of discipline, and dominated by depression. Monk mode is a route out of the gutters of hell, a long and winding path of redemption for the mediocre who’ve decided enough is enough.

So what’s the next step after Monk Mode? Let’s assume you have used monk mode, are no longer a complete loser, but still aren’t killing it in life. What key ingredient are you missing, what do you need to give you that extra edge? You need a champion’s mentality – this article will tell you how to get one, as well as demonstrate its attitude.

Champion mentality is about optimising your life and relationships so that you continuously win, improve and raise your value. Inevitably by merit of accomplishment and the achievement-based narcissism that accompanies it, such a lifestyle leads to a higher quality of life spiritually, socially and financially.

2.) Monk Mode Recap:

People who create are more interesting than people who don’t because they apply their essence to an art form. In doing this they add value to themselves, they are more developed human-beings and thus more interesting.

People who do nothing but consume are basic people who have no real value, most of their interests (and thus what they talk about) is vicarious and based on the achievement of others. Losers live through other people, winners live through themselves; losers invest in nothing, winners don’t stop investing. Winners invest in themselves before investing in others, losers are interested in everything, but have no actual value to invest.

So how does a loser stop losing? Minimise hobbies that are consumptive and acquire hobbies that are productive. It’s really that simple. Switch Netflix for reading, writing or coding. I’m not going to babysit you with examples and brainstorm a 100 different hobbies that are productive so you can lazily pick one you like the sound of. Part of being a winner is doing the mental legwork. However, if you’re ailed by the creative capacity of a damp towel, I will note some generalised examples to get you started: martial arts, musical instruments and
languages.

Assess your life by looking at the activities you engage in. Now categorise which activities create value, and which feel good but don’t really enhance your value as a person. Now cut out/reduce the things in the consumption category, and replace these activities with those that build value.

3.) Consume Less, Produce More:

It’s funny average people blame the rich for their problems instead of becoming more like them – this is why they keep losing.

If you are poor and have no marketable skills or value, rather than waste time whining online about how 1%ers need taxing more to subsidise your pathetic existence, how do you take responsibility for yourself and become more like them? It’s incredibly simple:

**Get a hobby, get good at it, monetise it, and as it scales up you will find yourself succeeding. All of a sudden you’re the winner who doesn’t want to be taxed more, rather than the loser expecting the state to steal from the rich for you.**

If you don’t have your own business, you don’t have as much freedom as somebody who does. You probably don’t enjoy what you do either. Some people enjoy their jobs, but this is besides the point. You don’t get rich on a salary, you get rich by having a successful business idea and scaling it up. It’s not the only way to get rich, but it’s the most common way.

Developing a hobby for X number of years, and then monetising it into a product or service once you’re competent is how businesses are built and rat races are escaped.

If you don’t spend your spare time developing a skill that you can master enough to monetise, you won’t start a business and thus you’ll always be massaging another man’s balls for a living.

Taking a monthly salary from another man is horrible. When you make another man rich, you are undervalued and only one person pays you. When you make yourself rich, you get what you’re worth and hundreds or even thousands of people are paying you by buying your product or service. If you are in the prior category you’re a slave, if you’re in the latter you’re a free man.

Common sense isn’t common because average people never got the memo. When you read the words on this page, intuitively it will sound like common sense that should go without saying. I should be preaching to the choir and in doing so stating the obvious and making myself look like a resounding idiot.

**And yet, if people actually applied this wisdom, we’d have more winners than losers in this life. Most people you pass on a day-to-day basis are losers. They are everywhere, it’s an epidemic!**

What do you think they do when they get home? Sit down, watch Netflix, bash one out and laze around being mediocre. They piss all their time away on nonsense, but then believe the
reason they’re failing at life is because they’re unlucky – pathetic!

They are losers because they don't invest in themselves, it's that simple.

Hobbies where you consume rather than produce are junk hobbies, much like pizza and red bull they should be used in moderation.

- Gaming? Consuming
- Shopping? Consuming
- Baking? Producing
- Writing? Producing

This doesn’t mean never game, shop or have fun. Basic binary thinkers miss the point and think all this focus on self-improvement and productivity is advocating a boring type A personality that never has fun. It isn’t. It means if you want to be a winner, you have to do consumptive things far less than productive things. Make this a habit and a way of life, and you will see both your quality of life and bank balance rise. It’s this simple, yet most find it difficult to achieve.

To apply the Pareto principle to having fun, 80% of your time should be spent on producing, whilst 20% is spent on consumption.

As a bonus, when you actually become good at the thing you produce you will have fun doing it. This allows you to have fun and produce simultaneously!

4.) Enjoying Work:

Losers without any skills need to consume to have fun because they lack the value necessary to enjoy life without indulging in someone else’s value.

A talented coder for instance has his own value, when he “works” on an app, he has a lot of fun doing it despite the challenge it represents. He can work and have fun at the same time, this is the hallmark of a winner, losers can’t do this so they don’t understand it.

Whilst a loser could never conceive of the fun inherent to producing (to a loser, all work is equally soul-crushing), winners know exactly what I’m talking about – work can be fun!

Work stops being work when you love what you do and you’re good at it. This is why it pays dividends in happiness and general quality of life to monetise a hobby. There’s no point being rich if you’re too miserable to enjoy it.

There’s no point to money you can’t enjoy, so if you want to be rich and happy – achieving it via a hobby is the way to go. Become an expert pianist, fighter, writer or whatever.

When you find something you absolutely love, you work hard without feeling exhausted from the undertaking. You enjoy your work so much that your work does not feel like work, it feels like something you’d do anyway, but just so happen to get paid for.

Because your work is a hobby you’ve monetised, you will work hard and not feel like you’re
working, which means low stress, high happiness and a well fed wallet. For people with the necessary work ethic, this is highly attainable. To losers it sounds like a myth, because they can’t imagine a life that doesn’t consist of being miserable.

5.) Escape The Crab Bucket & Avoid Victim Mentality:

If you’re born in a crab bucket, the first thing you must do is escape and seek lessons from winners. To losers nothing’s their fault, they rationalise their inferiority by shifting blame to those they’re jealous of, they’re pathetic. Losers are socialists and people who think the world owes them something. Nothing is their fault, everything bad that happens to these people is the fault of people more successful than them, these people must be avoided at all costs.

The thing that keeps people poor the most is other poor people filling their minds with shit, you must detach. If you’re born to losers they teach you how to be a loser, not a winner. You must detach and reprogram yourself.

Losers keep you down with misinformation, then when by your own defiance you make it out, they try to take the credit for your successes. Pathetic! The very people who hold you back are the same people who want you to “remember them when you make it”. The people who doubt you are the same people who have their hand out when you make it, they are disloyal, pathetic and do not belong in your life.

If you were born a loser, were surrounded by losers and made it out, it isn’t the losers that got you out, it was you. You don’t owe them a cent.

Losers always try to guilt trip you, because if you are foolish enough to fall for it, they can pillage you.

Losers complain “once he made it he forgot about us and never came back, he betrayed his roots!”

Why did he do that? Because associating with losers is dumb, the people saying this will try to drag him down once he’s made it, and it’s his awareness of this that prevents him from continued association. Of course being the losers that they are, these people are completely ignorant to this, they just think the escaped crab is an asshole. Let them think that, for their opinions are as worthless as they are.

6.) On Losers:

Poverty is just turning the difficulty up on the game, you know why the poor stay poor? Scarcity mindset. The truly worthy always get what they deserve, but plenty of people get less than they feel they deserve, do you know why?

Because they’re not Machiavellian enough.

Those illiterate in matters of power idiotically work hard for another man their entire lives, so all they have to show for their effort when the curtain calls is a mountain of debt. This is
incredibly sad, and is not the mark of a life well lived.

If you work hard but not intelligently, you can still be broke. Clever people don't just work hard, they also work intelligently. They know they need to work for themselves as soon as they can, and that working for somebody else is just a means to an end until that time comes. Rather than rest on their laurels, they develop a skill in their “spare” time and have it monetised by yesterday!

Losers see your ambition and they shit on it because they have a scarcity mindset, people in a state of scarcity are excessively selfish and have no capacity to be magnanimous. Losers seek obstacles (why something isn’t possible), whilst winners seek solutions (how can I achieve this?)

Edgy losers are the funniest, they have the energy to “call bullshit” but don’t direct that energy into elevating themselves. Being angry doesn’t make you respectable, powerful or a winner, if you don’t channel your anger correctly you’re just an idiot other people laugh at.

**Anger is a powerful emotion, winners channel it into productive endeavours, losers squander it like they do everything and use it to bicker with irrelevant people on social media.**

Losers take more because they need more. Wherever a loser is and whatever he’s doing, he takes more than he gives if he even gives at all. The loser is a needy personality, he always wants help, be it emotional or financial. Losers are not self-sufficient and don’t even try to be, they are perpetual children. Women are more comfortable being losers than men as they more easily internalise a victim mentality, but it is prevalent to both sexes and is attractive in neither.

Winners surround themselves with superiors so they can up their game, losers surround themselves with inferiors so they can pad their ego. Why do losers become and stay losers? Because once they internalise they’re oppressed and that nothing’s their fault, it’s more comfortable for them to blame reality for their shortcomings instead of humbling up, realising they aren’t squat, and doing something about it.

**This is another thing about losers, they don’t move towards pain and struggle in order to improve themselves, they indulge in comfort, this is why they are weak.**

It’s easier to internalise your inferiority and blame your appointed enemy for your mediocrity than to introspect, improve and compete.

Only people with skill actually like meritocracy because they have a chance of winning. Unremarkable people want handouts, they don’t want to compete. Of course if you had a bad start in life you will have to deprogram a lot of the nonsense you were taught, but it’s better to bloom late than never at all.

7.) Quality Beats Quantity:

Want to bypass the mediocre majority? Most people are quantity focused, so do the opposite
and be quality focused.

This entire blog is built on this mantra, quality over quantity. I get more views, more followers and more money than people who have been doing this longer than I have because my focus is always on quality, never on quantity.

If you copy other people or produce content for the sake of producing it, you will never amount to much. Why will somebody settle for an imitation when they can get the original? You are basically broadcasting you’re a bootleg imitator when you do this. People are not blind, you may think you’re clever, but it is foolish to underestimate the intelligence of your readers.

Why would somebody read your nonsense when there are tens of thousands of publications vying for their attention? If you want people to read you, you have to be worth reading – this means being as original as possible and saying something because you have something to say, rather than saying something because you feel you must to remain relevant and seen.

I have never written an essay for the sake of writing it, I write because I have something to say. I genuinely love writing and sharing my ideas, writing is not a secondary objective to me, it’s the primary objective.

Ask any regular reader what they think of this blog, they will affirm I may not post as much as others, but that generally speaking my content is superior to everything else they come across, if not equal to it. Whatever I do turns to gold, otherwise I don’t bother doing it.

Whilst other people think they’re better than you because they outdo you in volume, you and anybody with an eye for quality knows you’re superior because you outdo them in quality. I use writing as an example because it’s what I do, but you can apply this to anything.

8.) Applying Quality Over Quantity To Sales:

The counterargument I often hear as to why quantity beats quality is “more sales is better than less sales as you’ll make more money”.

People who think this are obvious small fish, they must need to make numerous low ticket sales to masses of mediocre people because they’re thinking like lemonade stand owners!

The quality over quantity mantra applied to sales is simple, it is better for you to have one big contract or one big client (quality) than it is to have ten average or mediocre clients. Having more clients at a lower rate means more stress and work for less money. Even if the cumulative sum is higher for ten average clients than one good client, get two good clients and you’re still doing less work and earning more than you would from ten average clients. Winners optimise their time, losers squander it.

Losers will tell you that you need to get as many clients as possible and rush them in and out so you can move on to the next one, winners will tell you that you need to find the right clients and do your very best for them.
Quality over quantity does not mean “just the one, just the best” it means “only work with quality, cultivate quality and focus on quality.” If you want to be the best or be considered the best, you have to obsess over quality. Kim Kardashian for example may be very popular with losers, but nobody considers her the best at anything because she is utterly talentless.

Aim for superiority in all things, combine the best product with a network consisting of nothing but the best people. Again, quality over quantity does not mean “I cannot sell the best product to as many people as possible” this is stupid. If you have the best product, anybody that can afford it will buy it because it will be popular.

For example with writing, it’s better for you to have one good book than five mediocre ones. My book isn’t even out yet and I’ve been writing for two and a half years. There are third-rate writers who have three books out in twelve months that make less than I do from Patreon on all their books combined. Hilarious, yet somewhat sad. I’m not going out of my way to ridicule anyone here, but I want my point to hit home as profoundly as possible: quality always trumps quantity.

One really good book can make more money than five crappy uninspiring books. Better to have your readers chomping at the bit for your book to come out, than releasing something for an unpacked theatre.

I am convinced being focused on quantity rather than quality is the path to mediocrity, and that greatness lies in innovation and the pursuit of the apex.

I apply this mantra to everything, I desire the best form, not the most reps and the best friends rather than the most friends.

Losers prefer to do a lot of mediocre things and call it success, rather than do one thing really well and become an expert at it. If you ask someone “what are you good at?” and they don’t have an answer, the answer is nothing. Because someone who doesn’t know what they’re good at has not obsessed enough in any one area to discover themselves and foster mastery – they are mediocre.

9.) Loser’s Entitlement Mentality – Give It To Me Now!:

People want to be on top the instant they set their mind to something, but progression is incremental, not exponential. People who consume copiously without counterbalancing via creation tend to be boring.

Low value people take value from others and do not build value. High value people give value to others and are constantly building it. People who pretend to be busy are low value, because if they were high value they’d actually be busy producing something.

If someone is expecting instant quick and effortless change, I already know they’re a loser. That’s not how life works. Marketing targets losers with bullshit promises of “easy, instant results” because it plays to the fantasy that greatness isn’t a matter of skill and dedication, but rather something that is monopolised and can be bought. It cannot, and this is false.
The only thing such marketing achieves is the monetisation of losers to the profit a private company, it does not stop losers from losing. If the advice on this blog was disseminated on TV, half of these companies would stop making money, especially sectors like the fitness industry.

Why is this? Because only losers buy into false promises and pump money into gimmicky equipment that promises to make your workout easier, these are the same people who pay for gym subscriptions they don't even use – losers!

The fitness industry is entirely dependent on the finance of losers to remain profitable, it’s hilarious, yet somewhat sad to see a section of the economy operate in this manner.

Winners get more for less money because they have the work ethic, dedication and subsequent skill that comes from this not to fall for the bogus promises of flashy, bottom-feeding salesmen.

10.) Don’t Take Advice From Losers & Victims:

Reality is politically incorrect, winners embrace this, losers don’t; sensibility is an expensive prison. Sensitive people tell you one thing straight from the get go without even intending to: they’re losers. Avoid sensitive people, not only do you have to waste energy watching what you do and don’t say, but seeing as they’re losers they have less to offer you.

Losers don’t have any form of narcissistic supply other than “giving advice”, their “advice” is terrible, ignore all of it. The people whose advice you really want aren’t lining up to give it to you, those who are lining up are losers nine out of ten times.

Losers have no achievements to get high off because they haven’t achieved anything, so their way of feeling big is misinforming you with nonsense they pulled out of their ass. They achieve this by telling you how to live your life when they’re not even on top of their own.

Whiners don’t want to win they just want to be pitied, pity is pathetic. Nobody worth a damn identifies as a loser even if they come from garbage. The more you try to talk sense to somebody determined to be a victim, the more they dig their heels in about how unfair life is. Pathetic.

Anybody who has read this blog has probably deduced I have the capacity to be dangerous if I wanted to be. But instead of endeavouring to destroy people, I don’t, I help them instead.

I’m about contributing to the world, adding value, and ultimately as a higher goal: rebuilding the masculinity of western civilization brick by brick.

I have a goal higher than myself, which means I go further in providing for today’s men than the companies who don’t care but are just looking to make a buck by exploiting masculine insecurities (height, dick size, earnings etc.) Winners need a goal higher than themselves. You don’t become great if you can't see past yourself. You should be selfish, and you should seek to better yourself, but once you have momentum do not limit yourself to greed, have a higher goal, preferably something noble, and you will excel more than those motivated solely
by money.

**Winners have a positive mentality and wish to create, losers have a negative mentality and wish to destroy.**

My life is proof to me you can have absolutely fuck all and nobody there for you and still become a winner. I’ve had to overcome more than most to get where I am, and this is why I don’t have time for whiners. You can whine all you like about patriarchy or white privilege, but this is all fake nonsense. People who whine about this fiction do so because they have no real hardships to complain of. People who’ve actually had to endure hardship recognise the people who whine about these things for the phonies that they are.

I’ve been a loser, I grew up with nothing and nobody. Nobody gave a shit about me growing up, virtually nobody. I didn’t become the man I am today because I had an easy life, I forged myself from a crucible of both spiritual and material deprivation.

I’ve been homeless, I’ve slept in a park under a tree in the rain because I had nowhere to go. I was in care as a kid and **I’ve never known my father**. By this description I should be a snivelling loser, a weakling, somebody going nowhere, a crumbled and torn piece of paper tumbling in the winds of an icy English street, and yet I’m stronger than almost everybody I meet. I’m strong enough to announce this on a website read by hundreds of thousands and not give a crap if anybody tries to use it against me.

I don’t milk the misfortunes life handed me to monetise people’s pity, because I’m not a loser. I don’t need people’s pity to get ahead, I can get ahead on my own merit, and this is what I encourage others to do. I got where I am in life by providing value, not by selling a sob story. Follow this example, be a winner, be someone worth something, there is no dignity nor honour in monetising misfortune.

**I know how to help the helpless because I’ve been helpless.**

Now you know part of my story, you know why I’m emotionally invested in helping men. I had a tough life devoid of guidance, I now offer what I never had to those afflicted by these very maladies.

11.) **In Closing / Relevant Reading:**

Stand on your own two feet and take life by the balls, expecting good things to happen because you want them to is how a loser thinks, winners make it happen. If neither sex nor dignity inspires you to improve, fear of our impending civilizational collapse should do the trick.

People can help you for money, and you can read these blogs as much as you like, but people can’t fill the void that is a non-existent work ethic. If you think you’re a loser, you are. Don’t wish for a better life, make one.
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1.) Introduction:

Back in December I published a collection of Machiavellian Maxims that precede the assortment here. If you missed that, you can find it here. As for the creation of yet more maxims? Only time will tell. With that said, I present the latest set of Machiavellian maxims for your reading pleasure.

2.) The Maxims:

1. – Hijacking is a special kind of Machiavellianism, for it wears the agenda of another whilst pursuing its own, like a metaphorical Russian doll, it hides an agenda within an agenda.

2. – Read between the lines, if you can deduce why somebody is asking a question and you do not like the reasoning for their question, do not deign an answer. Ignore or dismiss traps, do not fall into them.

3. – When someone attempts to undermine rather than refute you, they’re the enemy.

4. – Undermining is personal, refutation isn’t. Refutation communicates “I believe you’re
wrong due to the findings of the available evidence”. Undermining communicates “I’m going to humiliate you because your opinions invoke my disdain.” Refutations are logical retorts, undermining is interrelational violence. Learn to distinguish between the two, for they oft appear similar.

5. - Bending the rules is no more than the abuse of technicality to circumvent the spirit of the rule without violating its letter.

6. - Love doesn’t conquer psychopathy.

7. - Only pick fights that’ll yield profit; pettiness will erode your credibility, fighting on many fronts will exhaust you.

8. - The crab bucket mentality is pervasive, a jealous friend is a betrayal waiting to happen. Know when to cut the gangrenous limb, do not allow the sentimental nostalgia to sustain poisonous ties.

9. - If you are drawn into something emotionally, the odds of damaging your reputation and engaging in regrettable acts exponentially increases.

10. - Many arrogant men believe anger is the safe emotion they can display without real consequence, this belief is folly. Man should endeavour to be mindful, for this will allow him to rein in unruly emotion.

11. - He who does not control his emotions is puppeteered by them. Strict adherence to emotional data is tactical death, whilst ignoring emotion idiotic, and suppressing it tiresome. As such, emotion should be channelled, not ignored or obeyed.

12. - On national anniversaries of loss or celebration, people are at their most vulnerable. It is at times of heightened cultural emotivity that reflection takes root in the mediocre, and filled with regret, the populace is at their most manipulable.

13. - Self-deprecation builds trust, when people see even minor imperfections, they’re endeared by the transparency.

14. - People are susceptible to negativity bias, if something is negative, it is more likely to be believed without rigorous investigation. Acts of virtue come with a burden of proof, acts of unvirtue do not.

15. - Appear easily provoked, then ignore those who see it as an opportunity to attack; this is good for enticing the lurking foe to reveal himself. Present an illusion of disordered vulnerability, seduce an attack, and by the time your foe realises the ruse it is too late, he has revealed himself.

16. - An effective strategist knows when to utilise counterintuitive gambits to get a better view of the battlefield. For example, if you are strong in one area, make your enemy think you are weak. If you are weak in an area, make your enemy think you are strong. If you confuse the enemy’s data points, he cannot successfully analyse you. If he cannot analyse you, he cannot defeat you.
17. - Be wary the plausible deniability of jokes, “it’s just a joke” is the most common phrase used to disguise a transgression. All good jokes contain truth, as such if one crosses your boundaries under the guise of humour, they are still trespassing, humour but smoke and mirrors for such trespass.

18. - He who acts boldly under the cloak of sadistic humour is not to be trusted, for humour is the jester’s shield and sword.

19. - People who get caught doing something they shouldn’t do not reveal the complete truth at once. They opt to reveal the least self-incriminating aspects first.

20. - The objective of trickle truth is damage control, to minimise the damage done to one’s reputation when a loss of reputation is all but unavoidable.

21. - As lies compound, trust erodes, and the more difficult it becomes to lie. The more it is perceived that you lie, the better you must be at lying to successfully do so. As such, compulsive lying is tactically unsound – lie only when necessary.

22. - Trust can be earned and spent, but if you spend too much too quickly, your account with the betrayed individual is permanently closed, no matter what you do, you will always be spent.

23. - People love to be seduced, but they do not like to know how. Honesty doesn’t pay when transparency compromises the beauty of the illusion that sustains you. Like any magic trick, people enjoy the perception of mystery, not what creates it.

24. - Apply seduction to romance or sales, never reveal your tricks. Give your pitch, not your essence.

25. - Effortlessness and dismissiveness foster an appearance of strength.

26. - If people feel judged by you, they hate you. In diplomacy, suggest via statement, do not undermine with command or overt dispute.

27. - Honesty is ugly, most people want their opinions validated, not disproved. It is but a minority of intellectuals who enjoy being disproved.

28. - Manufacture a threat and you can sell its solution.

29. - Control both sides and simulate a conflict, monitor organic responses for potential allies and enemies.

30. - Utilise counterintuitive strategies, it pays to create a group to undermine your interests. By creating a group to threaten your interests, you prevent a concealed threat from mobilising. Those interested in undermining your interests will join your artificial opposition rather than form their own.

31. - The truly best deceivers begin with themselves, and therefore tend to be more emotional than rational in disposition.
32. – Environments come with varying expectations and codes of behaviour, environments define expectation unless you are bigger than your environment.

33. – It is better to define what will be expected of you, than allow others to define their expectations. If you do not define what people expect of you, they will define it for you.

34. – He who defines his role has more freedom, for people become their roles.

35. – Your benefactors should overestimate you and your enemies should underestimate you.

36. – The lower the average intellect of a man’s company, the more he must show aggression to be respected, more intelligent company demands the inverse.

37. – As a Machiavellian, it is always pertinent to ascertain the intellect of one’s company, and then adjust one’s demeanour as relevant. A person who cannot dial-up their personality up or down is unfit to wield power.

38. – Intelligent narcissists require consistent displays of histrionic aggression in order to respect somebody.

39. – Acting is necessary. Just as one key cannot open every lock to every door, a single disposition cannot unlock every favour from every person, as such, adaptability.

40. – People are like safes with combinations, by correctly calibrating your traits to align with their values, you unlock their trust, desire, and respect. Incorrect calibrations create apathy and disdain.

41. – Disagreement is acceptable for it can teach, but sabotage is never. A leader’s task is to discern the prior from the latter. When in doubt, assume sabotage.

42. – It is important to work smarter than harder, but better to be seen as dumb and hard-working. Few like a rich man who earns more in a less arduous condition, for jealousy of his privileged position is rife. A smart man earns more than a hard-working man, yet a smart, hard-working man who appears average outears both.

43. – It’s easy not to outshine the brilliant, but it’s difficult not to outshine the incompetent. Regardless, know your place and behave accordingly.

44. – Ignore powerless idiots, ridicule powerful ones. Powerless idiocy is an annoyance, powerful idiocy is a problem. Relevance and status shall determine classification.

45. – The man confined to reason will be humiliated by psychic warfare, whilst the man confined to cunning will have his sophistry undressed. Logic and cunning are the most powerful psychological tools, therefore you would do well to cultivate them both. To cultivate neither is to be weak and to cultivate one is to be average, but to cultivate both – this is to be dangerous. [Read More Here]

46. – Logicians look for reasons, Machiavellians look for loopholes.
47. - Incentive is the most persuasive use of soft power, with fear its hard power counterpart. Those who can’t be bribed can be threatened, whilst those who can’t be threatened can be bribed – very few are immune to both.

48. - Be egotistical only when necessary. [Read More Here]

49. - You bond with people over the things they hold dear, pets, media franchises, hobbies – this is how you gain trust. In matters of trust one should appeal to emotion, never to reason. Give plenty of reasons you should be trusted, give nonsense reasons for why you shouldn’t.

50. - In social matters, people do not reward he who is most logical, but rather he who is most impressive.

51. - Cunning and rhetoric almost always triumph over logic, fact and statistic in matters of persuasion.

52. - Despair in the moment is tantamount to forfeiture.

53. - Most are foolish, instead of befriending power, they hate on it. These people aren’t cut out for the game, for one does not acquire power by hating the powerful.

54. - A champion must always defend his crown, for as much as he is admired, there is always a man who lusts to take the powerful’s wealth and status for himself.

55. - The least patriotic leader’s one who so utterly dominates his kingdom, that he does not allow it to flourish out of the insecurity that permitting so would remove him from power.

56. - All abusable systems are abused, and so it is folly to expect any system not to be abused. Systems should be designed on the assumption they will be abused, and where less than infallible, retroactively amended to be so.

57. - Absolute dignity is rare, most pride is no more than resistance that can be removed for a price. The weaker the ego, the lower the price. For the right price, fantasies of all persuasions find manifestation.

58. - In matters of effective sophistry, one must calibrate language to the discerned intelligence of their listener.

59. - Disdain precarious alliances, it is better to have no alliance than a precarious one, for weak alliances foreshadow betrayal.

60. - Taste isn’t just a matter of food or scent, but likewise of personality. One man’s annoyance is another’s joy, delicate tastes require finesse. And yet if is a taste is too demanding, specific or exacting, one may wish to wholly reject the fetishist notion and cease all association.

61. - Don’t become the slave of another man’s tastes. Exercise prerogative with association. If you know the taste you can leverage its fantasy, but if the taste is concealed and used as a benchmark for invalidating you, leave.
62. - People decide quickly who they do and do not like. When factions form, anybody not on your side should be assumed to collaborate with the enemy. As for those who do join your cause, analyse their motives.

63. - Whilst punishment should be swift, reward should be gradual.

64. - It is far more profitable to see things from your point of view than from the opposition’s. The more you acknowledge the opposition’s point of view, the more power you give it. Therefore for your point of view to dominate, you must dismiss your enemy’s.

65. - Displays of agility typically indicate one of two things: you’re being mesmerised by a diversion, or you’re witnessing mastery.

66. - Don’t play cards you don’t need to play. Holding all the cards does not make you indestructible, you may still lose if you play your cards poorly. Execution is everything, a poorly played card is worse than one not played.

67. - Tailor your approach to the personality you’re dealing with.

68. - Nothing is more compelling than fantasy, do not underestimate its power to convince or exploit.

3.) Relevant Reading / In Closing:

If you enjoyed these maxims, check out the following material.

Blog:

Machiavellian Maxims (Part 1)
Machiavellian Maxims (Part 3)
Machiavellian Maxims (Part 4)

Books:

Rochefoucauld’s Maxims
The Art of War
The Art of Worldly Wisdom
The Prince
“One ought to hold on to one’s heart; for if one lets it go, one soon loses control of the head too.” – Friedrich Nietzsche

Contents:
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4.) The Role of Rationalisation & Sophistry
5.) In Closing/Relevant Reading

1.) Introduction:

As I write this, I cast my mind back to a time I did not understand women. It is surreal to write on “how women work” when one so vividly remembers being a man clueless in such matters.

