

# **sadomasochrist**

## ARCHIVE

compiled by /u/dream-hunter

May 15, 2023

[www.TheRedArchive.com](http://www.TheRedArchive.com)

# Table of Contents

---

CMV : According to the framework proposed by feminists, men are the superior gender to women. ....	5
Meta : Why is TRP removing references that women are sex objects? .....	6
An ode to the Red Pill Woman, unicorns of the Red Pill Man. ....	7
Q4ALL : What sacrifices do you believe each gender makes for a family that are more common or unique to their gender? .....	8
So I was talking to some fish about being a fisherman.... ..	9
The solution to the problem "who is the right man for my daughter" or bluepers "no red pillars have daughters" problem. ....	10
Moderating self deceptive bullshit by disputing : "Your kids will be fine or even better in a divorce" .....	12
Carl Jung : The process of unplugging and the conceptualization of woman by man .....	15
From the meta-analysis, where the red pill is actually wrong. hint : it's basically all correct. ....	16
The only true power women hold in the SMV, is that men care and most are hopelessly solipsistic, so in far that they can only conceptualize responses to the (female) SMV which they are still honor bound, loyal and romantic (if even alternately so), even if pragmatically romantic. ....	18
CMV: Red pill concepts don't translate into the blue pill. ....	20
With apologies to the blue pill users of the sub... ..	21
DJ's story : The story of the narcissistic high beta that fooled us all... the blue pill alpha male. ....	24
It is difficult to digest not because it is false, but because it is true. If you think it is false, bring your smoking gun. We're all waiting, we'd all love to return to a world not in ruin. ....	26
Children without fathers, and women without providers. Short term mates, long term mates, alpha bucks and the silverback patriarch. ....	27
She knows you're a fraud .....	31
Schrödinger's (n)AWALT : Right now, she (never) love(s/d) you. E.g. tingles uber alles and why finding a "unicorn" is a waste of time. ....	32
Schrödinger's (n)AWALT : Right now, she (never) love(s/d) you. E.g. tingles uber alles and why finding a "unicorn" is a waste of time. ....	35
There is no such thing as "purple pill." .....	38
What you can learn from foreigners infecting women with HIV, worst reason to understand stats ever... ..	40
Q4W What is a "high quality" woman, and what is a "low quality" woman? .....	42
The failed feminist hypothesis : PT1 The Norwegian gender paradox .....	43
Q4BPW : When a woman infers another woman is either high or low quality, what does that mean? .....	45
Q4BPW : What are the most important features of what\who you aspire to be? .....	46
Q4BPW What does "to be a good wife" mean to most women? .....	47
One question that will help unplug you any time you need some perspective... "What does *to be a good wife*, mean to *most women*?" .....	48

Q4BPW What are 3 things most women judge other women for, that isn't cheating or being unattractive, if they do judge others. ....	50
RPW is not significantly different than what has traditionally been known as "being a good wife" .....	51
Q4W : For women who do believe intergender relations were better in more traditional times, what do you believe can be done to return to those value systems? .....	52
Q4RPM : Tall Chads, what percentage of women remain loyal, if their man is lower in SMV to her or you? .....	53
Tall chads, what percentage of women in an LTR if she is higher SMV than him or lower than you will cheat? .....	54
CMV : For parents who want daughters raised with the most likely chance of them entering traditional relationships, religion is the most likely way to accomplish this goal .....	55
CMV: If every variation of "that won't work on everyone" is removed from debate. TRP is iron clad. ....	56
For the Incels - The only post you need, so you can shut up. Forever. ....	57
CMV Assuming alpha widows exist for women, it is unsolvable .....	62
Back to Basics : Hypergamy doesn't care... about women either. ....	63
Protectors vs providers, AFBB. Killing the blue pill dream. ....	64
"But not everyone is like that" .....	68
The Nordic Family Paradox - The Nuclear Family Is A Male Value System (Briffault's Law) .....	69
Why do most men, cross culturally, who have the most casual sex, embody the values, behaviors and attitudes towards women that the red pill advocates? .....	73
The "true alpha" : On male virtue .....	74
Alain Soral on Feminism : Marxist application of conflict to use women for capitalist goals, built on the backs of lower class women. ....	78
"The Deal" : Amy, Monogamy, Polygamy, Hypergamy & Loyalty. ....	80
On male value : Calling debt due and boiling the frog. ....	86
Young girls want love. Grown women want partnership. ....	90
Long term field report which even boggled my mind...oh wait, not really. ....	91
RE: TRP vs MRP on red pill application of knowledge within a blue pill relationship .....	92
Stacy's Credo : Death of the plow horse .....	96
The emotional load of bullshit, failed mothers and household management. ....	100
The emotional load of bullshit, failed mothers and household management. ....	104
Discussion: Men of reddit, if you could take the gay pill, and be permanently gay (no longer attracted to women), why or why not, would you take it? How do you think it would change society? .....	105
Diaries of the plow horse slaughters 1 : Suffer in silence .....	106
[CMV] Despite the complexity of reasons as to why the SMP in the black community degenerated, it's a cautionary tale of what will happen if the SMP continues to "degrade." .....	109
The official "an incel murdered somebody" thread for onlookers, bystanders & media suit types (ignore this and publish a story saying we are just like them for that sweet adrev) .....	110
"Older men getting with 20 year olds is a TRP revenge fantasy..." Oops! Maybe not! .....	116
Q4W who are roughly average, what areas, if you do you feel like there are any, need to be	

