

NightwingTRP ARCHIVE

compiled by /u/dream-hunter

April 29, 2022

www.TheRedArchive.com

Table of Contents

Turning things around will take time... but time keeps marching no matter what you do	3
On the Bruce Lee Principle	5
Useful skill sets	6
On Debating and Discussion as a Man	7
Male Domestic Violence Victim urges others to speak out	9
FR - Re-Plate success	10
The TRP Field Toolkit - Part 1: Attitude, Ego and IDGAF	13
The TRP Field Toolkit - Part 2: Frame, Posture and Body Language	16
The TRP Field Toolkit - Part 3: Shit tests and Comfort tests	18
The TRP Field Toolkit - Part 4: Flags, ASD, LMR and Walking Away	22
Why would a man *pretend* that his wife is a tyrant?	25
Attitude - It doesn't even matter if you're right	28
Roles, respect and responsibility acceptance as an alpha trait	31
My friend appears to be becoming a natural MGTOW	34
Are white women who sleep with/date black men "contaminated" or damaged in some way?	35
Adopting the best attitude to learn	36
Self-control is vital: Nature has not adapted to modern society	38
The Decline has made us the poorest men in history	40
FR - Flying by the seat of my pants	43
Feminism is actually hedonism	45
On Leadership	48
Basic Guide to Argumentation and Intellectual Growth	51
Reggie Yates documentary on the manosphere - A review	56
Jennifer Lawrence explains her fee-fees	59
Wants vs needs: the sexual attitude nuance	61
Compassion for your fellow man	64
[Repost] Roles, respect and responsibility acceptance as an alpha trait	65
Commanding 101	68
Sokal 2.0 - The open secret of feminist philosophy	73

Turning things around will take time... but time keeps marching no matter what you do

36 upvotes | December 7, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

One of the things I've noticed from the dramatic change I've been making to my life, is how difficult it is for some of us. The simple fact is that for anyone with a high level of discipline and a strong drive, the journey is just a mechanical process. That said, most of us do not have that level of discipline and drive. We have a normal level which will run into trouble at some point. We've all seen the posts or rants from some men who come back to state the same fucking problems over and over again. How do you help people like that? There are irregular reminders on the sub to stay the course. Encouraging/inspiring posts. Then field reports from people who have made the journey to remind you what you're going to achieve. I would posit that this should be enough for the average guy.

Typically when they come back, there will be a denial of the issues. Whatever went wrong is not their fault. Bad news buddy, it is your fault. It is entirely your fault because your weak-ass mind could not hold on and power through the boredom and discomfort. Sometimes I even read complaining about whatever is wrong with them. Well complaining without action is not the way forward. It's a beta trait that assumes the problem is going to solve itself. So here's the bitter truth for these people: Life will go on no matter what you do. It does not care. Imagine the worst things in your entire life happening. Once they happen, life will go on. Time has no pity for you and any time you're not using productively is time you're wasting. Don't get me wrong, relaxation is important, but relaxation should never be at the expense of achieving the goals you've set for yourself.

I like to think of the journey as though you're in charge of a huge oil tanker. Unfortunately, due to some shit GPS handed to you by society, you've ended up in blue pill waters. Now you've been sailing in the wrong direction, you need to turn around and get back into the red pill waters. If you choose to do nothing, or fail to do anything, then you can enjoy your voyage in blue pill waters because the engine is running and that tanker is still pressing forwards. You want to turn it around you say? Well sure, turn that wheel. What's that? The wheel is heavy? Yeah, of course it's heavy. It's fucking great oil tanker and they forgot to install power steering!

The guy with tremendous discipline and drive is like the bodybuilder at the helm. He turns the wheel with ease and holds it without breaking a sweat. Even though he does that, it still takes him months to sail the ship out of those blue pill waters and into a nice red sea. Each action you take, is a minor turn of the wheel. Optimising your t levels? That's a fraction turn. Lifting? That's another fraction. Reading material? Another fraction. They all add up to turning the wheel and altering course. But what's this? The wheel is pushing back! It doesn't like it. You've got to exert strength to hold it in place.

What happened now? You stopped lifting? You've failed to hold the wheel. It's slipped back by a fraction. You haven't read anything useful in a while? Slipped back again. Oh dear, you're no longer heading for red pill waters. So you come back here to post about it and have a rant and a vent. But the engines are still running and you've let go of the wheel. Returning to the sub is one thing to gain encouragement or ask for advice. By all means, do this. But realise that YOU are the only person who can enact it. You're the one at the helm, steering the ship. Nobody else. You want to achieve the gargantuan task of sailing this beast out of those accursed waters? Then grab onto the wheel, pull

hard and hold the fuck on! Even when your mind and body is screaming "no more" you have to hold on. Nobody else can turn the wheel for you. It's down to you. Don't let go because nobody is going to be here to grab it and save you at the last second.

On the Bruce Lee Principle

15 upvotes | December 16, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Why the Bruce Lee principle must always apply to Red Pill Theory. "Adapt what is useful, reject what is useless, and add what is specifically your own."

Reading a post the other day which cited some old classic behaviourist studies, it reminded me of why the old behaviourism movement is no longer as prominent in current psychology. This does not say that it has nothing to offer. It has some great ideas and explains some things well, but we've reached a stage these days where it is no longer the explanation of everything. Now there's two ways you can take this, depending upon your point of view: we don't need something to explain everything, we just need some soft analysis skills to make sense of things; or that relativism is a self defeating principle and we must admit that softer sciences are known as such because we simply don't have all the explanations yet. An example would be the theories of lift. A few years ago, I was discussing this with a physicist who was about to do a PhD at Cambridge in theoretical physics. I was curious as to the practicality of this, so he kindly gave the example that there are/were three competing theories which explained lift (the force we believe makes planes fly.) They're not compatible, so we know for sure that they're not all right, however we don't know which one is right *BUT* we do know that planes fly. This is a good example of a hard science approach. We've got observations and we have theories on why these are so, but we can't yet be certain of the explanation. You can apply this principle all the way down the softer sciences and especially to psychology.

I firmly believe there is no reason we can't take both views. There is no rational reason to reject two sensible ideas that come from a strong logical basis. Soft analysis skills (something which seems to be dying out in modern society) have tremendous advantages. Calibration of social skills, the diagnosis of disease, the understanding and adaptability of your own principle views on life etc etc. However, that is not a good enough reason to accept a relativist principle: the only truth, is that there is no truth. Predictions made decades ago by prominent theoretical physicists have been proven over the past few years as our exploration and knowledge of space has increased. Deductive reasoning on the basis of truth is proving that there is truth out there. So as with most things, let's adopt a middle ground which works best. We can dismiss relativism, there is truth to nature, we don't fully understand it... however we can still use a soft analytical approach to adapt to it. See reality for what it is, continue to debate the theory behind the observations made by red pill men, but approach with adaptability in mind. It is the best approach. To "adapt what is useful, reject what is useless, and add what is specifically your own." Never stop thinking. Never stop adapting. Never stop trying to add something new which is specifically your own.

Useful skill sets

29 upvotes | December 20, 2014 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

One of the major things which underlines red pill philosophy towards life is constantly bettering yourself. It's something I easily relate to because I used to think that way as a kid. I seemed to lose my way a little when I got lost in the rat race. Another thing I've noticed is that not all skill sets are as useful as others. If we discount the basics such as lifting and reading, what would you as an individual RP man recommend as a skill set or two that people consider learning?

Cooking, nutrition and a greater depth of knowledge on alcohol would be my recommendations to anyone reading this. Diet goes hand in hand with lifting - cooking allows you greater flexibility with what you eat and allows you to increase the quality of the food you eat. Greater knowledge of alcohol, what is best for you and how to enjoy it more etc is simply because... you might be drinking less or it may just turn into an occasional treat, so you'd might aswell get the most out of it.

On Debating and Discussion as a Man

27 upvotes | January 25, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Being the smartest guy in the room offers you great confidence, quick wit and respect from the social group. But how did that guy become the smartest guy in the room? Sometimes it's natural. The social group all got similar education and he just happened to be genetically gifted. But if you're making new social groups all the time or swapping around a bit... do you really want to lower your standards for peers just to be the smartest guy in the group? No. Of course you don't. Luckily, there's a simple way to encourage your own intellectual growth which isn't open to women in the same way. Unfortunately, it's been dying out thanks to the feminisation of society. This is the art of debate and discussion (but not how most people think about it.)

I don't need to go into detail about the advantages as a man of intellectual growth. It leads to better emotional growth, maturity, confidence, better decisions which lead to achieving more goals etc etc. It is truly essential for any man who wants to advance in this world. The only limitation to this improvement is your genetics. This is the same as with your body. You might not have the genetics to become Arnie or some other bodybuilder, but you can still get big and muscular. You can still look great. Intelligence is the same. You may not become Einstein, but you can grow your own base level intelligence and adaptive cognitive functions. Your genetics will only provide a ceiling to this. Even knowing this, I would still say that everybody has plenty of room for growth.

The simple way to do this is to change your views on debate and discussion. At the moment, thanks to the feminisation of society, whenever people get into a disagreement on a topic, emotional arguments will trump things or they'll argue passionately for their own point and never consider the other side. It's that simple to them: I'm right and I will shout them down. If we skip past how retarded that is in itself and how I bet there are people rolling their eyes and going "well duh!" at this bit... even in this sub (the last bastion of masculinity) we still see this crap. It's rare I've seen anyone do a 180 on their opinion here. This worries me because that is precisely where the growth comes from. Not from being right, but from being proven wrong by others. That guy who is consistently the smartest guy in the room: he was the intellectual bitch of smarter men and he embraced it and grew in a way that a woman never could.

Women have a few inbuilt restrictions when it comes to mental growth. That's just biology and you can check the post about women being the most responsible teenager in the house for the overview. A small number may buck the odds, but ultimately the stats show men have the advantage here (so use it!) There's post after post about how a man must struggle to achieve. His ego will take hits and keep on coming back for more. This doesn't just apply to growth of confidence in approaching women, it applies to mental growth too.

The original purpose of debate was to put two people on opposing sides who would argue over an issue as best they could. From observation of the points being put forward, an intelligent man could gain truth and thus gain intellectual growth. The difficulty comes if you're one of the guys making the arguments. If you are, take a step back and try to see things from the other side of the table. Not only will this allow you to construct stronger arguments, but it will force you to accept the weaknesses on your own side. In doing so, you'll be more open to learning and getting the intellectual growth you need. The more you begin to realise you're wrong about things, the better understanding you get on a topic and the more intellectual growth. This is something men should be very strong at (growing

through competition.)

Discussion is not about winning, but treat the discussion itself as though it is. Once you've done that, become objective and analyse things. This is the key to fast-tracking your journey to achieving any goal that requires input from the mind. (Which is just about everything.) If you're finding yourself name calling in a discussion you're serious about then you're already failing. If you think there's no way you can be proven wrong, your mind is too closed off. (Just because you're open to being proven wrong doesn't mean you will be.) If you're unable to understand the other person's logic, then you may be missing out on a chance for growth. Understanding the strengths of opposing viewpoints and appreciating them is essential. Without knowing that, you can't get to the truth and you can't grow. If you can eliminate the feminine reaction to the competitive aspect of discussing irreconcilable ideas then you'll find your understanding growing exponentially. Use that growth well.

Edit: Thanks to [Fluviant](#) for this suggestion, I think it was a very good one. A short practical example:

Back when the UK was looking at the alternative vote system and performing the referendum on this topic, some of the strongest propaganda I've ever seen came out. Perfectly emotionally targeted, it declared that the new system is "too complex for people to understand." (This appeals so well because people can confidently declare this without even trying to understand. As most people did. It makes them feel okay with their ignorance.) Someone close to me took this view and confidently declared to me it was too complicated and they didn't understand it. I laughed and cried inside for a moment because I knew it was laughably simple. I explained the system in about 2 minutes and it dawned on them just how simple the new system was. After this, they became a supporter of the alternative vote system. (It never passed though.)

Anyway, the takeaway from this is: * two opposing viewpoints came out. * This person knows that I am someone worth listening to on topics. * After laying out their stance, they heard that I was going to provide on-the-spot proof that the view was wrong. They encouraged me to do this. * They listened and tried to understand, asked questions where needed to get me to clarify anything they didn't understand. The focus was to understand the opposing point. * Once they understood, there was no upset about changing their mind. Just a straight 180 in their views. Both of us felt good about this. They grew.

Note the absence of emotion in this. There was no holding back by either side or trying to make the other person feel better or being diplomatic. The focus was on proving the truth. This is how we resolve disagreements as men if there is a truth to be found. If there is no objective truth on a topic then it can also end with agreeing to disagree.

TL:DR -

- 1.Feminization of society has led to the deterioration of pure discourse of ideas.
- 2.Name-calling and other appeals to emotion mean you've already lost the debate.
- 3.Intellectual growth, much like SMV growth, is at its core a function of how you handle and cope with rejection (being proven wrong).
- 4."Understanding the strengths of opposing viewpoints and appreciating them is essential,"
...especially if you want to completely undermine the opponent's viewpoints!

EDIT2: [Additional reading](#)

Male Domestic Violence Victim urges others to speak out

72 upvotes | March 13, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

During my lunchtime news browsing, I came across [this piece](#) on The Independent newspaper website. While obviously the tale of the violence he suffered is awful, he appears to have acted in the best way possible to push for a change.

He's shared some meaningful quotes which will shock some blue pillers:

"As a man who is a bit older and who isn't exactly small, there is a perception that you can't be a victim of domestic violence,"

Mr Gregory wants to address the stigma surrounding men who are abused by their wives and partners. He added, "it should be the same message that they put out for women – don't be frightened, you don't have to put up with it."

Chair of ManKind Mark Brookes told The Independent: "While Mr Gregory's case is awful we should not be overly surprised that domestic abuse can happen to men too. We need a real sea change in public attitude and recognition in that domestic abuse can affect anyone. "There are still too many barriers that men face in feeling comfortable in coming forward and getting help," he added.

Nice to see a little media attention being drawn to this serious issue. It's a piece that can be shared with anyone who isn't a misandrist which is a bonus. The bitly suggests it has been shared over 5,000 times already.

FR - Re-Plate success

70 upvotes | April 24, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So I typically run experiments with some of the chicks I meet. This is out of a combination of curiosity and boredom. It's all good experience. This little experiment was started pretty much entirely on a whim fuelled by the good vibes of my mates at the cigar club. My plate had suddenly ditched me for some bizarre beta boy offering her instant commitment. I later discovered she'd been orbiting him for around 10 years. As a mid twenties gal, this meant from school age she'd been pining for him. I deduced he was probably pretty good looking or she was just even more insecure than I'd expected (she comfort tested all the time which was annoying... but she also never shit tested after the first meeting/sex. Swings and roundabouts guys.) So the report starts with my shrugged shoulders decision to see if I could re-plate her. I must confess at this point... I actually expected to fail. This is probably why I went into this with the shrugged shoulders/IDGAF attitude that I take towards most of my sexual strategy. I've never run boyfriend destroyer game before and, more than this, it felt like I needed to adapt the principles slightly. I only researched it a week or so ago and it seemed to have little relevance to what I was doing here. It's not normally my thing... but adaptability and all that. More tools in the box.

So I start it off with a phone call intending to ask some asinine question that leaves her with more questions of her own as to why I was acting this way. She didn't pick up, so I left a simple mysterious text. (If you haven't tried the mystery method yet, I'd recommend it. It's been working better than some of my other approaches to general conversation.) As predicted, she takes the bait... whether she wants another orbiter or is just listening to her emotions going "fun guy doing stuff I don't understand, this is interesting" doesn't really matter. Three texts over the course of the evening probing me. I ignore them and go to bed, reply the next morning with more mysterious nonsense, around the sort of time I know she goes to work. That morning, due to family emergency, she's taken the morning off work and happens to be in my area. I suddenly get a request to meet up for coffee. As far as I'm concerned, this meeting will be recon. I don't know what I'm up against with this guy she's committed to and I'm also unsure how my own SMV has been affected by this.

My opening gambit is to reassert how much higher my SMV is than hers. So I up my asshole game and open with the greeting "wow, you look like crap!" (she hadn't put in effort like she had in our previous meetings) and then compare her look as she's waiting for me (I'm purposefully late) to gollum. She laps this up and agrees with it, hugging me. I take the free kino but also ensure I'm the one to break the hug and actively push her away. As a note for any newer guys, SMV is always relative in the eyes of the chick. She may be a HB6, but that doesn't matter if she sees herself as a 9. The reverse is also true. You need to work to ensure the relative distance between your SMV and hers is that yours is a little higher than hers. Beta boy's gay little admission of strong feelings for her and offering her commitment for nothing will have raised her SMV in her eyes, particularly because she'd been orbiting him for so long. All of this asshole game works to reduce her SMV in her eyes and increase mine. Pretty standard if you're starting from scratch.

This meeting is where I leave her to fill in the background for me. I show no active interest in what's changed and leave her to broach the subject of her commitment to beta boy. I treat just about every aspect of the discussion about beta boy as a shit test. Specifically the point where she goes "I expected you to be angry" and I just shrug my shoulders with my default bored expression. Throw in

some agree and amplify style sarcasm: "yes, I am quite obviously suffering uncontrollable rage. Oooh! Cake!" She goes on to talk about why she agreed to the beta commitment, and I'm predominantly disinterested (what she says has no real bearing on what's actually going on for the most part. Remember that women don't actually understand themselves.) until she talked about his declarations of strong feelings as "cringeworthy" stuff. She pays for everything and I decide we're going somewhere else specific. Bitches love surprises, throw them one anytime you can because it's as much fun for you as it is for her. Her motivation for this entire meeting is that she wants to know about mysterious old me. The fun is what I get out of it and it shines through in my attitude. Throughout the walk to the next event and then back to where I parked, she's feeling up my arm and getting really close. Turn to say goodbye and she's feeling up my chest. I decide, fuck it, and take a kiss. She kisses back. I break the kiss early and just say goodbye and walk off. Desire is heavy, now I just need to give beta boy time to fuck himself with his beta game before I make my move. (And oh boy, does he fuck himself royally. I find this out at the end though. Here I'm just letting nature take its course.)

I leave it three days then pretend I have a spare ticket for something I booked ages ago and a mate cancelled on me. I assert she should tag along. Instant agreement from her to join me. I give her the time and place to meet and then tell her to not look like shit and put some effort in this time. (When I saw her, she'd clearly put in A LOT of effort for a midweek meeting.) No reply from her to confirm, but I'm confident she's going to show up since she replied instantly after getting off work. As an added kicker, I'm chatting with an ex plate (mostly for entertainment) and decide to meet her beforehand and check out some new coffee place. This gave me both a good social warmup and allowed me to add in some preselection. I wait at the meeting point with ex plate until I see the bus of committed girl coming in. She's looking from the window, so I hug ex plate and send her on her way. Committed girl meets, asks who that was and I give a vague reply and press into the small talk as a basic pressure flip. "A friend of mine. How's your day been?"

I say we've got a little time to kill, so we hit a bar, then onto the ticketed event. She pays for drinks at the bar and at the event. I swap the furniture around slightly while she gets the drinks in so that I can achieve the most kino possible. She comes back, and her opening gambit is the sort of tedious shit test I've already been dealing with. "guess who did -insert sappy romantic gesture here- the other day?" Quick as a flash I reply "Your stalker?" She stops dead in her tracks, babbles for a moment before admitting it is the sort of creepy thing a stalker would do. As I said before... beta boy's lovely beta game will only make me more appealing. That was the final shit test I see from her.