As a clueless man bereft of the knowledge my sanity demanded, I would ask men to explain women, I would ask women to explain women, and I would ask Google to explain women. Nobody really knew what they were talking about. The only answers I would get were gynocentric inanities mixed with general rhetorical platitudes such as “be yourself” and “be confident”.

The problem with the mainstream gynocentric viewpoint is it teaches men how to be a good slave, rather than a good master. It teaches men how to cater to women, rather than how to inspire a woman’s desire to cater to them. It actively suppresses truths related to women, whilst spreading vitriolic untruth about men. At this point it seems the system would prefer
men are useful but ignorant, rather than enlightened and sovereign.

Men yearn to understand women, for they wish to attract them, as well as protect themselves from womanly predations. This knowledge is essential paramount sustenance all but crucial for the preservation of man’s sanity. And yet quite sadistically, this wisdom eludes most men no matter how earnestly they seek it.

Today, life changing truth is only readily available should a man happen upon a site such as this. Most men are unaware of women’s true nature, and the minority who are aware dare not discuss the elephant in the room, for doing so may come at incredible cost.

2.) The Cultural Battle of the Sexes:

The number of men aware of the realities inherent to female nature continues to dwindle, whilst the cultural hysteria touting “men are evil and women can do no wrong” reigns pervasively.

Men are taught to worship women, whilst women are taught to distrust men. Men are taught to serve women, whilst women are taught to deceive men. Society believes it morally reprehensible for a man to dupe a woman, and yet bares no such disdain when the polarity is reversed, often going to extreme lengths to rationalise aesthetically pleasing justifications for immoral female behaviour.

Before the emergence of red pill philosophy, no meaningful infrastructure existed to support and educate men on matters of women, and this is why what we do is crucial. We educate boys and men on matters nobody else is capable of, and support them where nobody else cares.

Culturally there is a power imbalance where the masculine has become so weak and the feminine has gotten so out of control, that she threatens to destabilise civilization’s very core with a tyrannic power she is not fit to wield. The red pill (as well as this very publication) does to the extent of its reach, attempt to redress this imbalance by giving men the tools they need to exercise power and remain sovereign.

Red pill philosophy is effective, it thoroughly details female behaviour from numerous perspectives (sociologically, evolutionarily and occasionally, economically) to form a rich and comprehensive philosophy.

However, having internalised much of this “forbidden knowledge” over the years, I wish to do something I do not believe has been done before: unify the red pill understanding of women into a framework that depicts the relationships between the mechanisms that embody the feminine.

When I was clueless about women, I’d have killed for an article like this, so if that sounds like you, strap yourself in because you’re in for a treat. You’re going to learn what many men never learn, and what many others pay in pain and poverty to merely intuit.

3.) Solipsism’s Role In Femininity:
One cannot deny that women are vigorously interested in themselves and how men perceive them, yet regardless, this passion does not translate into a meaningful philosophical enquiry on womankind by herself. As such, a woman’s opinion of her sex is inseparably tied up with how she sees herself. To simplify: whatever a woman believes to be true of women, is 99 out of 100 times, something she believes to be true of herself.

Solipsism leads women to believe the opinions they hold of themselves accurately represent the behaviours generalisable to their sex. Naturally most women are oblivious to their flaws, and are as a matter of ego, unwilling to even ponder the possibility they’re not intrinsically wonderful.

Most women do not realise the negative traits they possess should be rectified where possible or otherwise mitigated, because they do not recognise themselves as having said undesirable qualities to begin with. Simply put, women lack self-awareness, they tend to deny their shortcomings rather than fix them, and this is why there is a substantial lack of bodies in the women’s online self-improvement community.

If you talk about the general nature of women to a woman, but you do not distinguish between her and “most women”, she will almost always lump herself in with “most women” and fail to make the distinction between herself and women as a whole. This leads her to constantly miss the forest for trees, stating that “she was in a similar situation and she was never like that” when you generalise her sex.

Now, whilst it is certainly possible the woman you’re talking to may be the exception to something, it is more likely that she is not but believes in all delusional earnest that she is. Because she follows her feelings, and it feels better for her to believe she’s different than to be aware of her shortcomings, she will believe an aspect of her behaviour immune to generalisation even when her behaviours confirm the generalisation!

You may even remember a time when the woman you’re talking to embodied the exact generalisation you’re asserting, and yet like a crazy person with amnesia, she will claim to be nothing like that. This is another “function” of solipsism, a woman’s pre-occupation with the self is mirrored by an utter lack of self-awareness of what said self consists of.

And so it is only in the grand denial of a woman’s solipsism that if she believes there’s nothing “wrong” with her, then there’s nothing “wrong” with women either. If she believes she’s not like that, then she incorrectly concludes that most women aren’t like that either.

It is the observation that nearly all women will unironically say “not all women are like that” that gives away the feminine’s solipsistic point of reference, that a woman will attempt to differentiate herself as superior when in competition, but should you criticise women in general, suddenly her ability to make distinctions between herself and her group vanishes.

In juxtaposition, if something negative is said about men, most men can simultaneously weigh up whether the generalisation applies to men as a group, and if it does, if it applies to them. They do not instantly conflate opinions of their sex with opinions of themselves, and so unlike women, are not reflexively offended by negative statements made about their sex if an element of that statement is based in reality.
Naive men believe “women must be experts on women, because being women themselves they know all about women!” such a belief is folly, and no more than a reflection of a man’s naivety, for it assumes women are abstractive rather than solipsistic, that is, more interested in the truth than being purposefully ignorant in order to maintain an optimum level of happiness. This couldn’t be further from the truth.

When women talk about women, they project rather than investigate because they’re prone to emotional solipsism, not rational investigation. Solipsism is the core base of all female behaviour, it is the intrinsic way of being, the very foundation on which the female’s other psychological aspects spawn.

Women with little power and low self-esteem are solipsistic and prone to infantile narcissism, whilst those with high self-esteem and great power are grandiosely narcissistic, the latter meaning they possess a characteristically masculine air of arrogant detachment.

Where solipsism is her internal dialogue and mode of thought, its external counterpart is infantile narcissism, women’s insecurity of her relative inferiority to man, and dependence on men. If one analyses the thinking of the feminist movement for a second, a great part of it fixates on “empowering women by granting them independence.”

This suggests a few things, that firstly, women do not possess the ability or desire to take independence for themselves and so need powerful politicians to legally mandate it. And secondly, that the feminist fixation with independence is a macro manifestation of female insecurity. This to say, that women are all too aware of their reliance on men for both economic and emotional support, and that collectively, rather than be grateful for man’s magnanimity, a great deal despise it. The saying “no good deed goes unpunished” seems apt here.

Women are deadly, yet needy. They have always needed men, still do, and most likely always will. And yet it is in the infantile stubbornness of femininity that a resentment brews for this biologically ordained neediness.

Even the women who do well to provide for themselves end up requiring a man who earns more than they, who is mentally stronger than they, and so on. A woman is hypergamous by her very nature, and thus much to the disdain of her insecurity, requires male superiority in order to even find men attractive.

The topic of feminine infantile narcissism presents the perfect opportunity to explore why women are more inherently cunning than men. It is because women are so incredibly aware of their heightened neediness relative to men that they develop an intrinsic penchant for cunning. They are all too aware the depth and breadth of assistance they require from the opposite sex is greater than the inverse, and so it is this position in large part which fuels their motive for manipulating as a way of life.

Women are in a position of neediness, and yet they cannot fully trust men to give them what they need, so they manipulate men in order to give them what they want, but then resent the men who fall prey to such devices. This phenomenon alone should explain to you the mental hell women occupy, and explain much of their external craziness.
Even the sweetest, kindest, best raised woman is a cunning creature, for it is in the insecurity inherent to reliance that a woman protects herself via the impassioned practice of cunning. I believe that where nature gave man superior strength, women were bestowed pathological cunning. Unfortunately, what was granted to be used as a means of defence, is often in practice used for anything but.

Infantile as they are, women are ill-equipped to handle power, and that which is born out of the insecurity that a man may do her wrong, turns into an exploitative, predatory misuse of power that fuels **grandiose narcissism**, and thus masculinises her. The aforementioned relationships between the different aspects of the female psyche do not explain it in its entirety, but nonetheless, should accurately depict its root and core.

4.) The Role of Rationalisation & Sophistry:

In contrast to the prior section, this section will be quite short as many of the mechanisms relevant to this behaviour are aptly described in my distillation of solipsism. Whilst solipsism requires greater explanation because of its breadth as “something she is”, rationalisation requires less explanation because it’s merely “something she does.”

Rationalisation is the grand act of seeking justification or explanation for something that has occurred in order to flatter/benefit the person who performed the behaviour. It is not an honest attempt to understand what causes a behaviour.

Women often do not understand why they feel what they feel, because rationally verbalising primal impulses is difficult if not impossible. She cannot acknowledge that she doesn’t even know why she said or did something as she’ll look stupid. So to save face, she will come up with persuasive nonsense to reconcile the irrationality of her behaviour with the aestheticism of something that sounds convincing.

To simplify, she will find something that sounds reasonable to explain her behaviour, regardless of whether this is the true cause of said behaviour. As long as it makes her look and feel good, it is a sufficient rationalisation that serves the purpose she needs it to.

Women are far less concerned with communicating the truth about themselves than they are maintaining an acceptable image. Again, this is why it is folly to ask women about women. They’re less interested, capable and incentivised to understand themselves than men are.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

Here before you lies just a few of the aspects inherent to the operating system of female psychology. It is incomplete, as a complete treatise on the topic is not merely substantial in depth, but likewise of breadth. Time permitting, it is my desire to pen a follow up piece that details other aspects inherent to female nature, linking them in with the aspects previously described in order to create a coherent framework.
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**Fifty Shades of Red**
Fifty Shades Redder
The AWALT Misconception
The Myth of Female Rationality - [Part 1] - [Part 2]
The Nature of Women

Book(s):

The Manipulated Man
“The true man wants two things: danger and play. For that reason he wants woman, as the most dangerous plaything.” – Friedrich Nietzsche

Contents:
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1.) Introduction:

The maxims that comprise the bulk of this article are designed to educate men on the nature of women, as well as the nature of themselves in relation to women. Being a loose collection of maxims, the article is easy-to-read by merit of its broken down format. I’ve likewise adopted brevity here in the hope that the most prominent points will stick more easily.

The maxims listed are inclusive, but not exhaustive. As such, these maxims do not compromise the totality of wisdom available on this topic. This is part 3 in a continuing series, you can find part 2 here, and part 1 here.

2.) The Maxims:

IM MAXIM #101 – A woman’s charm comes from her happiness, a man’s, from his confidence. An inconsolable woman’s as unattractive as a timid man.

IM MAXIM #102 – Men must earn value, women must preserve it. It is because of this very reason a woman’s age is taboo whilst a man’s is not. The passage of time fares man better than woman.

IM MAXIM #103 – If you’re pining for a girl, next her. You’ve already lost, for it is she who
should be pining for you. Be the prize, not the contestant, prizes never lose, contestants often do.

**IM MAXIM #104** – Women play men like Mozart played piano. Men manipulate nature, women manipulate men. Civilization is man’s project, man is woman’s.

**IM MAXIM #105** – Narcissism is a suit well-worn by a man, but one ill-fitting on a woman. Male narcissism is attractive to women, but female narcissism is not to man. **Corollary:** men with dark triad mothers are attracted to narcissistic women.

**IM MAXIM #106** – A man must be more narcissistic than a women to attract her. In cultures which worship women, the average woman is more narcissistic than her male counterpart, where this occurs, great swathes of men are found unattractive.

**IM MAXIM #107** – A difference in narcissism (female gratitude and male arrogance) is the great equaliser between the beauty of the feminine form, and the lack thereof common to men. When women are equally if not more narcissistic than men, such an equaliser vanishes. Being grandiose never hindered a man’s chances of getting laid.

**IM MAXIM #108** – Give a woman less attention than she wants, and she will desire it. Give her as much of it as she wants, and she will not. Women quickly devalue the attention of a man who would attend to her every whim, so be frugal; it is easy for a man to be too generous, but near impossible for him to be too frugal.

**IM MAXIM #109** – In matters of women, entitlement and worthiness is a matter of false equivalence; her level of entitlement almost always exceeds what she is worth.

**IM MAXIM #110** – If she can find a way to blame a man for her decisions, she will. If she can find a way to avoid guilt, she will. Oft these two intertwine, for women are allergic to responsibility and loathe to be held accountable.

**IM MAXIM #111** – Women have a propensity to distract you from your mission, do not permit this.

**IM MAXIM #112** – The difference between girls and women is not so great as the difference between boys and men.

**IM MAXIM #113** – A woman’s uppity moral facade is no more than a shaming mechanism designed to manipulate men into deference. Be shameless in your convictions, lest you allow her to co-opt you with guilt.

**IM MAXIM #114** – Women cannot negotiate attraction with male weakness, but man is attracted to the vulnerability of the feminine. As such, sexually there can be no equality, for the very basis of female attraction necessitates the burden of strength falls squarely on man.

**IM MAXIM #115** – Whenever there is a problem between a man and woman, the fault is always assumed to lie with the man and never the woman. And so because of this, the onus to fix the problem lies on the man, not the woman. Even when it is obvious that all if not most the blame lies with a woman, polite society will reject all good sense and insist that liability is
man’s to bear. Would it then be a stretch to presuppose that even on the most subconscious of levels, people believe it easier to coerce a man than reason with a woman?

**IM MAXIM #116** – Women define themselves by their relationships, men by their achievements. Refer to Maxim #104

**IM MAXIM #117** – Female helplessness is an asset prompting charity and sympathy, male helplessness is a liability prompting disgust and aversion. Women are independent by choice, men have no choice.

**IM MAXIM #118** – Any man who needs a woman is not a man she’d want. Women want to feel wanted, not needed, they can’t handle being needed. Needing a woman is tantamount to forfeiting her, women are repelled by desire that has transformed into need.

**IM MAXIM #119** – Women are the needier sex and hence the deadlier sex; great need necessitates great duplicity.

**IM MAXIM #120** – Logic is the realm of men, cunning is the realm of women, whilst strategy is the realm of male ingenuity.

**IM MAXIM #121** – A woman’s sex appeal is the fulcrum on which she obtains everything, hence the misery of ugly women. It is woman’s instinct to leverage man’s desire to fulfil her material and emotional needs. Conversely, men merely leverage female desire for their sexual needs. Refer to Maxim #119

**IM MAXIM #122** – Women loathe being sexually objectified by lesser men, crafting their disgust for the unworthy into a veneer of moral superiority. Yet hidden within this guise of upright disgust is a depraved desire to be objectified by a powerful man. The weak man gets nothing, the strong man enjoys her perversions.

**IM MAXIM #123** – Snagging a high value man is women’s entire purpose for being, although she’s never quite sure she got the best deal possible. Refer to Maxim #116

**IM MAXIM #124** – The balcony looks more impressive seen from the street than when stood on, hypergamy doesn’t realise this. Refer to Maxim #123

**IM MAXIM #125** – Today’s women don’t believe men are manly enough, and today’s men don’t believe women are womanly enough. Both are correct, androgyny plagues our time.

**IM MAXIM #126** – If a woman accuses you of cheating when you haven’t done anything, there’s a high chance she’s projecting her infidelity onto you – abandon her.

**IM MAXIM #127** – The reason women set up their sons to be failures is because they can only see things from a female point of view. A son left in the sole care of his mother with no external masculine influence is being set up for failure. The most loving mother cannot adequately guide her son, for she lacks the abstraction necessary to understand or empathise with the male existential viewpoint. These are the limitations of her nature, not a choice.
IM MAXIM #128 – Women need their ex’s to be losers to feel like they made the right choice. If even one is a winner, her hypergamy will realise a glitch in its optimisation and thus the afflicted woman becomes awash with regret.

IM MAXIM #129 – If you place your trust on a woman’s conscience to compel her to do the right thing, then you are a fool by definition.

IM MAXIM #130 – The smarter the woman, the more nimble the rationalisation of her emotion. [See here for more.]

IM MAXIM #131 – Soul mates are top-tier fantasy men women have pedestalised in their collective subconscious. Men don’t have soul mates, they have women they like and women they don’t.

IM MAXIM #132 – As a man, win or lose, you have to take risks; being complacent and passive is a female privilege – men have the burden of performance. Taking risks is core to the personality of masculinity, when nature gave you XY chromosomes, this was ordained. Meek and lazy men get nothing.

IM MAXIM #133 – Masculine women are a poor simulacrum of man, for they capture man’s fierceness absent his reason or accountability.

IM MAXIM #134 – A woman hates a man who won’t give her what she wants, but she absolutely detests a man who does, and without a fight.

IM MAXIM #135 – As a woman ages, her capacity to attract a top-tier mate decreases, as a man ages, his capacity to attract a top-tier mate increases. In the relationship game women are smarter than men, for they settle as their value is dropping whilst men will settle as their value continues to rise.

IM MAXIM #136 – In matters of fertility and desirability, time is on man’s side, not women’s. From the male viewpoint, women appear to be in a rush to reach ever greater heights of commitment; the truth is, women are in a hurry because they more keenly experience depreciation. Refer to Maxim #102.

IM MAXIM #137 – In relationships, an alpha male will give false opportunities for exercising power (like picking curtain colours) whilst subjugating firmly when needed. The feminine ego necessitates an illusion of inconsequential power.

IM MAXIM #138 – If you’re winning, women care about your tiniest grievances, when you’re losing, you’re dead to them.

IM MAXIM #139 – When you’re winning you can be rude and unruly and she will apologise for your mistakes. When you’re losing, she will blame you for her mistakes. Refer to Maxim #138.

IM MAXIM #140 – Much like the weak parent gives in to the child to both their eventual detriment, the weak man does the same with his woman.
**IM MAXIM #141** – In much the way a man cannot take sex, a woman cannot take commitment. Men seduce women into sex, women seduce men into commitment. Women pitch, men invest.

**IM MAXIM #142** – The less emotionally available you are, the more emotionally available she is – the inverse is also true.

**IM MAXIM #143** – The trick to defending male space from female influence is to shock 99% of female amygdalae. The remaining 1% will be a: smart, b: psychopaths, c: masochists.

**IM MAXIM #144** – Innocence is women’s favoured illusion, and when seemingly present is almost always just that – an illusion.

**IM MAXIM #145** – Don’t be honest with women you wish to admire you, if you are too truthful your honesty will offend, and in this offence a woman’s scorn knows no greater enemy than the trifling man who dared connect her with a less comfortable reality.

**IM MAXIM #146** – Post break-up women move on quicker than men, they can do this because it’s easier for them to find a replacement, they invest less, and they excel at rewriting their memories to dismiss everything that was ever good about you.

**IM MAXIM #147** – Women make great servants, but poor masters. It is ill-advised to give a woman power should you want the thing she has power over to flourish, or even remain intact and functional.

**IM MAXIM #148** – Women are loyal to power at all costs, have it, and you have them, lack it, and they will betray you. **Refer to Maxim #139**

**IM MAXIM #149** – If you are not a high energy dominant man, you’re unlovable to women. Women only love men more ruthless than they are. Any arrangement made in absence of such a personality is one of economic convenience, not love.

**IM MAXIM #150** – A single woman is one who cannot secure investment, a single man is one who will not provide it. **Refer to Maxim #141**

3.) Relevant Reading:

Buy *“The Art of Seduction”* in the USA  
Buy *“The Art of Seduction”* in the UK  
Buy *“The Art of Seduction”* in Canada  
Buy *“The Rational Male”* in the USA  
Buy *“The Rational Male”* in the UK  
Buy *“The Rational Male”* in Canada
“It is natural for a feeling of mere indifference to exist between men, but between women it is actual enmity. This is due perhaps to the fact that odium figulinum in the case of men, is limited to their everyday affairs, but with women embraces the whole sex; since they have only one kind of business.” – Arthur Schopenhauer
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1.) Introduction:

Where testosterone coalesces with creativity, the engine of civilization hums on the fuel of male ambition. Civilization is man’s grand project, an expression of his thought form and aspiration, and although from time to time atypical women will make spontaneous contributions, its distinctly masculine texture remains dominant.

Man has a mission beyond the scope of the home, it is merely the scale of vision and ability
to actualise that differs among men. Indeed, we owe modern civilization to men who kept firm to their life’s work and executed their vision, for it is women who bring us into existence, but men who make said existence glorious. All men have missions, but it is within the provision for humanity through the development of civilization that the greats illuminate the depth and scale of said ambition.

Women are concerned with matters of people, people are women’s business, reproduction with a powerful man is their life goal – they are simple. Where woman’s ambitions are concrete, some may even say mundane, man’s potential is infinite. This is not to say that men do not seek to reproduce, but rather that babies and hearth do not constitute success for a man in quite the way they do for a woman. A woman who achieves these goals actualises her femininity, her mission is complete, and so rarely will she aspire beyond it.

Men on the other hand do not find completion in family life, it is important to them, but it does not encompass the sum of their being. Men do not live for relationships, family and people in quite the way that women do. Whilst the social fabric is the beating heart of all that matters to women, it is but a puzzle piece in a grander picture for men. Being the architects and providers of humanity, man’s focus is expectedly different; the scope of his existence is wider, and thus the extent he must be willing to go, more extreme.

To play it safe as a woman brings success, but for a man it elicits nought but failure. A woman married with children is the apotheosis of feminine success, but a married man with children is not. **Even should a man not marry nor reproduce**, the need for a mission persists, for whilst woman is self-defined by her relationships, man defines himself by his achievements.

2.) Mission Before Woman:

Because woman’s sex drive is far weaker than man’s, on appearance it seems the pursuant man is needier. Being more lustful, he demonstrates greater interest – bestowing woman the power of choice through function of her lower libido. However, the female relies on man’s greater sex drive for every iota of power she has, the great bluff being that because she lusts less, she needs less. In reality, because she lusts less, she is able to extract what she really needs: a man’s protection, provision and emotional support.

A man should marry a craft before even thinking to marry a woman, she should be his second love, lest he ruin her with obsessive worship. For women the opposite is healthy, a woman undedicated to her man is an unworthy partner, and so should she emulate man in dedication to the abstract, she will assuredly make a poor lover and mother. Men are not women and women are not men, and this difference is reflected in all things. The man who worships his wife mimics the feminine, whilst the woman who worships commerce mimics the masculine.

A successful man is a man who makes something of himself, whereas a successful woman is a woman who manages to monopolise said man; and so it is from within this dynamic we see the differences between the male and female agenda. Because the female is more dependent, her preoccupation is with the male, whereas because the male is more independent, his preoccupation is with creation. Poetic then is it not, considering women
create life, that men are the ones preoccupied with creation in life.

3.) Man Is Her Mission:

It is unhealthy for a man to live his life in dedication to a woman, for better and more stable dividends are reaped from creation and commerce. It is within the busyness of productivity a man acquires the distance necessary to be more craved by his woman, a boon rather than detriment to the relationship despite her protestations to the contrary.

A woman will always complain when a man has a mission greater than her, for it deprives her the flow of attention she requires to optimally function. Yet in the presence of an indentured man, she will complain of a lack of ambition, an absence of mission. A woman’s complaints bear little if any merit, for in much the way crying is the way of babies, complaining is the way of women. An unambitious man elicits complaint just as much as an ambitious one, for dissatisfaction is emphatic and characteristic of the feminine psyche.

Where man works the world, woman works man; there is not necessarily premeditation nor malice in this regard, but rather simply, it is woman’s nature to use man. A woman need not work the world when she can work a man, and so where woman is man’s desire, man is less commonly a desire than he is a tool.

Truly then, the assured commitment of a powerful man is woman’s greatest objective, for whether she engages in business or academia, nothing external serves as an adequate substitute. A woman who rejects this and plays the game of men past peak fecundity, is either an unsuccessful woman unable to accomplish her mission, or an outlier with masculine yearnings.

4.) Compromise & Womanly Worthiness:

Relationships with women require compromise, for women are extremely emotional and thus burdensome to contend with. Their nature is to be insecure, and so they are predisposed towards the theatrical and the petty. A man must as such be discriminant in discerning a woman’s worth, for few are worth the compromise they all demand.

Where a woman encumbers a man more than she supports him, she is redundant, an anchor on the ship rather than the caretaker that would maintain it. Naturally being a woman, she has needs, and her needs are many. But if said neediness is to manifest itself as a transgression of her man’s boundaries, as an imposition upon his sovereignty and need for solitude, then she is more hassle than she is worth.

Idealistically, man and woman live happily, making calculated compromises to ensure the union is not undermined by the desires of the individual – micro collectivism. By definition then, a relationship with a woman requires giving up a measure of freedom in order to assuage the demands of the feminine. It is my contention that due to the debilitation of a woman’s pressing emotional wants, a relationship almost always serves her, whilst for it is a riskier affair for man, for the likelihood he receives equal or greater benefit is improbable. A woman is oft a burden posing as a partner, and many a man is fooled as such, when in
reality, she is almost always little more than a dependant.

The question that then naturally follows is “will she be enjoyable enough to be worth the burden she will impose?” Sex can be and often is withdrawn without notice, and so a man cannot rely on either quality or quantity of sex as an indicator of womanly worth, and even were sex a certainty, such narrow scope in the evaluation of woman would lead to blunderous mate choice. Man must thus ask himself if the woman in question has a penchant for drama, and if she is interesting or merely fixated with relationships, social happenings and idle consumption. Generally speaking, the more substantive and less dramatic she is, the worthier and more enjoyable she is.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

Women pitch, men invest. A single woman is one who cannot secure investment, a single man is one who will not provide it. This alone should explain the disparity in anxiety between the single man and the single woman. A single man is anxious only should he be looking to prove his worth, for such a thing is the product of inexperience, the manifestation of the male ego eager to prove itself. It is a rite of passage for a young virgin man, a rite of passage that if unfulfilled, becomes the central focus that consumes him to a point of insanity.

And yet regardless of a woman’s level of experience, she will be deeply anxious if she finds herself single. Socially, having a boyfriend is imperative in woman’s world, for women who cannot get commitment are seen as lesser by their peers who can. Evolutionarily, women’s life mission is marriage and babies, thus if she is incapable of achieving either, “she’s not a real woman.”

The reason low-tier women who cannot secure commitment conceive children from one night stands, is that facilitated by the welfare state, a woman can part-actualise her femininity by having a child. To be a mother lends a woman status, it makes her “more of a woman”, and so it is only through this lens of self-centred feminine egotism that any remote sense can be made of women consciously deciding to raise a child without its father. This is but one example of the extremity a woman will go to in order to actualise an aspect of her femininity.

As a point of note, when “manning up” is used to manipulate men into committing themselves, it is no more than projection. Because the woman brings less to the relationship than the man, her commitment is objectively less qualitative, and thus among other factors, it is this quintessential value disparity that drives her eagerness and cements his reticence. The rule is as such: where woman believes greater benefit is derived from commitment than is not, she presses for it. Where she believes the benefit lesser, she does not. Whilst not strictly logical, woman is pragmatic. This is why a younger woman is typically more relationally adverse than an older woman – greater bargaining power. Whereas for man, his investment is near always significant irrespective of age and thus his reluctance remains consistent.

From a solipsistic frame of reference, she is not “a real woman” should she remain single and childless beyond her peak years, and so by her own standards, a man unaccomplished in this way is equally unactualised; such is the folly of women holding men to feminine metrics of achievement. It is as I said at the beginning, although hearth and home are human wants,
they are more emphatically feminine wants than they are masculine.

**ARTICLE UPDATE:** You wouldn’t have received an e-mail because the piece was updated rather than republished, but last week I significantly overhauled my dark triad Q&A. If you missed out on that, you can find it in all its remastered glory here.

Books:

**The Empress Is Naked**
**The Married Man Sex Life Primer**
**The Rational Male: Preventative Medicine**
**The Testosterone Hypothesis**
The Sanctity of Time
by IM | April 26, 2016 | Link

“\textit{This is what you deserve. You could be good today. But instead you choose tomorrow.}”
\begin{flushright}
\textit{– Marcus Aurelius}
\end{flushright}

Contents:
1.) The Philosophy of Time  
2.) Drama Avoidance  
3.) Create An Elitist Bubble  
4.) Love The Grind  
5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading

1.) The Philosophy of Time:

An ambitious man feels like he never quite has enough time, for vision is vast and time brief. A man who lives to achieve must thus do so constantly, for considerable gaps in productivity lead to self-loathing. A man who respects time disrespects himself for wasting it, his very reason for being tied inextricably to his productivity.

If an ambitious man is productive, he is happy, if he’s not, he isn’t; he doesn’t achieve because he wants to, but rather, because he has to. Such a man has no choice in the matter, but rather this is the way his life must be, for if his \textit{happiness} were not tied to his productivity, his life would not be a life worth living.