At this point I realise she's started mixing her drinks like crazy. Jumping around from wines to cocktails to spirits to beer. She's paying for all the drinks and comes back with one drink for me and two for herself because she's "having such a great time" and "thank you so much for inviting me out tonight Nightwing. I'm having such a fun time." Of course you are, because I'm fun and beta boy's "dates" will have been tedious as fuck/non-stop emotional talk. By this point I'm satisfied she's going to cheat on beta boy with me tonight. It's just a matter of me not fucking it up. She's made her decision and is now prepping her deniability by being drunk. I stopped her short of getting seriously drunk but left her tipsy enough that she was satisfied.

So we leave and head for my car. Here come her comfort tests again. "Why are you still with me?" To be fair at this point... I'm a little tipsy myself and I'm sick of this nonsense. I decide to go for dominance broke and grab her, pull her in to a sort of hug and then grab her by the throat with my other hand, pushing her head back and leaning in very close. (For reference, she likes being choked a

little during rough sex. She's told me before when I hold her by the throat she feels helpless but safe and "it's so amazing." So this was a calculated move by me.) I stare at her eyes and tell her to shut up and stop whining. She nods. I drop a rough, passionate kiss on her and she's massively into it. I then tell her that her pussy belongs to me. She nods again. We're going home now, understood? Another nod. Away we go and she couldn't smile any wider if she tried.

Once we get back, she insists she needs a shower and invites me to join. (Because yeah... serious committed girls have platonic showers with guys they've previously had sex with.) I get some LMR from her about not having sex. I can't remember if I ignored it or gave a disinterested "ok" reply. Either way, I just began playing with her body, heavy escalation. Same LMR repeats and I just spank her. She turns and drops to her knees to give me a very enthusiastic blowjob (because loyal, committed chicks totally give super enthusiastic blowjobs to their platonic friends.) Things escalate from there as expected. She's really into the sex and during post-coital pillow talk she informs me about the sappy romantic gestures beta boy has been doing. I'm literally laughing at them and she reveals she doesn't like how he's trying to force a serious relationship. Leaving beta boy to play his beta game was a solid move. At a rough estimate he's spent about ten times as much money as I have on her this past week. I'm not even sure if he managed to get a kiss off her. I'm the one lying in bed with her. Classic AF/BB.

So beta boy is taking her out for a nice dinner tonight. I'm looking forward to hearing about it later. This is because I know she's "feeling so guilty" that her opening gambit, once they've sat down, will be blunt words to the effect of "I had sex with Nightwing last night and again this morning." She thinks he'll be quite upset. I hope he is.

Moral of the story gentleman: do not try to fight with men you are inferior to. You're wasting your time. Go monk mode and improve yourself. Beta game always fails against practiced alpha game.

More serious moral for newbies: Do not be beta boy. He is a faggot and deserves every last ounce of pain he suffers this evening. If this leads him to TRP, then that's all fine and good, he can unplug and improve himself. He's lost this battle, but he can still make a better fight of the war. If it does not, then he can consign himself to depression and life as an omega or a cuckold. Ultimately, he is not my problem. Despite my motivations being boredom, this is still proof positive: The alpha takes what he wants.

TL:DR - Plate accepts instant commitment from a beta and breaks things off with me. I have her cheat on him with me because I can. (And more so because he's affected one of the bitches I was managing, which inconveniences me. I take back my more convenient sex. Fail turned into win in about a week.)

The TRP Field Toolkit - Part 1: Attitude, Ego and IDGAF

422 upvotes | April 28, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

TL:DR - A compilation of the basic tools you need in the field to handle the vast majority of situations which could arise. The way I explain everything is the way I see it and how it has been working well for me including examples and links to additional reading. As a result of all the detail, it was extremely long, so I've broken it down into four parts for ease of use. This part covers an introduction, guide preface and Attitude, Ego and IDGAF.

- Introduction (My motivation. Skip if you don't care.)

Ever since I unfortunately had to remove the Field Report I put up about a month ago, I wanted to find a way to get that information back out into the community. I had a couple of guys message me to thank me for the "masterclass" in TRP seduction. While I'm flattered by that, I don't believe I'm a complete master. (I also believe that any attitude suggesting you have nothing left to learn is counter-productive for any man looking to continually better himself. We are all apprentices in a craft where no one ever becomes a master.)

Everything I used in that FR, I learned from this sub and the IRC chat. When I realised just how much I'd learnt and how many principles I put into play over the course of that night, I realised that there is no one piece which draws these strands all together. That's what I intend to do with this guide. That way any newer guys have a complete list of everything in one place and can quickly see where their strengths and weaknesses are. Most of these work very well for me when applied to the right situation, YMMV depending on your appearance, approach and personality.

- Preface to the guide

This is the "in-the-moment social dynamics which is essentially the raw game itself, getting popular/laid is based on all this bullshit, which is effectively the basis of animal attraction/charm/social grace. We don't get too many posts like this anymore, but it's always good to rehash the basis of interaction, especially for guys who are busy working or doing other shit and need to dust up their social skills. Like anything, too much time out of the game makes you rusty and these behaviours you describe which otherwise come naturally to many become lost and need re-learning/reawakening, which I'm sure your descriptions will aid in. Also helps the autists who never had a clue to begin with, too." - /u/Ilimitableman (Thanks for your input on this and giving so freely of your time to better the community.)

Your TRP knowledge is a bit like a toolbox. We hear plenty about how personal calibration of game is a significant factor in your success with women. Each tool has its own specific use for a specific problem. Utilising the correct tool in the right way at the right time is the essence of proper calibration. However, like any craftsman, you may be better at using some tools than others. Develop the best quality tools you can and work to your strengths as much as possible.

- Attitude and ego.

Attitude is all about the inner monologue going through your mind. In my opinion, this is the most important part of any interaction. I say this because I strongly believe your attitude and ego are the

foundations which underlie your frame and your ability to respond to tests. I have also now had two women later tell me how they "internally felt" my attitude within 15 seconds of meeting me. (One of them even got it literally word-for-word.)

Setting your attitude may take some time, but there are a few phrases I remind myself of in order to maintain the right attitude. These phrases may seem raw or even offensive to newer members who are trying to learn from this. Some of them are actively wrong, but you want to keep them just to keep you in the right frame of mind. There is a big difference between your ego out in the field, and your ego on TRP. Your ego/confidence, (maybe even narcissism at a push), should be absolute in the field. Once you get back on the TRP sub though, you should kill your ego in order to be more objective. So these phrases apply to frame of mind in the field, not on the sub.

- I am entitled to touch her body. (You're not really, we don't encourage rape or molestation if she's clearly uncomfortable. This phrase gives you confidence in your kino. If she doesn't like it then she'll find a way to let you know. If any chick ever does, it's no big deal. Shit happens, but kino is vital to escalation!)
- I am the God of my own little world. (This is your frame. She may be here by her choice, but she's also here because you allowed her to be. Never forget this and never let her insinuate anything different. You're in charge of you, she is not.)
- She is worth just as little as the next slut. (She might not be, but that's not the point of this. This is about reminding you of the right attitude to take to make yourself as attractive as possible. Reminder of the biological realities of AWALT. Reminder of abundance mentality. Reminder aimed to ensure you act like your SMV is higher than hers. There are no good girls. There are no unicorns. Don't be an idiot and keep that perspective.)
- I am here to have fun. Whatever else happens, happens. (Outcome independence. You are completely disinterested in a specific outcome. You control yourself and your ability to have fun. Use that. Everything else is irrelevant. Any interaction you have with a woman should be fun. If you're not having fun, leave her and go find someone more fun.)
- All women are sluts. You will now go prove this. (While not entirely true, every woman does have the *capacity* to be a slut. The requirement to be a slut is to have a vagina and spread your legs often. **Every** last woman is capable of this if she doesn't control herself. If you're looking for quick sex then remember that it is your task to turn her on and put her in a situation where she can be the slut her body is urging her to be for any man of high enough SMV. A smart woman who doesn't want to be a slut will avoid such situations, but that's her responsibility, not yours.)
- I'm going to walk away if I choose. (Your time is valuable. You are not going to waste it. You know what's happening and what you want. This is to remind yourself that you are outcome independent, you are in control of the interaction and your SMV is higher than hers. Women are very talented at spotting fakes. If you don't truly believe you are her superior then she'll read between the lines and figure it out. Remember that women date up!)
- She is here at my whim. (You are out to enjoy yourself and she has been allowed along. It's true that she needs to want to be there too, but that must not be the way you view it. The moment her presence becomes her decision rather than yours is when you step into her frame. As a dominant man, it is your frame and your whim which is the ultimate deciding factor. The fact

she wants to be there is incidental, you could still have chosen not to allow her along because there are plenty more women out there. Abundance mentality. Outcome independence.)

Some of those may be a bit raw for the newer guys and anyone who likes to call TRP misogynistic. As I said, they're not all true, but you need the right attitude to project your superior value. The truth of the sexual market place is that women will only go for men of higher value than they have. Which means in contrast, you've only got a chance with women who perceive themselves to be of lower value than you. You want a chance with that girl? Better start thinking she's getting the better end of the deal. Doesn't matter if that's true or not. Develop an ego which truly believes it.

- A note on IDGAF. (I Don't Give A Fuck.)

Typically speaking, along with developing the right attitude to symbolise your superior SMV, you'll also develop a bit of an attitude like women don't matter. Actually, they don't. They're just another part of the world. Most things don't really matter in the grand scheme. All you really need is food, water and warmth and you'll survive. Everything else is gravy. You can survive, you can achieve your life mission... you can do most things without women.

Woman tries to tell me what to do/how to think - like I care? I can think for myself. Let the disinterest flow.

Guy tries to AMOG me - you do you mate. Doesn't matter to me, I'm still gonna do me. Look at all these fucks I couldn't give.

Shot down by the bitch shield - that's one chick... what does she matter as the tiniest cosmic fleck in my universe? Time to go dance to the theme song.

Essential reading.

The less you care, the better. Outcome independence. Stronger frame. Pussy off the pedestal. All rolled into one. Next time I will be tackling Frame, Posture and Body Language.

The TRP Field Toolkit - Part 2: Frame, Posture and Body Language

214 upvotes | April 29, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

TL:DR - This is the TRP Field Toolkit. A more detailed guide to all the basics used in the field that will allow you to deal with the vast majority of situations which arise. The way I explain everything is the way I see it and how it has been working well for me including examples and links to additional reading. The first part of the guide covered Attitude, Ego and IDGAF. This part covers Frame, Posture and Body Language.

- Frame.

"Frame is an often subconscious, mutually acknowledged personal narrative under which auspices people will be influenced." - [Rollo Tomassi](#).

Controlling and holding the frame of your interactions is absolutely vital to being seen as a strong, high value man in the field. Frame is the reality of your world. Your underlying attitude will give off a vibe which influences the frame. You must be in control of it. The difficulty for many new members of TRP is spotting where frame is being tested or stolen by someone else. Whether that be by a woman or by being AMOG'd. On the simplest and most basic level, I would tell someone the best way to maintain frame is to consciously and actively make your own decisions. The woman has made a choice to enter your world and it's down to you to take her on a little tour of your world/life so she can see how cool and fun it is.

Setting the tone of your frame is about three things. Firstly, you are going to have fun and choose to enjoy yourself. She gets the privilege to come along. To achieve this, just use statements about what the two of you will do. Be assertive, but not rude. Second, the frame of your interactions will be sexual. Blue jokes/sexual teasing early is the best way to set the right tone and let her know that this frame is sexual and you're not talking to someone you consider a platonic friend. Thirdly, touch her. (Not like that right away you twit! Unless you're in a club, in which case have at it. She'll slap your hand away if it's not welcome, so don't force it.) Break that psychological barrier early and make it very clear that the frame she's just entered will involve physical contact. A hug and a rub of her arms, taking her hand etc etc. Once frame is established, the woman has every right to leave if she so chooses. However, the truth is that women want dominant men who display value and they're **very** happy in such a frame because it allows them to act upon their natural femininity. It's a lovely, comfortable place for a woman to be when she's in the frame of a man she trusts and desires.

The frame I set tends to be uncompromising and this will occasionally backfire. (You will be called the asshole with a grin if the woman thinks you're within her SMV range. You'll be called it with a scowl for the same behaviour if she thinks your SMV is too high for her. Most women are like children and will throw tantrums if they think they're being denied what they're entitled to.) However, as [/u/TRPsubmitter](#) states: uncompromising > chump. Remember the attitude - IDGAFOS. ("I Don't Give A Fuck Or Shit" for the uninitiated.)

- Posture and Body Language

Posture is a well noted hack for increasing your SMV in a very short time. In simple terms: poor

posture = weak man. Good posture = strong man. As you sort out your lifting regiment, make sure to research good posture and enact whatever exercises you need in order to fix any posture problems. [This post](#) was particularly useful to me and prompted me to begin my research and targeted exercises. Remember to keep your posture corrected in the field!

Once again, in the field, you'll need to remember your body language at first. However, over time, it will become more natural. Chances are, if you've come to TRP after much failure with women, you were probably emitting the body language of a loser your whole life. [Start here](#).

The simplest and most effective advice I can give to keep your body language dominant in the field is to remember to spread out. Two basic alpha positions will be used most often. Walking - head high, chest out, shoulders back. If you're still correcting your posture, lean back a bit while you walk. You'll be surprised how that impacts things positively. Sitting - back up straight, shoulders back (arms to the side if you can to take up more space), legs spread (your massive cock clearly needs room.) The more space you can take up, the better.

When performing actions - nicely paced, deliberate actions are the way forward. Avoid being timid at all costs. (Do, or do not. There is no try.) Beyond this, try to keep any resting body language (i.e. any body language which you're holding for more than a second or two) as open as possible. Eye contact should be maintained with anyone. You should try to ensure they always break eye contact first (unless you might end up walking into something.) Try to gain as much eye contact as you can with women. Eye contact in itself can produce feelings over an extended period, so never underestimate it as a really strong tool in your box. If you have trouble with eye contact, you need to force yourself to start doing it everywhere. When you're out shopping, when you're going to the movies. Whoever is serving you, get some eye contact. You'll become more comfortable the more you do this. (This has even made a difference in the way I am served at places, so do it!) Posture and body language are base game in my opinion. Your attitude will influence your frame and body language. Frame and body language will influence your behaviours.

[Additional reading](#).

The next piece will cover Shit tests and Comfort tests.

The TRP Field Toolkit - Part 3: Shit tests and Comfort tests

191 upvotes | April 30, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

TL:DR - This is the TRP Field Toolkit. A more detailed guide to all the basics used in the field that will allow you to deal with the vast majority of situations which arise. The way I explain everything is the way I see it and how it has been working well for me including examples and links to additional reading. The second part of the guide covered Frame, Posture and Body Language. This part covers Shit tests and Comfort tests.

- Shit tests.

Naturally I will now point to the [sidebar material](#) on this as the most basic reading. Once you've figured out these basic responses and learned a little on the benefits of [silence](#), it's time to start calibrating your game.

This is down to your individual personality. I've said before that women are great at spotting fakes. They've been practicing their social skills and reading between the lines much more than most men. Your game will be significantly stronger if you play to your strengths and your personality. First, figure out if you're a strong silent type, or the life of the party joker, or maybe you're that douchebag jock guy who'll benefit from a heavy dose of asshole game.

Pick the responses to shit tests that will work best for you. This will require some experimentation, but you should be able to settle down nicely as you test things out. I'll briefly go through a quick application of the basic combats to shit tests. (Remember, in essence all shit tests break the rapport and look for you to follow suit and demonstrate your strong social skills. So the same style of response can be used by different types of men in different ways.)

I'll quickly run through some examples of the classic shit test "I bet you say that to all the girls." I am answering the same test to demonstrate that you will be able to see what style of response best fits your personality (and that not all types of response are equally strong. This is the essence behind why you need to calibrate.)

Example responses:

- Agree and Amplify

"Of course I do. That queue outside is actually girls lining up to hear it."

"Definitely. Every hot girl who crosses my path, so I think I've said it like ten thousand times. This is ten thousand and one."

I've chosen these examples because I think they can be delivered as both jokey and serious depending upon your own calibration and what suits your personality. I don't tend to use A&A often, but it works nicely when I think it's the right move. In essence A&A is just playful sarcasm which adds silly-style-fun to the conversation while not answering her question properly. (Because all shit test questions aren't worthy of a serious response. They're not designed for a serious response, they're designed to see if they phase/concern you or not.)

- Ignore (change the subject)

"Oh I love this song, have you heard it before?"

"My glass is empty, when do you plan on refilling it?" (Add smirk obviously.)

From my experience, randomly changing the subject tends to work less well than changing it to something concrete and relevant to the evening you're having with her. It makes it seem like the conversation has moved on naturally, rather than overtly trying to dodge. This can be both cheeky and serious, just mould the delivery according to how you want to be perceived.

- Ignore (silence)

If you have eye contact already, hold it and wait until she looks away. Then look off in whatever direction, (preferably in the direction of a hot chick) and then throw out a bit of laughter and move the conversation forward.

If you don't have eye contact, don't look for it. Just look off into the middle distance and let a smirk slowly cross your face. Make sure she fills the silence. (She'll want to because silences make most girls uncomfortable.)

Silence is my preferred response to a shit test like this. Silence is also an excellent way to feed the hamster. Feeding the hamster is simply leaving details out, being vague and leaving her to fill in the gaps (which, if she likes you, she'll fill them in positively thanks to the halo effect.) It's the same principle on which dread game is based. Keep that hamster fed gentlemen!

- Pressure flip (my personal fav)

"Yes. Do you ask all the boys that?"

"Maybe. What's your go-to line?"

"Why do you care about the other girls chasing me?"

Pressure flips are my favourite because they suit my personality. I believe they're a combination of ignoring the nonsense and reasserting frame. They're like a playful form of confrontation and will work particularly well if you're a naturally aggressive man. I particularly like them because it forces a small flush of emotion in the girl which combined with your demolishing of her shit test gives you bonus tingles. You can answer the question if you want in a pressure flip, but typically you want to question the assumption the test is based on. Force her to think about why she's asking the question because most girls don't actually know or understand why they ask these things. If she's reduced to babbling nonsense then that's worked well and you can assume you've caused some tingles. Always use these under any circumstances where she's showing some submissive responses or submissive body language. It's a fun and strong assertion of dominance and frame.

I have met one woman who could fight my pressure flips by restating her shit test in the same words. (I pressure flipped 3 times, with 3 different lines and she repeated the exact same words back to me 3 more times.) Since I hadn't encountered such absurd stupidity before, it threw me until I had time to reflect. If this happens, I would jump to a command respect response and declare "I will not answer your question until you answer mine." Repeat as needed. She must cave first. Frame reasserted. Then when she's finished answering, then go for the vague response.

- Commanding respect

"I don't like when girls compliment-fish like that to try and feel special. You're already spending time

with me so you should feel special and I don't want you questioning me on that. It's disrespectful of my motives."

"Don't imply I'm some kind of sleazy pick-up artist who just spouts lines. If you don't trust my word then we don't have to hang out, but if you do then you'll trust me and won't imply that I don't really mean the things I say."

The commanding respect response is a mega-heavy dominant, reassertion of frame. Essentially you're trying to say very directly and clearly "I will not tolerate your shit. Show me respect." in a very uncompromising fashion. I would advise using this sparingly at first, and maybe on girls who are pretending they're "good girls" because it fits nicely with their narrative. The more playful responses which hint that you might be a cad are what I'd advise most on a first meeting. Commanding respect can/should be used on later meetings if she's still shit testing you. However, again, calibrate according to your own personality. Always remember that trying to command respect from an entitled girl who isn't certain of your SMV being significantly higher than hers is likely to backfire and lower your SMV. This is because it will come across as you having poor social awareness. These girls are better off being negged, ignored, or a combination of both until they change their attitude. If they don't, then it doesn't matter and you don't need to have anything to do with them. Plenty more women out there.

(You may have noticed I've skipped the nuclear option... this is because I firmly believe an alpha male has no need to use this. If you have internalised the correct attitude and have some level of amused mastery about you, then her acting like a spoiled brat will merely amuse you at best and make you silently leave at worst. Either way, using the nuclear option shows she has got to you. Remember that this woman is merely another gnat in the swamp. Plenty more for you to have a swat at. No need to nuke this one from orbit.)

Essential shit test theory reading.

Further reading on Super-Shit tests

- Comfort tests.

Once you've mastered your responses to shit testing, you'll eventually start meeting another obstacle. You've asserted your SMV is higher than hers and demonstrated higher fitness by demolishing her shit tests and continuing to hold the frame of the interaction no matter how much she tests it. All women doubt themselves and at some point, if she sees you as a seriously high-value male, she'll worry that maybe her value isn't quite high enough for you and that she has no real hope with you. At the core of it, women know instinctively when a man is way outside their league. They know if they're a 3/10 then the 9/10 guy will go for their 7/10 friend and not them. Normally they will disqualify themselves as a social precaution. (There are occasional retarded exceptions, but the rule is generally solid.) This is why beta game tends to work really well for the pretti-boi. (A man who is considered to be naturally physically attractive in the top 5%. These guys still get laid as betas, but they tend to fail at relationships if they never develop any natural alpha traits.)

If you've spent time talking with a girl and she was confident at the beginning that you were within her SMV grasp, then as you display higher and higher levels of fitness through amused mastery and demolition of shit tests, some women will become insecure. (i.e. girl sees herself as a 6 or 7 out of 10. She initially sees you as an 8/10. As the night wears on, she's come to the conclusion you're a 10/10. "Oh no! A 9/10 competitor may come along and steal him. Is he really that interested in me? Have I

undervalued myself?") She still wants you, but she wants to be sure she doesn't make an idiot of herself by chasing a man she has no chance with.

This is where she will drop a comfort test on you. Classic comfort tests are typically implying (or even straight saying) that they're worried you're going to leave them. That they're not pretty enough for you. Maybe they even think girl X is going to snatch you away when she clicks her fingers. Your role here is to calm her fears. Give her that validation and increase her SMV slightly so she's sure you're still obtainable. Note that providing emotional comfort in specific situations is not the same as being an emotional tampon. The emotional tampon is used at her whim. Providing comfort is you demonstrating your social awareness and catering to a need. This should be done with minimal words. A sentence will suffice. No big beta speeches about undying love for her!!!

"Why are you with me?" or "I'm worried you're just going to have sex with me and I'll never see you again." These are two pretty typical comfort tests from a girl who has become insecure. The language of these gets varied, but they've been coming up more and more often for me. Here's a couple of direct responses which avoid surrendering the frame.

"Because you're hot, fun and you like to kiss me." (Then kiss her obv.) This one surrenders the frame slightly by answering her question directly, allowing her a little control, but then takes it straight back by you initiating the kiss. (Don't work it like a pressure flip though because that will have the opposite effect. Think romantic delivery.) This would work best for a jokey/clownish dominant guy.

"I wouldn't be here if I just wanted sex with you. We'd have already finished by now and I'd have gone. You're fun/funny/interesting/fascinating, so you'd see me again." Essentially just tell her that her theory is wrong, phrasing it in a positive way that shows you have the power of decision making. Then throw her a compliment. Whatever compliment you think is truthful about her. This is not a time for her bullshit detector to go off. This response would probably suit a more serious or strong/silent type.

"Nobody is good enough for me. But I've chosen you." (An Illimitableman instant-classic.) It's cocky and high-level asshole game for the guy who truly wants to make love to a reflection of himself. Essentially saying I'm the shit and you're lucky to be with me, now shut up and stop whining or you'll lose me.

Next time, in the final part of the guide, I'll be covering identifying Red and Green flags, bypassing the Anti-Slut Defence and Last Minute Resistance, and finally, knowing when to Walk Away.

The TRP Field Toolkit - Part 4: Flags, ASD, LMR and Walking Away

184 upvotes | May 1, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

TL:DR - This is the TRP Field Toolkit. A more detailed guide to all the basics used in the field that will allow you to deal with the vast majority of situations which arise. The way I explain everything is the way I see it and how it has been working well for me including examples and links to additional reading. The third part of the guide covered Shit tests and Comfort tests. This final part covers identifying Red and Green flags, bypassing the Anti-Slut Defence and Last Minute Resistance, and finally, knowing when to Walk Away.

- Identifying flags.

Red flags and green flags are most important to the men who want to have a long term relationship with a woman. However, I think identifying them can be very useful for deciding how to order the importance of your plates and additionally as a good evaluation system to see what sort of schedule from meeting to sex you can expect with this chick.

Red Flags.

More Red Flags.

Even More Red Flags.

I would also add to these any chick with bright coloured hair, lots of piercings, tattoos, used to be a stripper/camgirl at any point in her life or is generally a bit of an attention whore. These things scream "I love to take my clothes off for strangers. And oh whoops, it just happened where he fell into and out of me several times by mistake. I'm totes not like that really."

Also, we must never forget the standard public service announcement: **Do not stick your dick in crazy**. If you're new and you find that crazy chick to be hot... go search for a few of the horror stories on the sub. It'll change your mind pretty fast.

Green Flags.

More Green Flags.

Green flags typically show a woman who is likely to treat you better and a woman who's going to hang around. Better plate material. Better LTR material. Generally much more pleasant to be around. I'd advise you to pump and dump any girl who doesn't display at least one green flag. This is because she's likely to be a nightmare to manage, even as a plate.

- The ASD (Anti-Slut defence) and LMR (Last Minute Resistance.)

These two are linked. The Anti-Slut Defence can be both Last Minute Resistance, or it can be a pre-empt that shows she's already eager to fuck you. (While this post shows multiple layers of meaning, I also consider it to be a form of ASD pre-empt. i.e. "I don't do that. Oh, it wasn't planned, it just happened, so I'm still not a slut.") In my opinion ASD is just a combined shit/comfort test. She wants to know you're dominant enough to take her, while also comforting her hamster and ensuring that her sluttiness won't become public knowledge.

From my experience, I tend to either get a variation of the shit test "you sleep with all girls on the first date?" (which I always respond with a disinterested "gentlemen don't kiss and tell. What about you?" She typically doesn't respond to that. She's satisfied her sluttiness will be kept secret.) or I'll meet the ASD later. For all modern sex-positive feminism shouts and screams that sluts are nothing to be ashamed of... most women are still ashamed and embarrassed when people know they are sluts. Late ASD would also count as LMR and should be dealt with in the same way as LMR.

Further reading on ASD.

LMR is something that I am convinced is a final shit test, thrown out if she's not 100% certain of your high SMV in order to double check at the last second. From my experience, it comes out much more often when my frame hasn't been solid or I've made a misstep or two earlier, but then recovered. The essential attitude underlying the methods to overcoming LMR are IDGAF combined with a healthy abundance mentality. Her token resistance of "we shouldn't have sex" is just that, it's token resistance. Typically a girl won't end up naked and alone in her bedroom with a guy she doesn't want to fuck. (No matter what the blue pill idiots say, that's just not a sensible thing for a girl to do and there is no amount of rationalising which will change my view on this.)

There are two methods which come from the attitude to bypass the last minute resistance. Personally I favour the latter because of the modern day rape hysteria which goes on, but both are good. Firstly, you can pay very close attention to her body language and continue doing things which will turn her on that are not penetrative sex. Playing with her nipples and then putting her hand on your cock is a solid move which typically leads to sex. Keep turning her on until she's all but begging for you inside her. If you want to take this method, I strongly advise using the "If you say stop, I'll stop." line. It establishes a very clear safeword and allows her to submit to you if that's what she wants.

The second approach is to really channel your IDGAFOS to level 2.0 by beginning to leave and looking completely unphased. Most women will have experienced the beta reaction to their LMR a few times. (Beta reactions being things like getting pissy at her for being a cock tease or starting to beg for sex.) As a result of this, she may be a little confused at first until she realises what she's almost done and scrambles to recover and satisfy her tingles. An alpha does not care, he can pull on his pants, walk out the door right now and go get sex elsewhere. You have to believe this or else you risk this not working. She will reinitiate in some way to get you back. Begging you not to go and you can escalate again. This can be done with small talk, but one line I've had some good success with is "I'm not certain I'll be able to control myself if I stay. You should make me go." It leaves a little ambiguity for her while making your intentions very clear. She lets you leave or she gets you to stay for sex. With good eye contact and silence I've seen multiple ravenous reactions to this. A less direct (and more methodical) approach to the same method is covered in the book Bang by Roosh V. But I'm impatient and women can tell this, so they tend to make up their mind faster.

- Walking away.

It is better to cut your losses and walk away, than risk further losses. Walking away is **always** an option for you. ALWAYS.

I've found this field report to be one of the best examples of walking away even when the value is high and you've invested time and effort. The moment you won't walk away, you've surrendered the power in the relationship and/or the interaction. You are willing to walk away from **anything** if circumstances show that you've lost control or it will do you damage to stay. You need to be

effortlessly dominant and consistent. Sometimes this means you'll have to walk away from a situation where you can't be these things.

If it's a relationship, the option to walk away is always there. If it's an interaction and it's going down in flames, just walk away. Ultimately, your time on this earth is short and that time is valuable. **Don't waste it on shit that isn't going where you want it to go.**

Why would a man *pretend* that his wife is a tyrant?

25 upvotes | August 24, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Welcome to your daily dose of mainstream insanity, designed to remind you just how retarded the things we are allowed to say can be - just so long as it licks the boots of women everywhere.

TL:DR - Article defends beta marriages by dismissing the man's feelings and encourages everyone else to dismiss it because feminism and if you don't agree you're basically just a racist. (Enjoy your attempts to keep up with this exceptional level of male hamster from the mangina poster-boy.)

[Link to the article.](#) - Two things I want to do with this example, firstly I'm going copy and paste a few of the more insane things said. (I honestly can't fathom how this man could ever have become a "professional" writer. His use of language is disgraceful because he seems unable to actually communicate. He's under the impression that throwing random buzzwords together will communicate a point. All it communicates to me is that he's stupid, feminised and desperate for validation.) Then I'm going to show how it's all already explained by Red Pill theory.

A generation ago, one of the worst things you could say of a man was that he was under the proverbial thumb at home. Whatever the reality of his domestic power structure, no chap wanted to be seen by his mates and colleagues as anything other than the one who wore the trousers behind closed doors. [...] Nowadays though, many are desperate for the world to believe they are henpecked in the home.

What? Why would any man want this?

The typical culprit is the middle-class man who has reached that symbolic moment in life when, full of regret, he consigns his acoustic guitar to the attic. Then, the moment he is in all-male company, out pour the denunciations of his better half.

Oh right... everything now makes total sense. Any man who thinks his wife is anything but perfect must be bitter and resentful that his life didn't turn out better. Standard nonsense that men are to blame for everything... even their own complaints are all their fault.

Red Pill Reality: This is a man trapped in a beta marriage. He has no spine and acts in a very feminine manner. While he does everything his wife wants, he gets no reward for his kindness/sacrifices and instead goes to his friends for sympathy over his plight, because guess what! Men have emotions too! He can sense his own unhappiness but believes he's not quite doing things well enough to deserve happiness. See No More Mr Nice Guy for further details.

So relentless is this man's effort to build an image of himself as a hopeless minion, that it cannot be inadvertent. I've been in social scenarios where it's even become competitive: a 'wimp-off' between a group of men, scrapping to mythologise their respective spouses as the bossiest, most possessive and least reasonable nag of them all. [...] And then one meets one of them and – surprise! – they turn out to not be the dreadful despots their husbands had implied.

Ah yes, what's a good blue piece without a good dose of combining shaming tactics with dismissal of their views as completely unthinkable. This hamster is gathering pace.

Red Pill Reality: A demonstration of the deeply sad competitive streak in beta males. Betas still want

to be competitive, it's inbuilt. It's less about going out to play sports and more feminised and focused on fee-fees and trying to play the victim card. (That card is not in your deck guys... not in modern society.) Oh and look, he's met the wife and she's lovely. Idiot. Women are masters of playing different roles for different people. She's delightful in a social setting where her status can be affected... and a different person in private where it can't. Any man who has not seen the difference between the way women act in public and the way they'll act in private has clearly not been with enough women. I think I've seen about 2 in my lifetime who were the same in public and private. They're an extreme minority and both of my examples were bitches.

What the hell is this all about? The knee jerk answer would be that it's simply resentment. Men are now expected to be more involved in parenthood and domestic chores than they were 20 years ago. The family home is less patriarchal and autonomous. Things have got fairer – and because some men aren't sure whether they like this, they exaggerate it, like the daft racists who greet increased ethnic equality with a thundering: "It's political correctness gone mad!"

Hamster to mission control. We have achieved warp speed. Yes... a man who thinks his wife is controlling is quite obviously the equivalent of a racist. Makes complete sense... there's no massive logical leaps in there whatsoever.

Red Pill Reality: An extreme load of nonsense which draws upon a false analogy to try and shame any man who does not willingly accept his place in servitude of women. I'm surprised we haven't reached the stage yet where he's saying that all men who aren't cuckolds aren't real men and are still whining over nothing. Ya know... because male emotion is irrelevant.

Linguistic double standards have long bounced between the sexes, and while self-assured men are praised for being assertive, undaunted women are often damned as being bossy, or controlling.

Right out of the feminist handbook... I wonder if he copy/pasted it.

Red Pill Reality: The beta in a marriage like this knows he's unhappy being treated like shit but he's carrying on under the assumption "happy wife = happy life." But of course, his wife is never happy. It's nothing to do with linguistic double standards... but just to cover all bases... if you knew a woman was going to be a bossy harpy who aggressively told you everything to do... would you want a relationship with that woman? Or would you possibly say something like "fairly obvious why she's still single."

Perhaps we shouldn't be too hard on the chaps. The pace at which things have changed means today's middle-aged men are a bridging generation between two eras: the patriarchal times of their fathers, and the more liberal era their children will walk into. Those who make their wives into false tyrants are grasping vulnerably for a way to express their sensitivity and modernity, testing out-loud how they feel about their role in this brave new world.

What? I can't even understand this... the language just appears to be a collection of buzz phrases and platitudes.

Red Pill Reality: Manginas and white knights will continue to defend while the walls of the castle are crumbling and they've finally noticed they're using cardboard for armour and rubber chickens as

swords. The delusional should be ignored.

I can't help thinking, though, that most men who boast of possessive wives are speaking wishfully. "She won't let me out of her sight," says one chap I know of his wife. I've met her – she clearly cannot wait for a night to her self.

Again... more "women are the real victims" stuff. Though one thing from this could be true... that the beta male is speaking wishfully.

Red Pill Reality: That's a marriage heading downhill and she's prepping to branch swing ASAP. The beta male has no idea what to do. He can sense her desire is gone, and his has not. It's only a matter of time before she fucks another guy and divorces him. The order of these is irrelevant. Both will happen.

In other cases, there's reverse psychology going on. I'm sure that one particular chap that I know keeps saying his wife is dictator behind closed doors in the hope that his words may eventually push her to become the most laissez-faire lady to ever live.

It still amazes me sometimes how the blue pill men can't see the reality that's right in front of them. I think it's probably more difficult to come up with these bizarrely bad thought processes to try and protect women's images than it is to stick to simple logic. This is suggesting an incredibly contrived and practically impossible attempt at manipulation.

Red Pill Reality: Hamster to mission control. We have left the solar system and are prepared to explore the stars! Good luck Captain Hamster.

It is unsurprising to find in the poll (towards the bottom) on whether you know men like this that it's pretty evenly split between "yes, they're annoying." and "no, they're not pretending." Much like the Red and Blue pill camps... some see reality and others pretend it's not really happening. Don't be one of the guys who're pretending it's not happening. We know how that ends and there are plenty of Blue Pill examples on here of where that goes - the lesson is always the same with this. Don't be beta bob.

Attitude - It doesn't even matter if you're right

52 upvotes | August 27, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

TL:DR - A "dating coach" - and I use the term loosely - attacks the red pill attitude and suggests it will not bring success with women. Even when we assume he's right... he's still proven wrong on his own terms. This highlights a good point on attitude for both dating and general life which everyone can benefit from - maximising positives and minimising negatives, regardless of whether you're right or wrong.

Recently I was reading a piece, linked through another post on TRP - by [Andrew of therulesrevisited dot com](#), - which suggested that many of the men who were writing advice pieces in the manosphere were "bad with women." Moreso that this was demonstrated by the titles they used like "The age of flakes" and "How to get rid of approach anxiety."

Now for anyone who can't understand the argument the guy is making here, (it's needlessly unclear) it's based upon an assumption. It dismisses the idea that women are at fault, naturally. Instead it suggests that a man being flaked on shows that he is not as attractive as he thinks he is. That the man suffering approach anxiety is either aiming too high or is getting the anxiety because he's been rejected often (read: he's not as attractive as he thinks and should re-evaluate the hotness of women he is approaching.)

While I can hear the collective "fuck that" echoing across the manosphere... I'm going to say that his point is actually irrelevant. It genuinely doesn't matter if we agree or disagree with it. I want to do this to demonstrate a deeper point on good attitude applied to both game and real life. So to do this, let's assume that he's right and we'll use me as an example. I've had my attitude reviewed as almost ideal before by some veterans of TRP and my opening piece of the [TRP Field Toolkit on basic game attitude](#) was stickied for almost a week. I am successful with women... but whether that's the truth or whether you want to doubt it is irrelevant in this case because we're going to assume that he was right. We'll assume that my previously having (and sometimes still having a hint of) approach anxiety combined with having been flaked on, demonstrate that I'm a failure with women. The attitude that I preach to others should not be preached.

So why, you ask, should I continue to adopt an attitude which leads to failure with women? I'm just going to demonstrate through their own logic of what will work... why the idea that my attitude won't work is patently absurd. One universal truth across all dating advice inside and outside of the manosphere is that women love a confident man. It's also agreed, even in blue pill land, that women universally like positive/happy men. Men who are happy to be alive and are enjoying their life. The psychological research on depression shows how people with depression tend to maximise defeats and minimise the impact of success in a self-fulfilling prophecy. It's generally accepted that the opposite is also true... really happy people tend to maximise their successes and minimise defeats. This attitude breeds not only happiness, but confidence too. (Because if you think you're generally successful when you do things... you're confident in what you're doing. In addition, the positive self-fulfilling prophecy also comes into play so you'll succeed more too.)

So when I don't give a flying fuck about that flake and dismiss her as another overly entitled bitch who is too much work to be worthy of my glorious phallus... if the goal is to have sex, then I'm minimising a failure. When I feel approach anxiety and I make the approach, only to be rejected... I say to myself "made another approach." Maximising success. Her rejection is irrelevant. In fact, my

attitude includes that her decision isn't down to my own attractiveness, it's mostly down to her mood at the time, what friends were with her and her social status etc. This can be seen as rationalising... and EVEN IF IT IS, I'm minimising a failure and dismissing the ownership of that failure which in turn keeps my confidence high because what I'm doing is right. NOTE: My focus here is not on reality or truth, I take my stance because it helps keep my attitude towards maximising success and minimising failure. Objective truth is irrelevant when you do this because otherwise you could dent your confidence and happiness. You can't afford to do this because women can spot fake attitudes. Sooner or later, that confidence and happiness level of mine is going to be found attractive by women. My attitude will be found attractive. If it isn't... then blue pill and red pill are both wrong about some of the few things they agree on! So regardless of whether I'm right about the specifics of women flaking or approach anxiety or rejections... if I hold the attitude, it will bring success.