Only a man without an appreciation for time is content to waste it, for absent ambition he is
ignorant of the path forfeited. If the unambitious man could peek into the life of his productive self, he’d believe the greatness strewn in front of him were a con. Consumed by ignorance and unable to appreciate the relationship between greatness and productivity, the mundane man does not even dream dreams, let alone build them.

An actualised man bereft present or future achievement is a shadow of his former self, for achievement is addictive and ambition cruel. A man who’s given up is not really a man, he doesn’t feel like one and nobody sees him as one, for expectations of men are great and the achievements of such men, poor. Many struggle to optimise their time and few master the endeavour, but he who does not try or no longer tries is held in contempt by those who retain a respect for time.

To be an actualised man is not merely to have achieved, but to continue to do so; actualisation does not entail retirement, for a man’s work is not done until his time’s spent. Time is limited and ambition gluttonous, and so a man must separate the worthy from the unworthy, make firm choices, and live with them regardless of their retrospective efficacy.

A man cannot choose to spend time like he can money, for time answers to no man, spending itself until spent. Armed with the knowledge that time is spent regardless of one’s will, the wise man endeavours to spend it as wisely as possible. It is from this knowledge that the productivity obsession is born, born from the realisation that although one’s quantity of time is fixed, its quality need not be.

The ambitious man is all too aware of mortality’s brevity, and with a scope of mind that can tap into the infinite, he is compelled to lead life in the knowledge that nothing he does will ever be enough, but that to not even make the attempt is an act of self-betrayal.

If a man can optimise his time but his competition can’t, he beats the competition. If he and his competition have equal time, but he can do more with less of it, he beats the competition. We are all allocated an amount of time to do with as we see fit, but not all time is of equal quality. It is the man himself who determines the quality of his time, whilst chance determines its quantity.

The quality of time is determined by three core factors: vision, energy and focus. Absent energy a man cannot act, absent vision he cannot strive, and absent focus he cannot actualise. Master all three facets and the quality of one’s time vastly improves, lack even one facet and one’s potential escapes them. Vision alone is inadequate, and this is why many men dream but do not achieve. Vision bereft energy lacks the impetus to manifest, whilst vision bereft focus lacks the discipline to implement.

An underachieving man should pay particular attention to the three facets, and take the time to honestly introspect with himself. He should identify which aspect of his character is lacking, and form a plan of attack for rectifying the dysfunction.

2.) Drama Avoidance:

The internet contains a volume of knowledge beyond even one’s wildest dreams, and yet it is a sea of theatricism full of people violently competing for your attention. The average
person’s self-discipline is inferior to the average narcissist’s lust for attention, and so in light of such a reality, one must exercise great care in who they apportion their time.

To be used effectively, the internet requires great discipline. The internet is an attention economy, and so histrionic narcissism sells, and sells big time. This is fine for average people, but a man who wants to become great has no time for such trivialities.

Drama is attention porn and junk information, it psychically robs a man of his focus and time the same way junk food robs it physically. People who create drama do not care about your struggle to be a better man, they are all too happy to take the time you need to build yourself to build their brand. Do not let them.

A man’s time is valuable not only to him, but likewise to those who would prey on his emotions to monopolise his attention. Fortunes are built on capturing attention, and the easiest way to do this is through drama. Everything costs a man time, but not everything gives him value for his time. If productivity is about enhancing the value of time by doing things that enhance the practitioner, then drama at best gives a man nothing for something, and at worst ruins his mental state with no pay-off.

Drama creates hysteria, and hysteria’s real value is to serve its master, not the pawns that it consumes and controls. As such, the optimisation of one’s time all but necessitates the avoidance of drama, great men create drama as a strategic gambit, but they are not pulled into the webs of others.

3.) Create An Elitist Bubble:

It is important for a man to filter the information he consumes, for he becomes what he exposes himself to. If he watches mediocrity, reads mediocrity and discusses mediocrity, then he is destined to be mediocre. When stated so plainly it seems obvious, but in practice it is typically anything but.

A man should not only avoid the dramatic, but likewise the low value. Average people are a drain because the average are mediocre, they have no thirst for greatness nor vision, and thus an aspirational man has not even the slightest hope of relating to them.

Average people aren’t going anywhere in life, so they deify trivia to keep themselves distracted. When a man is not building a life, he is busy commenting on how other’s run theirs; this is a manifestation of the consumer/producer mentality that distinguishes winners from losers and these are the type of people you want to avoid.

The average are fuelled by triviality, but the great do all they can to avoid it. The reason it is so difficult to avoid the trivial is because the average are numerous, and triviality is their prime interest. To become great you must avoid triviality, and in order to achieve this you will find yourself becoming more elitist in your associations. As the standards you hold yourself to rise, so do your standards of others, those who no longer meet the bar must be left behind, lest they drag you back.

4.) Love The Grind:
Unaccomplished men have a tendency to complain about how difficult it is to improve instead of using the energy spent complaining on improving. The trick to grinding is to enjoy the grind. If a man enjoys doing something productive, it doesn’t feel like work and thus he performs better than if he looked at it as work. A man should always go into something with the idea it better completes him to do it, that in doing it he gains, and that gains require effort and effort is normal.

It should be a man’s goal to mentally reach a place where he’s so in love with the game he can’t imagine doing anything but playing it. This is in contrast to those who avoid the game because they fear it, a full conversion from escaping into the mediocrity of pop culture and entertainment, to reading, lifting, networking and creating.

Emotions dictate a lot of what a man does and doesn’t do regardless of how weak or strong his logic is. A negative perception of a task makes it subjectively difficult regardless of whether said task is objectively difficult, as such a man should construct positive perceptions for difficult tasks if he seeks greatness.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

A man can build himself a great life only if he pursues the difficult and relishes the pain of challenge. He should not waste time on regret, as although one should not aspire to squander time, they should forgive themselves for doing so; punishing one’s self for past frivolity is an act of present frivolity – carpe diem.
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1.) Introduction:
Welcome to part 3 in my series of Machiavellian maxims, you know the drill by now, contained within is a pithy collection of Machiavellian wisdom. If you’ve not read anything in this series before, you can find part 1 here, and part 2 here.

2.) The Maxims:
1. – In matters of persuasion one should appeal to emotion, not reason. Where this fails, use sophistry.
2. – Logical fallacies double as effective Machiavellian power plays, for logic is antithetical to cunning.
3. – Anticipate your opponent’s moves, preempting where possible and implementing contingencies where not.
4. – An intellectual more than anybody must become Machiavellian, for it is this and this alone that will save them from predacious egos. [See More Here,]
5. - Delivery is more persuasive than substance, optimise appearance and strike when the time is right, for masterful delivery can make even the mundane into magic.

6. - In matters of defection it is more effective to offer revenge than money.

7. - It is foolish to sentimentally gauge the chance of betrayal, but rather, one should assess the incentive and capacity for doing so. Offer disincentives to maximise loyalty.

8. - Your most intimate enemies will admire you, copy you and take all your advice only to use it for an agenda that undermines yours.

9. - Each personality is a puzzle in which favour can be unlocked by demonstrating the traits desired by the personality, learn a personality and complement it to influence it.

10. - Apologies are oft ineffectual, for they stir up resentment and exacerbate matters by highlighting wrongdoing. A leader should not show regret, he should ignore, deny acknowledgement, or spin a negative into a positive. To regret is to show weakness and invite belittlement.

11. - Appear unappealing to those who don’t appeal to you, for it is better to be undesired than to be desired by the undesirable.

12. - To permit insolence from one is to court it from all; crush the insolent or deprive them a platform, lest you earn a reputation for timidity.

13. - The most terrible action can be bred from the best of intention. Be mindful of bad advice from the well intended, they may mean well but unintentional or not, their misinformation will destroy you.

14. - The power players have learned to harness the zealous delusions of their pawns to dress unvirtuous agendas in the clothing of nobility.

15. - Anybody who can conceive of evil can enact it.

16. - Conceal your intentions whilst ascertaining the competition’s, he who has the most correct data wins; always be mindful of misinformation.

17. - Most believe one should never be ruthless (because it’s evil) or that one should always be ruthless (because otherwise you’re weak). Both are wrong.

18. - Provocation is an invitation to act in a way that reduce’s one’s power; as such, ignoring is a skill any would-be Machiavellian would do well to master.

19. - Mastery of interpersonal psychology is micro Machiavellianism, mastery of military strategy is macro Machiavellianism and business strategy is both.

20. - Transactional analysis: Every time somebody asks you a question, they want you to give them value, or they’re looking to sabotage you. Be mindful of the blur between curiosity and inquisition.
21. - Strive for success but be cautious of it, for one who knows not how to handle it will be robbed of the qualities that made them great; rampant success introduces an overconfidence that diminishes reason and a complacency that destroys drive – do not be a victim of your success.

22. - The histrionic weaponises their storytelling talent on the slightest whim, for blackmail is how they obtain and chaos is how they indulge. Be wary the histrionic, for they take root and disrupt venomously like a toxin.

23. - Should you see the trifecta of: confrontation, dismissiveness and attention seeking – you have yourself a histrionic. Tread on their egg shells and succumb to aggressive sensitivity, or reject them by refusing to deign acknowledgement.

24. - Absence increases respect only when the absence is legitimate. If you ignore somebody but are observed by the ignored engaging others, you are not absent, and so elicit disrespect rather than respect. True absence is in disappearance, not observable silence.

25. - It’s subtler to deprive than to inflict. Inflict to make a statement, deprive to attack with the stealth of plausible deniability.

26. - If you don’t know how to play the game, people do not respect you, if you play the game, people think you’re untrustworthy. If one must choose, it is always better to be distrusted than disrespected.

27. - The unfocused and the stupid are easily made the puppets and pawns of those who manufacture controversy for nothing but their own advantage.

28. - When dealing with a troublesome women, a man must realise the presumption of innocence works in her favour. Reframe her presumed innocence, keep the focus on her and make veiled threats with pleasant language.

29. - Neither cuteness nor beauty translates into virtue, but the charm of such things leads the idiot to believe it does.

30. - Not addressing the concerns of lieutenants is one of the gravest mistakes a general can make. Dismissal will cost morale, loyalty and cohesion.

31. - The paranoid assume predation, and so in their lack of finesse make their distrust obvious eliciting nought but disdain.

32. - If you want power you have to become highly resistant to provocation, the weak will always try to provoke you to siphon your credibility.

33. - Do not reward insolence, it is far more efficient to silently dismiss than loudly dispute. Shows of force are only necessary should one wish to set an example.

34. - Never reward passive aggressiveness, for it is merely a precursor to insolence.

35. - The fewer words you need to explain, the likelier you are believed. This is why honest
justification is intuited as dishonest – it doth protest too much.

36. - It is pointless to explain why you’re rejecting somebody because they will disdain the rejection more than they appreciate the reasoning behind your decision.

37. - The rejected will use your reason for denying them as ammunition for a smear campaign; it is wiser to deprive them data than fuel their fire. Concealment trumps transparency in matters of rejection.

38. - You may be tempted to gloat about why you’re rejecting a person, but as a matter of class and concealment, know when to stop.

39. - Cost-benefit hassle to reward ratio, where hassle exceeds reward, association or investment is unprofitable.

40. - Be very suspicious of neutral people, but be as neutral as feasible yourself; polarise only when necessary.

41. - As a scientist tests his hypotheses a Machiavellian should test his strategies.

42. - Utilise ambiguity as bait to ascertain interest.

43. - You should be civil to strangers but it should not be easy to become your friend, only lower the drawbridge for the worthy. A man who welcomes everybody into his kingdom will soon enough have no kingdom to speak of; what is true of countries is likewise of men. Pick your friends carefully.

44. - The most common way people inadvertently reveal their hand is through projection.

45. - People’s assumptions normally stem from the opinions they hold of themselves, the more emotional the individual, the more likely they are projecting.

46. - The more people want to believe, the easier it is to sell; the less people want to believe, the easier it is to hide.

47. - Use finesse when asking questions, lest you grant the impression you’re interrogating and arouse suspicions.

48. - Do not quibble over small sums or tiny favours, for the pettier you are, the smaller you seem.

49. - Misdirection is superior to omission in matters of concealment.

50. - The quickest way to make an ally is to pay up, and the quickest way to make an enemy? Not paying up.

51. - In matters of negotiation, once you identify the insecurities of the other party you have the power. If they are timid, identify their insecurities and spontaneously demonstrate qualities that assuage their fears. If they are ruthless, leverage their insecurities to degrade
their ability to negotiate for more favourable terms.

52. - Find out what a person wants and you’re a step closer to knowing what they need. From here discern what they fear losing, and what they want but can’t get. Wherever there is dependence there is fear, and wherever there is fear there is leverage. Find the fear and acquire leverage.

53. - Regardless of who you deal with, be he virtuous or unvirtuous, it always pays to know a man’s fears.

54. - Whoever is willing to go further will invariably win, for he who denies a winning strategy on moral grounds forfeits victory.

55. - Every powerful man needs a fall man, a man to commit dirty deeds on his behalf, for it is in this way he will evade the deposition that follows from hate.

3.) Relevant Reading / In Closing:
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1.) Introduction:

The 48 Laws of Power is the modern man’s Machiavellian bible; based on the incisive strategic thought of prominent classical thinkers Niccolo Machiavelli and Baltasar Gracian, Robert Greene sets out to elucidate the reader on the nature of power. He explores power by dissecting its elements, explaining each element’s uses, and exemplifying its manifestation through regaling historic tales of Europe’s elite.

The 48 Laws of Power is so thoroughly potent in its capacity to teach cunning, that it is not only a bestseller, but likewise the most loaned book in U.S prison libraries. In some prisons the book is even banned, as such one is almost certain that if the text had been released in an earlier era, it would have ended up on the Vatican’s list of forbidden texts in the same way Machiavelli’s “The Prince” did.
2.) What The Book Lacks:

It’s important for the aspiring Machiavellian to know what The 48 Laws of Power lacks in order to compensate for the gap in understanding they will be left with. Some of the things left unsaid in the text will be outlined within the confines of this essay, whilst others will require further reading.

The 48 Laws of Power is not a complete treatise on power. Although a detailed set of in-depth maxims, it focuses predominantly on the micro and omits near all mention of the macro. It focuses on the optimisation of personal affects to enhance social power, but does not offer strategic models or blueprints.

Realising The 48 Laws of Power was an incomplete treatise, Greene released The 33 Strategies of War. The 33 Strategies is The 48 Law’s complementary sister text, because where the 48 Laws focuses on the micro, The 33 Strategies focuses on the macro. Only once an individual has studied both texts will they possess a complete understanding of the Machiavellian world that Greene elucidates, neither book is sufficient in and of itself.

To expound on what I mean by this, The 48 Laws of Power will make you shrewder with people, but it won’t help you formulate effective business strategies. Whilst the 33 Strategies of War will arm a man with the understanding necessary to engage in corporate warfare, it will do little to assist him interpersonally. As such, neither is a comprehensive education in power, but together they form a complete and unassailable treatise. Combine these texts with Machiavelli’s “The Prince”, and one has both the psychological tools and philosophical understanding to develop a masterful competency in cunning.

The examples used to illustrate the book’s laws take place among a social class most cannot relate to in an era alien to all who live today. As such, it is necessary to transfer the elements of power represented in a classical paradigm into a contemporary one. Whilst competent abstract thinkers will have no problem doing this, the average person will find it challenging to translate some of the laws into a modern context and will as such struggle to truly understand the precepts of the text.

Greene exposes the granular building blocks of power, but that’s where he stops. The book does not provide methodological instruction to help the reader implement the laws. And likewise, it does not teach the reader which law takes precedence when two contradicting laws are relevant to one’s situation. It is down to the reader to work these things out for themselves, and if they cannot, they will be unable to derive the entirety of what the book has to offer.

3.) The Spectral Nature of The Laws:

A common erroneous tendency I have noticed in those studying The 48 Laws is to treat the laws too rigidly, ironic, considering law 48 is “assume formlessness”, the advocation of adaptability as a strategem. In so much as one should adapt their strategy based on the ever-changing nature of the battlefield, one should likewise tailor each stratagem to suit the situation they find themselves in.
Generally one should not **outshine the master**, but it is important to remember that “generally” does not equate to “never.” There will come a time when defying a law is necessary to maximise your options.

Say your boss takes the credit for all your hard work and does not properly respect or compensate you. This makes you want to leave, and you suspect your boss wants to fire you anyway. In a meeting with your boss and your bosses’ boss, it would pay to outshine your boss. By impressing your bosses’ boss, you gain the favour of somebody more important and become less disposable. Double this up with an anonymous smear campaign of your boss, and perhaps your boss will be fired by his boss and you will retain your job.

After all it was your boss that was the problem, not the job. If the gambit fails, your already anticipated exit will likely hasten, but with little to lose the gamble is worth it.

The laws are generalised aspects of power, moldable to the dynamics of the situation in hand. When applying a law, one should generally consider two things: is the timing right? (law 35) and is the current strategy working? (law 48). If the answer to the first question is yes and the second no, one should use a law reversal. If the answer to the first and second questions is no, continue as you are, mindful to execute a law reversal at an opportune moment.

“Assume formlessness” was specifically chosen as the final law because it is the single stratagem that encompasses and concludes all others. There is no one specific way of perceiving or using a law, and although not specifically and explicitly communicating this, Robert Greene demonstrates the dual nature of laws by exploring their reversals. In the same way that an organism must adapt to its environment for natural selection to favour it, the changing tides of power demand the same of the Machiavellian.

Do not see the laws as monolithic entities, but rather as stratagems that encompass a contradicting and varied nature. Each law falls on a spectrum between 0 and 100, the law in its default form is the law at 100, whilst the reversal is the law at 0. You may employ the law at different gradations and still effectively utilise the power of said law. Although a law at 0 will utilise the same element of power as a law at 100, it will be completely antithetical to it.

With the law “always say less than necessary” for example, 100 would be the default interpretation of the law, meaning one would say as little as necessary to communicate. The reversal would be the same law of power at 0 on the spectrum, meaning the individual would speak verbosely without revealing any substance. This bombards the victim with excess information, which is not merely concealment, but likewise distractive. That which is typically a defensive move gains a subtle attacking component when reversed.

The mid-point at 50 would be to reveal information, but keep your trump card hidden. Essentially, the individual would say less than necessary whilst appearing open. Each law thus falls on a spectrum and can be rotated and rendered in any way one’s imagination deems fit, to know when and how to apply a law is to know the art of finesse. I cannot teach you how to do this through essays, essay reading will only make you aware of the possibility. To teach the skill would require one-on-one tutelage and some practice.
4.) Perfecting The Learning Process:

If one simply reads The 48 Laws of Power as quickly as possible, they do themselves a disservice. It is a book that should be read at one’s pace and savoured. My recommendation for learning the text is as follows:

- Read a law and do your best to understand it. See if you can transfer the historical example into a contemporary one, this will allow you to better relate to the aspect of power being discussed.

- Read the law again, this time taking notes on what you think are the key points which make up the crux of the law. Write down any hypothetical examples relevant to the law you can come up with.

- Listen to the law in question narrated on YouTube (or buy the audiobook) to promote further internalisation. If I’ve written an essay on the law in question, you can glean understanding from my insights. My essays on the laws will appear on this page. Eventually I’ll have a write-up on all the laws.

- Analyse present and past situations for examples of where the law took place (efficacy of this step is obviously limited by the strength of your memory) – this will compound your understanding of a law’s applicability on top of any hypothetical examples you came up with.

- Practice exercising the laws defensively with your social groups.

- Join a disposable social group (a club of some sort you don’t really care about) where you can practice a more aggressive use of the laws without any meaningful or lasting consequence.

- Utilise the laws aggressively with your main social groups should you deem it necessary.

5.) In Closing:

The 48 Laws of Power, The 33 Strategies of War and The Prince are the three principal books on which an aspiring Machiavellian should base their understanding of cunning. As a recommended reading order, I advise first reading The Prince in order to acquaint yourself with the holistic philosophical and ethical viewpoint of the Machiavellian. This should be followed up with a reading on The 48 Laws of Power, as the text will acquaint the reader with people’s personal affects and teach them how to handle these.

The third and final book that makes up the core foundation of Machiavellian knowledge is The 33 Strategies of War. If you are an entrepreneur or businessman, you will find the strategies outlined in The 33 Strategies of War to be invaluable. Essentially the text teaches one how to wage warfare on a military scale, and being on the institutional scale, that which applies to the military is likewise transferable to the corporate.

Each foundational text will expand and change the way you think about people and power. Machiavelli’s The Prince will encourage you to critically examine the Judeo-Christian view of
morality and how it relates to political power – this is why the Vatican originally banned it. The 48 Laws of Power will teach you to behave in a way that elicits respect from your peers, whilst enhancing your perception of their manipulations. And The 33 Strategies of War will open your eyes to strategy on a larger scale, highlighting the relationship between human and institutional behaviour.

These three texts form the foundational fulcrum necessary to make a Machiavellian of a man. Additional texts on power are out there, but they are merely additive rather than necessitative for the power and strategy aficionado.

If you enjoy my work and want to give back, you can show some love with Patreon.
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How To Apply The 48 Laws of Power: Machiavellian Social Competencies
Machiavellian Thinking vs. Conventional Logic
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“Don’t lower your expectations to meet your performance. Raise your level of performance to meet your expectations.” - Ralph Marston
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1.) Introduction:

So you’re in Monk Mode, but you find yourself regularly lacking the energy and focus you need to complete all the tasks you assign yourself. You find it hard to concentrate when reading books, and your workouts suck because you get tired quickly. What do you do about it? Other than getting your testosterone, estrogen and thyroid checked, you start taking modafinil.

Some of the most influential people throughout mankind’s history have done drugs. Freud developed his psychoanalytic theory under the influence of pharmaceutical grade cocaine, Winston Churchill took nitrous oxide and Francis Crick, was supposedly (it’s disputed) high on LSD when he discovered DNA. Like it or not and irrespective of stigma, sourced well and dosed correctly chemical compounds can help an individual think in new ways and perform at an elite level.

Now whilst I shan’t ever be advocating the consumption of outlawed narcotics here at Illimitable Men, there are a class of substances known as nootropics that can greatly enhance
a whole range of things. Effects vary from the enhancement of creativity and memory, to the alleviation of depression and fatigue.

In fact, you probably unknowingly take at least one nootropic everyday: caffeine. Caffeine is the world’s most famous nootropic, relied upon and consumed by millions day in, day out. Many people will shamelessly admit to a caffeine addiction because it’s socially acceptable and carries no stigma, but at its essence caffeine addiction is a biological addiction.

The main problem with caffeine is that tolerance is developed quickly. It’s a diuretic (you keep needing to go to the toilet, which interrupts your productive phases) and positive effects only last for a few hours (at most) before another dose is needed, and so when caffeine wears off, the individual experiences a horrible crash. Take it for too long and you become dependent, caffeine is habit-forming.

Modafinil is one of the strongest nootropics on the market, in truth I’d say its potency puts it somewhere between a drug and a nootropic, as it’s too weak to be a drug but too strong to be a nootropic. Luckily for you, the powers that be disagree with my assessment and classify modafinil as a nootropic off-label and a prescription medicine on-label. As such getting hold of the stuff is simple, and to my knowledge there is no penalty for possessing it (but this may vary by jurisdiction, so do research on the laws in your country before ordering anything.)

In the US under the controlled substances act, modafinil is categorised as a schedule IV drug, meaning to legally purchase the compound you need a prescription for narcolepsy or shift work sleep disorder, however in some instances it is given for sleep apnea. Most people cannot get a prescription from their doctor for modafinil, or even if they can, find it is cheaper to buy it online than with medical insurance. I’ll tell you exactly where you can source it from a reputable supplier further in.

2.) The Risks of Modafinil:

When one first takes modafinil they must exercise extreme caution, because before you start taking it you don’t know how high or low your body’s natural tolerance is.

According to my research, there are effectively three types of responders: non-responders, standard responders and sensitive responders. Most of the advice on “getting started with modafinil” out there is aimed at standard responders, and so if you’re a sensitive responder and take the conventional advice on dosing, you’re going to have a horrible, frightening experience with it. Nobody else will tell you this, you’ve heard it here first.

The reason you won’t hear this anywhere else is because either A: the blogger/vlogger discussing their experience with modafinil is a standard responder and so didn’t need to be cautious or B: the site you’re on actually sells modafinil and doesn’t want to persuade you out of a purchase, so they’ll omit if not play down the compound’s potential risks.

I’m not a standard responder (I’m a sensitive responder) and I don’t sell modafinil, so I can speak from a prudentialist perspective and guide you on how to use modafinil off-label in the safest way possible.
When you’ve never taken a substance before and want to try it for the first time, it is in your interest to assume you are a sensitive responder. If you’re not, you can scale up your dosage to obtain the desired effects. If you are, you save yourself from experiencing a long list of adverse side effects. So if you’ve never taken modafinil before, but want to try it, assume you’re a sensitive responder.

If you assume you are a standard responder and you’re not, you can experience any combination of the following side effects:

- Loss of consciousness
- Dizziness (a focus so strong it feels too intense to look at things or make sudden movements)
- Cardiac arrhythmia (irregular heartbeat)
- Heart palpitations (stronger heartbeat)
- Complete loss of appetite (you try to eat, take two mouthfuls and feel as if you’re full)
- Migraines
- Increased anxiety/paranoia
- A tight throbbing sensation in the throat

I have experienced all of the above side effects (yes, I even blacked out), and yet I still recommend this substance. Why? Because it obliterates fatigue, increases concentration and improves your motivation and sense of well-being. That is of course assuming, you take it correctly.

All the adverse effects I experienced were due to being a sensitive responder who didn’t know how to take it correctly, I didn’t know how to take it correctly because there was a lack of pre-existing information on how sensitive responders should dose. I had to single-handedly figure out how to take modafinil safely as a sensitive responder, and having suffered as a guinea pig on your behalf, you can avoid the negative effects by learning from my mistakes.

The first time I ordered modafinil I was told to take 100mg of modalert (that’s half a tablet) on an empty stomach. This will do absolutely nothing if you’re a non-responder, and the effects will kick in very quickly (within a minute) if you’re a standard responder.

However this is what nobody else will tell you: if you’re a sensitive responder, you will black out and then feel extremely dizzy for anywhere up to 2 hours, because 100mg on an empty stomach constitutes an overdose due to your naturally low tolerance level. The first time I took modafinil was the one time I blacked out on it. I blacked out because the instructions provided were bogus, they were bogus because they assumed a base level tolerance that was too high. As I said earlier, for the sake of one’s safety it should be assumed you are a sensitive responder until proven otherwise.

3.) How To Start Using Modafinil Safely:

The first time you take modafinil should not be on an empty stomach, because taking it on an empty stomach leads to vastly increased potency of the compound and can completely overwhelm you with dizziness.
As for dose, do not take any more than 50mg. Assuming you possess the modalert 200 variant, the pill is 200mg and thus a quarter of a pill is 50mg. Use a sharp knife or pill cutter to cut the pill in half (pill cutters are better as they are more precise), then cut it in half again. If you are sensitive, this will stop you from blacking out because less pill equals lower dosage. 200mg (an entire pill) is far too high a dose for sensitive responders.

You should eat at least 3 large eggs or 5 regular eggs before taking modafinil, the choline will prevent you from getting migraines, and if you combine this with ample hydration, you won’t experience any headaches.

To minimise the risk of heart palpitations or cardiac issues, you should supplement with 200mg of L-Theanine. If you still experience cardiac issues after taking modafinil, try upping your L-Theanine supplementation to 400mg. If you have no luck there, try upping to 600mg. If you continue to have problems, do not increase your L-Theanine supplementation any further. Modafinil is no good for you and you should avoid it, it is not worth hurting your heart to enjoy a nootropic.

Modafinil requires timing if you do not want to upset your sleeping pattern. The substance has a half-life of 16 hours, but sleep should be attainable 9-12 hours after ingestion. Assuming you sleep 8 hours a day, you should take it within the first 4 hours of being awake. If you woke up at 11am and took it at 3pm, you’d be able to go to sleep by 3am. If you woke up at 5am and took it at 8am, you’d be able to sleep by 8pm. Time your dose correctly to avoid a sleepless night.

You hear a lot of nonsense about people suffering from modafinil-induced insomnia, but this is because they have stupidly popped an entire pill at a party late in the evening, mixed it with alcohol, and now idiotically wonder whilst they’re shivering in a stranger’s bed blacking out over and over again at 8am the next day.

The simple fact of the matter is if you take modafinil like an idiotic infant at a college party, it will harm you. If you take it sensibly, it will enhance you.

You should not drink tea, coffee or alcohol when taking modafinil unless the dose you’ve taken is too weak and you wish to increase its potency without taking additional modafinil. Caffeine interacts with modafinil, significantly increasing the chances you experience heart palpitations and anxiety. Despite its L-Theanine content, even green tea can cause these problems due to its caffeine content. This is why when on modafinil, I recommend supplementing with L-Theanine rather than drinking green tea; this way you get the L-Theanine you need to balance yourself without bringing caffeine into the mix.

Personally I haven’t noticed any tolerance build-up, and like initial sensitivity, whether one builds a tolerance will vary from individual to individual. Nonetheless, if you’re a sensitive responder taking a quarter of a pill a day, 40 pills will last you just over 5 months. Of course if you do build tolerance, you will get through more quicker. Those who build tolerance have reported being able to keep tolerance down by cycling modafinil 5 days on and 2 days off, so if you do build tolerance, this is worth trying.

As a final note, you should plan your day out before taking modafinil, and then immediately
set to enacting your plan once you’ve taken it. If you do not, you may find yourself wasting your enhanced energy and focus on nonsense. Whilst modafinil most certainly does give you focus, it does not give you discipline. If you choose to read clickbait or have conversations on social media, this is precisely what you’ll waste hours upon hours doing. Be mindful, and use this time of enhanced faculty to do the things that really matter.

In summary:

- Take no more than 50mg - this is a low dose that will prevent dizziness/fainting
- Take modafinil shortly AFTER food, not before or with - this will reduce its potency
- Drink lots of water to prevents headaches
- Eat at least 3 large eggs or 5 regular ones before taking modafinil – this prevents migraines
- Supplement with 200mg of L-Theanine - this prevents heart palpitations and anxiety
- Do not drink any tea or coffee, as caffeine will interact with the modafinil and potentiate it
- Do not drink alcohol with modafinil, it can lead to blackouts and memory loss

Please bear in mind these are guidelines to begin taking modafinil safely, they are not hard rules for continued consumption. For instance, people with higher tolerances find they do not get the most out of their modafinil unless they combine it with coffee. Until you are more intimately familiar with your tolerance level, these guidelines are a good starting place.

4.) The Benefits of Modafinil:

On modafinil, you will stop being lazy and become motivated, things that normally feel like a chore won’t feel like one. If you are constantly tired, you will stop feeling tired. If you have problems concentrating, concentrating will become easy. Modafinil allows you to unlock your full potential and properly seize the day, there is nothing else quite like it to reliably boost productivity.

Many people’s general fatigue stems from low dopamine, and modafinil fixes this by prohibiting dopamine transportation, allowing greater dopamine to accrue in the brain.

Many people report elevated mood when taking modafinil, which is probably an effect of increased dopamine resulting in the alleviation of sub-clinical depression. That is to say, the person in question unknowingly suffers from sub-clinical depression due to low dopamine, and the dopamine increase caused by modafinil has alleviated this, resulting in a greater sense of well-being.

- Increased aggressiveness:

Conventional sites classify this as an adverse side effect and I can see situations in which it could prove unhelpful, but considering the vast majority of men are meek and unassertive nowadays, I think it’s more of a benefit than a detriment. Men looking to reclaim their masculinity will probably agree with me on this.

Modafinil will make you bolder and more short with people. When I’m on modafinil, I’m less conflict avoidant. It’s not so bad it sends you into a neurotic rage, but it certainly lowers your tolerance for nonsense. Let’s put it another way: if you are the kind of person who is normally
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too scared to ask for things, you won’t feel that way when you’re on modafinil.

- **Reduced appetite/weight loss:**

On low doses of modafinil there is a greater disinterest in eating, you may eat if you desire it, but you won’t actually feel hungry. If you want to reduce calorie consumption in order to lose body fat, or you wish to keep to a certain feeding window because you’re fasting, this aspect is incredibly useful. Many people report weight loss after consuming modafinil for some time.

- **Addiction suppression:**

People seek dopamine from unhealthy consumption, such as eating junk food, smoking or doing drugs. As modafinil boosts dopamine, unhealthy addictions will fall to the wayside. There are reports of smokers giving up cigarettes, and even **preliminary research** looking at whether modafinil can be used to cure cocaine addiction.

Modafinil bonds to the same receptor sites in the brain as cocaine by increasing dopamine, except unlike cocaine the effects last significantly longer and it does not make the user feel high. You could probably use modafinil to beat a cocaine addiction, although as someone who’s never been addicted to cocaine, I’m unable to test this hypothesis for myself.

- **Enhanced cognition:**

Greater focus and clearer thoughts, improved short-term memory recall and superior concentration. It may increase or decrease your creativity, but this factor seems to vary from individual to individual. According to **the twitter poll I conducted on self-reported modafinil users**, it is more likely to increase rather than decrease creativity, but will most likely have no bearing on it.

- **Fatigue alleviation:**

Modafinil does not come on suddenly and intensely unless you take a dose your body can’t handle. It is not like other stimulants such as caffeine or cocaine where you will feel immediately wired, quickly reach a peak and then crash. Modafinil does not wire you, but rather it will imbue you with an increased sense of effortless concentration. Any sense of fatigue that was bogging you down will immediately clear up, and you will feel more energetic.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

What kind of people take modafinil? **Winners** take modafinil, be they students at ivy league colleges, high-powered lawyers or top finance execs. Winners take modafinil because they’re ambitious, driven, and want to perform at their best. There are few other substances out there that can give you a kick in the ass the way modafinil does, and as long as you use it intelligently you can get an edge without paying in pain.

As for sourcing Modafinil, there are many different vendors of modafinil on the internet, some sell fake products, others sell generics rather than the branded stuff. I got my modafinil from Modafinil Cat. Modafinil Cat has a great tracking service and the modafinil they sell is
100% legit pharmaceutical grade straight from the manufacturers in India, if you want good stuff they’re your guys.

**PLEASE NOTE:** I am not a medical professional and thus the information contained herein does not constitute medical advice and should not be construed as such. This information is purely for educational purposes.

You can buy L-Theanine here, and Modafinil here.
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Notes On Law 27: “Play On People’s Need to Believe to Create a Cult-like Following”
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“The only difference between a cult and a religion is the amount of real estate they own.”

- Frank Zappa
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1.) Introduction – Summarising The Law:

The need to believe in the improbable and the idealistic is a common source of passion and comfort for the unfulfilled. Gullibility is profitable, particularly if it can be sustained, hence the lucratives of cults.

Law 27 touches upon the single aspect of the human psyche that dictates the form of all human thought and action, as well as the movement of capital that accompanies it – belief. This is why ideology, marketing, subculture and religion all frenetically compete to influence the people with their various interpretations of reality, for those who buy into their views reward them politically and financially.

Belief and gullibility are inextricably intertwined, for gullibility finds its root in greed, escape, and the want of happiness. All minds are suggestible, it is just that some are convinced to a
greater degree and with less effort than others.

Remember, to form a cult is not to merely impress a mind, but rather, to capture it by defining the very filter with which it interprets its surrounding reality. If you can sustain a delusion and extract a regular tithe from your followers, wonderful. If not, you’ll be forced into a nomadic lifestyle in the unending pursuit of fresh marks.

2.) Notes On The Law:

- A following is the cultural embodiment of an army, your most zealous followers will preserve your reputation by fighting your detractors.

- With a following in tow, the enforcement of your will becomes automated. Your followers will act as relays for your ideas, pushing your agenda and converting others to your cause. Like any good business, a successful faith outsources proselytisation to its most fervent pawns.

- People are blessed with the ability to adapt to a harsh reality, but cursed with a need to believe in delightful implausibilities.

- The allure of the unreal is the grace of transcendence, fantasy bestows escape from mediocrity, and it is in this desire gullibility finds partial form.

- Cult creation relies on a central point of worship, a person or thing that symbolises a group’s shared values. Cult leaders appear to be the living personification of the ideals, norms and values that the wider group holds dear.

- In the absence of religion there is a power vacuum, the people’s need to believe remains, but the cult which previously sustained the need is absent. As such, people turn to smaller and less ancient cults, swapping religion for ideology in the unending quest to understand a cold world and experience a better tomorrow.

- The gullible outsource their agency to faith, rationalising failure as fate.

- The greater your number of followers, the easier it becomes to acquire new ones; this is preselection at work.

- A sophistic charlatan is infallible to his cult, misfortunes are rationalised around him rather than attributed to him.

- In groups, people are more emotional and less capable of reasoning – see mob mentality.

- In the midst of a mob, passion is contagious and a naysayer’s doubt is quickly dispelled by riled up sycophants.

- Crowds can be molded into followers, and followers can be molded into cultists. It is in a cult leader’s interests to have stupid followers, because they are more passionate and contagious in their conversion of non-believers, incapable of thinking critically they are less likely to question the leadership. [See Law 21 – Play a Sucker to Catch a Sucker.]
• Real power is garnered by appealing to the wishes, opinions and preferences of the uneducated masses; it is not earned by appealing to the reason of an intellectual minority.

• Inculcate an optimism bias by conflating desire with probability of outcome. It is easier to misrepresent probability when the objective is desired and the want to believe is present, one only need invent a rhetorically plausible methodology to sway the gullible.

• By rationalising backwards from a desire, optimism bias can be created by customising a narrative to fit desire as opposed to observing the material facts and planning in harmony with them. The prior form of reasoning is a top-down approach driven by dogma and unconcerned with probability, the latter is a bottom-up approach driven by a cost-benefit risk/reward analysis pegged to probability. The gullible reason with the prior, the rational with the latter.

• To create a cult you need to bring attention to yourself, the best way to gain attention is to make large but vague promises.

• Emphasise the sensual over the intellectual, make your ambiguity attractive by using invigorating and passionate language, you can even make up new words to explain vague concepts. Employing language in this way makes people think you’re a type of sage full of insight and expertise. Be elaborate, visual and descriptive in your language, for this is far more compelling than explaining the mundanities of a thing.

• A Machiavellian uses science to manipulate rather than educate, borrowing the authenticity of scientific factuality and perverting it to lend plausibility to the bogus. Such a thing can be achieved through the employ of falsified data, the deliberate misinterpretation of findings and statistical misrepresentation.

• One must balance ambiguity against specificity, being careful not to utilise too much of either. Too much ambiguity makes you untrustworthy, whilst too much specificity will obligate you to promises and expectations that run counter to your interests. To condense the idea into a maxim: be vague, but not empty. [See Law 20 – Do Not Commit To Anyone.]

• Keep your ambiguous promises simple, most lack the patience to try to understand something and want a simple solution for their problems. Promise a simple solution without being too specific, and you will appear revolutionary, greatly bolstering the numbers who join your ranks. [See Law 21 – and Law 08]

• Boredom and scepticism are a threat to the narrative you peddle, sceptics will expose you and the bored will desert you.

• To prevent abandonment and clear thinking, overwhelm the senses. Attack smell, sight and sound, using theatricism to bewilder and entice.

• Emulate the form and structure of religion to give your cult power, create rituals and ranks with religious overtones and be sure to require sacrifices from your followers. You must be careful with how you ask for sacrifice, as you do not want to seem greedy. Offer your service for free, but require a type of emotional sacrifice or point to a grand
social cause that will inevitably necessitate the donation of money or possessions. By asking for nothing directly, you only seem more magnificent.

- Behave like a prophet, speak in proverbs and quote profound observations to give yourself an air of authority and mysticism.

- No matter how rich you become from your cult, you must be careful not to seem greedy.

- When you become rich from your follower’s contributions, surround yourself with luxury, but disguise how your income was earned. Attribute your wealth to the beliefs your cult espouses, rather than the donations it receives from its members. Surrounded by opulence, your followers will naively believe they can be as prosperous as you if only they believe more fervently and do as you do.

- Utilise the polarisation strategy, create a very strong us-vs-them mentality, promote the benefits of the cult whilst warning your followers of the deviousness of those who do not follow the same path. By feeling like they’re part of an exclusive group, the bonds between your followers will be strengthened whilst outsiders who could expose the cult will be dismissed because they’re distrusted. This is vital to retaining followers and preventing competing ideologies from encroaching on your power base.

- The importance of the polarisation strategy cannot be emphasised enough, if you have no enemies, invent a fictional one. If anybody causes you trouble, accuse them of being said fictional enemy.

- Leverage mystery and imagination (1) - hint at a grand achievement or difficulty indifferently and without fully explaining it; this will provoke people into thinking you’re better than you really are. People will think you’re special as your nonchalance to the spectacular implies great fortitude. As they ask for greater detail, refuse or redirect, let their imaginations take control, and hyperbolic tales of your exploits will be concocted by your follower’s awe.

- Leverage mystery and imagination (2) – Think of it like this: initially you garner a following with grand and outlandish claims. With a following built, you switch from outrageous to humble, leaving breadcrumbs for the awestruck who inflate your deeds and regale grand tales of your exploits. When the people are promoting and defending you, you need do neither to any great degree. For now you enjoy the luxury of elitist humility, minimally affirming questions about your successes with a quaint and sophisticated dignity. – [See Law 34 – Be Royal In Your Own Fashion.]

- Granting your followers one of their wishes by having them engage in a ritual first only furthers their belief in your cult, attributing success to the ritual rather than the mundanity of human action.

- Your beliefs and practices should provide comfort to your followers in an uncomfortable world, in doing so, you augment their desire to believe in you and your ideas.

- Appeal to emotion rather than reason and you will be justly rewarded, appeal to reason rather than emotion and you will be unjustly punished.
• Identify something that makes a person believe with passion, and they will rationalise a framework around it, crediting you as a prophet or genius for initially introducing them to it.

• Generally speaking, women’s need to believe is greater than man’s, as through mechanism of vitiated reason there is greater gullibility.

3.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

If you have any additional questions or suggestions, leave a comment. You can read more articles like this here.
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“Stupidity combined with arrogance and a huge ego will get you a long way.” – Chris Lowe
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1.) The Building Blocks of Reinvention:

Whether they’re aware of it or not, everyone has an opinion on narcissism, and a value system based on a preference for its presence or absence. Some respect only the boldness of grandiosity, whereas others are repelled by the lack of grace exhibited by unadulterated id. As such, those looking to reinvent themselves are typically confused about the degree of ego they should aspire toward in the pursuit of their idealised self. Is ego good, or is it bad? This is a context dependent question, but in the grand scheme of things it is neither, rather it is a tool.

One’s mental visualisation of their ideal persona changes in accordance with their life experience. The arrogant self-aware intellectual can see where arrogance has cost him, and may as such aspire to a more stoic life. Should a man’s failure be associated with passivity on the other hand, he will view egotism as the answer.
It is a fallacy of instinct to believe embodiment of the egotistical opposite is a solution to the floundering personality of current. Balance is necessary in all things, and ego is no exception. To maximise one’s success, you must be plural rather than singular, not the stoic OR the narcissist, but rather the stoic AND the narcissist. Many, many people disagree with this premise out of distaste, but nonetheless, its utility is incontestable.

The egotistical should practice humility, as the humble should egotism. Each is necessary and neither is sufficient, for finesse requires the ability to wield both. The ability to exercise finesse is more a product of trial-and-error than it is an innate competency, and so the area you’re weak in is the one that requires the most focus. In short, do not pick a side, develop your weaker one.

2.) Of Ego & Humility:

Some scenarios require ego where others necessitate humility, finesse is an awareness of the ego-humility spectrum, and the ability to be as humble or egotistical as a given situation demands. Expressing anger or ingratitude when you win at something demonstrates hubris, which in turn detracts from the beauty of your accomplishment by infecting it with crudeness. Be humble in success and egotistical in struggle, for ego is attractive in struggle, but redundant in achievement. Context is of course key to this maxim, and a man of the nuanced competency necessary to practice finesse understands this.

In matters of women ego always pays, women admire dominance and thus reward ego irrespective of their protestations. In sales, whether or not ego pays is contingent on who you’re selling to. If you’re targeting the lower end of the market, it pays well. If you’re targeting the upper end, it will not. At the upper end you need passion devoid insolence and servility, a single-minded belief in the thing you’re pitching rather than an overt desire to persuade; the exact gradient of finesse you’re looking to embody here is one of passionate humility.

The influential are viscerally repulsed by the forceful crudeness with which a less accomplished egotist proclaims and dismisses. They want to see vision shining through struggle, enough ego to get the job done, but not so much you act like you’re better than they are. To understand the level of ego necessary to get what you want from a person and adjust your behaviour accordingly is ultimately to exercise finesse. Finesse is both diplomacy and narcissism, sophistication when diplomacy pays and arrogance when it doesn’t; an effective strategist puts neither off the table.

A man adept at wielding power is a man of finesse, he is neither stoic nor egotistical, but a compartmentalisation of each, a dual personality proficient in recognising the needs of a situation and unleashing or restraining his ego as necessary. To be able to summon egotism or humility at will rather than embody one or the other is an abnormal state. Most are confined to an identity rooted in one or the other, unable to adapt as required and thusly suffering because of it. As such, like most things the average person cannot do, learn this and you gain a distinct edge.

The contrast of ego and humility is incredibly attractive, and together blurs into a kind of “humble confidence” that makes you difficult to read. The difference between the confident
man and the arrogant one is the arrogant lacks the civility to express humility. Confident people can make very narcissistic remarks, but their sporadic demonstrations of humility dissuade people from shunning them as egotists. People make value judgements based on your level of overt egocentrism, and so by switching between overt narcissism and thoughtful humility, your inconsistent complexity fascinates them.

3.) Of Adaptability & Authenticity:

Learning people and adapting to them is fundamental to the practice of effective Machiavellianism. In the pursuit of finesse, almost everything you do will come down to getting better at understanding people from scarce information. As you learn more about them, you adapt to them, conducting yourself in a manner they’ll appreciate.

You do not talk to the egotistical in the way you do the reserved, nor the intelligent in the way you do the dim. By being able to correctly identify personalities and their attendant traits (eg: egocentrism for narcissists, scepticism for rationals and simplicity for dumb people) you learn to talk to people in the way that makes them most receptive.

The foolish and uncontrollably vainglorious are big on the idea of authenticity, that a person should always behave in the way most natural to them irrespective of all else. Strategically speaking, this advice is complete hogwash. It implies artifice is quintessentially negative, unnecessary and that simply “being yourself” is enough to succeed.

This is a lie that everybody wants to believe, that they are innately enough, and that they don’t need to behave in ways that don’t suit them in order to succeed. Be yourself only if you’ve given up on life, or are already a highly developed person and thus “being you” entails a capacity for finesse. Otherwise, whatever you do, do not be yourself, this is the worst advice anyone could give you.

For those of you interested in logic, “be yourself” is a social personification of the naturalistic fallacy, the assumption that the artificial is bad and the natural is good. This assumption is amusing, considering we spent thousands of years developing the unnatural indoors in order to escape the perfectly natural outdoors, however, I digress.

If “being yourself” means the self can adapt to a multitude of various personalities, I’m all for it, but if it means “behave in the way that comes easiest rather than the way that’ll improve your chances of winning” then I am not. Mark my words, authenticity is an indulgence of the accomplished narcissist trying to build rapport by sharing his struggles. This inspires people, quells jealousy and ultimately, makes money. It’s a good strategy – for him, but for you, it’s misinformation. There is authenticity in dedication, but beyond that, everything is political.

Those who tout the horn of authenticity are often some of the smoothest social chameleons you’ll ever meet; they had to be to get where they are. They are playing the game, they are exercising finesse, and in buying into the romance of their struggle and taking their advice on authenticity to heart, you severely cripple yourself.

One does not grow and build relationships with diverse people without trying on styles unnatural to them. People are told to be themselves even when their selves are insufficient,
because supposedly artifice is so undesirable it’s better to be a natural loser than an artificial winner. Yes, you should accept yourself, but no, this doesn’t mean you shouldn’t use social finesse. Most who convincingly endorse authenticity do so from a position of power, power is rarely obtained, and is never sustained in the absence of finesse.

If you talk to everybody in the same way, your inability to tailor your attitude and speech stylistic will leave many doors closed. This is not so much “being fake” as it is “being dynamic”, a person able to converse with a multitude of people rather than a mere subset is vastly more effective than one who cannot.

Caveat: if you cannot convincingly tailor your demeanour to a person and the stakes are high, do not emulate them at all. Your inability to convincingly complement them will be seen as an affront, and rather than be respected for being alike, you will be disrespected for appearing false. In this instance, your go to strategy should be to employ passionate humility. Flexibility is only falsity when its unsuccessful, falsity is no more than the failure of finesse, an inadequate attempt at mimicry that results in ostracisation.

4.) Of Learning:

If you are not very good at something and want to get better at it, ego is your worst enemy. It will render you impervious to constructive criticism, robbing you the introspection necessary to fix your flaws. If you want to develop your knowledge or refine a methodology, take the position you are clueless and seek feedback from observers to discover what you did wrong.

The key reason people don’t alter failing strategies is because they’re prone to personifying them. If you become too ego invested in how you do something rather than see your actions as tools, you won’t want to change method as it’ll hurt too much to acknowledge your failure. When you see your actions as a means to an end rather than as a value judgement against yourself, you’re able to do what must be done. By being humble in learning you not only become adaptive, but you escape your worst critic – yourself.

In short, when you’re trying to improve, humility is the path to competence and ego will cause you to suffer. Do not trust your ego when you’re struggling to get something right, it’ll deceive you; be rigorous and ask yourself “is this logical?” followed by “is it true?”

5.) In Closing:

Always use the least amount of power necessary to convince or destroy, never excess. Excessive use of power is sloppy, indicative of one who knows not how to wield it. An overuse of power can result in unforeseen consequences detrimental to the wielder, hence law 47’s “in victory, know when to stop.”

As a final note, heed this: the stoic is a bore and the narcissist but a fool, the wise man knows what he must be, and is what he must be when he must be it.

Summary Notes:

- Fine tune your ego to complement the person you’re dealing with.
- Use stereotypes to form a baseline assumption of a person’s expectations, and if they disprove the assumption (eg: you thought they’d respect a humble person, but they only respect the egotistical) then switch.

- Passionate humility is more effective than supplication or arrogance when they have the upper hand. Supplication is transparently manipulative, arrogance is grating and insolent.

- You can go all in with ego, bluff, and try to reverse value perceptions in negotiation, but ultimately if they’re the one taking on the risk, you need them more than they need you.

- Authenticity is how the accomplished build rapport with the unaccomplished, it does not mean they don’t play the game. All successful people are playing the game.

- Humility and ego are not binary, passionate humility aka “nice narcissism” is the mid-point.

- Passionate humility defined: you’re obsessed with what you do and you talk it up, but you credit others and defend with passion rather than attack with vitriol.

- Ego is a tool to be used when beneficial and put away when it is not. If you want to attract a woman, be egotistical. If you wish to learn a thing, be humble.

- “Be yourself” is an empty nonsensical platitude, be what you must be to maximise your chances of success.

- Sporadic demonstrations of humility and grandiosity make you appealing and difficult to morally judge.

- And ultimately: don’t identify with either ego or humility, both are tools, use them.
“Dissimulation is innate in woman and almost as characteristic of the very stupid as of the clever.” – Arthur Schopenhauer
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1.) The Paradox of Cunning Naivety:

Why are women so manipulative? Know that firstly in matters of people, manipulation is as natural to a woman as stinging is to a scorpion. Woman herself needs no education in wielding her sexual powers to exert undue influence on man, for nature has equipped man to covet her sexuality, and woman herself to abuse it. This intersexual blend of Machiavellianism is thus as automatic as it is instinctive, it is less so a product of conscious higher thinking, and more so an inevitability of the selection pressures that bred her.
From here we discover a curiously enigmatic piece of the feminine puzzle, one that leaves many a man dumbfounded in its seemingly paradoxical juxtaposition. If we are to presuppose that woman is intrinsically cunning, then how can we simultaneously assert her propensity for fantastical gullibility? If women are so manipulative, why is it that they are more susceptible to propaganda and given to believe more fervently in the supernatural, the religious, and other such unsubstantiable things? After all, the cunning are known not for their epitomisation of gullibility, but for their deficit of it. So if they are to be mutually exclusive, should one not the preclude the other? And if so, how can she be cunning if she is likewise gullible?

It is my contention that in neither man nor woman is gullibility mutually exclusive from cunning, and I shall endeavour to explain why this is hence forth.

As I alluded previously, a woman’s cunning is a byproduct of her instinct, not a premeditated affair. Her ability to seduce is more nature than it is nurture, her manipulations no more than mechanisms of her biological wiring than they are conscious exertions. Her spasmodic capriciousness, penchant for blame shifting and affinity to the plausibly deniable are evolutionarily adapted survival traits, as is her propensity for rationalisation and its subsequent supplantation of her reason.

And yet the very capacity for rationalisation that makes her manipulations so powerful is the very thing which confers her gullibility in matters of the esoteric and abstract. Effectively, her ability to rationalise makes her most effective in the manipulation of people, but the very deficit of reason such rationalisation causes is what leads to her gullibility in the abstract.

As an additional factor, one must note women’s unconditional loyalty to authority. She is obedient in much the way a child is, and it is this obedience which makes her prone to foolishness.

If a person of repute is to tell her something, she will evaluate the thing based on the importance of the person who told her it rather than dissect the elements of what she was told. It is in this way that lesbianic upper class women duped the common woman into working; by playing on the innate victim complex characteristic of woman’s infantile narcissism, they were able to convince her that labour was a freedom women were denied rather than a burden from which they were saved. Womankind subsequently rationalised away her position of relative comfort unencumbered by the harshnesses of labour, and bought into the idea she was born into an oppressed class. As such it becomes quite clear, interpersonally she is cunning, but ideologically she is the very fool she manipulates relationally.

Be she cunning mindfully or instinctually, she is innately predisposed to a degree of cunning one way or the other. This is not to suggest that women are incapable of consciously premeditating their manipulations for such a thing is possible if not commonplace, but rather it is testament to the baseline of duplicity present in women even when conscious effort is absent. Even then, I make this distinction only to emphasise the intrinsicality with which cunning exists in women, I by no means believe the typical woman lacks either the interest or inclination to more mindfully develop the instincts that nature bestowed her. Likewise it is in tangential relevance to this I find it important to note that women’s profound
interest in, and domination of academic psychology is no more than an effect of her intrinsic Machiavellian propensity.

Women who are instinctively cunning rather than mindfully cunning will often succumb to gullibility in spite of themselves. For you see, their instincts equip them solely to seduce and petition man, not to engage in the strategisation of complex, abstract mental work. Women with a flair for the strategic are either learned or dark triad and are therefore by definition outliers, the base of the female population’s Machiavellian instinct scantly extends beyond the interpersonal and the intersexual.

And so when it comes to things outside of this arena, she is as naive as the dictation of her emotions and the deficit of her reason allows. Combine this deficit in logic with her evolutionary propensity to rationalise away the undesirable, and the strength of her need to believe is laid bare.

2.) The Double Edged Sword of Rationalisation:

The very thing that makes her manipulations so notoriously effective is the same thing that leads her to be so easily misled - her tendency to rationalise rather than reason. Whilst the average woman is more manipulating than the average man, she is likewise more manipulable than him. Where the typical woman is manipulating in relationships but manipulable in matters of reality, the average man is manipulable in relationships and more finely astute of the abstract.

The gift of reason that lends a man his astuteness in matters of reality is thus absent in his estimation of women, the deficit of reason experienced by women abstractly is equivalent to the deficit of cunning man experiences intersexually. In a relationship, man is behaviourally idealistic whilst she is behaviourally pragmatic, although one should note that such a thing does not prevent her from amassing unrealistic expectations of what being a man should consist of in relation to her self-interest.

Where beauty is the primary cornerstone of feminine power, the capacity for pronounced rationalisation is its secondary cornerstone. Where a man’s reason prohibits him from employing the mental gymnastics necessary to effectively execute a manipulation, a woman faces no such obstacle. Sanity as we think of it is an assessment of one’s ability to demonstrate cogency in their methods and consistency in their beliefs, women are hard pressed to demonstrate either, which is why we often think of them as crazy.

One should not also forget that womankind has been evolutionarily equipped to rationalise the undesirable through her maternal line’s history as a spoil of war. Before civilization legislated against, and effectively nullified the power of man’s physical strength, a woman’s ability to deceive man was her only defence against his encroachments.

3.) Her Deficit of Loyalty:

Where traditional masculinity is rigid, based on systems of honour and loyalty and reliant on force to punish transgressions of these, femininity has no such concerns and is therefore more fluid in the fickleness of its alliances. Where men want their team to win, women simply
want to be on the winning team. The men who are similar to women in this way tend to be **dark triad** in their personality makeup.

Women’s inherent amorality leaves her capable of showing loyalty to whoever exerts the most dominance over her. A woman never completely rules out betrayal, for women are creatures of opportunity; instead she hedges her bets by playing both sides and betraying as is financially or emotionally necessary.

Betrayal is the spark that ignites the match when a woman moves on and adapts herself to a new man in the face of what she deemed to be insufficiency in the previous. Loyalty is symptomatic of honour, an inherently masculine behaviour. Don’t believe me? Look at the divorce rates. The majority of divorces are initiated by women, a true testament to their disloyalty. Likewise men report a light switch effect when breaking up with a woman, a 180 degree change in her personality as she effortlessly gets over him whilst he continues to pine for her.