So yes newbies, these are your lessons for the day in terms of attitude:

- When you approach, having made the approach is the victory. The outcome is irrelevant (outcome independence, maximise positives.)
- Early rejections made by women are part of their sexual strategy (to maximise rejections as a filtering system) and therefore irrelevant to your personal situation or your own attractiveness. They should have zero impact on your own strategy. Ignore them and move on. (Outcome independence, minimise negatives.)
- Women flake, it's what they do. Perhaps you didn't raise your SMV high enough to keep her interest. So long as your mindset independently continues to raise your SMV then this flake is utterly irrelevant. There are far more important things going on than one woman demonstrating: at best disorganisation, at worst contempt. She has demonstrated she was unworthy of your attentions so it's actually another good thing in your life to be rid of her. (Maximise the positive, minimise the negative.)
- Women are good at spotting fakes. They've spent their teens being far more empathic and analysing social interactions because they don't tend to do much else with their existence. Simply saying "I will adopt this attitude" is not enough to gain instant success with women. This is because many will know your bravado is fake... that you don't truly believe it and they'll look over at me and go "he **knows** he's the shit." Ignore the blue pill fear mongers and keep correcting yourself until you truly believe you are the second coming, and the first will be all over her face.
- In general, having an attitude which maximises your successes and minimises your failures will make you feel happier. This is simply the opposite of the attitude adopted by those with clinical depression. This is a great attitude to have. Others will consider you quite egotistical to so easily dismiss foolishness when they spout it... but frankly, isn't your happiness more important than their words getting validation? Isn't your happiness more important than a woman's sexual strategy? (This is actually one of a few ways to adjust your cognitions that allow you to make an active choice to be happier.)
- Have you noticed yet how my attitude towards women would be considered heresy to put all the blame on women? It's why they call it misogynistic. I call it practical. It has other benefits like keeping the pussy off the pedestal and making yourself the prize too. But for now gentlemen, be practical, and focus on making an attitude which maximises the positives and

minimises the negatives. The gold standard to minimising negatives (or other people's judgements of you) is to not give a fuck. Try it... I think you'll like it.

Roles, respect and responsibility acceptance as an alpha trait

316 upvotes | September 9, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

TL:DR - There is no TL:DR of this. Poor role understanding within the sub has caused the mods to have to post about the leadership and direction of the sub multiple times in the past 12 months. This post tries to solve the root of the problem. If you believe in the overall goals of the sub, then you'll read it in full.

I recently posted a [mini-analysis](#) of the functioning of the sub using an analogy of a military base that didn't quite know the role of every academy graduate. This was an attempt to explain why we keep seeing people questioning the direction of the sub and positing how to solve it as a long term issue.

Keeping with that analogy, we essentially see the squaddies thinking that they can run the base better than the base commander. When the squaddie challenges the drill sergeant on methods of training... they're surprised to be called into the base commander's office and get told they're going to be thrown out. "But... you said that command was always open to ideas? That this is a place where we care about debate and understanding reality ahead of everything else? Without caring about language?"

Yeah, we do. But you fucked up your basic social skills. It's also why your attitude probably isn't working quite so well in the field. Achievements through numbers rather than skill. This is because (while some dominant alphas have natural genetics making them good looking enough that they can pretty much get away with murder) you don't have the ability to completely ignore social etiquette. You can bend it a little maybe... but you're not Jagger. He can ignore all social etiquette and send three 9/10s back to his hotel room to wait for him. You on the other hand, when you ignore social etiquette, it's a demonstration of low SMV. Poor social skills.

Alphas generally don't have poor social skills. So what does this mean to be an alpha without being an 11/10 superstar? It means you've got a role to play. **If you understand the game and the goal, then you'll find your role.** With women, playing the role of the modern dominant alpha will give her the tingles because women like to put guys in boxes. It increases your SMV once you end up in that box in her mind. While this particular bit of info isn't the main thing I want to discuss here, I wanted to demonstrate that an alpha knowing how to play his role is a positive thing for pure sexual strategy. However the crux of this is going to diverge slightly to address how a group of alpha male leaders work best together.

Firstly, I'd like to make a side note about AMOGing which I like to call the AMOG fallacy. This is the idea that when someone AMOGs, he is the alpha of the group. This is an oversimplification. While he may be the apex alpha in terms of status, this does not mean that all other members of the group are beta. Following that logic would suggest that only [/u/RedPillSchool](#) is alpha on the sub and everyone else is consequently beta. That the base commander is the only alpha simply because his captains, sergeants, squad leaders and trainees all have to obey him. The football team out drinking will have an apex alpha in the group, but that doesn't make the rest of the group are betas. There's a reason such groups and fraternities all get laid - because they're all alpha, whether it be by status or, more importantly, behaviour.

[/u/Whisper](#) recently made a post (which amused me greatly) about Gronk! For those of you who didn't read it, Gronk! is the typical example of an insecure alpha wannabe who seems to be under the impression that alpha is achieved by dominating everyone around you and demonstrating you have

the biggest muscles, the greatest height, the biggest dick, the most swollen balls and the purest testosterone. He tries to AMOG everyone. Have you ever met a Gronk! before? His social skills are laughable. In fact, when I see one out and about... I'll stop playing my game and grab some popcorn so I can find a comfy chair to watch the show. Why do I do this? Because in the same way I don't respect the modern woman, I don't respect Gronk! Like women, he has been placed on this planet for my amusement. Gronk! is undoubtedly my inferior. Why? The man who tries to out-alpha me is my inferior. How? Because he hasn't figured out how to be my equal. This swings back to my point before which now explains why members consistently keep trying to question the direction of the sub. In making dominant leaders, the sub itself creates young men who want to try and assume the leadership role and try to dominate those around them. However they were never given good role models growing up to see how dominant alpha males interact with other dominant alpha males. How they treat equals. **And if you can't treat an alpha as an equal, then you aren't his equal.**

Surprisingly enough, Gronk! isn't welcome in the group of dominant alphas. There's an excellent scene in Gran Torino where Clint Eastwood demonstrates to the kid he's taken under his wing, that secure heterosexual men who are friends have a level of implied respect within the most derogatory of statements. The kid then tries to imitate this and is told that it's incredibly offensive. It's probably the most basic social skill which isn't taught enough on here - finding the right mix between polite and kissing ass to start out and then allowing the relationship to progress. This is similar to finding the correct tone to be assertive with women without being controlling or weird. The nuance in tone that allows you to rant like bloke and not whine like a woman.

The reaction of the Italian threatening to "blow his gook head off" reminds me of a reply made by /u/RedPillWatchTower to my original analogy of a military base. It's why you should avoid being confrontational or needlessly offensive. I don't feel I need to add anything to this:

I think a lot of new guys confuse "alpha" with "peacocking" or "AMOGing". What I've noticed lately is guys with 3 month old alt accounts coming in, declaring that they've lurked on TRP since the dawn of time, then proceed to start telling ECs they don't know what they are talking about.

This is the Reddit version of a guy who spent 3 months at the gym, goes to the local bar, and picks a fight with the biggest guy in the place to try to prove something. Little did he know that the guy he picked a fight with is not only going to kick his ass, that guy is also friends with the bar owner. So now he's got a black eye and is in jail.

That's pretty much how it works here.

I don't continue to post here for myself so much anymore. I've learnt what I need to learn. I've enacted what I need to enact. I have a solid understanding of theory so, without being humble about it, I believe I can explain and pass it on to boys who are now in a similar position to the one I used to be in. I know my specific role - pass on the knowledge and analytical ability. Help train the next set of men. My role **is not** to lead the sub as a whole or decide on the direction. Don't get me wrong, if I think I've got a good idea, I'll voice it. When I do, I will do so in a respectful manner. I won't tell any of the veterans that they're wrong. That's needlessly confrontational and sets the wrong tone. These people are my equals and I'd like to think many of them are my friends (depending on whether you think you can be friends with people you've never met) and should be treated as such. I'll voice my

opinion and let them make up their own mind. Blue Pill men need others to listen and adhere to what they think. Red Pill men don't need to care. We share our knowledge to help any man who wants to listen... if they won't, it's not our loss. Ultimately, if you're not looking to listen to ideas you hadn't considered before then what the fuck are you doing here? Go back to the mainstream.

So now comes the big question: how do we identify our role? TRP has always been excellent for telling the new recruits what they need to do, pointing out who the drill sergeants are and showing that the base commander is in charge. What it has struggled with is the graduates, the squad leaders and the corporals.

- If you're a raw recruit then you'll be reading the sidebar and keeping quiet. No exceptions.
- If you've become a squaddie after a month or two, chip in where you think you understand what is going on and keep your ears pricked up in case the drill sergeant or a corporal comes round to correct you. Don't be the dickhead who posts for two weeks and then tells the drill sergeant that he doesn't know what he's talking about. You'll be seen for the moron you are.
- If you've begun applying things in the real world and you're getting positive feedback on your understanding then congratulations on your promotion to lance-corporal. Keep contributing where you think you can and listen out for further advice from the drill sergeants and base commanders.
- You've secured your first plate or two? Excellent work corporal. See what parts of the training you can help with from your personal experiences. Just don't let that first success go to your head. The drill sergeants have been doing this a lot longer than you have and will help to correct you if you've had a rare experience without realising. Keep that mind open and keep learning.
- The drill sergeants and base commanders don't need to be told what to do. It's self explanatory.

You have a role in the group. Sometimes that role is just team member and not leader. It's a logical fallacy to think that not being the leader makes you less alpha. The alpha will take his role and work it - he knows that for the group to succeed, all members of the team need to work their role effectively. You've chosen to be a part of the team and I'm assuming you've done that because you want to see that group succeed in its goals. Alpha men will gladly defer to more experienced/knowledgeable men when they're trying to achieve a mutual goal. It's just common sense to let the expert/more experienced/more knowledgeable guy lead the group.

As a community, the TRP sub is no different. Alpha men work together for the good of the community, taking on the roles required of them. Women bitch and bicker amongst themselves and nothing gets done. See twoX as a prime example. It pretends to have purpose... but nothing ever gets achieved there. Here on TRP, boys become men. They go from hopeless and unfulfilled to confident and satisfied. You want to be a part of it? Then take on the responsibility of your role and treat the other roles with respect. That's what an alpha male does.

My friend appears to be becoming a natural MGTOW

7 upvotes | September 16, 2015 | /r/MGTOW | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Hello gentlemen. I come seeking a little advice from those who know the MGTOW community much better than I do.

I should provide a little context first. Recently when I was out with a friend, we were discussing what he and I had planned for the medium term future. When the topic of women and dating came up, he was very adamant that he's completely lost interest in women, feels they're not worth the time or money he'd have to invest, and he'd rather pursue other interests like his bodybuilding, work, video games, movies and exploration of the world. The way he spoke about this was as if he was looking for my input on the subject. (He comes to me for advice on things and I do what I can.) To me, I think he's struggling to find an identity because he doesn't really know any different from dating women.

I am a Red Pill Man and currently a plate spinner. I've previously done some research on MGTOW and listened to what you guys have to say. I'm still actually subscribed to Sandman and Lui Marco on youtube because I like their content. However that's pretty much where my knowledge ends. I do not believe I'm knowledgeable enough to provide the right advice to a potential MGTOW... but I'd like to be able to give him a starting point so he can do some of his own research on MGTOW and decide if the advice the movement offers could help him. (Or simply for me to be able to provide some worthwhile advice as his life alters and he tries to take on this new identity. I sense he may struggle a little when his mother and sister start pouring on the pressure.)

Would you guys be able to suggest any youtubers or sites that focus on lifestyle/practical things for MGTOWs, rather than the gender inequality issues and RP theory? While he agrees with all the RP things I've stated in conversations without explicitly mentioning RP, I don't wish to introduce him to TRP itself. However, I think some lifestyle/practical stuff from the MGTOW perspective would benefit him far more than any RP advice I could dole out. What/who do you guys think I should be looking at/reading?

Are white women who sleep with/date black men "contaminated" or damaged in some way?

1 upvotes | September 16, 2015 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I was quite intrigued when I saw Donovan Sharpe post today on the topic of "[White women who only date black men](#)"

I don't normally read Return of Kings, but I've seen Donovan's posts about his low times and think it's quite a risk to post that kind of stuff in the manosphere. (Not everybody seems to sympathise for some reason. Something I've never understood since most guys in the manosphere were beta at some point in their life.) Anyway, I keep an eye out for his Tuesday piece because it's usually interesting amongst the rubbish. This one made me cock an eyebrow.

Read what you will from the above link, but later in the article it comes to what I think is easily the most controversial statement I've read in a while:

In my personal experience with conversations I've had with friends over the years, there does seem to be an undercurrent or unwritten sentiment that women who have slept with or been in relationships with black men are somehow contaminated or off limits.

Now for those of a PC-leaning, Donovan says he himself is black, so by the standard PC nonsense he's one of a select few who can talk about that. My own dating history could be mistaken for a Benetton catalogue (references above my age! woo!) and I'm happy to plate any girl of any race so long as she's hot... but when I consider what I'd accept for LTR game... white girls going after black dudes - instinctively I'd say absolute no-no. I have no literal explanation for this, but from instinct alone it seems like a red flag to me given what I know about the preferences of women when it comes to race. (Unfair, but whatever, facts/stats it's just numbers. There's more women out there anyway.)

A good female friend of mine has a good looking sister who's married to a very affluent, high-value white male. According to my friend, she dated mostly black guys all through high school and college but guards that "secret" with her life and says she will take any admission of commingling with them to her grave.

Even a random woman seems to feel shame at this. (Crap sample size obv, but what are the odds he'd happen to know a woman right away who was ashamed at her sexual history with black men?)

My question is to both RPer and BPer... is Donovan onto something here? If so, why?

Adopting the best attitude to learn

99 upvotes | September 18, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

TL:DR - Learning requires failure and correction. Adopt the correct role as the student and the appropriate attitude. If you don't, the teacher will likely stop caring if you pass the class and succeed. A couple of times recently I've had responses to correcting people that were the equivalent of whining "why are you being mean to me?" or plain bitching for me correcting them instead of someone who was stupider/newer to TRP. This is beta behaviour which irritates me the most. Partly because I'm fucked off with myself for misjudging that person as deserving of my help, but also because they're adopting completely the wrong attitude if they want to learn and improve. While they're partly learning and improving from reading things, **the way to improve best/fastest is to have someone tell you specifically where you are wrong and correct you.** You should be embracing this.

I'm selective about who I reply to. There's a huge number of guys on TRP making comments. I don't correct guys on here for the sake of my ego. When you can play asshole game well enough, you're basically insulting women with a big grin on your face and then watching as she desperately tries to justify to you why she should be allowed to suck you off. That's a giant ego booster. Knowing I can do that is enough for me. I don't need to attempt online AMOGing to feel good about myself. I don't intend to speak for the other ECs and how they go about their posting. But from my PoV, my replies on TRP vary from joking and idle chatter, to explanations and corrections in attitude and understanding. The only thing I expect from someone I'm giving knowledge/advice/explanations to for free, is that they appreciate it/show some respect. If I'm replying to you to correct you, it's probably because I've seen your comments before and think you're saying good things. **This demonstrates your potential and so I'm happy to correct you because I want to help you achieve that potential.**

My own story is literally how I took on that role. I got involved and tried to surround myself with knowledgeable men who were around when I tried to put forward my understanding. From this, I was corrected many MANY times. I was literally putting myself in a position of being the intellectual bitch amongst the crowd. I embraced this wholeheartedly. I appreciated, and still do appreciate, that better men than me were willing to offer their knowledge and advice to me for free, simply because they saw potential in me. Potential and eagerness to be better. If you are here to learn and become a better man, **this is the way to do it.** I've posted before [on debating and discussion as a man](#). The essence of this draws from my time as a competitive debater and the useful skill that has allowed me to seek out truth in the most efficient manner. This is how you grow intellectually. For those who want to learn but aren't willing to do this because you need to protect your ego, I've got a couple of things to say to you.

Firstly, if you think you know it all, why are you not a mod or part of the vanguard? Pro-tip: it's because you don't know it all. Secondly, I've said before that adopting an attitude where you think you know it all is not conducive to continual self-betterment. To reapply Hemingway's classic quote: "We are all apprentices in a craft where no one ever becomes a master." Once you become alpha, you can still learn from your peers. Why? Because even equals can teach each other. It's only inferiors who can't teach superiors much (if anything.)

The beta brat will think he knows better. He'll dismiss everything out of hand which is said directly to

him. He will argue in a manner of "but this shows you're wrong" instead of asking for an explanation of a situation that doesn't seem to fit. He'll only learn from reading other things independent of his own thoughts and then try to force his thoughts around them. He doesn't respond with questions to ask for more guidance. How are we supposed to deal with such stubborn fools?

One of the guys I've learnt a lot from and respect, [/u/HumanSockPuppet](#) recently declared in no uncertain terms that ECs should actively pull rank on newer members. I agree and disagree with this. I think if we had a more rigid structure where people were actively shamed when they tried to do stupid shit, then pulling rank might work (for example putting in a negative points system to publically shame the guys with the wrong attitude towards self improvement.) Even if we remember what the goal of the sub is, pulling rank will simply drag these guys back into class and make them sit.

Personally however, I don't want those little fucking bitches in my class. I can't force them to learn, so why force them to sit? I've openly told guys that in creating leaders, we want you to be able to take control and sort yourselves out - and one of those things about taking control is in deciding who you want to be educated by on here. **You are not required or obligated to be here.** None of us are. You are also not required or obligated to attend the class of any specific EC, Vanguard or Mod. There's plenty of good options, so if you don't like one, go find another. In the same way, **I do not require any particular student in my class.** (I know that this is a good reason why [/u/HumanSockPuppet](#) explained that pulling rank should work.) However **I actively do not want any student who needs me to pull rank on them.** My time is limited and I'm going to spend it as wisely as I can. So if your attitude when I offer my help or reply to a PM to correct your mistakes is to bitch/whine/complain or argue... then you might notice I won't bother responding to you or trying to help you in the future. As the student it's your loss, not mine, when the teacher no longer gives a shit if you learn. I don't have the time or patience to tell a student that they should shut up and learn. Ultimately, if you fail to pass the class so-to-speak, it's not my problem. You're the one who will suffer the consequences. Not me. This is my rant/solution to this beta bitch behaviour of so-called men who can't embrace their own intellectual failures on their Red Pill journey. To point out the best attitude to adopt. Being told you're wrong is not a bad thing. Kill your fucking ego on here and embrace your own failings. You've already accepted that you failed to work out enough and agreed to go lift. You accepted that you failed to learn to fish properly because you asked a fish instead of a fisherman and now you're reading what the fisherman has to say. Why can't you accept that you're going to fuck up along the way? Be thankful that any knowledgeable man was willing to help you correct your course for free. The success and associated satisfaction of getting it right will come in time, don't worry about that. But for the here and now while you're learning: success is a lousy teacher.

Self-control is vital: Nature has not adapted to modern society

76 upvotes | October 14, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

As I became more Red Pill, I've tended to read less of the manosphere. It repeats things I already know, have learned and have enacted in my life. It's less useful to me and I think most RP men would agree that as you move forward and improve your life and your SMV, less and less of what is posted on the TRP sub is of use to you. So if I feel this way, why am I still here? There's two reasons, the first is simple, I want to give back. It makes me feel good to know I'm helping other men to improve their lives in a world where having a good life as a man is becoming harder and harder. The second... is the rest of this post.