When a rival tribe would kidnap a woman, her ability to rationalise was the only thing that allowed her to cope, adapt, and continue to lead a rewarding and prosperous life. I believe it is this evolutionary history that is the foundation of women’s intrinsic loyalty deficit. Women who were inferior rationalisers would have expressed loyalty to their birth tribe in the presence of their captors, consequently causing themselves inordinate grief.

Inevitably, such women would’ve been culled to the point where only women with a more fluid sense of loyalty would survive such a prevalence of kidnapping, henceforth selecting for women who were loyal to the powerful and disloyal to the weak, the losses and gains of power imitating the ebbs and flows in her retraction and pledging of loyalty.

Where men adopt their own principles, women adopt the principles of the most powerful people in their lives. Where men fight enemy tribes and die in war, women fall in love with their captors using their innate capacity for cunning to completely remould themselves and even thrive – a feat even the most objectively talented man would be hard pressed to perform.

**4.) On The Duplicity of Beauty:**

Nature has armed womankind with dissimulation and aesthetic appeal, in which the latter vastly complements and lends itself to the former. Beauty is the fulcrum on which many a successful deception is predicated, for its inviting allure baits with desire whilst falsely associating itself with virtue. To enhance one’s beauty is therefore to augment one’s influence, to appear more noble, more capable, and therefore more trustworthy. Women know this intuitively.

Beauty is not only disarming but enticing, its presence aiding in the signalling of women’s most favoured illusion – innocence. Man’s most foolish visceralism is his propensity to conflate the beautiful with the virtuous, for in doing so, he invariably sees woman for who he’d like her to be rather than for who she is. It is this flaw of instinct in which man perceives virtue as an attendant characteristic of beauty that he inflicts on himself the self-detriment of intersexual naivety.
The duplicity of beauty is predicated on a presumption of innocence that only women and children enjoy, for beauty connotes its virtue through an aesthetic of infantilism. As Leo Tolstoy rather famously said, “It is amazing how complete is the delusion that beauty is goodness.” Beauty is as such feminine rather than masculine in its aesthetic, for handsomeness neither connotes nor confers onto its possessor the same illusion of virtue that beauty does.

Handsome lacks the visual childlike innocence signatory of beauty that leads the observer to infer virtue. Effectively the visual cues that lead us to believe in the innocence of children is the exact mechanism from which women’s beauty takes a degree of its power; that degree pertaining to the conflation of beauty with virtue and the presumption of innocence that results from it rather than woman’s sexual power per se. This phenomenon alone serves as further proof of women’s immaturity relative to man, if further proof were even necessary; greater neoteny is a biological marker of lesser maturity. In summary of this section’s thought, I leave you with this concluding statement: her first concern is her appearance, her second concern her cunning, but both serve the same ends.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

Woman’s desire to remain blameless forever and always plays a significant role in her desire to cultivate an innocent visage. Defensively, a woman’s primary method of manipulation is her presumption of innocence, offensively it is the seductiveness of her physicality; both rely on her beauty, the prior to a mere lesser degree than the latter.

The weaponisation of sex, the falsification of tears, the feigning of innocence and the allergy to blame, know the tools of womanly deception and recognise them for what they are when they rear their ugly heads. And remember, I do not convey such displeasurableness in order to dissuade you from interacting with women, but rather, so that you may act with shrewdness when you do interact with them.
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The Anatomy of Female Power (this book is incredibly expensive in the US, the first reason being it is out of print, and the second reason being feminists got it banned in the US – google for a PDF if this is too rich for your blood)

The Art of Seduction
The Manipulated Man
“The court jester had the right to say the most outrageous things to the king. Everything was permitted during carnival, even the songs that the Roman legionnaires would sing, calling Julius Caesar ‘queen,’ alluding, in a very transparent way, to his real, or presumed, homosexual escapades.” – Umberto Eco
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1.) Introduction:

The jester’s humour can take on either an attack or defence posture, with humiliation acting as his weapon, and plausible deniability his shield. And I say ‘he’, for of the few jesters I have encountered, not one has been female. Likewise if I am to put my personal experiences to one side and observe the wider culture, I remain at a loss in the attempt to identify a female jester.

The wit inherent to the mechanisms of the jester are intrinsically masculine in their nature, for the jester employs a type of verbal gladiatorship of which I have little doubt is fuelled in great part by the ordination that the male must prove his fitness to the female as opposed to the inverse. As the dearly departed Christopher Hitchens stated in simpler terms, women aren’t funny because they don’t need to be; and such a truism does not find any particular exception within the expression of one’s Machiavellian interpersonal style either.

Of course a high functioning dark triad woman is wittier than her neurotypical counterpart by
effect of her reduced emotional sensitivity, but this does not lend itself to becoming the
dominant function which underpins and subsequently characterises her interpersonal style. The **feminine Machiavellian archetype** is almost always that of the seductress, favouring
the weaponisation of sex and all the attendant traits this implies, she presupposes the
virginity of enemy men and the promiscuity of enemy women whilst overtly oozing innuendo
and sensualism in her bid to entice allies.

Think of a Machiavellian archetype as a flavour of cunning, all Machiavellians are cunning,
but the way in which that cunning is expressed differs vastly in its style and execution. Different archetypes use different stylistic mediums to exert their influence. Be it to charm or
humiliate, jesters use humour, seductresses use sexuality whereas fault finders use rules and **malicious compliance**. Cunning may be universal, but the asset utilised and the way in
which it is personified vastly differs. The jester’s power stems from a quick wit and their
ability to employ said wit humouristically, for it is their ability to verbally destroy an enemy to
a chorus of laughter that makes their otherwise unacceptable aggressiveness permissible.

The jester is a master of reframing perception through humour, and so of all the various
styles of cunning found manifest, his persuasion goes unmatched. His ability to sway group
opinion is second to none, for hilarity always brings great popularity, and seductiveness cannot target as large an audience as hilarity. Irrespective of environment, be it the royal courts of Europe or a television talk show, the jester’s subtle albeit inextricable
control of public perception goes indomitably unchallenged.

When people on the internet say “trolling is a skill”, they unknowingly nod gently to
this Machiavellian interpersonal style. To give an example of what a jester looks like, Milo
Yiannopoulos epitomically embodies the form of a jester. Stylish, cunning, witty and highly
narcissistic, the jester’s ability to theatrically employ wit and word to persuade, entertain
and humiliate is incontestable.

2.) Leadership Destabilisation Through Character Assassination:

The jester is as facetious as he is daring, incredibly individualist, he views himself as an
underdog possessing an innate albeit under-recognised superiority. He is not usually of noble
birth or high social rank, but owing to his bold and fearless employment of humour he is
given to finding himself brush shoulders with those connected and of means.

Humour aside, he is scornful of authority and extremely power hungry. In much the way he
seeks to inconsequentially violate people’s boundaries via ruthless and
humiliating utilisations of comedy, he seeks to remove all boundaries and expectations
imposed on himself. He is a freedom loving man, so much so that he not only shuns the
leadership, but shuns the role for himself, as the responsibilities that come with it impose on
his carnal desire for a freedom so absolute that tolerance for even a slither of responsibility is
amiss.

And yet the poetic irony in the jester’s loathing of authority lies in how his employ of humour
sets him up as an informal authority. Due to his aversion to responsibility the jester is rarely
an official leader in any meaningful capacity, and yet due to the affinity he earns from
grandiosely entertaining the people, he is looked to as one. And it is because of this the
jester has a propensity to outshine the formal leadership, unbefehld to the responsibilities that they are, whilst enjoying an equal if not superior level of influence to them. Alas the jester is not the squad captain, but rather the private that makes jokes at the captain’s expense and gets away with it; he is the one people look to despite a lack of formalised institutional rank, he is a leader absent the acknowledgement of title.

One of the jester’s seemingly counterintuitive strategies is to delegitimise the leadership by ruthlessly mocking their method of rule. This gambit serves two purposes, firstly, it brings him acclaim, fans and followers – people who will line his pockets and defend his reputation from his enemies.

Secondly, it serves as a warning shot to the leadership that subtextually communicates “If I wanted to, I could turn your people against you; I don’t answer to you and shall not ever. But you need me. So you should officially endorse me as an ally for as long as it benefits me, and you should not attempt to control me, for I am uncontrollable. If you try, I will see to it you lose favour with the people, and in making your rule that much more difficult I will single-handedly hasten your downfall, and I’ll do it with the blessing of the people to a chorus of hearty and mocking laughter – much to your chagrin.”

Intuitively this sounds dangerous; but emblazoned with a flair for the bold and dangerous, loyal to nothing but his own self-interest, the jester knows he need not win the master because he owns the crowd, and so by having control of the crowd it is the master who needs him more than the inverse. Drawing his power from the crowd is what makes the jester independent from the master, for by drawing his power from the people, he draws it of his own volition on the condition he can perform, rather than because the master’s whim proves favourable. It is the sheer terror of this subtext that will cause many a leader to buckle, to seek to befriend and ally with the jester, with the jester in turn feigning loyalty, only for his mocking of the leader to continue under a veneer of well-intentioned banter.

A jester is only as good as his last performance, but a leader loses effectiveness when the people love his funny man more than they do him. As such, a leader is given to the idea he might have his kingdom’s most cunning clown harmed, for intuitively it seems the best way to deal with a problem is to remove it. The flaw with such a measure is the jester is too well known and too well loved by the people to be removed quietly.

The people’s love acts as an armour for the jester, and should he be harmed, said love will transmute into a hate seeking the destruction of his destroyer. And so the leader finds himself in a bind, is he to tolerate the undermining of his leadership and lose respect, or is he to eradicate the upstart and risk the people’s ire?

The clever leader has him removed by mercenaries untraceable to himself, frames a common enemy for the crime, and feigns upset at news of the jester’s peril. The untameable jester should always be dealt with in this manner, the exception to this being the cooperative jester. A jester willing to show overt deference to the leadership can prove useful for morale as an entertainer, but even more importantly, he doubles as an effective character assassin for delegitimising the leadership’s enemies.

3.) How To Handle Jesters:
Engaging in battle with a jester requires an inordinate amount of energy, if one can avoid the affair altogether, such a thing is strategically preferable. However, I am inclined to think any soul reading this who does so in resonance with what they hear is probably beyond the point of evasion, and instead seeks practical tips to help them neutralise such a troublesome individual. In light of this, I will now speak a little on the ways in which one should best handle a jester.

In my essay Machiavellian Thinking vs. Conventional Thinking, I coined the maxim "justification is a Machiavellian fallacy". This can be simplified and distilled as "justifying yourself is anti-cunning and weakens one’s social power" – internalising this idea deeply is key to effectively battling a jester. Never take a jester’s questions seriously, assume every question to be nought but an insincere trap, and you will do well to avoid the pitfalls the jester so effortlessly and ravenously sets.

So what is one to do specifically in order to avoid said pitfalls? Answer questions with questions, use pressure flips, question the sincerity of his questions, and reframe even the slightest twinge of insincerity as immaturity. Whoever answers the most questions loses, for questioning is not utilised here to gain information, but rather to overwhelm the individual targeted by the questions. The jester has no interest in receiving straightforward answers to any of the questions he may posit, but rather, he uses them as nothing more than psychological pressure points to dominate and humiliate his target into disorientation and self-flagellating submission.

The jester is dependent on humour to draw his social power, and thus by establishing his humour as immature you may nullify the essence of his social dominance. To do this effectively however, the way in which you deliver your criticism of his lack of maturity is key. If you sound offended or upset, the tactic will have no effect and will only serve as fuel for his ridicule, whereas if you sound aggressive and candidly passionate about the core topic, it will. One should sound like a narcissistic man putting someone down for a lack of sophistication, not a whiny woman passing judgement on a thing that annoys her. The key with this tactic is to use the jester’s inappropriate flippancy as a way to frame him as uncredible and unimportant.

If you are bold, you should consider insulting the jester before he can invariably self-deprecate. Jesters are prone to self-deprecating as a means of preemptively blocking you from hitting their vulnerabilities. If all else fails, seek to intimidate the jester until he loses his blase frame and becomes fearful. You can achieve this by bombarding them with insult upon insult delivered in an animated and aggressive manner. The objective here is to make the jester uncomfortable, for if they are uncomfortable, they can be dominated.

This is easier said than done as the jester has supreme social confidence and possesses a certain “anti-social anxiety” about them, however, and this is the key to circumventing this supreme social confidence, they are usually ill-equipped to physically defend themselves. Having wielded wit and words as weapons all their lives, they have not learned to fight, and are not confident in their ability to do so. The jester will almost always try to keep the conflict mental rather than physical because of this, and will quickly lose frame if they believe they cannot prevent the conflict from escalating to fisticuffs.
If the jester believes there is a credible threat of violence, their frame will fall like the Berlin wall. They may not fear psychological violence, but they have dedicated themselves to it so much so that they have become wholly incompetent in violence that is physical. Of course, one need not actually escalate things to physical violence, they only need cause the jester to believe that physical violence is imminent. When the jester loses frame and their fear becomes evident, you may poetically question why they appear scared. For of course you were only joking in much the way they do, and you thought them to be an individual of sophisticated humour, their newfound timidity serving as no more than a testament to your strong disappointment in them.

As stated at the beginning of this passage, conquering a jester requires a ridiculous amount of energy. It is thus preferable to avoid conflict if possible, but should it not be, then the tips and tactics presented here are your blueprint for fighting an undesirable war. Effectively, you will play the game as the jester plays, only with greater intensity and more pointed technique. This is a game of energy, and you will need lots of it to win.

4.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

Never trust the court jester, for he is the least trustworthy funny man. He wields humour as a weapon of self-aggrandisement, and as a ruthless self-promoter he is eager to boost his profile at the expense of others. There is no comedy too cold nor too ruthless for him, for the fires of chaos gleam brightly in his anarchistic eyes in their lust for the next conflict. He needs conflict so that he may humiliate, he must humiliate to feel powerful, such is his nature, unchangeable, irredeemable.

Extremity is typical and expected of the jester, the norms of social conduct imposed on the majority do not apply to him, which in turn frees him to act with further impropriety simply because scandalousness has come to be expected.

Jesters love bringing down sensible authority figures (the very antithesis of what they are) because they know that should such a person dignify their provocations their credibility will go up whilst the sensible target’s will go down. The sensible cannot fight the jester with his own weaponry, for in doing so they lose power by appearing uncontrolled to their fans. The jester on the other hand is free to continue in such an outrageous and belligerent manner, for indecency is his reputational essence, in turn giving him an unfair advantage over those who do not possess the same antifragile reputational foundation.

There is an insidiousness to the humour symbolic of the jester, for he concurrently amuses and destroys in a display of the most theatrical and perverse sadomasochism, bringing greater and greater pleasure to his audience as he proceeds to strip layer upon layer of dignity from the unfortunate soul he has designated ripe for ridicule.

And because humour is entertaining irrespective of the person paying its expense, it always retains the favour and endorsement of the crowd in the absence of appropriateness or moral integrity. The naive presume humour is innocent and incorruptible due to its superficial nonthreatening pleasantry, “a bit of fun never hurt anybody” they say, au contraire, it has and it can.
Book(s):
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NOTE: I left room to develop “dark triad archetypes” into a series, but as of present I’m not committed to making that a reality. We’ll see!
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1.) Introduction:

Contrary to what may be impressed upon the reader by the length and intricacy of my essays, I greatly value simplification, especially when it comes to learning something. There are so many great books to read and so many interesting topics to discover, that there simply isn’t enough time to absorb it all. As such, when one is voracious for knowledge they must make choices in what they learn, and then strive to absorb what they have deemed worthy of learning as quickly as they can humanly learn it.

Knowledge is not power but power potential, and rather it is the application of knowledge and not knowledge itself that constitutes power as we think of it. As such, it is in one’s interest to accrue as much knowledge as possible in order to increase their power potential. Time however is as equally pressing as it is finite, if not because it is finite, and thus the net maximum potential power accumulable decreases in direct proportion to the amount of time expended on things extraneous of one’s current learning objective.
To simplify this statement: the more time one spends learning any specific thing, the less time they have left on the Earth to learn other things. And those things you’re not learning could be, unbeknownst to you, more conducive to your personal power than the things you have chosen to learn.

Cost-benefit analyses are our friends, but whatever we choose to learn incurs a sunk cost, and thereby it is in our interest to choose both wisely (to make the most informed decisions we’re capable of in choosing what we learn) and to choose quickly (to avoid the unproductive inertia of indecision and procrastination).

Naturally, the accuracy of a choice tends to increase with the slowness with which it is decided, and thus there’s an argument to be made that slower more accurate choices are superior to quicker and more sloppily made ones. Regardless, momentum is the achieving man’s friend, procrastination but his foe. And so in light of this there’s an even greater argument to be made: that in the pursuit of growth, it is better to simply make a decision than it is to make none at all, for even in failure there is education, whilst in stagnation there is little besides regret and the illusion of safety.

Ultimately, the goal of the most ambitious self-actualiser is to make smart learning choices in as little time as possible, whilst learning the chosen thing with maximum depth and understanding in the shortest time possible.

Most outwardly agree learning is important, fewer actually expend the effort necessary to actively learn, whilst even fewer seek to tinker with their learning methodology in order to optimise it. I of course am of the belief that in order to truly be the best that one can be, that simply doing is insufficient, doing is necessary, but more importantly one must seek to refine how they do. Learning is no exception to this need, and rather, I actually think of it to be the thing that epitomises this sentiment.

2.) Experience vs. Reading:

“But IM, is knowledge even important to the accumulation of power? Surely experience is superior to reading?”

There is indisputably great value to knowledge, but knowledge bereft a means of implementation is unactualised of purpose in much the way raw materials owned by nations without the means to refine them see the potential of said materials wasted.

Experience is vital in matters of the heart and the body, but it’s not the be-all and end-all. Simply put, experience is overrated, for there’s not enough time in this life to experience everything to the degree sufficient enough to master it. This is why we have specialisation, for it is better to be a master of one trade than a layman in all.

This is also why we compress time in the form of books, for they allow us to derive the core lessons of a thing without requiring us to invest the time necessary to fully experience it. Life is literally too short to experience everything to the degree necessary for a man to truly understand and master it, for beyond a certain level of proficiency, one falls victim to the law of diminishing returns.
The power of books lies in their ability to have us learn from those who have already invested the time to become an expert at a thing, they are almost like surrogate mentors if you will. And so in the grander picture, they are time-saving devices, although in the heat of immediacy many do not view books as such because they can take considerable time to ingest. Nonetheless, irrespective of the time it takes a man to read a particularly lengthy and intricate book, it would take him even longer to live the things the writer did in order to form a conclusion of equal authority.

By the time you become a wall street trader, a pro wrestler, or whatever it is that will teach you the lessons you want to learn, you could’ve read hundreds of books that would’ve taught you more than you would’ve learned from investing an equal or greater amount of time actually trying the thing for yourself.

Personal experience is inefficient because you do a lot of things that don’t work in order to discover what does, whereas the success derived from the experience of others can be distilled into knowledge that saves you from making the mistakes necessary to arrive at the same conclusion.

Books that draw knowledge from a wide data pool can pattern recognise trends to derive principles, and these principles can in turn be used by the uninitiated to increase their odds of success. It is this macro approach to knowledge which allows a person to draw inferences with a level of accuracy that would be simply impossible to derive were they reliant solely on personal experience.

Take The Bell Curve for instance, the employ of statistics garnered from thousands of studies allowed this book to make conclusions with a level of accuracy beyond that which any single person is capable of achieving. How is this so? Quite simply, more data. Anyone with even a basic understanding of statistics realises that absent wilful falsification, greater sample sizes lead to more accurate findings.

People trust experience more because it can’t be faked, and lord knows academics fabricate all kinds of data to support their ideological agendas, and yet irrespective of this, experience is most certainly overrated.

I’m not trying to debase the necessity of experience for it certainly has value, undoubtedly a great many thing requires experience in order to be truly understood. However, there are only so many experiences a person can have, and one’s experiences are often incomplete in the sense that they’re the byproducts of inability rather than achievement.

Likewise, people of greater mind can teach us things we don’t notice, or struggle to articulate and consciously understand. And so reading not only saves us time, but more importantly it allows us to pierce the universe more deeply than if we were to remain unlettered. It is this quality of the book that makes it irreplaceably additive to one’s time on this Earth.

This is the value of secondhand knowledge, and unlike experience, it is often undervalued owing to its indirect and vicarious nature. I think this to be incorrect, and rather that it is the unread experience junkie who is the fool rather than the individual who complements their living with the wisdom and discoveries of men greater than they.
To give an example I’m sure most of you will relate to, a divorced man knows enough about marriage to accurately forewarn younger men of the risks inherent to the endeavour. One need not actually go and get married and undergo the same pains, trials and tribulations that millions of other men have in order to validate the finding.

This would not only be extremely deleterious to one’s mental health, but likewise a terrible use of their time. This notion really exemplifies how knowledge can trump experience in educating one on “what not to do”, for when a person has internalised a long list of what they shouldn’t be doing, the number of mistakes necessary to get where they want to go is reduced exponentially. Yes, often to find the answers on how to specifically do a thing, a person need merely repeatedly attempt a thing whilst altering their approach with each iteration. But to discover what not to do and decrease the odds of failure from the get go, this is where reading provides quite the boon.

3.) Refining Reading – The Art of Summarising:

“Ok IM, I understand reading is necessary to augment my success, but if reading is the default state of learning, how do I optimise my learning process to learn even quicker?”

So in the paragraphs prior I detailed my philosophy on learning, now I will detail the steps I’ve taken in light of it.

Effective businessmen know that in order to scale up and earn truly ludicrous sums of money they must learn to delegate. Things they became accustomed to doing when they were small should be assigned to others in order to free up their time for grander tasks. I apply this idea to learning.

If a person can reduce the time taken to learn a thing without compromising on the depth with which they understand the thing, they can gain a huge edge over the competition.

So rather than constantly read books, I look for people who have gone to the effort of fully understanding a book, plucking out its gems and explaining what they mean in a summarised manner. This way, I can profit from their time investment and learn exactly what they’ve learned in only a fraction of the time.

Books condense life, but summaries condense books, and thus pound for pound I believe reading or at least actively listening to summaries given by people who have already fully read a text is something that will provide me with the greatest intellectual return in the shortest amount of time. I believe very few people are doing this, and that yet this one thing alone can give a man a great edge in this game we call life.

This is the beauty of the digital age, if you know where to look, you can find time-saving services that would simply not have been possible before the advent of the internet. Podcasts are an obvious place to begin streamlining the learning process, I particularly enjoy the Tim Ferriss podcast. The only drawback with podcasts is the advertising and predominance of socialising acts as no more than fluff to the budding learner. Podcasts are as such in my view, more semi-educational easy listening than they are concentrated catalysts for self-growth.
A step-up from podcasts are audio summaries, an audio summary is a person summarising the key points of a text they’ve read and articulating these findings to the listener. I particularly enjoy **illacertus’s YouTube channel** for this purpose. The advantage audio summaries have over podcasts is how the speaker directly delivers the information absent the fluff of banter or social observation you can expect from podcasts.

Finally, we have text summaries. The main reason I believe text summaries to be superior to audio summaries is because audio can play in the background, allowing you to tune them out whilst you do other things. Text on the other hand demands your full attention to be imbibed, and thus cannot fall victim to your need to check social media. It’s actually quite difficult to find anyone going through the hassle of summarising books into text summaries, however I managed to find an online bookclub which is doing exactly this.

4.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

I wouldn’t listen to a podcast in lieu of reading an actual book, however, if you’re reading to grow rather than for self-pleasure, I highly recommend integrating audio, and particularly text summaries into your autodidactic toolkit.

If you’re not improving, you’re not growing and if you’re not growing, you’re losing. By speeding up your rate of learning, you vastly increase your chances of success. Don’t hold yourself back.

**Books:**

The Art of Learning

**Blog:**

Monk Mode
"When hypocrisy is a character trait, it also affects one’s thinking, because it consists in the negation of all the aspects of reality that one finds disagreeable, irrational or repugnant.” - Octavio Paz
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1.) Introduction:

There is parallel advantage and disadvantage to living as male or female, for men are by and large deemed more credible, whilst the womanly form is more coveted. As such, if you are a man the world is more likely to respect you than it is to desire or care for you; whereas if you’re a woman, the world is more partial to be desiring and caring of you, than it is respecting. On some level, be it conscious or not, it would seem our fair
species recognises women as dependants and men as their guardians, treating each accordingly.

Now on the surface this sounds like men get a better deal, and within the infinite remit of ideological feminism and the intrinsicality of feminine self-pity, this is certainly what much of womankind believes as she takes a perverse sense of pride in being the prima facie victim. Yet in reality, man’s position comes with a burden, loneliness and difficulty of life that is as equal parts alien as it is undesirable to the feminine.

2.) Of Protestation & Petitioning:

Womanly complaint makes it a common point of contention that there are matters in which by injustice of her womanliness she suffers gross disadvantage, and it is this line of thinking which serves as the foundation for feminist thought.

Let it be clear, the root and core of feminism, that is the psychological seed from which it is sprung, is the notion that one is inferior by merit of their sex, and that this inferiority is not the product of innate deficit, but of a systematic oppression that must be corrected for politically, economically et cetera. For whether a woman identifies as a feminist or not, for as long as she perceives herself as unprivileged by comparison to man, she will for all intent and purpose behave in much the way a self-identifying feminist would. This is to state that although she may decline to call herself a feminist, all too aware the connotations of such a word bode poorly for her reputation, she is ailed by the same penis envying inferiority complex that the most rabid and outspoken of feminist ideologues are.

And yet as men, we consider complaining, irrespective of its justification or substantiation, to be hallmarks of the feminine character. For even if a man has good cause to complain, he is hard pressed to do so, for the act of complaint fills him with a kind of unproductive self-loathing that appears not to plague the female. As such when one is to complain without good cause, be it that man is remiss to complain even with good cause, he is filled with nothing but disgust for the caricatural pretensions of insolence attempting to pass itself off as justice seeking.

A man acts upon, he is not acted upon, therefore if he wants, he does, he does not wait, he proceeds. Should he deign to complain, there is little chance he will be helped, and even if he is, there is yet littler chance he can be helped whilst retaining his dignity. You see whilst women are ailed by eternal dissatisfaction and a need to communicate this dissatisfaction in the petition that man will remedy her contemporary concern, man is ailed by extreme pride. As such, even when a man is truly worthy of help, he is as likely to request it as he is to receive it, and by that I mean, in much the way society is unconcerned with caring for man, man himself does not wish to be taken care of.

A man’s primary emotional concern is his pride, respect but the corollary on which it rides. If a man cannot respect himself, he cannot expect others to, and therefore a man only requests help when he has no other option, be it that seeking help is the last thing he would look to do and not the first. Rather than complain about the unfair, he will seek to rectify it through nothing but sheer volition of whatever means he has available to him. Man tries to help himself, and only after he has been massively unsuccessful in the endeavour will he
attempt to seek assistance. For women the principle is reversed, she is quick to seek help, but slow to help herself should she even attempt to do so at all. Naturally, exceptions abound, but as a general statement of observation such a maxim should hold true.

It is not man’s goal to bask in the catharsis of emotional expungement and to petition others to do the bidding his emotions see fit, but rather to understand what is unoptimised and alter it so that it may improve. It is for this reason “nagging” has a strongly feminine connotation, be it that it is women who find all manner of things to gripe over as her insecurities are made fully manifest, for whilst a man changes the world via his hands, women change it by petitioning men.

Men do and take pride in doing, when they’re not doing, they’re ashamed of their unproductivity. A woman’s doings compose of influencing others to act on her behalf, be it that it may, she feels no shame in complaining, and in actual fact feels she is only exercising her natural rights in doing so. Alas, irrespective of woman’s social position, rich or poor, conservative or liberal, educated or uneducated, it is her nature to be dissatisfied with her station, and where she has little or zero problem, she will manufacture and amplify purely so she may enjoy the catharsis of complaining and all its attendant attention.

3.) To Act Or Be Acted Upon:

Inherent too is the magnificent difference in the standard of responsibility each gender holds itself to. Almost as if by some cerebral echo of sex, a woman believes the world is acting upon her, rather than she on it. Therefore when unsatisfied, she infers her condition is the fault of something external to her, and be it that it is man who acts upon her sexually, it is man she holds responsible for her dissatisfaction.

This brings us to a double standard that men dare not complain of and women care not to acknowledge, when a woman treats a man poorly, it is asked what he did to make her behave so unsightly, yet should a man treat a woman poorly, it is hastily concluded he is a monster without further investigation. Women are given the benefit of the doubt even when they have done wrong, with justifications being sought to explain away their wrongdoing – no such instinctual courtesy is extended to men.