I strongly believe in the stoic style of behaviour (not the full philosophy) and impassive responses to things you can't control. I think it helps your attitude, your game, your approach to life in general. To achieve this, you need to have control over your emotions. Newbies tend to suffer the most with this, they meet a hot girl and act like they don't care... but they really do. It leaks into their behaviour sometimes. How do you beat it? You control yourself. You don't allow that intoxicated feeling to take over and text her a million times.

That said, even the best of us will suffer from unhelpful emotions that tell us to do the opposite of what we know is best from a Red Pill perspective. Why is this? It's because we were designed that way. We are men. We were designed by evolution to improve and achieve to attract women, have sex with as many as possible, then find the best woman on offer, fall in love with her, protect her, our children, and sacrifice as needed to ensure their future survival/success. This is our base nature as men. Our emotions and instincts kindly denote this to us and it was fine for most of history. It worked.

Unfortunately the modern world has unrestricted hypergamy so badly that male nature has become counter-productive if you want to have a successful sex life... even just a successful life. Beta bob can achieve good income, good looking wife and kids etc... doesn't stop him getting divorce raped and subsequently losing everything he held dear... all because of his nature to protect and provide for his woman and children. To try and make their lives better and make them happy. To try and help them achieve their dreams.

The past year, every woman I've slept with, I've slept with her within a few hours of meeting her for the first time. (My game is almost brutally efficient. I have no time for women who pretend they can out-dominate me and immediately walk away.) But even I suffer from the nature of men. Women over on RedPillWomen understand their nature and try to control it as best they can in order to lead happy lives with their husbands and boyfriends. This is to be respected, and in turn, we can learn something there which is implied but never explicitly stated here on TRP: understand your own nature and control it as best you can.

First amongst this is to control your feelings. Oneitis is a very real threat for all men. It is in our nature to fall in love and place a woman above ourselves. It is also now a serious problem for the modern man. There's a base urge to protect and support women - keep it in check! Which brings me full circle to my second reason why I keep coming back. I re-read old reasons and read new examples of hypergamy in action. I remind myself why it is so dangerous to allow the wrong aspects of male nature to take control of me.

I remind myself why I need to keep my emotions in check. Why I need to control my nature.

The Decline has made us the poorest men in history

208 upvotes | October 26, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Prompted by the recent piece by [/u/IllimitableMan](#) on how to be happy, the below is an attempt of mine to address the depression phase. The realisation that while you're banging attractive women and have two or three plates spinning... it's not bringing you the inner happiness you wanted. In appreciating where this comes from, it should help get you to acceptance faster than I did.

I recently wrote in a thread about how we as men can no longer afford the luxury of falling in love, of being able to give in to those strong feelings which cause oneitis. From my rooftop, this is my view of the decline.

In order to understand this post you will need to have internalised the differences between

- [Men in love](#)
- [Women in love](#)

and then from this realised how oneitis is actually useful to nature in the past. There is no one, and it's pretty straightforward to maintain an abundance mentality. **But you were designed to fall in love with a woman** because if you didn't, then you'd leave her while she was pregnant to go spread your genes elsewhere. The successful strategy for any man who was not a tribal king or warlord (and thus had resources/people under his command to look after many women as he saw fit) would be to stick with the best quality woman who fell pregnant and protect her and his children. Otherwise the effort of passing on your genes would go to waste when the kids get murdered by a new man or barbarians come in and rape and kill her. Civilisation and societal etiquette is the fairly obvious solution to these old problems from stone age tribes. The modern oneitis comes from a persistent spreading of the soulmate myth. The deep loving feelings are the same, but the search was instead altered causing great pain for the modern misinformed man.

Anyway, as society has evolved, women were typically contained within a submissive role. The woman who stepped out of this role would be punished with physical violence. The "rule of thumb" is an excellent example of how this was previously legally enforced within society. So absurd levels of shit testing and frame stealing were legally enforced against, even for the most beta of betas. (The violence served as a deterrent for the women. If you pissed off your husband too much, he would likely beat you.) Please note that this **is not** an endorsement of violence against women. The sub has been very clear in its position on this. (Do not try to twist my explanation of history into some kind of sick endorsement.)

As a result of this high level of dominance being backed up legally and physically, we saw society develop on the cultural side to develop romanticism. I'm sure you're all familiar with the phrase men are the romantics pretending to pragmatic and women are the pragmatists pretending to be romantic. As we had set up the dominance/submission dynamic between men and women so strongly, men could afford an additional luxury out of the relationship. They could sacrifice a little dominance to enjoy being romantic with women. Any good LTR game will tell you how you need to mix alpha behaviour with a sprinkling of benevolent behaviour in order to achieve a balanced relationship that would not make the woman too insecure. I would count the romanticism of the time as such. So it actually benefitted the ladies and made them a bit happier too.

What we didn't note was that the change in the dynamic when we reformed laws on this, meant that romanticism to some degrees was a luxury that some men could no longer afford. This was when "the abuse" would begin as Girlwriteswhat would put it. I recall she's spoken about relationships in which women will follow their man from room to room constantly berating them, insulting them and putting them down. Telling them they're a worthless piece of shit, and he takes it because he can no longer react violently within legal means (though that didn't stop them sometimes, and why didn't it stop them? Because bullying and berating someone who can't escape is a form of psychological abuse. It's why we hate bullying in society.) That deterrent is no longer in place to prevent shit testing escalating to this kind of level. It presents a danger to men that was not faced by our ancestors. This new danger was the psychological violence women can enact on men with a level of impunity. The scales were reversed. It's no wonder men are not happy anymore.

If we put the marriage and divorce issues to one side for a moment (we already know these are bad deals for men, that's generally accepted here), let's take a quick look at the two major issues for Red Pill men who want to run LTR game. Screening is absolutely essential. The reality is that many women have either damaged themselves psychologically beyond repair and simply make bad long term partners, and others just had the wrong personality to begin with. In addition to this, you've then got the large pool of women who are too boring and/or don't share any common interests with you. Each of these four screening statements rules out a **huge** majority of modern women from being relationship material. There are probably more, which leaves an absolutely tiny percentage you could develop an LTR with.

We then add to this that the way the legal system now works, combined with the natural hypergamous behaviour of women, the dominant behaviour you display to maintain the balance in a modern relationship will be difficult. Even if you've screened for the right woman, you can never let your guard down. **Never**. Female love is conditional upon their emotional state. Upon their feelings currently being generated by your value. When that drops, she will be looking to head out the door at the first opportunity and take as much of your resources as she can with her. The reward for dealing with this over the long term will be a companion. You will need to balance your dominant and benevolent behaviours perfectly.

What you can't have is a woman you can fall in love with and develop the associated feelings of oneitis. Once you develop that oneitis, that is the beginning of the end. The emotions take over the rational and the slow decline into trying to please her begins. We've all seen how that story goes. It's all over the Red Pill. The majority of modern marriages tell the same similar tale ending in divorce (and frequently sexual infidelity.) That's before we even think about the disgusting rise in cuckoldry. It's both funny and sad to think about how a man could sell himself out like that. As a slave to a woman. Pathetic. That's an example of the horrifyingly negative power that oneitis can have on the modern man. A man who takes that level of psychological abuse because he loves her. There is no great equality in that. A man must protect himself.

With that in mind, it comes to your options... the only reasonable options all modern men now have:

- Live with spinning plates and develop no real emotional connection to them. Connect with your male peers and do other things with your life.
- Attempt to find one of the tiny percentage of rare women who are LTR material and achieve companionship along with a superficial emotional connection.
- Disconnect from the game altogether and become a MGTOW. Focus on your passions to try

and fulfil yourself emotionally.

The option you do not have **which previous generations did:**

- Find a good woman to fall in love with, develop a deep emotional connection to her and start a family.

Emotionally, (that force which *really* drives humanity) we are the poorest generation of men in the entire history of civilisation. The irony is, this generation in the job market now is the first generation in a century in the west to be poorer than their parents. The last time that happened was because of a world war.

Our economic poorness makes an excellent metaphor for the emotional landscape men now see. We now look back at history and see how our grandparents could afford that really nice house and that Ferrari. They worked hard and they earned these things. We now realise that the economy is so bad... that we can work twice as hard and we'll still never earn the Ferrari, and we'll be lucky to get a decent apartment. That is how emotionally poor the modern man is - and there's nothing wrong with being angry or depressed by this realisation. *It is. horrible.* With the relationship dynamic so screwed up that a deep emotional connection can no longer be maintained, the women are emotionally poorer too. They're ending up destroying their own relationships and marriages, then ending up alone with cats. This is the decline gentlemen. It's no wonder we're all so miserable with the modern dating market.

FR - Flying by the seat of my pants

155 upvotes | November 5, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

So it's been a while since my last FR... I actually wrote this one a while back, months ago, and then forgot about it. I stumbled across it when checking some old unfinished pieces I'd been putting together. This one reminded me just how important non-verbal communication is. Aura, exchanged looks and dominant presence, used to achieve an extremely rapid escalation. So here you have it.

I was driving overnight to visit a friend. (It's a good way to avoid traffic.) Decided to stop at a services to stretch my legs and get a coffee. I'm not looking my very best, my hair is a bit of a mess but my style is still very unique so I tend to still get some looks anyway. If I just did basic t-shirt and jeans, I don't get the looks. Cultivate your own unique style gentlemen and you'll get noticed for it. So I head for the coffee shop and order my coffee to sit in. There's barely anybody around, the place is almost deserted except for a couple of people eating at the burger king.

The petite chick who served me is very much the definition of a butterface. Looks early 20s, face is about 4 or 5/10 but she had a banging body 8/10 and her uniform couldn't hide the distinct hourglass shape and big perky tits. I'm not even thinking about gaming this chick, so I just wait in silence and read the scrolling news on the big screen telly. All of a sudden, she engages me in conversation, wants to know what I've been up to. Now banging this chick was not on my mind at all, but I'm used to running a very lazy style of game (I don't go out of my way to approach, I let the situation dictate the terms of engagement for me which allows me to achieve a much higher conversion rate than a PUA - I waste a lot less time and focus on myself)... as a result of this style of game, it tends to flow more naturally and makes me much more reactionary which has helped me to improve my ability to identify signals and read between the lines. If you want to practice this, then just put in less effort and start analysing more for signs. Care less about whether you bang her while you're learning. So this chick keeps stealing glances at me, some of which were certainly not looking for my face/eyes. So I indulge the conversation and talk some bullshit about being a model and getting back from an exhausting shoot.

She ate this up and was interested and asked more questions. (Seriously, me... a model. I am nowhere near good looking enough to be a model... but chicks will eat whatever bullshit you give them if they're into you. You can use stupid shit like this to test her.) It's at this point I decide I'm going to game her, throwing a quick neg about her hair being disgusting at the moment. She laughs and shoots me a smile and some eye contact. She serves my coffee and I use the chance to do some intentionally "accidental" kino. (Get that psychological barrier broken.) She asks if there's anything else she can do for me and I tell her I'll let her know. Walk off, don't look back and go enjoy my coffee. She cleans up and glances in my direction now and again. I'm busy on my phone browsing stuff while I drink my coffee and plan my next move.

With the coffee finished, I head back over to her and ask where the gents is. She tells me, but I tell her she should show me instead. She's hesitant and I point out there's nobody here to serve except me and "I require your service." (Note: If my SMV wasn't high enough, that would have come across as weird or creepy, but because my SMV is high enough, it's cute flirting.) Cheeky grin with that and she's smiling ear to ear, then comes bouncing out through the door at the side. At this point I'm pretty sure she's a little confused but also intrigued. Add some casual kino as she comes to lead the way. (Back of hands touching, arms touching, simple casual stuff when you're in her space.) I push her

gently on the small of her back saying "lead on" as a way to estimate and see if there's any negative signs. None.

So we get round the corner, literally like a 20 second walk. It was truly pointless from a rational perspective, but I needed to move her to a position where I could escalate properly. There's nobody about, so I just open the disabled toilet door and say "after you." Her eyes go wide and she covers her mouth to try and hide her big smile in a slightly coy, cute way. Extended eye contact from me that she keeps breaking, she's just rooted to the spot. Probably thinking "is this really happening?" She tells me that she can't and I just continue to give her the "I'm going to fuck you senseless" look with a smirk. So I don't break eye contact and step forward and take her wrist. Then make a bit of a show of looking around and seeing nobody. I smirk and then tug her wrist gently and she follows me inside. No words. Close and lock the door and she's got her hands all over me immediately and is practically ripping at my shirt.

Not a huge amount of foreplay, but while she's sucking my dick I pick up my jacket and thank my past self for putting the couple of condoms in my wallet. Always make sure you've got some condoms on you guys. - And make sure you take the time to get condoms that fit properly, it will improve the experience immeasurably.

Anyway, we're all done and I tell her to wait inside until I knock on the door. I'll just stand outside checking my phone if anybody is around, and when the coast is clear I'll knock on the door. I don't want her to get sacked for having fun with me and giving in to the tingles. So I check the coast is clear, knock on the door and leave.

I think this FR is particularly useful to guys because you should note how little I actually said to her. Most of that was identifying opportunities and making the small escalations I could within the circumstances... most of which were heavily between the lines. Pure non-verbal communication won the day. Practice your non-verbal communication, prepare yourself to react as things develop. Sexual desire can't be negotiated, if it's there then it is there and you may act on it. If it's not, then it's not and you can't act. This was purely flying by the seat-of-my-pants and helping her into a position where she could let go to her urges without her social status being in question. Check the attraction, then escalate, use escalation as a double check and just lead her into a position where she can throw rationality out the window in favour of sexual desire. I still don't know her name and she doesn't know mine. Desire is the only thing that was important here. Probably fulfilled a fantasy of hers too... and nobody else knows except me... and probably her friends. And now you too.

EDIT: This also reminded me of a talk I watched about a year ago by [Liam McRae on Rapid Escalation](#) which is very relevant to this discussion. Take what you like from it. I'm nothing new, guys have been learning to spot the signs and escalate for years if the desire is there.

Feminism is actually hedonism

498 upvotes | November 11, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

I was thinking the other day about the various hypocrisies of feminism and how they want feminine supremacy, but also want to be dominated in the bedroom and approached first... because no means no except when it means yes and yes can mean no in circumstances where yes sorta means yes but hindsight makes it mean no in that no means yes but it really means no when we've finally made our mind up but it still could have meant yes if it hadn't meant no. Am I acting like a feminist yet? This hedging your bets and never making a decision thing is easy. Does your head hurt?

The reason the feminist narrative on things like this confuses the living fuck out of anyone with either a basic understanding of logic, or simply anyone with their head screwed on correctly, is that it takes diametrically opposite views, statements, thoughts and policies without any shame in trotting them out like they actually make sense. "Yes" and "no" are diametrically opposed statements. Yes can't mean no, and no can't mean yes. (We are talking straight talk in here, not womanese for the smartarse who's about to point out how women can mean yes when they say no in social situations.) In terms of raw statement, they mean the total opposite. This is the basis of the doublethink fallacy that feminists are so fond of. It's how they can say that their rights should not be infringed upon, while simultaneously campaigning to infringe on the rights of others.

However I think there is a more instructive term that will better predict this behaviour, their doublethink and hypocrisy.

Hedonism.

They're not interested in feminine supremacy in and of itself as such, that will just be a side effect of their limitless hedonism-fuelled rationalisations and doublethink. I recently posited in a thread that feminism happily praises liberal philosophy when it suits them and provides pleasure (having casual sex, getting drunk, obesity/fat-positivity) but then on the exact same topics, it will adopt the diametrically opposite authoritarian philosophy to try and reduce the accompanying displeasure or pain (slut shaming, rape apologists, fat shaming are their cries.) I posit from this that the behaviour of feminism will act according to hedonistic principles on any particular topic.

Let's look at where they want quotas and where they aren't interested in adding quotas. They want quotas for women in:

- CEO positions
- Major company board rooms
- Political roles
- Science and Technology
- Engineering

All of these positions are either extremely well paid or very well paid and the top three include strong elements of power, respect and control over others. Now let's look at a few areas they don't want quotas to balance out either a lack of women or a lack of men:

- Refuse collection
- Sewer and drainage maintenance

- Secretarial work
- Teaching
- Nursing

The first two are male dominated. They generally have poor pay because they are mostly unskilled positions. There's no respect factor and the work could be considered unpleasant by many. Making women work in these fields would hurt them. So no quotas because we don't want pain.

Secretarial work is reasonably paid considering how low skill it is. This area is dominated by women. Putting in quotas disadvantages women in a field where the remuneration to skill level ratio is rather favourable. It would hurt women to do this. So no quotas because it would cause pain.

Teaching and nursing are reasonably paid to well paid professions, depending on where you fall on the scale. Both are dominated by women. Again, adding quotas for men to get jobs in these areas to achieve an arbitrary gender balance would cause pain to women. A woman could miss out on a well paid job, that is not maximising pleasure, but by continuing their dominance and continuing this idea that women are better empathisers (and thus have superior softer skills for these jobs) it minimises the pain for women. - i.e. not only do they dominate the fields, but they're more likely to get hired into these jobs too because of the false narrative of being better at it just because they're female.

Whilst we're on the topic of arbitrary quotas for gender, let's logically destroy it as an idea/concept. It's pissed me off for a long time, ever since I had the misfortune of being brought into a discussion with a feminist who couldn't justify to me the need for this arbitrary 50/50 split of gender. It's always dismissed as "women make up half the work force so they need to be represented in higher positions." They could not appreciate the concept that if a company has 75 men and 25 women, and then has 10 positions of power, it is very reasonable to have 8 men and 2 women in these positions of power. This is the likely ratio that a meritocracy would lead to and the ratio for everyone is 1 in 10. When you introduce a discriminatory quota and demand a 50/50 split, you have 75 men looking at 5 positions of power, a 1 in 15 representation for men, while women have a 1 in 5 representation. From this, you are now representing women three times as much as men.

But let's get away from the numbers for a moment, because we know feminists don't like numbers unless they've been made up like 1 in 5 statistics are. (And for the brainless feminist who reads this and thinks that is equivalent to my ratios from before... you're so much of an idiot that you're genuinely beyond helping.) Let's talk about the representation aspect. The idea that since women make up half the population of the country, they should be represented in the running of the country has a veneer of credibility to any fair minded person at first glance. However it rests upon the assumption that a man can't represent a woman's interests. Only a woman can do that.

They don't bother to point out that the entire democratic system would require an overhaul in order to address this factor. All current states in the US and constituencies in the UK would need to have separate male and female candidate lists and elect one male and one female in order to ensure that all women are represented fairly. (Under the current system, your local Senator or MP could be a man... which means he can't represent women based on the fact he has a penis.) No, instead we will force all-female quotas for top positions, because this makes the progression for these women easier, maximising the pleasure for women with no extra effort.

However, they conveniently gloss over things like the "He for She" campaign, which by definition demonstrates that **men can represent women**. The acceptance and endorsement of male feminists within their community shows clearly that genitals don't actually matter to feminists either when it

comes to representation. It's about following their narrative. Enforcing this doublethink means they don't lose out on mangina puppets spreading their propaganda, the reduction in pain and increase in pleasure/things that benefit them all rolled into one. So the very basis of their argument for increased representation doesn't even stand to begin with.

Everything feminism does is selfish. It is not an ideology and has nothing to do with equality. It is defined by the actions of a group attempting to legislate and manipulate culture for the sole purpose of enabling optimal female hedonism.

Mic drop.

On Leadership

66 upvotes | November 21, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Upon returning home, I had a quick flick through my previous comments to remind myself what I said I'd do. After noticing a couple of comments sitting in minus figures, I re-read them so I could have a laugh at what silly newbies were getting upset about... basically that I wasn't providing help to the specific standard that they demanded. Take a break here so you can have a good laugh at how entitled that is.