This is a social privilege women benefit from most emphatically, to the extent that even in courts of law their punishments are less punitive, should they even be punished at all. He is acting upon and she is acted upon – this line of thought continues to reassert and perpetuate itself all around us irrespective of the material facts.

Womankind sees the double standards she does not benefit from, but is blind to those which she does, incorrectly believing in all earnest that she is most oppressed when she is in actual fact freer than her counterpart. She wishes to reform the social standards from which she does not benefit, be it that she may increase her liberty by limiting her social consequences, but she is without either concern or impetus for the reformation of double standards from which she derives preexisting benefit. This is why women lament how unfair it is their reputations suffer from promiscuity whilst man’s benefits, but are oblivious to the fact they enjoy a level of compassion and assumed innocence that is all but alien to men.
4.) Respect Vs. Desire:

When a woman asks to be evaluated on the basis of her merit in the way a man is, she knows not what she asks for. She seeks greater respect and thus the recognition inherent to said respect, but is blissfully unaware of the drawbacks that come with this. Be it that were she to be respected in the way exclusive to man, she would no longer be cared for in the way exclusive to women.

Women are objects of desire, retaining enough infantile aesthetic in adulthood to elicit the compassion and care the species feels for children. Whereas men are objects of success, that is, a man is to be evaluated on the sum of his utility and achievement. There is no cushion, nor safety net for a man who falls too far into the abyss, yet were he a woman, his decline would be cushioned and prevented by social and governmental support alike. Nobody fundamentally cares for man on the basis that he exists, this privilege is but the preserve of women and children. Rather, his position in the world is predicated on what he can produce and solve, and it is by living in accordance with this nature and having the fruits to show for it a man comes into his own.

Simply put, women covet the respect exclusive to men, but do not understand that the respect men receive is a substitute for the care they do not. That is, society does not fundamentally care for those it respects, in much the way it does not look to guidance from those under its care. When you look up to someone, you respect what they can do and what they have done, but you don’t care for their weaknesses nor their fundamental person, for if you did, you would pity rather than respect. And one may either benefit from the care of pity or the admiration of respect, but not both, for each form of love is mutually exclusive, the presence of one precluding the materialisation of the other.

An aspect of the negative feminine resents not being boss, and yet it is only because of her secondary role that she benefits from a compassion of care and empathy that **men cease to receive after the infancy of boyhood**. Indeed, people may respect men more than they respect women, but it comes at the cost of being cared about merely for existing, and having the freedom to be vulnerable. Alas, focusing on what she doesn’t benefit from whilst neglecting what she does, many a woman abhors being the second sex, but she does so only because she doesn’t realise she’d hate being the primary even more.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

People keep inquiring about one-on-one consulting, and thus I have put up a page to address this, **see here**.
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Understanding Female Psychology
Machiavellian Maxims (Part 4)
by IM | January 15, 2017 | Link

“The promise given was a necessity of the past: the word broken is a necessity of the present.” - Niccolo Machiavelli
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1.) Introduction:
Welcome to part 4 in my series of Machiavellian maxims, as with the previous articles, contained within is a pithy collection of Machiavellian wisdom. If you’ve not read anything in this series before, you can find part 1 here, part 2 here and part 3 here.

META MESSAGE: I made a radio appearance on the Sharpe Reality show yesterday, you can check out the show here.

2.) The Maxims:
1. - Social causes are disguises for the predators and lifestyles for the sheep.

2. - Her first concern is her appearance, her second concern her cunning, both serve the same ends.

3. - Your response should be proportional to the perception of the threat, there’s no need to launch nukes when you can get the job done with a well-aimed bullet.

4. - A leader must be mindful in exercising benevolence, for too much benevolence is
perceived as weakness and fosters resentment.

5. - One is wise to openly support freedom of speech, but they should only do so for as long as such speech is not deleterious to their reputation; it is almost always an act of self folly to not censor those biting deep into their repute.

6. - Be mindful of the Streisand effect, if your detractors are persistent and resourceful, censoring will make things worse rather than better.

7. - People are bolder when they’re paying and meeker when they’re paid. Caveat: the latter doesn’t apply to blackmail.

8. - People want to forget, not be reminded. Very powerful. Never forget this.

9. - Tu quoque is the sophist’s most preferred logical fallacy, for it can justify their poor behaviour whilst simultaneously redirecting attention to the misdeeds of others.

10. - Weak and strong in matters of strategy are not effects of appearance in so much as they are a question of the tactical viability and efficacy of a plan.

11. - In financial exchange, the man paid covets payment in advance whilst the man paying seeks to pay after the fact.

12. - When people retroactively change their minds, they will blame you for their change of heart irrespective of whether it’s truly your fault.

13. - “Coincidence” is the term people use to describe a chess move they don’t understand.

14. - To see how ruthless life truly is, all one need do is observe the vast difference in means between people.

15. - Survival of the fittest, there is no greater truism; winners and losers, everyone takes what they can get. Nothing is owed, everything is game.

16. - Let the other man lose his cool, but be sure to keep yours, for it is the man with the most self-control that leaves victorious.

17. - The nicer the man, the more he suffers, for the world does not respect carte blanche kindness. Forget kindness, show only magnanimity – a selective kindness backed by thoughtfulness and strength.

18. - The beauty of a question is it’s in your power to decide whether you’re going to answer it or not.

19. - Sell a person on a thing by making them think you’re not selling anything. The moment they think you’re trying to sell them, they’ll behave as if they hold all the power.

20. - This is as true of physical action as it is of agenda pushing: that which happens suddenly is noticed and reacted to, whilst that which happens gradually is not. In stealth,
promote gradualness. Move too quickly and you will be discovered.

21. - A woman being cute is the metaphorical equivalent of a wolf adorning himself in the attire of a woolly sheep – it’s purposefully disarming. Recognise cuteness for the sham that it is. Beauty is not virtue. Cuteness implies innocence, something you can be most emphatically assured she is not.

22. - The problem with trust is everybody needs it, most are too scared to give it, and the most dangerous of humans are incapable of it.

23. - Know when people are trying to earn your trust in order to exploit it. There’s a greater likelihood you will be targeted in this fashion if you’re rich or have notable power within an organisation. Corollary: the higher the stakes, the longer the plays.

24. - Honesty is powerful, transparency is foolish; the difference between honesty and transparency is scale.

25. - Honesty is a micro snapshot of truth, whereas transparency is the macro totality of it, selective honesty as opposed to full disclosure. People like honesty, they rarely want full disclosure.

26. - If you need to keep absolving someone because they consistently maintain plausible deniability, you are being played. Punish them or cease association, do not continue to absolve.

27. - It is generally wise to allow people to project onto you the social or political views they find most appealing.

28. - People love power and want to be as close to it as possible without endangering themselves. Skin in the game separates the wheat from the chaff.

29. - Incompetence can serve as an effective cloak of secrecy with which to hide an agenda. For example, if one were to build a house under a house but wanted nobody to know the second house existed, they’d attribute the additional building time and costs incurred by the creation of the hidden house to the labour and bureaucratic incompetencies of the known house.

30. - Everything people do is strategic irrespective of its effectiveness or deliberateness. There’s always an angle, but it isn’t always insidious.

31. - Polarisation is the precursor to division, and division is a common prerequisite for control.

32. - Be bolder than your enemy, and you paralyse him upon the very nanosecond you confront him.

33. - Simulate your downfall to see who folds and sells you out. Loyalty is gauged in the face of failure, not success.
34. - Unless you’re exchanging blows, move slower than your enemy. The confidence throws them off immensely.

35. - If they’re going to disbelieve you, mirror your accuser, and then by act of disbelieving you, they disbelieve both of you.

36. - He who is most cunning, and furthermore, best equipped to execute the mechanisations of his cunning, will win a hundred wars and a thousand battles.

37. - Magnanimity is a projection of soft power, always leave a tip, it makes you look powerful and buys you favour with those who perform you services.

38. - Boldness almost always rewards, when it doesn’t, disappear.

39. - When you don’t have a good answer, ask a question, be sparing with this however, for abusing it will make you seem disgustingly untrustworthy.

40. - When the enemy is too powerful, it’s more profitable to ally with them than war with them irrespective of your feelings for them.

41. - Treat all unfinalised offers as bait.

42. - If one strategises purely from a position of emotionally driven personal preference and not pragmatism, one will strategise inadequately.

43. - You can’t trust a dark triad who isn’t dependent on you for a thing, and even then, the ruthless temporariness of their loyalty is predicated entirely on the degree to which you are useful.

44. - Breaking silence is tactically unsound. Wait for the other person to speak first, or do not speak at all.

45. - Know your enemies and know yourself, but in knowing your enemies, know your allies, ascertain who is loyal, and ascertain who is mercenary.

46. - If you don’t want war but the enemy does, you’ve lost before the battle’s even begun.

47. - Diplomat is a geopolitical euphemism for “intercontinental Machiavellian negotiator”

48. - The disparity between what a man says and what a man does are the reputational affecting aspects he takes into consideration when speaking.

49. - Bide your time after being attacked. Don’t respond straightaway. Let them think they’ve won, then as soon as they relax, strike.

50. - Whoever makes the first move without being baited holds the advantage, they control the battlefield because the element of surprise shocks and demoralises the enemy, striking a critical blow before they can even fortify themselves.
51. - The difference between a man who can suspend empathy and a man who has none is the latter is existentially incapable of virtue.

52. - Foreign aid is macro level statecraft philanthropy. Step 1: buy favour. Step 2: get a good reputation for your generosity and market it as enlightened altruism.

53. - Predators can destroy other predators, but the difficulty of such a thing persuades them to designate targets who’ll offer less resistance. Be expensive to defeat, and few will even dare to declare war.

54. - “What is left when honour is lost?” Strategy. The only way to lose it is to lose your life, strategy is the essence of life via adaptivity.

55. - People only care about what you have, not what it took to get. As such, if someone’s interested in the how, there’s a 99% chance they want to copy your blueprint or sabotage your achievements.

56. - If you’re afraid to play in the mud, the mud will involuntarily dirty you.

3.) Relevant Reading / In Closing:

I offer consulting services to a small number of people, you can find out more about that here. If you enjoyed these maxims, check out the following.
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Machiavellian Maxims (Part 3)
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“The courage of a man lies in commanding, a woman’s lies in obeying.” – Aristotle
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1.) Introduction:

It hardly feels worthy of mention, because it comes as naturally to one’s self as a sky of blue or a blade of green grass, yet in our age of dystopic social engineering and decadent artifice, it appears controversial that healthy romantic relationships between men and women take on a dominant-submissive dynamic.

In a culture of toxic femininity in which the feminine is made primary, the natural and healthy role of man and woman has been perverted to the extent the mere idea of man leading his
woman is deemed offensive, if not at the very least backward and regressive in its stance. The intelligentsia of our time, ever unenlightened as they are, have placed their chips on the pillars of equality and obstinately refuse to re-evaluate the foolishness of their pseudo-progressiveness.

2.) The Dancing Metaphor:

Dancing has been used ritualistically as a preliminary step to courtship since time immemorial, the dance itself serving as little more than a finessed way of ascertaining a man’s ability to take charge and a woman’s to follow. Now imagine if a couple were silly enough to think that neither partner should lead nor follow, owing to their shared belief that equality negates a need for hierarchy. If their roles as dance partners was not identical, they would inhabit a state of inequality. But because dancing requires a leader and a follower, and our fellow dancers do not believe in inequality, they would quite simply fail to dance! The absurdity of their beliefs would, effectively, render them incapable of dancing.

Extrapolating this to the dating market of today, much of the general dissatisfaction and unhappiness we see stems from this belief, or at the very least the incapacity for one or either sex to fulfil their roles as dominant and submissive. Be it that the man is an ineffectual and submissive “leader,” or the woman is an insolent, ball-busting sham of a “follower”. Neither is good relationship material for the other and neither will do, for although dominance and submission is necessary for a relationship to take place, a woman’s love is based upon respect, and her inability to respect a man she has been burdened to lead will ultimately conclude in her loss of love for him.

As such, it falls to man to lead, not to woman, for no matter how much the feminine ego may covet leadership, it is spiritually, emotionally, mentally and psychologically incapable of maintaining the dynamic in a mutually enjoyable and unexploitative fashion. It is within the narcissism and insecurity of women brainwashed by feminism who are uncomfortable in their femininity that we hear the cries of execration denouncing masculine authority, and yet ironically it is within the petty jealousy of this infantilism she lies completely oblivious to the fact that leadership is not all fun and games, but a burden, and a cumbersome one at that.

A dance in its physical elements foreshadows the optimal dynamic that should take place mentally and emotionally when man and woman couples; as such, dancing, much like relationships, is about complementation. The tyrannical social engineers through their inversion of values have our populace thinking that for a man to be dominant and lead his woman is to oppress her, and that her consequential submissive following of him is tantamount to enslavement, but in matters of intersexual dynamics these connotations are incorrect and misplaced.

3.) O Equality, Wherefore Art Thou Equality?:

As per feminist sociocultural influence, there has been a normalisation of the rather perverse paradigm in which the woman leads, or each party is somehow “equal” in the most intangible, esoteric and subjectivist of unquantifiable manners. And be it that this supposed equality is defined by the sentiment of the believer, who even knows what it looks like
beyond the figment of the wildest imagination, for equality is a fiction, and all romantic relationships are hierarchically contingent upon a leader-follower dynamic to take form and function.

Indeed this absurd idea that each party is equal to the other, that nobody leads nor follows, but rather that each makes proposals to the other and that such a thing somehow works is a dysfunctional, pervasive memetic. The absence of hierarchy is chaos, and thus to aim for and idealise equality is to promote and usher in chaos. It is inconceivable to think how one could reach consensus within a democracy of two, for one must eventually concede to the authority of the other, and without concession there is no basis for relationship, but merely a series of conflicts that lead to inevitable forfeiture and abandonment by whomever the most frustrated party happens to be. Antithetically, when one does concede to the authority of the other, equality is lost. As such, true equality is a notion, not a pragmatic relational methodology.

Egalitarianism, much as it fails to operate as a functional social model, likewise fails utterly as a workable relational model. This makes sense, for the only thing that separates socialism from the equality of gender in romantic is scale and context – the same, flawed and basic underpinnings are otherwise identical. As such, it seems foolish if not out right insidious to posit equality as an aspirational relationship model, for not only is equality a completely unobtainable end, but even were it obtainable, it would not yield the degree of relational satisfaction that a dominant-submissive dynamic encompasses, for equality is unsexy.

4.) Love & Lust Are Intrinsically Unequal:

Although sex is equally enjoyable, it is not equal in the roles that are performed, and neither is a relationship outside of the bedroom. In fact, if one wishes to get into the bedroom, they should be foreshadowing its dynamic outside of it. Neither man nor woman covets egalitarian liaisons, for it is within the very nature of man to want to dominate in the bedroom, as in the nature of woman to want to be taken in it. Unlike politics, dogma and social ideology, sex does not lie, for the heart wants what the heart wants and the purest manifestations of masculinity and femininity are laid bare in all their unfettered glory in the bedroom.

Love and lust are not based on mutual respect. Love is based on mutual care, lust on mutual desire. Women care and lust when they can respect man’s hardness, men lust for flesh, caring only when they are ensnared by a woman’s softness. An equal woman is not a soft woman, nor a desirable woman, nor a woman a man of any real standing desires to protect, and so she is neither a woman he will endure to commit to, nor a woman in anything but the physical sense of the word, for by behaving as a man and trying to compete as one, she devalues herself in his eyes.

It is as such the strategy of the wise woman to submit, complement and enjoy the fruits and protection of her man, whereas it is the purview of the foolish woman to compete with him at every turn. Women of a masculine nature will never be truly desirable to men in much the way men of a feminine nature will never be truly desirable to women. The difference between the two of course is masculine women can get laid, but feminine men can’t, where they are of course equal is neither receives commitment from anyone either.

5.) He Is To Mould, She Is To Be Moulded:
Many of you are privy to the fact that women are more easily influenced by their nation’s culture, religion, family, and immediate surroundings than are men. Yes, men are likewise influenced by said things, my point was not to say they solely affect women, but rather that those of you who aren’t so brainwashed as the common people realise women are on the whole more easily influenced.

What is the reasoning behind this? Well, I lack the requisite desire to speculate too deeply on the matter, and nor do I wish to digress too far from the central thesis of the essay, nonetheless I believe it comes down to women’s greater need for approval, an ability to be more fluid in character as a form of adaptation, and lastly, perhaps as a necessity for the capacity to perform the two prior functions: a diminished capacity and desire to employ logic.

So now I have firmly established the reasoning behind my belief in woman’s greater malleability, I return to my original point: a woman is to be moulded, a man is to mould. If a man is to find a woman when she is young, he can craft her into the woman he wants her to be, be it that young women are ever pliable, and if mentally healthy, ever hopeful at their prospects of a future with a strong man who loves them.

Much as I said in “Women of Substance Are Made, Not Born”, a good woman is the handiwork of great men, ideally well-raised by a strong father, but at the very least young and receptive to dominant, masculine governance. A woman cannot, try as she may, become the embodiment of what a man wants without her chosen partner having a hand in the matter, for her constitution is innately erratic, and as such, in the absence of a strong male figure in her life, she will in all likelihood fall prey to predacious dogma and sully herself.

The value of a young woman extends beyond the appeal of her physical youth and fertility, although both are covetously desirable in and of themselves, it is her malleability to be formed into a woman who complements a man that is her main draw. Older women are, much to the dismay of men everywhere, not solely lacking in beauty, but largely irredeemable in that they lack the pliability archetypal of young women.

Bitter older woman unable to secure a dominant alpha who see a young woman coupled with a man perhaps ten or even fifteen years her senior have an instinct to shame the couple, more specifically, the man. It is said by spinsters of ever-increasing opinionation that such men are no more than perverts, that they only covet a young woman’s body and sexuality, and that if such men were as refined as they, they’d look to date someone “more mature.” Be it that maturity for women is little more than bitterness that erodes their femininity, the point of maturity is an entirely moot point, for women mature little in adulthood. These spinsters disguise their vitriolic bitterness as concern for the well-being of young women, but in reality they are the jealous crabs in the bucket, scornful of the men who don’t want them, jealous of the women who can get them.

The man must act upon and mould a woman more than she does him, for if the woman is to act upon and mould the man, she will create something she finds abhorrent. More simply and explicitly stated, a woman will mould a man into someone she despises, but a man will mould a woman into someone he loves.
6.) Faith, Trust, Risk, Hope:

A man does not want to waste time trying to mould an unmouldable woman in much the way a mouldable woman does not want a dominant man to abandon her. Man must be careful, for the more he invests, the more he loves, and the more he loves, the more he is prone to holding an unworthy and toxic asset. Likewise, woman too must be careful, for if a man of dominance does not wish to intimately mould her in his paternal patience, he will not commit, and will as such subsequently abandon her. It is only wise that men and women alike are discerning when seeking to cultivate a healthy, sustainable masculine dominant and feminine submissive dynamic, for there are women who feign submissiveness in much the way there are men pretending to be dominant.

Likewise it bears mentioning the insecurities of women are no large secret, and it is equal parts ego in so much as it is fear that if a woman is to submit to a man, the man in question may exploit his influence over her to her detriment. It is her desire to yield, and yet her simultaneous fear that should she yield she will irreparably harm her emotional well-being. This is why trust is so integral, and must be fostered with great benevolence and might in order to be created and sustained. Trust is not an easy thing, but a woman cannot truly submit until she trusts a man sufficiently not to abuse his power over her.

When the young woman is around the right man, she has it within the depths of herself irrespective of how dysfunctional she may be to yield and give herself to a sufficiently dominant man. The older woman’s undesirability lies in her inability to cultivate this dynamic, betrayed beyond redemption and hurt too much previously, her inability to trust, place hope in a strong man and yield to him makes her a non-option to the most dominant of men.

Dominant men evaluate the concerns of their woman, dominance is not tyrannical in so much as it is paternal. Such a man rewards and disciplines, but does not do so mercilessly and without reason, but rather as a response to insolence and good behaviour. Trust is integral to the dominant-submissive dynamic, for if a man is not benevolent enough to be righteous in the exercise of his discipline, he will unduly punish and thus needlessly ostracise the woman he is partnered with. It is vital a woman’s fears are assuaged whilst her uppity affront is simultaneously quashed. Such a thing is achieved through sheer mastery of dominance, that is, knowing when to punish, knowing when to reward, and knowing how to encourage that which is deemed productive and good in a woman. It is a delicate balance that must be practised, and yet once it is attained, each party is all the better for it.

7.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

It is man’s responsibility to lead, and woman’s to follow, for man is drawn to feminine submission in much the way woman is drawn to masculine dominance. This basic premise is itself the very basic building block on which attraction is formed, and whether knowingly or unknowingly to those involved, all healthy, happy relationships operate upon this very foundation. To conflate masculine dominance with oppression is a grossly disingenuous mischaracterisation of the functional order between man and woman, and it is with the greatest of sadesses we see such an egregious idea adopted with ever fermenting commonality.
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1.) Introduction:

In this piece I will depart from my usual lofty prose to bring you something less abstract and more practical. Even though I lean toward the more literary, strategic and theoretical side of things most of the time, I think it’s important to write about practical things in a simple manner on occasion.

After all, I’m not just here to embellish my own love of wordsmithing, but likewise to help people by sharing what I’ve learned from my experiences and observations.
Now on that note, energy optimisation is of great importance to me. I’m not naturally high energy, but I’m naturally pretty smart. And I’ll tell you this. High energy guys with shit for brains will kill it more in life than low energy smart guys ever will.

Energy is king. Don’t let anyone tell you otherwise. A high energy dumbass will outperform a low energy genius every time without fail. Not only will his peak in any one scenario be higher, but his ability to endure will be greater.

**Without energy, you just can’t get shit done.**

When genius boy wants to lay back in his chair and do fuck all, dumbo the elephant wants to zoom around town completing errands.

It is energy and energy alone that underpins every single human’s ability to do anything. And so there should be nothing, absolutely nothing, that is more important for you to get under control than this.

If you’re not a high energy person, and you’re reading this, your objective should be to change this. Firstly, identify why and how you’re low energy, then engage in lifestyle changes and/or therapeutic treatments to fix the problem.

This is your true route to a better life, not binge reading self-improvement material. Self-improvement material can’t give you energy, it can only tell you what to do assuming you actually have the energy to follow its advice!

Being low energy is not an acceptable state of living. It’s normal to average people, because average people are accustomed to being in poor health, but if you read IM, you are obviously someone with zero interest in being average, and will do whatever it takes to win at life.

It doesn’t matter how capable you think you are, how smart, how talented, how whatever. As a smart man who’s had to deal with far too much fatigue throughout his life, I can tell you this:

**Smart men are smarter when they’re not fatigued.**

Having sharp effortless focus and not having to battle brain fog not only improves your performance, but rids you of the emotional frustration that comes with brain fog.

So however smart you think you are in your constant state of tiredness? Yeah, you’d be smarter if you weren’t tired all the time. If you’re not a high energy person, you will never reach your potential, you will find it hard to be motivated, social and productive.

**Nobody who is ambitious wants this for themselves.**

It’s not because you suck. It’s not because you’re lazy, or some other garbage where people with better physiology due to genetics or drug consumption look down on you for being less productive than them.

It’s because your hormonal profile sucks. It’s easy to kill it at life when your hormones rock,
which is why a lot of winners are into blood panel monitoring and hormonal optimisation. If you are tired all the time, your hormones suck, and it’s holding you back. Period.

A lot of people who don’t achieve much and are deemed lazy, may actually be very mentally ambitious and driven. But if they don’t have the energy to act on their ambitions?

**Then for all and intent and purpose the world thinks you’re a loser. It doesn’t care you’re tired. It just wants results. Wanting to produce results isn’t enough. You need to be actually able to produce them!**

It doesn’t matter if you’re a god damn rocket ship. If you have no rocket fuel, how are you getting to Mars? You’re not.

It’s easy for a high energy person with good hormones to tell a low energy person with bad hormones to work harder, that they need to get out of their head, that it’s their fault and theirs alone they suck and blah blah. I see egotistical chest beating fucks talking like this all the time.

Nonetheless, my objective is not to bitch for the entirety of this article – it’s to help. I believe this opening rant is necessary, because if you believe you suck innately, and don’t realise it’s a fixable biological problem that is to blame, there’s no hope for you.

Once you recognise the world is unfair, and that the reason you’re sucking at life stems from subpar health, you can find a way to do something about it.

And that my friends is the scope of this article.

2.) Energy & Social Skills:

Many lethargic people who think they have bad social skills actually do not. It’s simply their tiredness which prevents them from being as present and socially powerful as they would be if they were hormonally optimised and had high energy levels.

Children tend to be very social because they’re very energetic. The elderly less so, because they’re not.

One thing you’ll notice about popular people is they all tend to have very high energy. Low energy people can’t bring the hype because they’re always tired, and if your energy is really low, you may not even have it in you to socialise.

**Fatigue induces involuntary introversion.**

And even should you make the effort to socialise whilst fatigued, your ability to connect with others and have a rich interaction will be subpar.

If you are suffering or have suffered from fatigue for a long time, don’t identify with it, that’s not who you are. Who you really are, your true self, is being suppressed by sub-optimal health and it’s time to do something about it.
3.) Identifying The Cause:

Those of you who don’t like needles (that’s going to be most of you) aren’t going to like hearing this, but if you’re tired all the time, you’re going to need to get blood tests done to determine what’s wrong with you.

I believe the most common reasons for low energy are as follows:

- Untreated low testosterone
- Untreated hypothyroidism
- Untreated diabetes
- Lack of Vitamin D3
- Lack of B Vitamins

Now there are plenty of other conditions and mineral deficiencies that can cause fatigue and I more than suspect people to discuss these in the comments, however I can’t cover everything in one article.

So I’ve picked the five health issues I believe are the most common causes of fatigue in men.

You can start off by simply buying vitamin D3 and a decent vitamin B complex and seeing if that solves your fatigue problems. If it does, great, you can avoid getting blood tests done to check your hormones because you’re not tired anymore. Honestly though, I don’t recommend this.

It’s smart to keep your own health records and archive them over time to spot trends. The younger you are when you start doing this, the better.

So say you want to get checked for these things, what blood tests should you order? Should you trust your doctor to know what to order on your behalf because you told him you suspect you may have a certain ailment?

**No. You’re a man and your doctor doesn’t give a damn about you. You find out exactly what to test for yourself. You don’t waste time convincing a doctor you need certain tests done, you pay a lab directly out-of-pocket to get it done hassle free.**

For example if you go to your doc and say “hey doc, I think I have low testosterone” guess what the idiot is most likely to do, assuming he even tests you at all?

He will just order a testosterone test. Nothing else. He will quite literally just have your total testosterone checked, which by itself, is an utterly useless metric because it tells you nothing about the other hormones and proteins that interact with and affect your testosterone.

Your doctor not only makes you wait longer to see your result than if you’d ordered the test yourself, but when you get your result back he’ll tell you you’re fine without ever letting you see the numbers.

This is sub-optimal care, in fact it is damn right negligent and unprofessional, but such is the
state of modern medical practice. I am not being dramatic. This experience reflects that of many men who have gone to see their GPs concerned with their health, only to be turned away without proper testing or adequate treatment.

As a man, you have to look out for your own health and do your own research. Nobody really cares about you, least of all the medical profession.

“Okay IM, you’ve gone off topic in your disdain for the medical profession, if I suspect I have low testosterone, what blood tests should I order?”

- Total testosterone – self-explanatory – this is the total amount of testosterone circulating in your blood – **higher is better**

- SHBG (Sex Hormone Binding Globulin) – this is a protein that binds heavily to your testosterone, making it unavailable to your tissues for general use – **lower is better**

- Albumin – this is essentially a weaker form of SHBG, it’s a protein that binds loosely to your testosterone – **lower is better**

- Estrogen/Estradiol – **lower is better**
This is spelt as Oestrogen/Oestradiol in the UK. Alternate spellings can be confusing. This is worth noting to avoid potential confusion. E1 is Estrone, E2 is Estradiol. You’re interested in E2.

- Prolactin – this is the hormone responsible for lactation, in high amounts it reduces natural testosterone production – **lower is better**

SHBG and Albumin are used to determine your free testosterone, your free testosterone is distinct from your total testosterone in so much as your total testosterone is the sum of what exists in your body at any one point, but your free testosterone is what’s available to your body for your use (and thus well-being!)

Bound testosterone is inactive and unable to give you any benefit. You can have the highest testosterone in the world, but if it’s all bound up you will get no benefit from it and still suffer from the lethargy typical of low testosterone. I knew of one gentleman who had a natural total testosterone level of 900ng/dL, (31 nmol/L) – which is high T, but his SHBG was at around 70 nmol/L – so he never had any energy because despite being high T, he had low free T. Yes, if you’re high T but have low free T, you are for all intent and purpose low T.

The range for free testosterone deemed “normal” is 1.5% to 3% of your total testosterone. Naturally, higher is better. If your free testosterone is 1.5% of your total testosterone (or lower) – this is undoubtedly *THE* if not *A* cause of your fatigue. You don’t necessarily need to have low testosterone to suffer from low free testosterone. Whether you have low T, or low free T, the presence of either will cause fatigue.
Total testosterone should, in my opinion, be no lower than 700ng/dL, which is around 24nmol/L. Lower than that is only bad. You won’t be superman at this level, but you won’t feel like crap either. Your physician will disagree with my opinion and say you are fine if you are in the 300-600 range, but this is bullshit.

Elderly men in the 1980’s had 600+ as an average, but if a 20 year old in 2017 is at 600+, or even around 400, they’ll tell him he’s fine. What? How does that work? They keep revising the range for testosterone and sperm count down to lower and lower acceptable levels. This is extremely shady.

Why should we accept being less fertile and biologically masculine than our forefathers? We shouldn’t!

Aim for free testosterone that is at least 1.8%+ of your total testosterone. Anecdotally, this is as low as my free T has been where I haven’t been fatigued, but as we’re all physiologically distinct, you may require more or less than I do.

Once you have your blood test results back, you can use this free testosterone calculator to deduce your free testosterone % if the lab you used didn’t calculate it for you.

Need testosterone replacement therapy? Try http://chekd.com or http://primebody.com if you’re in the US.

In Europe? Then you’re shit out of luck for an internet based service. Western and Northern Europe are really crappy places to live if you want to get your hands on pharma grade testosterone. Try googling your area name followed by “testosterone replacement” or “men’s health clinic”. They’re expensive as hell. Alternatively, take a trip to Eastern Europe, buy a ton of testosterone over the counter, and bring it back (this is legal to do in the UK, but you should check the laws where you live!)

Live in a poor country? Poor countries don’t baby you. You can probably walk straight into your nearest pharmacy and buy pharma grade testosterone right over the counter, hassle free and without prescription. This is what a reader of mine from Pakistan did, going from 200ng/dL to 1000ng/dL in no time.

Okay IM, what blood tests should I order if I suspect hypothyroidism or diabetes?

For the assessment of potential thyroid issues, you want the following checked:

- TSH (Thyroid Stimulating Hormone) – a range of 1-2 mu/L is best – higher is worse, too low is bad
- FT4 (Free T4)
- FT3 (Free T3)
- RT3 (Reverse T3)
- TPOAb (Thyroid Peroxidase Antibodies) – lower is better
- TgAb (Thyroglobulin Antibodies)
The higher your TSH, the harder you will find it to cut body fat because your thyroid’s working slower. Some people supplement with thyroid hormone for this reason. I haven’t done it, so I can’t comment on it as much as I just did testosterone, but it’s worth mentioning.

For the assessment of diabetes, you want the following checked:

- **HbA1c** - It should be beneath 42mmol/mol - **lower is better**

42-47 is prediabetes and 48+ means you’re diabetic. If you want something “good” to compare it to, mine was sitting at 32 the last time it was checked.

If I’ve used measurements your country doesn’t use, you’ll have to find a converter online somewhere. The internet may be global, but the metrics used to measure things have not been globally standardised.

**Vitamin D3** and the **B vitamins** don’t really require a blood test because you can just buy some cheap supplements from Amazon and take them for 2 weeks. If you don’t start feeling more energetic, you know those weren’t the source of your tiredness.

If you want to be rigorous and have the cash, you can get these things checked as well, but they’re not as high priority as having your hormones checked.

If you get blood tests done by a doctor rather than getting them done independently, ask for a copy of your blood work so you can see the numbers and interpret the results yourself.

Many doctors will “interpret the results on your behalf” and then say they’re “fine” without even letting you see the numbers. You don’t want this, because this puts you at the mercy of their judgement, level of ignorance on the current literature, and whatever clinical vested interests they may have.

You use unspecialised doctors mainly for their ability to prescribe, not their opinion, as most have no clue about effective testosterone therapy. You have to be your own doctor. You can’t trust them to get everything right, or even have your best interest at heart. Any doctor reading this will hate me for saying it, but it’s true, there are far too many crappy doctors out there to be taking chances on your health.

**It’s your health, and you’re a man, so you have to take control.**

Personally I would recommend getting your tests done by an independent lab, as then you get to see all the numbers and don’t need to argue with your doctor to see your own blood work (many don’t like the idea you don’t just blindly trust them to interpret the results for you!)


### 4.) Methods For Improving Your Energy Levels:

I will start with the most conventional things you’re most likely to know, and get less and less
conventional as I go down the list.

Food - some people have far more energy on a low carb, high fat and high protein diet, whereas others feel terrible on a low carb diet. If you’ve been on low carb for awhile and never feel like you have any energy, your body is screaming out for carbs.

We do not all respond with equal success to the same macronutrient distributions, thus experimenting with your body and learning what does and doesn’t agree with you is essential. There is no generalised one size fits all diet – experiment with yourself!

Sleep - ideally you never wake up to an alarm clock and simply wake whenever your body decides it’s time to get up. Most people don’t have the freedom nor luxury to do this and have to be up at a set time everyday because they’re trapped in the rat race.

The average REM cycle lasts about 1.5 hours, so if you have to be up at 7am, go to bed at 11.30pm, 1am, 2.30am or 4am. Obviously going to bed at 4am and waking up at 7am is not a sustainable sleep habit, but by timing your sleep like this you will find it easy to get out of bed, as opposed to clambering out of bed full of grogginess.

Fasting – I really actually can’t recommend this enough. I will probably have to write an article on it at some point as whenever I mention it on Twitter, I get about a million questions, but I will address it here.

Fasting is great for getting rid of fatigue and boosting productivity. If you are a typically low energy person, it’s possible you have poor digestion stemming from a gut condition, or just have generally poor gut flora (which you fix by eating fermented foods like unpasteurised sauerkraut!) When fasted, your body is not digesting anything and thus you get more blood flow to your brain.

Not only that, but physiologically your body starts burning ketones for fuel, starts healing your body via autophagy, and jacks up cortisol, adrenaline and growth hormone secretion to give you energy in the absence of caloric consumption. If you want to learn more about the biological processes behind fasting, I highly recommend reading this book by Dr Jason Fung.

When fasted, I sleep less. On a training day I will sleep for around 7-9 hours. On a non-training day, I will sleep for 6-8 hours. On a fasted day, I will sleep for 4-6 hours. Fasting dramatically reduces sleep requirements. And yes, you wake up feeling completely refreshed and won’t feel the need to go to bed early during the day because you slept less.

How do I fast? I drink black coffee, green tea and water. I eat no food. I can regularly go for 22 hour periods without eating anything like this and be incredibly focused and energetic the entire time.

Now we’re going to move out of the realm of lifestyle change, and more into the realm of substance consumption to give yourself a quick boost.

Stimulants/Nootropics – None of these things will fix the underlying cause of your fatigue,
but they can act as short-term fixes until you get to the bottom of the cause.

- Modafinil, this is a wakefulness drug developed to treat narcolepsy and sleep apnea, but is used off-label as a study drug. It’s main mechanism is unknown, but it’s a dopamine reuptake inhibitor, which means it can make you motivated and energetic by keeping your dopamine high. I wrote an article explaining it in more depth before, which you can read here. Where can you buy it? https://www.afinilexpress.com/

- Whiskey, I bet you’re surprised to see this here. Your mileage may vary depending on your physiology. I wrote whiskey and not alcohol because not all alcohol has the same effect. Wine and beer tend to send you to sleep, whereas whiskey acts as a stimulant. Now it is not my wish to encourage alcoholism, however, what works, works. If you feel lifeless, a glass of whiskey or two could turn your day around and have you kicking. If you drink alcohol with any degree of regularity, be smart and take a liver protector with it. You can take NAC, or the far more powerful, but more expensive TUDCA.

- Black coffee with grass fed butter and MCT oil in it. Grass fed butter is recommended for the omega 3 (most people don’t get enough). This concoction gives a massive energy boost, and is known informally as “bulletproof coffee.” Get the darkest coffee you can get your hands on for extra strength.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

I am not a doctor or nutritionist and do not claim to be, thus none of this constitutes medical advice and you should take everything I’ve said with a pinch of salt.

I have not identified absolutely everything that could cause fatigue, merely a handful of things. The information here is comprehensive, but not exhaustive. If anyone has additional suggestions, I’d be more than happy to hear them in the comments. I hope the advice given proves itself useful. Until next time!

PS: before I forget to mention it, check out the latest podcast I did with Donovan over at The Sharpe Reality. We had a blast!

Yours,
IM
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1.) Introduction:

Seeing as people absolutely love maxims, I’ve decided to commit myself to another round of Fifty Shades of Red (being this article) and Machiavellian Maxims (which will come later on!)

The maxims that comprise the bulk of this article are designed to educate men on the nature of women, as well as the nature of themselves in relation to women. Being a loose collection of maxims, the article is easy-to-read by merit of its broken down format. I’ve likewise adopted brevity here in the hope that the most prominent points will stick more easily.
The maxims listed are inclusive, but not exhaustive. As such, these maxims do not compromise the totality of wisdom available on this topic. This is part 4 in a continuing series, you can find part 1 here, part 2 here and part 3 here.

2.) The Maxims:

**IM MAXIM #151** – If she suddenly stops wanting your attention, she’s getting attention of equal or greater value elsewhere.

**IM MAXIM #152** – The older the woman, the greater her sense of urgency, the older the man, the more reluctant his urge to commit.

**IM MAXIM #153** – All sensations of dread inflicted onto you by her should be responded to with equal or greater dread.

**IM MAXIM #154** – To conquer a woman’s ego, frame everything she does as suspicious, call her out, neg her, dismiss her, and you will win. The beauty of this strategy is not even her awareness can diminish its efficacy, for aware or not, dominance is dominance.

**IM MAXIM #155** – Preface everything she says with “right now I feel like” and you will understand her better, for she is capriciously fickle.

**IM MAXIM #156** – Her intentions are byproducts of her mood, not binding statements derived from a code of honour; a change in mood will as such void all and any prior declarations of intent made by her.

**IM MAXIM #157** – Women have to work hard to be likeable, men have to work hard to be fuckable.

**IM MAXIM #158** – If she says she needs space, neither argue nor plead. Withdraw all attention. Disappear. The ease with which you depart will make her second guess her decision.

**IM MAXIM #159** – Her need to feel safe should outweigh her infantishly narcissistic need to be in charge of things she doesn’t want to be held responsible for.

**IM MAXIM #160** – It’s hard for a child to understand the existential pressures of being an adult. To a lesser degree albeit significant degree, the same is true of women with men.

**IM MAXIM #161** – A woman with confidence issues can get a quality man because it’s a passive, feminine trait. **Boldness** is man’s burden.

**IM MAXIM #162** – Behind every messed up young woman who had potential is a man who broke her heart, or a misandrist harpy whispering venom into her ears.

**IM MAXIM #163** – For all her wiles and prowess in charming and deceiving others, womankind isn’t so good at decision-making. The reason she’s great at the former is the same reason she’s poor at the latter, she’s evolved to “fit in”, not to evaluate with, nor value reason.
IM MAXIM #164 – When you’re in a relationship with a woman, you must drag her up or she’ll drag you down.

IM MAXIM #165 – When women win, everyone loses, women included. They are masochists with a penchant for self-destruction and will destroy themselves as well as any who would help them - if you let them. Refer to Maxim #164

IM MAXIM #166 – Egotistical women think they’re above submissiveness because they’ve forgotten their place, but alphas seek submission, not conflict.

IM MAXIM #167 – Most young women are overly cautious with men because they are mindful of his sexual intent, yet when it comes to insidious older women who would corrupt them, they are gullible. Refer to Maxim #162

IM MAXIM #168 – Men thrive when they’re in touch with reality, women thrive when they’re detached from it, for the very loss of innocence which strengthens man damages woman.

IM MAXIM #169 – Despite the cultural narrative that it is men who are the cheats, women are responsible for the majority of adulterous divorce. Women have more opportunities to cheat and are less innately virtuous, thus only by mechanism of constant and ruthless discipline do they properly behave.

IM MAXIM #170 – A woman’s virtue is directly proportional to the level of ruthlessness her man subjects her to. Refer to Maxim #169

IM MAXIM #171 – If she characterises you as villainous, unsavoury, unethical, or otherwise morally reprehensible – you’re winning.

IM MAXIM #172 – A woman who boasts of her capacity to feign submissiveness is not a real woman, she is but a charlatan of artifice, the womanly equivalent of the faux dominant man.

IM MAXIM #173 – Loyalty is not a female trait. Refer to Maxim #170

IM MAXIM #174 – Despite her claims to the contrary, women care less about a man’s ethics than his genes and accomplishments. As such, women will rationalise around the impropriety of the former in order to reap the benefits of the latter. Refer to Maxim #170 and Maxim #171

IM MAXIM #175 – Men are meant to lead women, but women are naturally more cunning than men, consequently the most effective men are highly cunning leaders.

IM MAXIM #176 – Feeling safe with a man who could kill her is insatiably aphrodisiacal for woman, for the simultaneous tingle of attraction amalgamated with a most sensual of gentleness is her most harmonious opiate.

IM MAXIM #177 – When she ignores your shit tests, ignore her existence.

IM MAXIM #178 – If you always make her come to you first, you win. By not chasing her, you subtextually communicate you don’t need her and have other options. By chasing you,
she is investing upfront and thus subconsciously affirming to herself she needs you. See law 8.

**IM MAXIM #179** – Man’s burden of performance and need to prove his masculinity is often weaponised against him by women in an attempt to have him do things that run counter to his interest.

**IM MAXIM #180** – Women are so invertedly egotistical that no matter how damaged they are, they seek not to be fixed, but “merely” desired and accepted irrespective of their undoings.

**IM MAXIM #181** – You never get a break with women. If you choose poorly, she will be entitled, arrogant and demanding. She can be put in her place, but she will rebel often. If you choose a quality woman, she will be insecure and needy. Either way she is emotionally erratic, and thus either way, she will test you unrelentingly to feel the authoritative security of your dominance.

**IM MAXIM #182** – Women care not for manly emotions, for they are emotionally selfish, self-centred. Women respect man’s ability to make them feel a range of emotion, their inclinations being to feel desired and to feel pain.

**IM MAXIM #183** – A woman who wants to war more than she wants to serve, is a woman unfit for, and undeserving of, a relationship. Refer to Maxim #166

**IM MAXIM #184** – Real women are submissive, and submissive women crave safety, not control. Fake submissives have an unreconciled conflict between feminism and their true natures.

**IM MAXIM #185** – Irrespective of her quality, women crave a villain who isn’t afraid to treat her like the war prize her female ancestors were.

**IM MAXIM #186** – Due to the absence of a consistent and non-contradictory narrative, the opinions of women are close to worthless. Refer to Maxim #155

**IM MAXIM #187** – You are always at war with her. Even if she needs you, she will fight you to both of your detriments. If you’re not the boss, you’re nothing to her.

**IM MAXIM #188** – Due to their innately masochistic nature, women try to destroy themselves as well as any man who would dare help them. Refer to Maxim #180 and 187

**IM MAXIM #189** – When men fail in their capacity to subdue feminine chaos, when her waves of tyrannical emotion smash through the walls, nothing but the abyss remains.

**IM MAXIM #190** – Be under no illusion, women are the chaos element of humanity, men are the order element. It is man’s duty as such to subdue women’s chaos via the righteousness of his noblest discipline. Refer to Maxim #189

**IM MAXIM #191** – In a crisis your first concern should not be to fix the problem, but to handle her emotional state. Once her emotions have been handled, it is then and only then
she will allow you to address the problem, for until her emotions have been managed, she will be uncooperative and do little but panic and whine.

**IM MAXIM #192** – Where women are concerned, it always ends in emotion. Feelings are all the majority of women know, yet even amongst those who know logic – feelings constitute their prime value system. Logic is a quaint peculiarity, if not an outright obnoxious annoyance to the feminine.

**IM MAXIM #193** – Smart egotistical women fake submissiveness and wield it as a tool to get what they want. Refer to Maxim #195

**IM MAXIM #194** – She must feel like she needs you more than you need her, if she doesn’t, she will think she’s better than you. As a man, you don’t get to be needy, this freedom to be weak is the sole purview of the feminine. Refer to Maxim #199

**IM MAXIM #195** – Womanly **submissiveness** is crack to the male soul.

**IM MAXIM #196** – Men are superior workers, women superior breeders; men do better in the economy, women do better reproductively.

**IM MAXIM #197** – If she’s not a producer, she’s not a keeper. A lazy woman makes for a poor partner, and an even poorer mother.

**IM MAXIM #198** – If things become desexualised for any extended period of time, you’re in trouble. A cessation of flirtation foreshadows relational ominousness.

**IM MAXIM #199** – Sometimes destruction must precede creation in order for the optimal to be born anew. In this vein and given sufficient skill, man can destroy woman to rebuild her into his desired image, yet if woman is allowed to destroy man, know this: she will leave him to rot.

**IM MAXIM #200** – If she can get over you quickly, you weren’t brutal enough with her.

---

3.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

My Twitter DMs will be open for questions this Friday (tomorrow) at 7pm EST. I will endeavour to answer all your questions. Whilst we’re on the subject of Twitter, it looks like they’ve shadowbanned me again, so only a small % of my tweets will appear in your feed. If you like reading my tweets, go to my profile page directly to actually see everything I tweet.

My latest shit talking endeavour with my man Donovan Sharpe can be found here. May you enjoy listening to it as much as we enjoyed recording it!
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“There is no avoiding war; it can only be postponed to the advantage of others.” – Niccolo Machiavelli
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1.) Introduction:

Welcome to part 5 in my series of Machiavellian maxims, as with the previous entries, contained within’s a pithy collection of Machiavellian wisdom. If you’ve not read this series before, or simply wish to reread some of the older maxims, here’s a convenient bullet list for you:

- Part 1 [here](#)
- Part 2 [here](#)
- Part 3 [here](#)
- Part 4 [here](#)

In *Fifty Shades of Red (Part 4)*, I stated it was my intent to compile another series of Machiavellian Maxims. These maxim articles tend to be quite well received (I suppose you all enjoy the break from enduring the intricacy of my essays) – so here they are. Enjoy.

2.) The Maxims:

1. - Cull the fickle, insolent, and disloyal, for even if it injures you in the short-term, it will
benefit you in the long.

2. - Being likeable is a conflict avoidance strategy.

3. - When dealing with pedants, jobsworths and fault finders, use subjunctives such as “if”, “perhaps” and “maybe”, so they can't nail you down to a position. Anything that can be misconstrued, will be, plausible deniability is thus paramount.

4. - Trust is a self-fulfilling prophecy, the less you trust the other party, the less they'll trust you. The inverse is also true; the more you trust the other party, the likelier they'll trust you.

5. - When people don’t like you, they look for flaws in your methods in an attempt to discredit you. Give them something non life-threatening to chew on.

6. - Faced by a lion, most will step back, not forward.

7. - Egotists will underestimate you, cowards will overestimate you.

8. - Projection: most people posit the opinion they hold of themselves as a notable exception for generality in counterargument.

9. - When you describe a man to himself in accurate yet unflattering detail, you deal a crippling blow to his psyche.

10. - The waiting game is a necessary game, as such, it is strategically optimal to outwait those who would test your patience.

11. - If power is defined as one's ability to impose their will onto the world, then money is the commodification of power in physical form.

12. - The more words you use, the less they’ll like what you say.

13. - Misdirection: if they say a lot of words without communicating a bottom line, they’re deceiving you.

14. - War is everything. All the time, everywhere, war rages constantly. It has different forms, intensities, and appearances, but it persists perpetually, eternally.

15. - Competition is not war per se, but rather, its predicate. One can compete indirectly and without maliciousness of intent. War on the other hand is wilful violation, for it is less distant, more immediate, and manifests itself as conflict or sabotage.

16. - Frames are a war of propaganda. Do not absorb the other side’s frame, have them absorb yours. Whoever absorbs first, loses. If neither side concedes, stalemate. Caveat: satire.

17. - Intelligent energy allocation is a fundamental principle of effective strategy, for bereft energy, there is nothing.
18. – Pragmatism is king, doubly so when one is suffering.

19. – Strong ethics are oft the superficial purview of the elite and the substantive limiter of the loser.

20. – The middle class are confined to methodologically unsound moral codes, for it ensures they’re neither a threat nor a factor in the game of power.

21. – The poorest and the richest tend to be the least moral, for the poor have dire need, whereas the rich possess excess power; desperation and domination alike lend themselves to immorality.

22. – The immoral rich are unvirtuous on a greater scale than the immoral poor, for they have greater means with which to impose their ethics. The immoral poor in turn justify their immorality based on the actions of the immoral rich, people they’d likely mimic given the same resources.

23. – For the rich it’s easy to be moral because they can afford to be, for the poor, it’s easy to be moral because there’s little power to tempt them.

24. – The method necessary to win and it’s associated reputation are entirely distinct entities. Method is effectiveness, reputation is perception.

25. – If you want to sell someone, lie to them. If you want to help them, hit them with the truth. A spoonful of humour helps the medicine go down.

26. – Most are focused on how being bound to their word can limit their freedoms by putting them in a bind, the reversal however is that by speaking truthfully and keeping your word when no one else does, your credibility grows immeasurably. Irrespective of their aesthetic contradictions, both are simultaneously true. These are not mutually exclusive conditions.

27. – If you discover someone’s given you misinformation, ascertain the probability this was done so with ill intent; there’s a good chance you’re at war.

28. – To be successful is, effectively, to paint a bullseye on one’s back; to be famous is to intensify the geometric volume of said bullseye.

29. – Many notable people have acquired demons and skeletons in their pursuit to the top. Enemies instinctively expect this, hence the propensity to dirt dig and smear the noteworthy.

30. – People judge themselves less harshly than they judge you, to them, what is not permissible for you is so for them.

31. – Everyone judges you on your actions, but not everyone understands why you did what you did. Fewer care why.

32. – Bread, circuses and a pseudo-educated population ferment an apathy that makes for easy governance.
33. - Someone is always responsible for failure, but the person truly at fault is not always disposable. This is why the fall man was invented. He who is useless will be allocated the blame for the mistakes of he who is.

34. - When people analyse literature and interpret, they believe their deductions to be uniquely theirs, rather than seeds planted by the writer.

35. - Don’t avoid war, prepare for it.

36. - Inferiors think you’re equal when you validate their nonsense with a response. Corollary: the higher you ascend, the more proficient one need be at ignoring trite.

37. - When confused, the inverse of the overt statement’s appearance is often where you’ll find truth.

38. - When we see what we want to see instead of what is, we fool ourselves. All the other person need do is study our desires, and present themselves as such. They show us what we want to see, and we are all too happy to ignore anything extraneous. For this reason, it is clear: the person best suited to deceive you - is you.

39. - To expose subversive elements, appear reactive, then don’t react when a shot is fired in the grand confidence you will respond – upstart morale shatterer.

40. - Arguments are more about spin than they are material facts. It is not the best logician that wins, it’s the best spin artist.

41. - Be mindful about revealing how you would intend to react in threatening hypothetical scenarios, for if such a reaction is deemed profitable, you will inadvertently bring about its undesirable cause.

42. - The resentful weak will clutch at any avenue for revenge no matter how trivial and leverage it to its absolute utmost.

43. - Politics is war by psychological means, media but its delivery system.

44. - Typical enemies are visible, they promote you by being vocal in their hatred of you. Insidious enemies invisibly undermine you by recruiting someone to smear you, or by endorsing your visible enemies. The insidious enemy does not market for you, sometimes he even poses as a friend. Be mindful of him, for he is the Trojan horse.

45. - You detect Trojans based on what they don’t do rather than what they do. Even when hidden, enemies are usually close. Apply a probability heuristic to your surroundings to identify potential Trojans.

46. - He who is seen is only more powerful than he who isn’t, when being seen yields profit and being not doesn’t.

47. - Sow seeds of doubt invisibly to create division among others, whilst appearing warm to all involved. This will allow you to consolidate power in the popularity Olympics
that constitutes human relations.

48. - Business or war, targeting works the same, you target people with influence over others, not influencees. Destroy a leader, destroy his men. Win a leader, win them.

49. - Everything is a tactic or a play or a move, if you can’t see this, it’s because you’re undiscerning, not because it isn’t there.

50. - Use the word feel more when talking with feelers, use the word think more when talking with thinkers. This sounds simple when stated, but few realise just how much it affects their credibility.

51. - Winners don’t play fair, they hide their edge and maintain the illusion of fairness.

52. - The more powerful a person becomes, the more likely they are to distance themselves from previous allies.

53. - Be unpredictable, appear weak when strong, or strong when weak, alternatively, oscillate between the two to be an unpredictable enigma.

3.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

If you’re interested in consulting, click here. If you enjoyed these maxims, you will enjoy the following resources.
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1.) Introduction – Philosophical Metaphysics, Science & Religion:

The other day, a poster left a comment disputing the value of the writings at Illimitable Men due to the lack of studies and statistical data used to support the views espoused. Now, although I do not think one needs peer-reviewed studies to put forth observations and formulate opinions in relation to them; I am most intrigued by individuals who believe the absence of scientific evidence is sufficient grounds to invalidate a premise, for this is not only lazy thinking, but presumptive.

It is lazy because it permits the individual to dismiss a thing without consciously evaluating an argument based on its individual merits, and it is presumptive because it assumes contemporary science possesses the technological sophistication requisite to test all conceivable hypotheses. The latter is matter-of-factly untrue, for science in all its grandeur and mighty empiricism is as yet incapable of piercing the realm of metaphysics, which continues to defy quantification.

“Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence” – Carl Sagan
Consciousness remains an enigma to science, and for as long as this remains true, philosophy will remain hegemon of all things metaphysical and thereby spiritual in nature. This is precisely why philosophy exists, for it has repeatedly endured as a form of top-down investigation into the metaphysical substrate of reality for millennia, filling a vacuum of human need that religion embodies, but does not explain.

Religion is the symbolic mythologisation of the human metaphysical spirit into a myriad of stories designed to provide guidance, whereas philosophising is an evaluative process that attempts to make sense of the human soul and its cosmic abstractions via observation and reason. Philosophy is thus, by definition, not engaged in the politics of academic credentialism, nor bound to the empirical method as a means of discovery or conclusion forming.

Scientific materialism excludes the metaphysical, and is therefore hard-pressed to explain the aspects of humanity it cannot empirically reduce to a measurement. This is why people look to philosophy and religion to lead spiritually fulfilling lives rather than science, for empiricism is soulless in that it only claims what is measurable and experimentally replicable to be true, whilst holding what isn’t as untrue, or at the very least inconclusive.

2.) Critical Thinking & Belief Systems:

Ideological frameworks are belief systems that fill the vacuum left by an absence of religiosity, for whether one wishes to believe in God or not, humans have a propensity to seek a single unifying framework with which to make sense of the world. And so if one is to abandon religion due to a loss of faith, they will invariably act to fill their answerless identitarian void by adopting a completely new ideological system altogether.

In devoutly religious societies, the ruling religion embeds its ideological hegemony into the very essence of the nation by codifying its values into the architecture of its institutions: academia, the media, and law being the most prominent. In Saudi Arabia, this ideology would be Wahhabi Islam, under the Third Reich it was Nazism, and in the contemporary west, its the oppression Olympics more commonly known as political correctness but more accurately termed cultural Marxism.

As was stated in Robert Greene’s 48 Laws of Power, humans have an insatiable need to believe in something, and that something can be anything, but they have to believe in something, and it need not even be positive – only concretised as a suitable explanation for everything in the mind of the adherent. And although the word ‘belief’ has an overwhelmingly positive connotation attached to it, even a nihilist believes. The nihilist may believe “everything is pointless because it is the product of randomness rather than purposefulness”, and yet this is a belief nonetheless.

The intelligent have a propensity to self-develop hybrid systems of belief consisting of aspects from many different ideologies, religions and philosophies, whereas the masses adopt pre-existing ideology wholesale, leaving vast opportunity to mislead and control them via brainwashing, groupthink and social engineering, but I digress.

Where ideology instructs, science finds, and philosophy observes. This publication consists of
the latter rather than the former, for where scientific empirical materialism does not provide answers, and ideology requires blind faith, philosophy allows one to pierce the metaphysical and speculate with good sense.

3.) Citations, Citations, Where Art Thou Citations?

Illimitable Men is built on defeasible reasoning, and so although what is written is not deductively valid in the empirical sense, it aims to be compelling enough in its rationality to prompt the reader to think with greater rigour and criticality. Remember, the overall purpose of this publication is not to empirically demonstrate, but to compel to think.