Let me tell you something right now, I (nor anyone else on TRP) is here to lead your life for you. There is only one person who can take the lead in your life and who is best suited to lead you... **that is YOU**. You should already have a reasonably good idea of your strengths and weaknesses. Since you know these more intimately than others, you're in a much better position to make the decisions for that person.

Now this is one of the little nuances of TRP that gets misconstrued all the time. It's why TRP is called dogmatic and dictatorial. Which it is to a certain degree, a necessity in order to maintain the quality of the area. If you want to disagree with the basics, then head on over to purple pill debate. We don't have time to keep having to rejustify the sidebar every time a newbie shows up. The attitude is: if you agree, then come read more. If you disagree, there's the door. It's pretty simple and actually more libertarian than you'd think since it emphasises a space for individual decisions. For leadership of your own life.

One of the biggest problems in the modern western world, due to the feminisation of it, is this submissive and indecisive attitude which is being taken up by so many. These people don't want to make decisions because they might make the wrong choice. Instead they look to someone more qualified to make the decision for them. As logic, this isn't a bad idea. Unfortunately life does not operate on pure logic or frequently allow you second chances or perfect scenarios. It's a messy, ugly, irrational world you're dealing with that has little bits of logical sense scattered here and there. There is a reason we developed irrational instincts... because they worked in a pragmatic approach to things we don't 100% understand. And because they're irrational, they too are not going to work correctly 100% of the time either. We are all making educated guesses about most things in life either because we don't have all the facts or we don't have the time to analyse things properly. This isn't bad in and of itself... it's just the reality we have to accept and base our decisions upon.

So this brings me to something that raises the fear many guys have when it comes to taking command of their own lives: You're going to fuck up. You're going to make bad choices. You're going to look back and realise you did something wrong and you're going to have to pull it back together, get up, dust yourself down and carry on. And it's not because you're beta. It's not because you didn't get the right advice. It's not because you didn't do the right reading. It's because you're a human being and humans are prone to error. When you're living in a world where behaviour is sometimes rational and sometimes irrational, it's not surprising that you can't figure out which is going to happen on every single occasion. It's normal. And it's normal to feel a little upset or sad or angry when things don't go right. That's natural emotion. Nothing wrong with it. (Just don't be sharing that heavy stuff with women.)

However, you need to start taking those risks. You need to make those fucks up, because even if you make a decision and it's wrong... YOU made that decision and you led. This is the goal for all TRP

apprentices. You may seek advice and do reading... but don't look to anyone else to sit in your shoes and say what they'd do... because they're not you. I can react as me to a chick you describe... but ultimately only *you* can decide:

- how **you'd** best react to that chick.
- What interests you should be pursuing.
- What style best suits your features.
- What attitude and style of game will work best for you.

It's important that you take the lead on these individual aspects instead of asking for others to do it for you, because these issues are personal and if you try to fake being a different type of alpha to your own style... women will sniff it out and sense there's something fake about you. The end goal is to make your attitude, style of game and dress sense seem natural. Look at what **you** could be... not who is most successful. Those guys might be genetically different to you and therefore you're unable to become the same type of alpha as them... but that doesn't mean you can't be an alpha. Alphas are as diverse as the human gene pool.

You also have to remember that women want a natural alpha. The guy who "just gets it." She is not interested in the process a man goes through to become an alpha or the hard work he puts in. She wants the end product. Women can't see that it requires effort to become high SMV. This is because they don't need to put in effort to become high SMV. An HB8 or HB9 develops into that due to her genetics, as long as she doesn't overeat/not bother taking care of herself. The reason they want the man who effortlessly achieved great value... is because if the man did that effortlessly, it's because his position at the head of the pack was determined by his genetics. Hence great genetics. Hence she wants him for baby-making. So if you seem like you're not naturally at the head of the pack and you're faking your position there... there must be something wrong with your genetics. Bitch don't want faulty genetics. And that's all she wrote on it. They don't think about how a guy "eventually gets it" because they don't care. They want the guy who already "just gets it." So you need to become that natural.

Which brings me round to why leadership is so important for a man and how it fits in around here. As I said earlier, you are the one in the best position to know your strengths and weaknesses. Remember that alphas are as diverse as the gene pool. Similarly, the successful Red Pill men on here are also very diverse and each brings their own style of leadership to the table as demonstration. But the one thing they all have in common is that they're leading their own lives. They're standing up for their own analysis and their own opinions. They're not looking to others to do it for them. If you're respectful of the other men here, then they will be respectful to you, so you have nothing to fear in putting forward your own analysis/opinions and then standing by them. **BUT** remain humble as a new leader. As an inexperienced leader, you're likely to be worse at it than others, so be prepared to be proven wrong and accept the learning curve. That said, **it's part of the process because you must become a leader.**

This is because TRP is partly about teaching all men to become leaders. Leaders in their own lives, and leaders of women. Since most women are naturally submissive, they will look to you for leadership. You want a successful sexual strategy? **You need to be able to lead them.** You want to raise your SMV? We can give you the starting word: "LIFT!" But you've got to decide what programme you'll start and how you'll approach your diet. You're the one leading the project to improve your SMV. You're the one leading the project to become whatever it is you've chosen to be,

whether that's a plate spinner, LTR man or MGTOW. Seek advice and knowledge, not decisions. You can still compare and contrast your approach with what others would do as a learning experience... but in the end, **you need to be making your own calls sooner rather than later.** Get on that learning curve ASAP!

Just because you aren't leading the TRP sub, does not mean you are to be a follower. Leaders can work effectively together. Seek out my old post titled "Roles, Respect and Responsibility acceptance as an alpha trait" for an explanation of how they do.

Alpha males are leaders, not followers. You don't need to be mod, manager or president to be a leader. There's living proof all over this sub.

Basic Guide to Argumentation and Intellectual Growth

101 upvotes | November 30, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Summary: Firstly, this is a very long read. (More than twice the length of an essay.) The topic attempts to give you an overview of how argumentation works to achieve the goal of better understanding/getting you closer to truth. It is also *very meta*, because of the way I'm trying to get above the arguments themselves and provide some more generalised tools with wider applicability. I've tried to be as brief as I can, but this simply can't be covered effectively enough in a couple of paragraphs.

Background (or why am I talking about argumentation?)

When I first started posting my own original content to TRP after months lurking, I did a piece on intellectual growth entitled "[On Debating and Discussion as a Man.](#)" Let me quickly give a little background for context. I felt qualified writing about that early on because I'd spent the better part of a decade as a competitive debater, teaching it in schools and universities while competing up to international level. As with all types of analysis and critical thinking, argumentation is a skill that needs to be learned.

You do not need to be a competitive debater to learn the skills or enjoy the benefits. We typically learn good and bad arguments as we go along through life. However I would say circa 99% of people can't argue for shit even when they've got a good argument. Some don't really care enough, while others have selected their views, and that's it. The latter are a waste of oxygen in my opinion. An open mind is the way to intellectual growth. Being right is all well and good, but the way you actually grow and improve intellectually is through being proven wrong and changing your mind when a stronger argument comes along. Going into all discussions with the possibility that you could be wrong in the back of your mind is a good way to achieve this. (Not to be confused with being a pushover who changes their views with the political winds like Hilary Clinton.) This is fairly well covered in my original post that is almost a year old.

Typically I avoid talking about argumentation because it's not very popular. (It's not popular because it tends to destroy dogmatic emotion-based beliefs. - It hurts when you've stacked so much on your emotions and your mind can't back it up. - Bloopers don't like it for that reason. Idiots don't like it because they can't comprehend it, since you're applying generalised knowledge to a variety of facts and situations. Similar to how we apply Red Pill theory when we're out in the field observing the interactions of men and women.) However I've got a couple of reasons why I'm bringing this up now:

1. There has been a number of newer members with dogmatic views and lack of nuance. Rather than writing a massive 10,000 word dissertation on the nuances of the Pill from my personal vantage point, I want to give others the tools to dissect and separate nonsense from quality on their own terms. i.e. I won't give you a fish, I'm going to try and teach you the basics of fishing.
2. Being able to intellectually beat up someone else is legal, and I'm reasonably sure from both my days as a greater beta (and more recent months) that being able to intellectually dominate someone will turn on some girls. (Not all, obviously. But as I always advocate, more tools in

the box is better. You'll typically be seen as a better leader if you have better ideas and can prove it.) Usually these women are not feminists and a little more intelligent and in control of their emotions. Attracting a better quality of plate/LTR, who is easier to manage, is never a bad thing.

3. Part of TRP is to continually strive to improve yourself. It is important to think this way in order to have a successful sexual strategy. You alter your workout based upon changes and new information to continually improve your body... you should alter your thoughts and approach to things to continually improve your mind too.
4. Intellectual growth can actually become a pleasant thing in its own right. To quote [/u/IlimitableMan](#) "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." I think many learning TRP are not merely happy at finally having a way to enjoy sex on their own terms... but actually learning something which makes sense in regards to the interactions between men and women is a thoroughly pleasing experience when you realise you were previously flailing around in the dark.
5. The entire reason you've been able to swallow TRP is because your mind was open to the prospect that the mainstream thought was possibly wrong. I ask you to keep that open mind and consider the tools I offer you. You reserve the right to reject them if you wish.

So now I'm going to try and provide a really basic overview of argumentation and the difference between making a point and refuting it. Then I'll show why we should bear this in mind when we're reading suggestions and engaging in discussion here on the sub. My hope is that this will provide the tools for you to make better critical analysis of what you see and hear on the sub, which in turn will allow the cream to rise to the top more easily.

When you make a good argument, it typically consists of three things:

- Fact(s)
- Base principle(s)
- Causal logic (which links to the final conclusion.)

As an aside - The fourth thing which is taught to a competitive debater, but is less useful for you guys is rhetoric. Rhetoric is all about using things like weasel words to downplay the weaknesses of your argument and utilising emotive words to try and engage the emotions of your audience to sympathise so that those without analytical skill will also be convinced by you. (Believe me, it works, I've seen a couple of hundred students go from anti-death to endorsing cold blooded murder on my terms because I told them it was okay. Originally I was proud that day... after looking at where society has gone today, I look back on that day and feel frightened at how easy it is to sway idiots.)

Those three things make good arguments, without at least two of them you have nothing but a statement of opinion. Such a thing is worthless unless it can be backed up. The process of using two or three of these to build an argument is similar to putting down foundations and building a tower. The difference that refuting an argument has is that it's much simpler to refute something. There are two ways to refute something, you can prove it untrustworthy by pointing out a counter-example where their logic doesn't fit or you can demonstrate that their logic comes to a more ambiguous conclusion than they first showed. (I will try to provide brief examples in a moment to try and be as

clear as possible.) Or you can destroy it altogether. The latter requires more work because it is effectively building an argument that shows the opposite of what has been put forward.

Discussions rarely have something 100% right, so it is a matter of seeing which is more right, or sometimes which is the lesser evil. Since everything is mostly shades of grey, discussions that start from a black and white perspective will typically end up exploring the nuances. So for example, if someone has created an argument around AWALT, the refutation of this is a counter example of the behaviour of some of the ladies over on RedPillWomen. This refutation leads to an exploration of the nuance around AWALT, which I won't get into detail on here. Suffice to say it's about the base biological urges and feelings which can be controlled by some women, some of the time. Further Reading.

For the statement women are perfectly capable of love as a man hopes and all Red Pill is just bitter... this is a wide sweeping argument that would need to be built on some cherry picked examples of marriages and the behaviour of those couples. You'd not want to just show a counter example or show that it doesn't always end happily ever after. Here is where you'd look at a complete counter argument that destroys it completely... which would pick up huge amounts of reading across TRP. Basically most of the sidebar would be employed to give a full explanation as to why this statement was completely false. (Again, I'm trying to be brief, - and writing out the whole of Red Pill in one post is not brief, but I believe that this demonstrates the point well enough for everyone to understand the application.)

Once an argument is refuted, it no longer stands. Much like yanking a supporting beam from the tower, it doesn't stand anymore. When the person tries to shore it up, that's when you get into discussion of nuance and get to the specific positions of the people involved. That is the basics of what can happen in every single useful argument ever.

I want to enhance something /u/IllimitableMan said - "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." - This is where you can get into nuance and enhance your point of view to try and take into account the points of critique and explain them. Or you can weigh up and contrast whether the opinion can still stand, even with the critique or not. This is all intellectual growth and self improvement. More understanding means you can address more things in the world around you. More tools in the box.

People shouting statements at each other, trading insults, attempting shaming tactics, responding to a strawman, or just repeating their original point do not contribute anything useful and you can't grow intellectually from listening to them, so move on. That is the generalised overview that you can apply to absolutely any topic you discuss to get the most out of it and to know when to walk away. (And believe me, you will walk away often in the real world.)

A quick point on engagement

While there is a huge amount more to discuss in general terms about argumentation (to the point at which I can teach people to be capable of arguing about almost anything with minimal knowledge of the topic, and be convincing), there's one thing I see often on TRP: disengagement.

Disengagement is the term used to describe when someone entering an argument will try to refute a point or counter it by switching the specific topic of the argument. This is bad because no specific conclusion can be reached since the territory of the discussion keeps changing. It is similar to the way women tend to move the goalposts in a fashion that infuriates most men, even the bloopers. However it is not always as obvious as you'd think.

A now-classic example of the non-obvious version, on TRP, is the responses to the censorship by mods of material in order to keep the signal to noise ratio high. Since this is subjective, you naturally end up with some people who disagree with the decisions they make. The standard reaction from them is "but my free speech" or "you say you have open minds about things and you clearly don't." On the surface these seem like logical or intelligent responses since TRP does indeed like us being able to speak freely without things like political correctness getting in the way, and we do indeed have open minds because we want to have the best knowledge and discussion on sexual strategy. However, they are disengagements (and some naturally sense this and dismiss it without being able to explain it.)

To engage with the point on censorship you must either:

- challenge and disprove that the censorship the mods engage in, does not achieve the goal
- demonstrate that the censorship is actually counter-productive to this goal
- or logically demonstrate a method that would be more effective and why it would be more effective **when compared and contrasted** with the current method at achieving the end goal

(You can probably appreciate that this is all very targeted at achieving something from the discussion. This is why good understanding of argumentation is a great benefit - it allows you to get so much more out of disagreements and discussions.)

While my general view on this is that it's not our role to decide on how moderation works, I'll address this from principle instead to show the disengagement. The mods have shown time and again why the censorship fits with the pragmatic principles of TRP, so what has actually happened when the disengagement has occurred, is the guys disagreeing have strawmanned the base principle of TRP to be classical liberal individualism above and beyond everything else. It is not. (To put it another way, they are effectively stating that maintaining the liberal principle is more important than achieving the goal set. Forgetting that the principle of pragmatism places the achievement of the goal as the top priority.)

While the liberal principle of free speech is used to some degree on the sub, it has been adopted for pragmatic reasons (free exchange of ideas to achieve better understanding) so the principle is trumped by pragmatism here and that is/has been/probably always will be, the stance of the sub. (For the actual specifics straight from the horse's mouth, [go here](#). I'm merely using it as an example you guys are likely to be familiar with, in order to demonstrate a point.) That's not to say moral and political principles can't be discussed, it's to say they won't be ruling the sub and hopefully this provides a reasonably accurate explanation of the underlying reasoning for these nuances - and subsequently why the disengagement causes confusion among some people.

That last sentence is an aside, but the three points can be generalised to anything:

- the logic does not actually reach the conclusion
- the logic/method actually achieves some other conclusion

- compare the benefits of this with an alternative and contrast to prove the alternative is better

Keeping those in mind will ensure you always engage directly with the issue being discussed. In addition, I would tell you to never be afraid to concede points. If you are interested in learning and growing your mind, then you need to understand the PoV of the person you're talking to and they need to understand you. So it is very useful if you make it easy by pointing out the things you agree on, so that you can get down to the specific nuance where the disagreement is happening. You'll learn a bit about what you think and value in doing this. (Hurrah! Both personal and intellectual growth all in one!)

This post was a very meta overview and I've tried to include specific examples to demonstrate the application. As a result, I am well aware that it can be tough to get your head around and that may be down to me not being clear enough. In my attempt at brevity, I'm sure this has happened somewhere. So I'll be watching this topic to answer questions and provide clarification where I can. If you're interested in me writing more on this, then let me know and I'll see if I can put together something on base principles and assumption analysis. (Again, generalised, widely applicable to any topic.)

Reggie Yates documentary on the manosphere - A review

19 upvotes | December 16, 2015 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

For those of you who aren't aware, there was recently an hour long documentary put together in the UK on the manosphere. I recently watched this and have put together a review so that you won't have to waste your time watching it.

Background:

In short, the "documentary" - and I use the term loosely - by Reggie Yates on BBC 3 entitled "Men at war" (a part of his "Extreme UK" series) doesn't seem to actually understand the topic they're covering. (If you're wondering who Reggie Yates is... just consider him a minor celebrity from the UK.) In addition to this, the choice of language Reggie uses gives a clear indication of his biases and prejudice. His mind doesn't seem open to any of their views in the first place. Most of the men featured in this have their statements put forward and then (if they did justify the view afterwards) their justification or logic behind the statement is edited out. So this is pretty standard misrepresentation and spreading of misinformation about the manosphere.

Reggie himself is a feminist supporter because "I have sisters and like they need to be allowed to blossom" or some such nonsense. Demonstrating that he hasn't actually done his research properly. Everybody here knows that feminism is not a cut-and-dry "we want equality for women" movement. It does not act that way when you research it properly and you don't have to look far to find this evidence. A brief youtube search will find videos full of evidence. Stop assuming feminism can do no wrong Reggie, they can, have, and continue to do so.

The Review

So let's hack this shite into a few pieces. First off, they're poisoning the well rather nicely from the outset. When the show is called "Extreme UK" it's automatically suggesting that anyone who participates in the manosphere is an extremist of some description. (Nobody here could possibly be remotely reasonable, durr!)

A major issue for Reggie is that he is from another world where the problems we talk about don't actually exist. In the realms of celebrity, your SMV is artificially inflated so he'd never have any reason to seek out advice from the likes of Roosh and has no incentive to truly consider what he has to say. Roosh himself is misrepresented through some clever editing. Once again it is the issue of keeping the outrageous statements and skipping over any logic or reason to back them up. Reggie notes that the men going to Roosh's talk don't want to be seen and says this is odd... but then never tries to actually understand why. There is no further attempt to research and understand why these actions are being taken. This is a familiar theme in the documentary: they take statements and behaviours of people and portray them in a way to make them seem as absurd as possible and then never try to make any sense out of it. It is quite literally the definition of how not to make a documentary.

Which brings him to his discovery of MGTOW. When the community hears he's trying to interview

some of them, the community itself closes ranks and advises everyone to stay away and keep their faces well away from this. Again, Reggie makes no attempt to understand this, instead he remarks while chuckling "we haven't even done anything yet." - Again, trying to portray them as stupid instead of actually trying to comprehend their behaviour. I've said before that the BBC is horrendously biased, and many of the MGTOWs pointed this out too. Reggie dismisses this without any thought. By this point I'm starting to wonder if he's actually capable of independent thought. His behaviour suggests he isn't.

Next, the first interview with Milo Yiannopoulos is absurdly short. It has about 2 minutes of screen time. He builds up Milo as someone worth talking to and then gives him about 3 sentences worth of air time beyond the "hi, how are you" intro bit. Seriously Reggie? You think this is making a quality documentary?

The biggest problem that Reggie faces is that his mind is closed. When you see him discussing false rape with the 18yr old MRA, Reggie states "rape is happening on every street" which is an utterly absurd claim when you look at the stats. (You should be happy Reggie. We live in a society where gang rape isn't a bonding ritual and rite of passage like it is in some parts of Africa.) If the MRA took him to task on that, then it was cut during editing and the statement is left out there like some universal truth. The whole rape culture myth is probably one of the most damaging myths our society currently spreads. It's extremely disheartening to see it so casually reaffirmed. He's basically just a mouthpiece for the mainstream. There's no analysis or research going on here. I'd probably get a better level of research from a school kid.

Reggie comes back to check on how the MGTOWs have responded to his call for an interview. And the MGTOWs have basically told him to fuck off... quite literally. Some of the abuse is directed at his race and it's simply not making the MGTOWs look very good. Giving him precisely the ammunition he needs to portray them negatively.

So now he moves on to talk to Laurie Penny who does the standard complaint about abusive messages etc etc. No point delving into the fact that this happens to both feminists and MRAs Reggie... no, that would be balanced reporting and you're too busy doing a hatchet job. Seriously, there is no analysis of her views or what she says... it's just a pity party for the fact some idiots send her mean messages and shop her face into porn pics (if this is the worst thing that happens to you... oh boy have you had an easy life!)

But no hatchet job is complete without returning to Roosh for the piece de resistance: quote mining Roosh's books and who could forget that "make rape legal" piece he wrote. Basically all of the most retarded things Roosh has ever written being read back to back in the space of 60 seconds. Then he describes him as the "mammoth of the manosphere." Great... In fairness to Reggie, he does keep in the explanations Roosh gives for these things... but it seems like the well has already been poisoned and he describes Roosh as attempting to act like a victim. Which he does because he is partially a victim - he was assaulted in Canada. We just see what we already know, that Roosh isn't the brightest penny in the fountain when it comes to PR.

The whole thing ends on a rather odd note where he talks relatively coherently on the issue of male role models. He uses this to have a dig at the men in the manosphere having "issues" and "inadequacies." Makes you wonder what he'd make of the role models here on TRP. Perhaps he could interview GLO on the topic of treating women like children? He wraps it up saying that all these men really need is just a confidence boost. That's a nice coat of gloss to put over pretty much everything

you've missed.

I don't think Reggie is a bad person. He seems like an affable kind of guy, but I think he's probably just too lightweight to deal with something like the mansphere. (Also, an hour is nowhere near long enough to actually do a proper documentary on it. They'd need to do a series of hour long episodes to explain it all properly.) In summary, the research was poor and there was a lot of quote mining to simply reinforce the mainstream image and portray all of this as a large number of extremists. It's what we've come to expect from the BBC... they are feminists through and through. It is their religion. They blindly believe everything without question and parrot it all back to the viewing public. I wouldn't bother watching this: it's just another misrepresentation.

Jennifer Lawrence explains her fee-fees

270 upvotes | January 6, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

Just a quick reminder that Red Pill examples are all around us and that the blue pill women have got it wrong.

During my lunchtime browsing and keeping up with the news and so forth, I stumble across a piece that doesn't really belong in my trawling. However, the title screamed Red Pill at me, so I figured I'd double check.

The article was entitled [Jennifer Lawrence talks love life after Chris Martin: I'm single because I'm picky](#). Now before you click the link, let's make some predictions based upon what we know about Jen and about TRP theory. Jen is extremely successful and has press telling her she's a 10/10 beauty. (In my humble opinion, she's at most an 8, but remember... objectivity is irrelevant for women. I've seen 5s confidently declare they're easily HB8s.) So her view of her SMV will be stratospheric - 11/10 level. Therefore she'll only date 12/10s. The sort of men who have looks, muscles, status and bank big time, or a man with truly supreme status within his industry and the public view. From that alone, we already know the title is a rationalisation because she's not going to be attracted to many men. It's not that she's picky, it's that she's so successful that her pool of potential men is ridiculously small. This is not "where have all the good men gone?" this is "why are there no men in the first place?"

We can also assume that she probably shit tests off the charts as a result of this. Giving a girl absolutely everything will make her completely entitled to the very very best of top tier men. So let's turn to the article now and see what we can find that supports or refutes these predictions.

She is one of the most desirable women on the planet but Jennifer Lawrence as revealed that she is extremely "picky" when it comes to men. Speaking to America's Glamour magazine, the Hunger Games star revealed that despite the constant speculation surrounding her personal life, **she rarely feels attracted to someone.**

Straight out the starting gates and here we have it. Check the emphasis. Her perceived SMV is so high, even in Hollywood she can't find men with the stratospherically high level of SMV required. Women only feel attraction to superior men, and her dating pool is tiny.

"I'm picky. I feel a spark very, very rarely. **And it's really only about spark for me.** Not really anything else. **You should see some of the people I find attractive. You'd be shocked,**" she said. "I don't, like, date a lot. I don't meet a lot of guys who I want to go on a date with. **I'll find a guy attractive maybe once a year.**"

Emphasis mine, the last bit is just reiteration of the previous point. The rationalisation here is that she's picky because there's no other way to explain why she doesn't feel the fee-fees for many men. Once a year. It's all about spark just reaffirms what we know, women tend to follow their feelings first on things. Attraction is non-negotiable. "The spark" is either there or it isn't. That's just womanese for attraction. (Because they can't actually say shit straight up because fee-fees are very important.) After all "there's no spark" is much nicer than "I don't feel any attraction for you. In fact, you showing romantic interest in me, when I'm not attracted, repulses me."

Finally, let's keep this balanced: maybe I would be shocked at some of the men you find attractive.

Though I bet I could still explain it. Status trumps all. So perhaps my statement that she wants looks, muscles, bank and status is a little much. Perhaps she's referring to guys like Jack Nicholson.

The screen siren, who currently stars in semi-biographical comedy drama film Joy, previously dated her X-Men cast mate Nicholas Hoult. In August 2014 she was romantically linked to Coldplay frontman Chris Martin, 38, following his split from ex-wife Gwyneth Paltrow. The couple are said to have ended their **turbulent relationship in 2015**.

Her taste in male status is going up. Not surprising considering how she's become more and more successful in the past few years. There aren't many men in music with higher status than Chris Martin. Given the sort of music he writes, I'd say he's pretty blue pill and submissive, so combine that with the shit testing levels I previously predicted... a turbulent relationship is not remotely surprising.

While the prospect of being alone might frighten some people, the Oscar-winner insisted that she didn't believe she was lacking anything by choosing to stay single. "I'm not a lonely person. Me not dating someone is not a lack of anything in any way," she explained. "I feel completely fulfilled. Yes, when I spark with someone, it's exciting, but I definitely don't need that."

A woman rationalising that she doesn't really want what she can't seem to get? Nothing to see here guys.

Her frank revelation come just weeks after she admitted to sharing a secret smooch with her Hunger Games co-star Liam Hemsworth, who plays her character's best friend Gale Hawthorne. The pair have been dogged with romance rumours ever since they first showed off their on-screen chemistry in the first instalment of the franchise back in 2012.

"Liam and I grew up together. Liam's real hot, what would you have done? Yeah," she said during a game of Plead The Fifth on Bravo's Watch What Happens with Andy Cohen.

This is the most interesting. The woman attracts the most top tier of men that other women would happily murder their entire family in order to fuck, and there's clearly some physical attraction. But they grew up together, so she's seen his beta side (and make no mistake, no man is alpha all the time throughout his entire life. It's impossible. That's why we encourage you to take time away from your women and hang out with the guys, so they don't see the moments of non-alphaness. Only the guys who don't care about that will.)

I would say this statement that she'll smooch such a high SMV guy... but won't date him... is a very clear indication that status trumps all. She won't settle for reasonably high status men. No, she's got to have the very highest of the high.

Feel free to jump in with your own thoughts. Keep your eyes open and you'll spot all women act exactly as TRP explains they will. None are immune.

Wants vs needs: the sexual attitude nuance

59 upvotes | August 4, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

It's been a while since I've posted anything on here. I have been writing things, but I've been holding them back for a blog because I'm fucking busy all the bloody time. So I'm going to make a special effort to keep an eye on the comments section here despite being away for the weekend.

There's a toxic attitude starting to take hold with some people on TRP around the idea that sex is a need. In simple terms, it's not, it is a **want** rather than a need. Now there's a reason I'm being quite pedantic about this – psychological mindset for one. Secondly it'll hopefully provide a bit of background to that slightly paradoxical phenomenon where the man who doesn't seem to care about sex being more sexually successful.

You can give and take around things like physique, game, status etc and still be successful with women to varying degrees. However if your attitude is wrong then you're highly likely to have a bad time sooner or later. This is because the attitude of sex as a need over-values it and gives too much power to women. While the abundance is real, this won't be an issue for you because you will genuinely just move to another woman when one asks too much of you. However, what about the times for the newer guys when they're faking it until they make it? Or the guys who've hit a little bad luck and all of their plates smashed at once? This is when the over-valuation can harm you.

Let's get one thing out the way first and foremost: the philosophy of sex as a need is central to those perpetual betas/omegas who forever complain about inceldom. (This alone should be enough to have it extinguished as an idea from TRP, but unfortunately we have some contrarians here who hear the feminists saying “men aren't entitled to sex” and just **have** to disagree with them. Sorry guys, even a broken clock is right twice a day.) Much of the confusion here lies in the nuances. This attitude of entitlement to sex simply for existing is wrong. Having an attitude of entitlement to kino/drinks/sex simply for being there in the field is good and will demonstrate confidence/high value etc etc. The field is the difference. The attitude in the field is a necessary projection of attractiveness, the attitude on the sub and in private needs to be one of objectivity. You aren't entitled to sex. You've got to better yourself in order to be worthy. Remember, women are the gatekeepers of sex. You are the gatekeeper of commitment, and only a weak man commits to a woman who can't prove herself worthy. As a man, it is your job to prove yourself worthy of passing the gate for sex.

Now that we've got the attitude difference out of the way, we're going to talk for most of this in the objective view you should use for the sub. Much of TRP is dedicated to achieving sex, however the various bits of self-improvement are there because they link into achieving sex. They increase your value and make you more worthy of sex. When you scale it back to more simplistic terms, increasing your worthiness for sex is the same as making effort to increase achievement of sex. They do the same thing since achievement will be closely tied to worthiness. There is a cheat though, achievement can be made using game without having true worthiness – PUAs are the prime example. This can also be done through fake status or situational status. So if the difference between worthiness and achievement is only cheating, why does the sub endorse achievement over worthiness? The reality is that it endorses anything that achieves. The rest is down to you to decide.

Which brings us nicely to the wants vs needs of this. There are four basic human needs (five if you include shelter/warmth):

- Oxygen
- Water
- Sleep
- Food

I can tell you to go without sex for a day and you will not die. If you go without oxygen for a day, you will die. Oxygen is a need, sex is not.

I can tell you to go without sex for ten days and you will not die. If you go without water for ten days, you will (very likely) die. Water is a need, sex is not.

I can tell you to go for a month without sex and you will not die. If you go without sleep for a month, you will die. Sleep is a need, sex is not.

I can tell you to go without sex for six months and you will not die. If you go without food for six months, you will die. Food is a need, sex is not.

The difference should be *very* clear from those examples. Differing levels of need and sex isn't near any of them. Sex is a want. The fact that we want it every day or twice a day is neither here nor there. It's high up the "want" list, but it's still on that list. The requirement to differentiate between the two is highlighted by the post "Never settle for transactional sex" by [/u/Archwinger](#) who explains:

Remember, if a woman ever imposes rules or conditions on sex, makes you wait for sex, or makes you perform or behave a certain way (e.g., an unofficial payment or trade) for the sex, the sex is never worth what you're going through.

This is something that would be acceptable to a man who views sex as a need and is therefore worth trading for. A Red Pill man would never accept that. (Partly because transactional sex tends to be low quality anyway and in my experience low-quality sex isn't worth the effort.) If it is a want, then you can easily take the stance that trades are unacceptable. You can't do that with a need, because needs must be fulfilled and if costs must be met to fulfil that need, then those costs will be met. Wants allow you to choose and weigh up what you're willing to put in for what you get out. Thus it allows you to reject unfavourable terms. If you haven't drunk water for five days and someone has a bottle of water, you would accept extremely unfavourable terms to get that water. It would actually be rational and sensible to accept unfavourable terms for that bottle of water. However in this day and age where our basic needs are met (and then some) we seem to have forgotten what we can and can't live with. This has allowed us to start accepting unfavourable terms for our wants. In a word: don't.

As sex is not a need, we leave you to decide its importance based upon your own libido, interests and a variety of other wants. TRP gives you the rawness of achievement, including both cheats and ways to improve worthiness. You weigh this against your other wants. You get to decide what is worth your time and investment. Merely taking the lead in your own life and making these decisions for yourself is an instant improvement in attractive attitude and behaviour so I always advise people to start there. Seek the advice required to achieve what you want to achieve, don't ask others to decide for you or try to order your list of wants for you.

A final note on field attitude: the thirsty beta has sex at the top of their wants list. So much so, that they accept unfavourable terms simply to be in the presence of an attractive woman. Make sure your wants are balanced enough that *you* are the one in charge of deciding things. Whether this means increasing your worthiness or cheating, I don't care. Just know the difference and order your wants appropriately to your own life without allowing sex to end up too high up that list causing any bad

trades. A man with abundance mentality does not have to do a trade because he'll take it on his terms or not at all. If you're unwilling to do the "not at all" then you can't have the attitude of "I'll take it on my terms or not at all." It's a package deal guys and women are good at spotting fakes.

Compassion for your fellow man

300 upvotes | October 9, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

This post has been thrown together quickly, so I make no apologies for the quality level. Decide for yourself.

For the EC weekend I wanted to discuss a shorter topic which seems to be forgotten regularly on TRP. That is the situation in our society that lacks compassion for the average man. You'll see regular examples of this in the man paying alimony who can't afford it. The man who can't afford his child support being sent to prison. The general indifference a large chunk of society has towards the male suicide epidemic going on... you'd think in such an advanced society we'd see something like that as a national crisis or major emergency that needed solving as a priority. However it's treated like any ordinary national problem alongside the new doctors contract... to be sorted in due course, but not worthy of being fast-tracked.

It's generally accepted on TRP that you can expect society to largely ignore your needs. In addition to this, in order to remain attractive, you can't expect compassion from women when you are struggling. It makes you look weak and less attractive. We've seen plenty of examples where women admit the feelings of repulsion for a man who requires emotional support from them. (Usually combined with guilt.) Which leaves two places you can get this compassion. Your male friends, and TRP. You could also consider the internet in general, but going to places like r hamsters will usually just get you blamed for being too needy or some such nonsense.

Anyways, one of the things that TRP prides itself on is the freedom to come here and vent. Want to get that anger out? Fine. We're not going to judge you for it. Need a little emotional support because stuff has gone to shit? Fine, we'll do that too. How about you need a kick up the ass for being a little baby? We've got you covered. However this one is where some don't realise where it comes from. All of these are different ways of helping our fellow man which comes from a level of compassion that we all have, (and need to some degree), which is lacking for the men of today. Even when we're telling you that you're a pussy and need to man the fuck up, it comes from that compassion to adapt the message in the best way to get men to excel. In some cases, that challenging language works best to motivate.

The flip side of this is that there are some insecure men who need to tell others they're faggots or pussies mostly out of aggression or directionless rage. In other words, the language isn't there for motivation and compassion never drove it. While I have no interest in tone policing, I would make an observation from a self-improvement perspective: If you're laying down some aggressive language, ask yourself one question: is it to challenge them out of compassion? If not, then perhaps there is some introspection you could do to figure out where this is coming from.

This journey we're on never ends gentlemen. We are all apprentices in a craft we shall never master. Now watch as this post brings out a few of the guys who could do with the introspection I've just mentioned.

[Repost] Roles, respect and responsibility acceptance as an alpha trait

36 upvotes | October 15, 2016 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

This is a repost of a piece I wrote a year ago. We've just had somebody bitching at the mods for banning someone who called a post dumb and the mod was "not alpha." This style of interaction does not fit for a man who's internalised TRP. This post will shed some light on how the interactions between alpha men work and how they can work best. The complete repost along with old context follows.

TL:DR - There is no TL:DR of this. Poor role understanding within the sub has caused the mods to have to post about the leadership and direction of the sub multiple times in the past 12 months. This post tries to solve the root of the problem. If you believe in the overall goals of the sub, then you'll read it in full.

I recently posted a [mini-analysis](#) of the functioning of the sub using an analogy of a military base that didn't quite know the role of every academy graduate. This was an attempt to explain why we keep seeing people questioning the direction of the sub and positing how to solve it as a long term issue.

Keeping with that analogy, we essentially see the squaddies thinking that they can run the base better than the base commander. When the squaddie challenges the drill sergeant on methods of training... they're surprised to be called into the base commander's office and get told they're going to be thrown out. "But... you said that command was always open to ideas? That this is a place where we care about debate and understanding reality ahead of everything else? Without caring about language?"

Yeah, we do. But you fucked up your basic social skills. It's also why your attitude probably isn't working quite so well in the field. Achievements through numbers rather than skill. This is because (while some dominant alphas have natural genetics making them good looking enough that they can pretty much get away with murder) you don't have the ability to completely ignore social etiquette. You can bend it a little maybe... but you're not Jagger. He can ignore all social etiquette and send three 9/10s back to his hotel room to wait for him. You on the other hand, when you ignore social etiquette, it's a demonstration of low SMV. Poor social skills.

Alphas generally don't have poor social skills. So what does this mean to be an alpha without being an 11/10 superstar? It means you've got a role to play. **If you understand the game and the goal, then you'll find your role.** With women, playing the role of the modern dominant alpha will give her the tingles because women like to put guys in boxes. It increases your SMV once you end up in that box in her mind. While this particular bit of info isn't the main thing I want to discuss here, I wanted to demonstrate that an alpha knowing how to play his role is a positive thing for pure sexual strategy. However the crux of this is going to diverge slightly to address how a group of alpha male leaders work best together.

Firstly, I'd like to make a side note about AMOGing which I like to call the AMOG fallacy. This is the idea that when someone AMOGs, he is the alpha of the group. This is an oversimplification. While he may be the apex alpha in terms of status, this does not mean that all other members of the group are beta. Following that logic would suggest that only [/u/RedPillSchool](#) is alpha on the sub and everyone else is consequently beta. That the base commander is the only alpha simply because his captains, sergeants, squad leaders and trainees all have to obey him. The football team out drinking

will have an apex alpha in the group, but that doesn't make the rest of the group are betas. There's a reason such groups and fraternities all get laid - because they're all alpha, whether it be by status or, more importantly, behaviour.

[/u/Whisper](#) recently made a post (which amused me greatly) about Gronk! For those of you who didn't read it, Gronk! is the typical example of an insecure alpha wannabe who seems to be under the impression that alpha is achieved by dominating everyone around you and demonstrating you have the biggest muscles, the greatest height, the biggest dick, the most swollen balls and the purest testosterone. He tries to AMOG everyone. Have you ever met a Gronk! before? His social skills are laughable. In fact, when I see one out and about... I'll stop playing my game and grab some popcorn so I can find a comfy chair to watch the show. Why do I do this? Because in the same way I don't respect the modern woman, I don't respect Gronk! Like women, he has been placed on this planet for my amusement. Gronk! is undoubtedly my inferior. Why? The man who tries to out-alpha me is my inferior. How? Because he hasn't figured out how to be my equal. This swings back to my point before which now explains why members consistently keep trying to question the direction of the sub. In making dominant leaders, the sub itself creates young men who want to try and assume the leadership role and try to dominate those around them. However they were never given good role models growing up to see how dominant alpha males interact with other dominant alpha males. How they treat equals. **And if you can't treat an alpha as an equal, then you aren't his equal.**

Surprisingly enough, Gronk! isn't welcome in the group of dominant alphas. There's an excellent scene in Gran Torino where Clint Eastwood demonstrates to the kid he's taken under his wing, that secure heterosexual men who are friends have a level of implied respect within the most derogatory of statements. The kid then tries to imitate this and is told that it's incredibly offensive. It's probably the most basic social skill which isn't taught enough on here - finding the right mix between polite and kissing ass to start out and then allowing the relationship to progress. This is similar to finding the correct tone to be assertive with women without being controlling or weird. The nuance in tone that allows you to rant like bloke and not whine like a woman.