As such, arbitrarily requiring citations whenever one asserts a viewpoint implies an absence of evidence is evidence of absence, and further implies that the individual dismissing a set of claims based on the absence of empirical evidence does not themselves hold beliefs that aren’t deductively valid. In practice this is untrue, and nothing more than a lazy way to refute premises one finds distasteful, for it is not the genuine nature of people to form beliefs solely on the basis they are backed by empirical evidence.

People adopt viewpoints because they are either A: likable, B: relatable, C: thought probable, or D: conclusively proven. As such, empirical evidence is a sufficient, but unnecessary condition to generate belief; if this were untrue, there would be no such thing as a muslim, nor a communist.

The citation needed fallacy suggests the individual will only hold beliefs that fulfil condition D to the exclusion of all other conditions. This is false, but is asserted as such because the individual asking for the citation doesn’t like the premise put forth.

You see, as corollary to why people believe in things, they likewise often disbelieve things because they are either A: unlikable, B: unrelatable, C: thought improbable or D: conclusively disproven. So often when one is asked for a citation, condition A of their reason for dismissing your premise is superficially conflated with condition D as a means of rejecting your claim and thereby dismissing you with minimal effort. The request for scientific evidence is not an earnest one, but rather a means in and of itself to dismiss your claims. If you actually provide evidence, such a person will look for a flaw in the study as proof of invalidation and therefore maintain their dismissal, as they prioritise the maintenance of personal narrative over the pursuit of truth.

On the topic of scientific proof, science often disproves things, but rarely does it actually ever prove anything. This is because it is a negative epistemology, its propensity is to disprove by trying to invalidate a claim, not prove a claim. And so when one looks to form beliefs in solidifying their understanding of the world, science at its sincerest can only tell people what not to believe, rather than what to. But belief, which is the micro dilution to faith’s macro devoutness cannot function on negative epistemology alone. To believe, something must be a near certainty, and science specialises in creating doubts, not providing assurances.

So how does one believe? Either via delusion, or because upon evaluating a thing you find it to be rationally compelling. Empirical proof is an often sufficient, but ultimately unnecessary condition for generating belief. Even if one does present studies to support their
argument, we must be wary that said studies are meritable and haven’t been commissioned by a company with an economic interest in proving a thing, nor corrupted by the bias of mainstream academic politics.

4.) A Lamentation of Academia & The Folly of Referencing:

I shan’t be so bold as to presume all who come across this writing are aware of what referencing is, so I shall labour to briefly explain it. Referencing is an inextricable and integral part of academic writing, in university, you are expected to validate your claims by citing sources that support the things you’ve written.

Sources can take the form of books, studies, or even websites. You populate your writing with sources by adding small numbers in brackets to the end of each claim, and then in the footer of your work you link the numbered claim to its relevant source. This allows the reader to see if there is evidence available to support a claim (or perhaps more accurately: if anybody else is corroborating your claim), in addition to serving as a repository of reading material for those with a deeper interest in the concept referred to.

Referencing can increase a student’s grade to the point it accounts for as much as 20% of the marks obtainable, although it is more commonly in the realm of 5-15% depending on the subject, module and whim of the professor. The hilarity to this of course is that a mischievous student could opt to write something completely unrelated to the assigned task, yet hypothetically receive 20% of the available marks if they’d properly referenced their claims. This is the extent to which academia values referencing, and naturally, it conditions students to think a thing doesn’t have intellectual integrity if it does not cite sources for its claims.

The flaw in this reasoning is that it discourages novel ideas and disputation of academic consensus in subjects where “the correct answer” is more a byproduct of mainstream politics than it is a chain of conclusions derived from credible evidence based research. If unsubstantiated pseudo-scientific studies are used as evidence to assert the truthfulness of fictional sociopolitical beliefs, and one wishes to contest these points in their work, said studies will be used as “evidence” and the student’s claims are untrue, even if the student’s claims are more firmly rooted in objective reality than the study’s. As such it becomes apparent that, irrespective of truth, studies benefit from a greater presumption of credibility than individuals do.

In practice, studies are often revered by collectivist students, low-grade teachers and laymen alike as undeniable proofs of a thing, and referred to as such irrespective of if the study in question is even credible. Alas, in the social sciences in particular, a study is more a hallmark of status, pedigree and credentialism than it is a sign of any real evidence. And this is not only a sad indictment of academia, but likewise, the corrupt nature of the peer review system it heralds; for studies are meant to serve as scientific proofs or disproofs of investigation, not units of ideological credibility ostentatiously masquerading as empiric scientific truth.

Corroboration is thought to increase plausibility, but what if one cherry picks what they cite and ignores or simply dismisses the studies that disagree with their position? If you have studies that are for and against a thing, will you ever possess a true answer, or will you simply pick the answers that confirm your biases? Is it constructive to occupy an infinitely
pedantic stalemate where one side’s starting premise of “this is true” cherry picks studies to support its position, whilst those with a starting premise of “this is false” arm themselves in much the same way, only for each side to dismiss one another and conclude nothing?

Doesn’t the fact science is unable to come to any hard conclusion on so many topics highlight its limitations? In the presence of both supporting and opposing studies, is it not rich then that one’s position ultimately comes down to the subjectivity of the studies they prefer, and not the objectivity of the data? And are you not then simply “saying what you think” in much the way a philosophising observer does, except rather than infer with earnest from observation, you partake in a convoluted system of research and peer review prone to corruption born out of prestige preservation and political posturing?

Is it healthy for one to live in constant doubt because nothing is really ever proven, but more things are suggested and interpreted by the data. Likewise even when you interpret the data, there is a metaphysical subjectivity to what you think the data means. Is there empirical methodology to quantify the validity of one’s interpretations, or does one weight the opinion using further subjective metrics like “expertise” and “perceived authority of the opinion holder?”

Is the corroboration of studies an inextricably plausible phenomenon, or can you simply have a house of cards where nonsense corroborates nonsense due to the shared ideological dispositions of so-called independent researchers? Are independent researchers truly independent when their minds metaphysically inhabit the same ideological space? It is notoriously known the social sciences have low replicability (and funnily enough, its most psychometrically valid variable, IQ, is its most disputed), so I’d think not.

Even if one’s starting premise is completely unmarred by prejudice, we now go into the infinitely pedantic exercise of quibbling over the validity of a study due to its sample size, testing methodology, or how long ago it was performed. And if it doesn’t fail on any of these metrics, we can opt to attack it for its lack of replicability, for even if other studies support the same conclusion, perhaps their samples were different, or used different experimental methodologies, and so the study wasn’t truly replicated and therefore yet further doubt can be cast on whether any of the findings hold even the slightest validity.

It is in this way one may proceed in their neurosis of never reaching any meaningful conclusion about anything, and yet due to the academic prestige inherent to citing certain names from certain years and quoting ‘experts’ from certain books, this makes them more superficially credible than an independent thinker divorced from the political neurosis of academic credentialism.

Is this not then, really just an exercise of the most futile befuddlement? To debate and to confuse with contradiction ad infinitum is not, as far as I’m concerned, the height of intelligence. And if one is to accept science is always in the process of disproving itself, then it is safe to assume that nothing is really true; for what is currently believed as true is merely contemporarily true, an approximation of truth held as true due to its proximity to truth, but not a truth in the purest and most absolute sense.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:
I do not believe occupying this continual landscape of epistemic uncertainty and inconclusiveness in a system rife with political bias, inadequate research methodology, low replicability and low data validity that passes for evidence bestows it the credibility it assumes carte blanche. As such, “citation needed” is becoming little more than the most fallacious of thought terminating cliches.

In addition, where scientific empirical materialism does not provide answers, philosophy pierces the metaphysical by observing universal patterns to form rationally compelling conclusions about the nature of the human psyche – such is the purview and purpose of philosophy, as well as this author’s humble writings. Where science flounders, philosophy begins, for just because you cannot empirically prove a thing you observe and deduce to be true, it does not mean one’s observance nor interpretation of their observance is false.

In the attempt to know the unknowable by understanding the unprovable, rational evaluation is a compelling form of evaluation, for there is a disconnect between the metaphysical and materialist worlds, and philosophy serves as the bridge between both.
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1.) Introduction

I have tried to make this guide as comprehensive as possible. I am not above updating it and improving it in the future.

I do not claim to know everything, claim to go into the greatest biological and scientific detail on each point, nor be a medical expert, but I know enough to answer almost any question someone who is just beginning or thinking about beginning TRT could want to know.

I may know more than the average general practitioner, or even endocrinologist, but I am not a doctor, nor licensed to give medical advice.

So even if your doctor is a complete idiot who knows less than I do, it is he/she who is licensed with the necessary credentials that legally permit them to give you medical advice, so you should only take advice from them, not me.
This is a practical, rather than intellectual piece. I will employ a simple writing style accordingly.

The structure of this article will take a questions and answers format from section 4 onward, with some background into the importance of TRT beforehand.

I have fielded questions from across the internet (email, blog, Twitter, Reddit) and the purpose of this article is to answer the plethora of questions put to me on TRT in a single, centralised location despite the controversy my thread fielding questions for this post generated. TRT is, unfortunately, something of a taboo mired in ignorant fearmongering.

There's a lot of interest in TRT in the men's part of the internet, and as a website dedicated to the betterment of man, I do not believe Illimitable Men would be complete in fulfilling the vision I have for it if I shied away from covering this topic simply because its controversial.

Men don’t shy away from things just because it’s going to elicit some outrage and disapproval.

I have no doubt that, upon the publication of this piece, there will be additional questions in the comments. Valuable questions that haven’t already been answered may be added to the article in future revisions, time permitting.

I want this piece to be as helpful, truthful and comprehensive as possible.

It’s taken me awhile to publish this since I first announced I would be working on it, but alas, you will see it has been worth the wait. Reading this will tell you many of the most relevant things you need to know about TRT.

But before we begin, let me reiterate the following: any test recommendations, health services or health information provided by illimitablemen.com, written or verbal, is for educational purposes only and is not intended to diagnose, treat, or cure any disease or condition.

2.) Why Do More & More Men Need Testosterone Replacement Therapy?:

There is a generational decline in testosterone levels amongst men independent of typical age expected decline.

This means men aren’t just losing testosterone as they get older, but men of all ages have lower testosterone than men who were their age the year before. So 2012’s 20 year olds would have 1% greater testosterone than 2013’s 20 year olds.

The later you were born, the lower your testosterone is likelier to be at any given age relative to men who were your age in a previous year.

The average 20 year old man in 2017 has less testosterone than the average 20 year old man in 1997 who has less testosterone than the average 20 year old man in 1977.

This is true for men in every age bracket. Men of all ages across the board have lower
testosterone levels. Your grandfather will have higher testosterone at 75 than your father, and your father will have higher testosterone at 75 than you will.

Male hormonal health and fertility is in crisis, and little is being done about it. In fact, blood testing laboratories continually lower their “acceptable range” of blood serum testosterone levels as the population’s testosterone decreases year on year.

They do this, because they devise the range based upon a sample of men from the population.

But if the average man’s health is deteriorating over time due to poor lifestyle choices and inhospitable environmental factors, then the quality standards for male health is effectively decreasing over time.

Men who would’ve gotten help with old reference ranges will no longer get help with newer, revised reference ranges because most doctors will not treat men who fall within the reference ranges even if they’re symptomatic.

And naturally, if the reference range was taken from a population whose health is deteriorating over time anyway, and there is a long-term trend in testosterone decline that hasn’t been fully investigated, then revising the range downward is foolish, as it makes it harder for men with ever poorer health to get the treatment they need.

Look at these recently revised testosterone ranges from LabCorp in July 2017 for instance.

A 25 year old man with say 400ng/dL of testosterone and showing symptoms of hypogonadism (low T) might’ve gotten help back in June from a sympathetic doctor, because although he was in range, he was barely within range.

Now in September 2017, the same 25 year old would be “much more deeply entrenched” within the accepted range, and therefore, although his symptoms of low T remain the same as they did back in June...

**He is now far less likely to get the treatment he needs because the revised range makes him appear healthier, even though he isn’t.**
The reference ranges really skew the frame of reference doctors use in deciding whether treatment is necessary or not. And the reference ranges are continually lowered to permit an ever declining state of health in men.

Likewise, the WHO (World Health Organisation) keeps downward revising what constitutes an acceptable quality and quantity of sperm.

Lower natural testosterone levels, means lower sperm count, and poorer sperm quality.

In 1968, around 38% of sperm was abnormal in the average man. In 2008, 97% of all sperm was abnormal.

So effectively, there is an epidemic in male hormonal health and fertility and little if anything being done by the medical establishment to redress it.

If you don’t take your health into your own hands and look after yourself, no one else will.

The doctors are busy fiddling numbers downwards instead of helping those who need it by basing their testosterone ranges on erroneous population samples that reflect the state of societal health as it is, rather than reflect an actual desirable healthy state in the body.

The fatal flaw in this is the presupposition that the current state of health in 18-39 year old men with a BMI under 30 is desirable, and that it is wise to gauge reference ranges based upon a large sample derived from this population.

The downward trends over time in both testosterone level and sperm quality and quantity suggest otherwise.

Perhaps one day male health will be taken seriously and society will do something to rectify
this truly shocking state of affairs.

But until that time, it’s good to be a man that’s ahead of the curve, and proactively taking matters into his own hands instead of waiting for his nuts to shrivel into nothingness.

3.) What Are The Benefits of Testosterone Replacement Therapy?:

There are two primary reasons to take TRT. Replacement, or optimisation. Replacement applies to men who have low testosterone, and so wish to replace their body’s poor natural production with a higher level in order to reap the benefits of high testosterone.

Optimisation applies to men who are not low in testosterone, but want an edge in life. Not only low testosterone men want to enjoy the benefits of testosterone. Mid testosterone men often do too.

This is a controversial and unorthodox reason for taking testosterone, and is shunned by both the public and much of the medical establishment, yet many men take testosterone for precisely this reason. I’m not here to sugarcoat or hide information from you, so here it is.

What benefits are to be had from a high testosterone level?

- Improved mood/confidence
- Improved energy
- Reduced anxiety
- Improved erections (occur more frequently, and when they occur, are stronger)
- Increased penile girth/length (for some TRT users, but not all)
- Deeper voice (for some TRT users, but not all)
- An increase in muscularity and a decrease in body fat (not instantly, but over time) – even occurs in men who don’t work out, but the effect is even more pronounced in men who do
- Increased insulin sensitivity, meaning greater protection against diabetes
- Greater exercise tolerance (greater strength and endurance)
- Increased ability to gain muscle mass

4.) Your TRT Questions Answered:

“I don’t want to inject testosterone, but am doing everything right with my diet, sleep and exercise and believe I can no longer increase my T naturally. Are there any other options aside pharmaceutical testosterone for increasing my natural testosterone levels?”

Yes, you have three options that I’m aware of, which, despite not being natural methods, will
increase your testosterone level without requiring you to inject testosterone.

The first two options are applicable to any man, whilst the final option is context dependent in that it will help increase testosterone levels in some men, but not in all men due to its method of action.

The first option is clomid monotherapy, clomid is a drug which increases your luteinizing hormone (LH) and follicle stimulating hormone (FSH). It is your LH and FSH that are responsible for communicating to your testicles how much testosterone (and sperm) they should be making.

Think of them as hormonal signal instructions that biologically dictate to your testicles how hard they should be working.

**The higher your LH and FSH, the more testosterone your testicles will make, the lower your LH and FSH, the less testosterone your testicles will make.**

Now despite not being a “natural method to increase testosterone”, clomid increases your body’s endogenous (internal) production of testosterone as opposed to shutting it down by introducing an exogenous (external) source of testosterone.

The first advantage to this treatment method is it’s an oral, so it gives the needle phobic a way of treating their low testosterone without injecting.

Secondly, the body’s natural ability to produce testosterone is not reduced by this treatment method, but rather, for the duration of the treatment, is ramped up.

The downside is that many men who employ this treatment method feel absolutely horrendous while on it. Reports of fatigue and a general poor sense of well-being are not uncommon.

Having high T but feeling terrible seems completely pointless, and that’s why I wouldn’t recommend clomid for this purpose.

The second option is HCG monotherapy. Rather than injecting testosterone intramuscularly (into a muscle), you would inject HCG subcutaneously (into stomach fat).

HCG is not luteinizing hormone, but rather mimics it and tricks the body into thinking it is it, this causes the testicles to produce more testosterone and sperm.

Men often take HCG as an ancillary drug when injecting testosterone in order to maintain their fertility, but it can be used alone.

**Men who take HCG by itself, as well as in conjunction with TRT, often report a greater sense of well-being.**

For those on HCG monotherapy, this is because their testosterone levels are higher.

For the men on TRT who already have high testosterone, this is because the precursor
hormones that were depleted (the hormones necessary to synthesise testosterone naturally) have been replenished.

The third option is an aromatase inhibitor.

An aromatase inhibitor will increase testosterone significantly in a man who has low testosterone and high estrogen, but will have little to no effect in men who have low testosterone and normal estrogen.

Before supplementing with an aromatase inhibitor, you should get blood work to see your total testosterone and your estradiol (E2).

If estradiol is in the high range whilst total testosterone is in the mid-range or lower, you may see significant increases in testosterone without going on TRT by opting for an aromatase inhibitor protocol.

Naturally, as with TRT and HCG, the dosage and frequency with which the aromatase inhibitor is to be taken is person dependent. What works for one does not necessarily work for another.

---

**“If I start TRT, will I have to stick a needle in my vein like junkies do? How does the injection work?”**

No. Testosterone is not injected intravenously (into the vein). It is injected intramuscularly (directly into the muscle) or subcutaneously (directly into the abdominal or love handle fat tissue).

Doctors at the forefront of developing TRT practice via experimentation (primarily, Dr. John Crissler of allthingsmale.com) recommend subcutaneous injections as the safest and most effective method of administering testosterone replacement.

This method of administration allows you to pierce the fat layer with a tiny 29, 30 or even 31 gauge needle that reduces the injection pain associated with larger needles and avoids muscle scar tissue.

Intramuscular is more common and is still preferred by many as it was the standard for many years.

There are numerous muscles you can inject into, such as the deltoid (beneath the shoulder on the outer arm), the ventrogluteal (the hip) and the gluteus maximus (ass cheek).

Personally I prefer to inject subcutaneously into the abdominal fat, as it’s not at an awkward angle to inject and I’m not tearing up my muscle tissue by sticking a needle in it.
“My doctor has given me a 300mg/ml vial of testosterone to self-inject 100mg per week at home, how do I inject 100mg if the vial is 300mg per ml?”

Very simple. You don’t need to inject an entire millilitre of oil.

If you were injecting 100mg once every 7 days, you’d draw 0.33ml of oil into the syringe because 100 is a third of 300 and 1ml of oil contains 300mg of testosterone.

If you were injecting 50mg twice a week, you’d draw 0.165ml of oil into the syringe, because we know 0.33ml of oil contains 100mg of testosterone which naturally means 0.165, which is half of 0.33, will contain 50mg of testosterone.

When drawing such small amounts of oil, you’re best off using a 1ml syringe so that you can better titrate the dose.

If you use a bigger syringe, say a 2.5ml one, the measurements for each line on the syringe will go up in 0.1’s (0.1ml up to 0.2ml up to 0.3ml) rather than 0.01’s (0.10ml, to 0.11ml to 0.12ml) making it very hard to accurately dose between hundredths of a millilitre rather than tenths.

So for small injection volumes (1ml or less) you’re better off with a 1ml syringe so you can more accurately titrate the dose.

Typically, testosterone propionate has fewer milligrams of testosterone per millilitre, at a ratio of 10mg of testosterone to each 0.1ml of carrier oil.

Whereas testosterone enanthate and cypionate tend to have 20mg, 25mg, or in your case, 30mg of testosterone to each 0.1ml of carrier oil, allowing you to get higher testosterone for a smaller injection volume.

You will never need to inject more than 0.5ml at any one time when doing TRT level doses of testosterone.

Larger volumes (and thus bigger syringes that can accommodate a greater volume of oil) are for steroid users.

“I’ve had big issues with acne in the past, mostly on my back. Will TRT cause this to inflame?”

Yes. Testosterone converts into estrogen via the aromatase enzyme, and into
Dihydrotestosterone (DHT) via the 5-alpha-reductase enzyme. The higher your DHT level, the more acne you will have.

You can use alpha-reductase inhibitors (ARIs) to block the 5-alpha-reductase enzyme from converting your testosterone into dihydrotestosterone, but they are not very well tolerated TRT ancillary drugs.

DHT is likewise responsible for things such as voice depth and overall body hair growth – thus I cannot, in good conscience, recommend the use of alpha-reductase inhibitors.

---

“Does taking an estrogen blocker mean I need to have an additional injection?”

No. Estrogen blockers (known as aromatase inhibitors) are orals, not injectables, and thus the control of estrogen does not require an injection.

---

“How does TRT affect fertility?”

Negatively. TRT makes you subfertile, lowering the quality and quantity of your sperm because your body is sending far below normal amounts of LH and FSH to your testicles.

The reason this is happening is because TRT is suppressive of your body’s natural production of testosterone, that’s why it’s called testosterone replacement therapy – it is replacing your body’s natural testosterone.

So because you have high testosterone from injections, your body sees this, and your testicles decide they don’t need to do any work because you have more than enough testosterone in your body.

The side-effect of this is the testicles are not only responsible for producing testosterone, but likewise sperm. So your fertility is negatively impacted.

You can run HCG concurrently with TRT to increase the quality and quantity of your sperm, and failing that, come off TRT in order to conceive.

By doing this, the body’s natural sperm and testosterone production will begin again. Permanent infertility is incredibly rare.

People who say TRT will make you infertile are fearmongering and do not know what they are talking about. It makes you temporarily subfertile for the duration of treatment and there are concurrent treatments you can use with TRT in order to abate this entirely.
“How do I know my estrogen is high without getting blood work done?”

If you start getting general fatigue, fatigue after eating meals that don’t have a high glycemic index, a sense of social anxiety, sore/itchy nipples, no morning erections, or weaker erection strength when stimulated, your estrogen is probably spiking via aromatisation of the extra testosterone in your body.

The more of these symptoms you have, the likelier excess estrogen is to blame. And at the same time, you could have none of these symptoms, and still have high estrogen.

The more body fat you have, the more you aromatise testosterone into estrogen and the likelier estrogen is the cause of your problems.

Be mindful not to crash your estrogen levels with large doses of aromatase inhibitors, as this will lead to general fatigue and joint pain.

Only people who are very experienced with TRT and know their bodies very well are able to accurately gauge if their estrogen is high or low without blood work. In short, you’re going to need to get regular blood work, otherwise you’re just playing guessing games.

“I’m 24 years old with 576ng/dL testosterone. Can Modafinil/Ritalin or Nootropics in general make up for low T?”

You have suboptimal testosterone for your age, but not low testosterone. If you have the symptoms of low T, you might have low free T or high estrogen. You need to run blood work to determine this.

You can’t really compare CNS (central nervous system) stimulants to a hormone. If you’re thinking of using stimulants, I will assume **fatigue** is the main thing you’re looking to fix.

The stimulants will alleviate fatigue for as long as tolerance to said stimulants remains low, but they will not alleviate any of the other issues associated with low T. Your body does not build up tolerance to testosterone like it does stimulants, so from a tolerance perspective alone TRT is superior.

**And that’s not even the main reason TRT is better.**

Higher testosterone has a whole range of benefits, including but not limited to: improved mood, insulin sensitivity and erections. In a nutshell, don’t look for a band-aid to fix issues caused by suboptimal testosterone, address the root cause of the problem.
“I've read that TRT before 25 isn't advisable because your brain is still developing, is this true?”

Most physicians won’t prescribe TRT if you are under the age of 25 out of fear it will permanently screw up your hypothalamic pituitary testicular axis (HPTA). Unless you have extremely low levels, say 100ng/dL, or are missing a testicle or something, they are unlikely to prescribe you testosterone.

“Will TRT make me go bald?”

Only if you have the male pattern baldness gene. If you have the male pattern baldness gene, no matter what you do, you’re going to go bald.

Higher levels of testosterone will make it happen quicker and sooner.

Are any of the men in your family bald? If not, more testosterone isn’t going to make you magically go bald either.

If you want to know for definite, get your genes analysed by 23andme.com to see if the MPD (Male Pattern Baldness) gene is present in your genome.

Men who do not have this gene will not go bald irrespective of whether they use TRT or not.

“What is the maximum allowable interval between injections?”

This depends on the type of testosterone you’re using. If you use testosterone propionate, every 2 days. If you’re using testosterone enanthate, every 7 days. If you’re using testosterone cypionate, every 8 days.

Injecting this infrequently will not give most men optimum testosterone levels, but will instead start you off high and leave you mid level before you next inject.

If you want to keep your level high all the time, you would inject more frequently. The propionate daily, and the cypionate/enanthate every 3-3.5 days.

There is a form of testosterone known as testosterone undecanoate that would allow you to
have a single injection every 3 or 4 weeks, but it is not approved for use in the US and does not keep your testosterone levels as stable as the faster acting esters, so is not recommended.

“My doctor gave me 23 gauge needles to inject my testosterone, but I’m in considerable pain when I inject. I don’t understand all the different needle sizes. Can you explain how the needle sizes work, and which ones I should use to inject my TRT?

The gauge is the thickness of the needle, the inch measurement is the length. The lower the gauge, the greater the thickness. An 18 gauge needle is a lot thicker than a 25 gauge needle.

The largest available needle is a gauge 6, and the smallest is a 34, although gauges outside the 18 – 31 range are so uncommon there’s an extremely low chance you will ever use them.

Needle length varies, and is proportional to the gauge. Thicker needles with lower gauge numbers have greater lengths than thinner needles with higher gauge numbers.

Your average 18 gauge needle is 1.5 to 2 inches long, whereas a 25 gauge needle is usually 5/8th’s of an inch and a 27 gauge needle is usually 1/2 an inch in length.

I would recommend using an 18 gauge needle to draw the fluid into the syringe, and nothing bigger than a 25 gauge 5/8” to inject it.

A number of men prefer to use 29-31 gauge 1/2″ needles subcutaneously to minimise pain when injecting.

“What would the optimal TRT protocol look like?”

Firstly, you run blood work and see what your levels are. You get your testosterone checked, you get your SHBG checked, your PSA, your LH, your FSH, your prolactin and your estrogen (E2) checked.

You get your free testosterone calculated included in the test otherwise you’re going to be working it out manually with a calculator such as this one when you get your blood work back.

You get put on 100mg of testosterone enanthate or cypionate per week.

You do 2 injections per week, once on Monday, once on Thursday.
You inject 50mg each time into the subcutaneous fat tissue, rotating between the left and right abdomen.

You do this for 4-6 weeks, then you get more blood work done.

You time the blood test so your sample is taken just before you’re due for your next injection. This allows you to see the lowest level your testosterone reaches between injections.

You’ll be mainly looking at testosterone, estrogen, prostate specific antigen, hematocrit and hemoglobin to see if they’re at desirable levels. You don’t want your blood getting too thick.

If your blood gets too thick, you will have to have a therapeutic phlebotomy (give blood), you may have to do this regularly.

If your testosterone is too low (say 500ng/dL when you only injected 3 days ago) – you increase your weekly dose to 150mg of testosterone, splitting the dose to 75mg twice weekly.

If estrogen is too high, you introduce an aromatase inhibitor. A starting protocol is 12.5mg of exemestane every other day.

If you plan on having children in the future, you add HCG into the mix, usually 1000IUs per week split between two 500IU injections.

You run blood work again in 4-6 weeks and adapt your dosages and frequency of injections/consumption of aromatase inhibitor as necessary.

This is called “getting dialled in” – adjusting the dosages of what you take and when you take them so you feel good and get good blood work back. It takes time, money and patience.

It will take a while to optimise your TRT protocol. You will not be fixed instantly. This is hard work. It’s for men who are mature enough and frankly bold enough to take control of their health, and can handle all the responsibility that comes with that, and would prefer that rather than spend their lives in a low testosterone state because injections are scary and monitoring blood work sounds like a lot of effort.

5.) In Closing / Relevant Reading:

Tired all the time? Depressed for no reason? Go and get your blood work done. I’ve already told you what to check.

When you get your blood work done, make sure you actually have a physical copy of the results so you can interpret your own blood work.

The number of times doctors have said “your levels are normal” to sick people is so off the charts, it’s criminal.

If you’re in the continental US, there are some online mail order TRT clinics you can use (I am
affiliated with neither group):

http://primebody.com/
http://chekd.com/

If you want to do further reading on TRT before committing yourself to what is ultimately a lifelong endeavour of injections and blood work monitoring, I recommend the following books:

Testosterone: A Man’s Guide
The Definitive Testosterone Replacement Manuel

Godspeed.