The reaction of the Italian threatening to "blow his gook head off" reminds me of a reply made by [/u/RedPillWatchTower](#) to my original analogy of a military base. It's why you should avoid being confrontational or needlessly offensive. I don't feel I need to add anything to this:

I think a lot of new guys confuse "alpha" with "peacocking" or "AMOGing". What I've noticed lately is guys with 3 month old alt accounts coming in, declaring that they've lurked on TRP since the dawn of time, then proceed to start telling ECs they don't know what they are talking about.

This is the Reddit version of a guy who spent 3 months at the gym, goes to the local bar, and picks a fight with the biggest guy in the place to try to prove something. Little did he know that the guy he picked a fight with is not only going to kick his ass, that guy is also friends with the bar owner. So now he's got a black eye and is in jail.

That's pretty much how it works here.

I don't continue to post here for myself so much anymore. I've learnt what I need to learn. I've enacted what I need to enact. I have a solid understanding of theory so, without being humble about it, I believe I can explain and pass it on to boys who are now in a similar position to the one I used to

be in. I know my specific role - pass on the knowledge and analytical ability. Help train the next set of men. My role **is not** to lead the sub as a whole or decide on the direction. Don't get me wrong, if I think I've got a good idea, I'll voice it. When I do, I will do so in a respectful manner. I won't tell any of the veterans that they're wrong. That's needlessly confrontational and sets the wrong tone. These people are my equals and I'd like to think many of them are my friends (depending on whether you think you can be friends with people you've never met) and should be treated as such. I'll voice my opinion and let them make up their own mind. Blue Pill men need others to listen and adhere to what they think. Red Pill men don't need to care. We share our knowledge to help any man who wants to listen... if they won't, it's not our loss. Ultimately, if you're not looking to listen to ideas you hadn't considered before then what the fuck are you doing here? Go back to the mainstream.

So now comes the big question: how do we identify our role? TRP has always been excellent for telling the new recruits what they need to do, pointing out who the drill sergeants are and showing that the base commander is in charge. What it has struggled with is the graduates, the squad leaders and the corporals.

- If you're a raw recruit then you'll be reading the sidebar and keeping quiet. No exceptions.
- If you've become a squaddie after a month or two, chip in where you think you understand what is going on and keep your ears pricked up in case the drill sergeant or a corporal comes round to correct you. Don't be the dickhead who posts for two weeks and then tells the drill sergeant that he doesn't know what he's talking about. You'll be seen for the moron you are.
- If you've begun applying things in the real world and you're getting positive feedback on your understanding then congratulations on your promotion to lance-corporal. Keep contributing where you think you can and listen out for further advice from the drill sergeants and base commanders.
- You've secured your first plate or two? Excellent work corporal. See what parts of the training you can help with from your personal experiences. Just don't let that first success go to your head. The drill sergeants have been doing this a lot longer than you have and will help to correct you if you've had a rare experience without realising. Keep that mind open and keep learning.
- The drill sergeants and base commanders don't need to be told what to do. It's self explanatory.

You have a role in the group. Sometimes that role is just team member and not leader. It's a logical fallacy to think that not being the leader makes you less alpha. The alpha will take his role and work it - he knows that for the group to succeed, all members of the team need to work their role effectively. You've chosen to be a part of the team and I'm assuming you've done that because you want to see that group succeed in its goals. Alpha men will gladly defer to more experienced/knowledgeable men when they're trying to achieve a mutual goal. It's just common sense to let the expert/more experienced/more knowledgeable guy lead the group.

As a community, the TRP sub is no different. Alpha men work together for the good of the community, taking on the roles required of them. Women bitch and bicker amongst themselves and nothing gets done. See twoX as a prime example. It pretends to have purpose... but nothing ever gets achieved there. Here on TRP, boys become men. They go from hopeless and unfulfilled to confident and satisfied. You want to be a part of it? Then take on the responsibility of your role and treat the other roles with respect. That's what an alpha male does.

Commanding 101

710 upvotes | March 26, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

This is a supplementary guide following on from my TRP Field Toolkit. While commanding is used as part of game when you're out in the field trying to get laid for the first time, it's predominantly used on plates or LTRs. As a result, you should be confident and proficient in the majority of aspects of base game before implementing this guide.

Introduction

Women love being commanded. Telling a woman, straight up, what to do allows her to feel safe and secure being led by a strong, confident man. You'd think this was a straightforward topic. Tell women what to do, they obey, job done. Unfortunately, since women no longer wish to love, honour and *obey* it has made the issue of commanding more complicated than it needs to be. It's made it socially acceptable to perform the shit test of disobedience.

Since the dominant/submissive dynamic is still the one that creates the best harmony between men and women, we as men must simply find ways around the problem society has presented us. Naturally, we found a way, it's called not caring. However this is not ideal from the perspective of managing a woman. In experimenting with different plates I have found the most successful method of long term management is not caring less, but leading more. This guide should help you to do that and feel confident in the way you go about it.

Commanding is a broader subject than we tend to give credit on TRP. When we talk about commanding, we talk about commanding respect, we talk about issuing commands and we also talk about instructing, educating and laying down boundaries or rules. It is an essential part of leadership and a multi-faceted tool for managing the relationship dynamic (for either LTRs or plates) and altering the subtext exchange in order to deal more effectively with the plethora of mental and emotional needs a woman has.

From the bloopy perspective, this is the raw essence of the manipulation in TRP. Telling a woman what to do. Which it could be... but in that case it's only the male equivalent of a woman moving her body in a sexually suggestive way while asking a beta to do something for her. Just like the man can refuse to do her bidding, she is welcome at any time to say no to you. It is because your SMV is high and she trusts you that she will submit/obey your instructions. They try to discourage this in blue pill land because, underneath it all, they know that an order from a man with a commanding presence will be followed by most women. They don't like this because it takes power away from them and gives it to men, and in the great power struggle of our opposing sexual strategies – they want the ladies to have the upper hand. I don't. We should have the power. This is the correct dynamic. I would also state that the man being in the leadership role is absolutely vital for the success of an LTR. The opposing dynamic is what causes relationships to fail frequently.

As a point of reference when it comes to game: commands and commanding are used less in the beginning and more as a woman settles into being a good plate or an LTR. The reason for this is that your SMV is not cemented in her mind early on, however once she's slept with you once or twice she is less likely to presume your SMV could be lower – this is an ego defence mechanism because

women need to rationalise that they've only slept with men of high value. If they didn't do this, it would risk them admitting to themselves that they are low value and not worthy of going after the highest value of men. They can't afford to admit this because it is counter to their optimal sexual strategy. (This is also why you have post-relationship rationalisations from women and the light switch effect, rewriting of history in her mind etc etc. She absolutely cannot let go of the idea that she would never willingly choose to sleep with any man who is not high SMV. Some other factor caused her to make the mistake. Usually some way of framing it that sees the man as a con artist who tricked her.)

The purpose of commands

All forms of command are heavy handed dominant moves. They are the clear assertion of your leadership combined with a demand (not a request) for submission. Therefore they have a threefold purpose:

- To assert the dominance/submission dynamic
- To achieve a specific outcome
- To set the stage for the future social dynamic

The specific outcome you want can be anything from demanding a respectful interaction from the woman (e.g. don't speak to me like that. Apologise.) through expecting her to control her behaviour better, (e.g. don't do that – said in a fairly dismissive/disappointed manner) to simply wanting a specific task done (e.g. go make me dinner.) The specific context is what will decide what outcome you want and, when combined with the current relationship dynamic, will inform how heavy handed or subtle the command should be.

The other two parts, asserting the dynamic and setting the stage for the future dynamic are intertwined and both part of the subtext of the interaction. I separate them because they have active and passive subtexts. The active subtext is to tell the woman “you will submit to me now.” The passive subtext is after she has submitted, she is effectively replying “I will submit, I accept that you are the leader of this social relationship dynamic.” Similar to the sales idea that once you've got someone to say “yes” to you once, they are more likely to say yes to something else you ask.

Basic commands

In the most simplistic of terms, a basic command is to just tell a woman to do something e.g. “Come here” or “go get that table” or “bring that chair over here.” The important distinction that separates it from a request is that you do not use words like please. It is an order that is given with the expectation that she will fulfil it. The expectation is what gives the subtext its strength and thus why it is heavy handed dominance.

(As a sidenote, you may have come across women issuing you basic commands in a similar fashion. The correct response to this is something like “what's the magic word?” much like your parents may have said to you as a child, instructing her to change her command to a request. When she complies she is submitting to your framing of the situation and returning to the correct dynamic. You may use commands, she MUST use requests.)

Basic commands are a good way to assert dominance at any time when dealing with women. They're also an excellent addition for passing comfort tests in a more dominant fashion. For example, you identify the nonsense she is speaking is a comfort test. You issue a command such as "sit" while patting your lap, and then follow with physical comfort such as a kiss. If you want to add further emotional comfort you could add something like "I don't kiss girls who aren't attractive enough." That's off the top of my head, but the point is that you can adapt this general use to be more personalised to the situation and woman depending on her emotional needs.

It is also a good idea to get into the habit of using basic commands on a first date. Simple commands like "wear a red dress tonight" or "come here" or "go get the tickets/drinks/food" are all excellent ways of setting the tone and the appropriate social dynamic.

Instructions/Suggestions

Instructions are a softer form of command, essentially coaxing the woman to submit to you. These are useful as a measure of your comparative SMV in her mind, along with all the benefits of a typical command. On a basic level, an instruction would be "you should do X" or "why don't you do Z?" It holds the same straight talk as issuing a command, but instead makes it a suggestion. If she responds to this as a bratty child, then you know the dynamic is not set properly. Respond as if it's a shit test (as it effectively is... she's subtextually challenging your leadership.) While it does not assert the dominance in the same way an assumptive command does, it will assert leadership and imply the dominant/submissive dynamic.

The subtext involved is "I know what to do, follow my lead." As with all commands, the woman can choose to submit or not. This is particularly useful because instructions or suggestions give a woman the social "out" that she needs in order to disobey you without looking like a bitch. So when she does submit, it is much more telling for the dynamic of the relationship and more telling of the future intentions of the woman (and thus indicative of how heavy handed you can be in the future.)

Simple examples would be "I'm hungry, why don't you put together some sandwiches?" or "Empty glass here. You should grab us a refill." These are all socially acceptable things which are easily included in general activities as a cheeky little line and will reinforce the correct social dynamic you want with women. They can also be incorporated quite easily into first dates to test the waters of the dynamic.

Educating/Demanding respect

Educating or demanding in simple terms is just telling the woman how you expect her to behave. There are various ways to communicate this and it is unlikely to work without a set power dynamic already in place. However, if the dynamic is in place and the woman still sees you as a highly desirable man, then this is the most minimal-fuss way of altering her behaviour. When using education commands or demanding commands, there is no room for disobedience as this is breaking subtextual womanese communication in favour of direct masculine straight talk. Disobedience must result in punishment, whether that be radio silence, increased dread or a hard next, something bad that she doesn't want to happen, **must** happen.

In general you'll tell her straight what she has done which is unacceptable. You'll tell her not to do it

ever again. Then you'll tell her how you want her to behave and usually end by commanding her to apologise and think of a way to make it up to you. Dissent is not acceptable. If your frame is weak or she doesn't respect you sufficiently then she will probably try to justify herself to you, usually interrupting you to try this. Simple retorts that speak back over the top of her "don't interrupt me, it's rude. Wait." will reassert the power dynamic.

Note: never issue an ultimatum. There's no point to it, and it implies that you think there's a realistic possibility that she will disobey your command. Never leave that as a possibility that has entered your head. You are telling her what will happen. The subtext is very simple here: "your behaviour has been poor. Correct it now." This is particularly powerful because as a man with strong game, you typically speak womanese to her. The fact that you have broken this and descended into one-sided masculine straight talk is a strength in itself, when used late on, as it implies that her ability to communicate subtextually or understand you on a subtextual level (read: speaking womanese) is not good enough and you have been forced to deal with her differently.

The classic shit test response of commanding respect comes under a similar umbrella in my view. I've said before that the subtext of dealing with a shit test in this way is a slightly exasperated "I'm tired of your shit. I'm obviously higher SMV than you, cut this shit out or else." The "or else" in the subtext is always read by the woman since a high SMV man has options. It is one of the reasons that commanding works so well. While she is naturally submissive, she will also test you for your ability to lead her and she is acutely aware that if she won't follow, then another woman likely will. This is also the same way you'd have a talk setting down boundaries or rules for your relationship, whether that be a plate or an LTR.

Rudeness and disrespect should not be tolerated. There are multiple ways to deal with this. Dread is the most highly recommended method. With multiple plates you can simply switch plate. This is a strategy that has served me very well. However, I don't like only having one tool to correct problems like this. Commanding respect is the other major option and it's such a heavy handed or "hard no" response to a shit test, you use a similar response to incidents of disrespect. Don't tolerate it, come down hard.

Group Leadership Commands

These are the most diverse all-purpose commands. They can be used on first dates, established plates and just as regular reinforcement of the correct leadership dynamic in an LTR. In simple terms they are an order mixed in with a statement of intent. "You go do X while I sort out Y." They clearly assert both dominance and leadership by providing a plan of action for the two of you as a group while also being an order for her to follow. For example: "You go get dinner started while I clean up in here." Or "You go grab the table/drinks while I get the drinks/table." These are also very socially acceptable since they don't come across as orders despite the fact they are part order. This is a subtle way to enforce the dynamic on particularly bratty women. Well behaved submissive women all react particularly positively to this because they feel like you're investing in them when you've stated you'll do something to share the load with her. It's a sort of mini-commitment share, so it's a useful plate management tool and something to point to dismissively/amused masterly if she says you don't do things together.

Closing thoughts

Overall, game for me is a bit like woodworking. You've got your tools and your raw materials, use each tool correctly and you can put together an LTR a ONS or get a plate spinning. Commanding, on the other hand, is a bit more like moulding clay. Moulding the dynamic and using that to then tweak the behaviours. Try to think of it as a relationship dynamic tool that supplements your game.

As an example of my own success, my main plate (who has slowly learned excellent behaviour), joked once about me "scolding her" for her bad behaviour. She responded well to these demands for better behaviour, but this remark from her is clearly a test to see if my frame will bend at all on my demands for her behaviour. Of course, it will not. After I told her "when you step out of line, you need a spank" she responded very enthusiastically in her body language and demeanour. (Remember, even after all those months your women will still test you.) She was satisfied with my leadership and responded with more physical affection than usual. A beta would have apologised for behaving in a fashion she labelled negatively. Remember that you're in charge and you're sure of your decisions. Don't budge. Tell her she needed the reality check and you command her because you care. When you hold women to account they will love you for it and follow you almost anywhere.

Sokal 2.0 - The open secret of feminist philosophy

103 upvotes | October 3, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

You'll already be aware of the "Academic Grievance studies scandal" which, to anybody who has been paying attention to mainstream culture in the past few years, is basically the social justice academia being embarrassed yet again. This scandal is providing some good evidence of what we already knew, that people working in the social justice arena are not intelligent, their work is a sham and their PhDs are false awards. They are not called professor for being intelligent, knowledgeable or capable of providing anything useful to modern research. They are given it to meet diversity quotas. They are given these titles to shut them up. They are awarded these PhDs to quiet their shouts of *misogyny*.

Respected independent magazine Quillette has published a [set of responses](#) to this Sokal affair 2.0 from academics in various fields. It is a worthwhile read for the entire article. However for this post I want to look at one response in particular which is very relevant to the recent quarantining of TRP. For context, our quarantine is due to a claim of "misogyny" which is thrown quite calmly around without any specifics. Backed by the academic idea of positive masculinity endorsed by what is acceptable to feminist academics. We have not adhered to that, so we must be punished. Except... there's a very interesting statement regarding the school of thought we refuse to adhere to in this response piece.

Neven Sesardic is a Croatian philosopher who has taught philosophy at universities in Croatia, the United States, Japan, England, and Hong Kong.

One cannot properly judge this new (multiple) version of the Sokal affair before studying the fake articles that were part of the project conducted by Lindsay, Boghossian, and Pluckrose.

Among all these submitted papers mixing "absurdities and morally fashionable political ideas" the project collaborators single out the article that was accepted by the journal *Hypatia* (A Journal of Feminist Philosophy) as their most important success. Indeed, kudos to them. **Yet the reader should know that it is a carefully guarded secret in philosophy that feminist philosophy is often not characterized by intellectual rigor and high academic standards.** (The secret is so well-guarded, though, that many philosophers do not dare to admit even to themselves to know it, let alone express it publicly.) So *Hypatia* was a logical and easy choice for the attempt to place a fake paper in one of the well-known philosophy journals.

Emphasis mine. It is an open secret that the feminists have been given a seat at the table despite the fact everybody knows their ramblings are unworthy of giving even slight consideration. I wonder why they did that? And I wonder why they keep it a secret that they all know these feminists are spouting illogical nonsense? Might it be a cry of misogyny that they are trying to stay away from? That perhaps holds weight as an accusation even when it is being applied incorrectly? Are we living in a society where terms like sexist and racist are flung about with great abandon, applied incorrectly on a regular basis, simply as a manner of smearing political or ideological opponents who won't fall in line with your religious doctrine? I do not answer these questions but leave them for you to

consider. Let us continue to the example evidence that Neven provides:

Occasionally, however, unintentional absurdities of feminist thinking have crept into much better philosophical journals than *Hypatia*. A good example is an article from the Australasian Journal of Philosophy in which a feminist describes a “phallic drama” involving two statements, p and $\sim p$ (the negation of p):

There is really only one actor, p , and $\sim p$ is merely its receptacle. In the representation of the Venn diagram, p penetrates a passive, undifferentiated universal other which is specified as a lack, which offers no resistance, and whose behavior it controls completely.

Note that this is no longer a Sokal-type hoax but an instance of authentic feminist philosophy. Sometimes it is impossible to tell the difference. For more information about how caving in to feminism damages philosophy as a discipline see [the 2014 article](#) co-authored by Rafael De Clercq and me.

(Emphasis for Sesardic's quote from another paper.) Most interesting. It appears that feminist nonsense (and I use the term advisedly because that example is most certainly what Sokal would have referred to as nonsense) is seeping outside of their own little echo chamber despite failing to reach basic academic evidence and theoretical standards.

This is the measurement by which we are judged by reddit to be misogynists. They have openly stated such by linking to show "this is what positive masculinity is" and linking to feminist academia. Academia itself considers it to be nonsense, so I'm relatively confident that the reddit admins are also spouting nonsense in an attempt to appear smart... not unlike these feminism PhD holders.

The Red Pill is the idea that there is forbidden truth. Something going on behind the curtain. When the reddit admin make up a spurious reason to reject any appeal and ban us for this nebulous "misogyny" as defined by their feminism academics, we have yet further proof of our own position. This is a persecution. A witch hunt against those who will not fall in line with the feminist religion and dare to have the heretical thought that men, men's thoughts and men's interests actually matter too.

Register over on [TRP.red](#) today unless you wish to have the blue pill forced upon you.