focused on in terms of women's rights? .....	119
Women who act in ways, that are consistent with the widespread understanding of how a slut acts or looks, are unreasonable to expect to be treated as if they are not the same or share enough similarities to escape judgement. ....	120
Most women will prioritize their relationships over their children. ....	122
TRP is scientific, not pseudoscience. ....	124
A priori proof of AWALT, definition of AWALT .....	126
Would her father bring a shotgun and a shovel? .....	127
Better to die a monster than a milksop .....	130
Q4BPW - If you're going or can limit the extent of your son or daughter's sexual exploration, where would the limits be? .....	134
The universal way forward, you get the relationship you deserve. ....	135
The fundamental conflict of the rational man when confronted with hypergamy, a repost of what I found to be the archetypical covert female initiated destruction of a marriage. A failed effort to have him kill the puppy. ....	138
On Jordan Peterson : The ultimate TRP meta conflict brought into the mainstream. Why you're here, is why he's wrong. ....	144
Women will only be jailed for serious crimes, Justice Secretary reveals .....	155
Women should no longer be sent to prison unless they have committed a serious crime says Justice Secretary .....	156
Good hearted men with an edge .....	158
CMV : Less than 20% (likely 5% or less) of women are capable of obtaining the educational and career goals that UMC women are arrogantly promoting as "the solution." .....	161
TRP at the Movies : Locke .....	164
TRP at the movies : Locke .....	167
Are men who aren't competitive in the SMP in either STR or LTRs omegas or outsiders? .....	170
No alternative framework exists for men to be sexually successful with women other than TRP .....	171
Is there no way to tell blue pill men they're not being masculine that is PC? .....	172
Q4w how do you avoid being pumped and dumped? .....	173
Do you dream about opening presents with your wife and kids in the future tomorrow with the lessons you'll learn here? Are you a "family alpha?" .....	174
The words "hate speech" (group and related), rape, sexual assault, misogynist and incel have all become worthless. ....	176
CMV : This subreddit has failed .....	177
The death of god. ....	178
Suicide note from alpha widow "streamer" who kills herself over AF\BB and liberal culture .....	180

## CMV : According to the framework proposed by feminists, men are the superior gender to women.

14 upvotes | December 27, 2016 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

- Women claim to be equals intellectually and in terms of capability in the work force.
- Studies have determined differences in earning capacity are due to a lack of negotiation skill.
- Men are physically superior to women, so much so, that the weakest men are in general, stronger than the strongest women.

So their argument is more or less boiled down to "we're just as good as you" and handwaving physicality and natural aggression, instead branding these things as "toxic masculinity."

The odd thing, from my perspective, is that feminists (though not women at large) tend to by in large, try to disregard any argument that places value on being a mother in the same way they disregard male strength (both mentally and physically) as a benefit to society at large (and in many cases, calling this "toxic masculinity").

It would appear to me that either women (who at large, I think recognize this argument) need to accept the notion that *equity* between the genders requires women to recognize their value in the creation and nurturing of life and also pay honor to what men bring to the world, or recognize their inferiority in terms of describing themselves in a masculine frame, as earners and competitors in the socioeconomic system.

In the same that men see themselves as complete and total "equals" to women are in effect, actually saying that women are the superior gender, since they bring and nurture life. Something men are entirely less equipped to do (in terms of nurturing and their contribution towards creation).

In short, feminists try to diminish motherhood as their primary benefit to society at whole, and in turn, demonstrate according to their own framework they are the inferior gender.

Under a traditional frame, they achieve equity, possibly even superiority.

## Meta : Why is TRP removing references that women are sex objects?

2 upvotes | December 28, 2016 | /r/askTRP | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Have not got a reply from the mods, but this post was removed.

In reply to a blooper trying to moralize that the redpill man needs a wife and long term relationship.

| This isn't the blue pill. No one here recommends a wife. Women are sex objects.

It took me a long damn time to kill my purple pill ways and now we're deep sixing hard red? Trying pretty hard to come up with the mental gymnastics here of why this would be removed.

# An ode to the Red Pill Woman, unicorns of the Red Pill Man.

78 upvotes | January 13, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Let's first talk about the blue pill unicorn fantasy girl, known as Manic Pixie Dream Girl. She has blue hair, a nose ring, and she's your own personal whore. Just for you, no one else. She likes video games, you have the same taste in music, you two are inseparable. Turns out she also has the same taste in cock as a Red Pill Woman, alpha, and you weren't it.

At the time you couldn't see it, but she was playing *Girl Game*. That girl doesn't represent a mirror of the man she wants, but merely what *men want*. In *Gone Girl*, she is referred to as *cool girl*. Through time she changes, but she's the same. She represents what the average man would want, if he could design the perfect woman. Her design is to maximize validation, however, her end goal, is no different than the Red Pill Woman.

The difference between the most hardcore feminist and the most hardcore feminine woman is really only the degree of self deception.

So you steeped yourself in the sidebar, you read and read and read and you even found some holes in the theories.

You start spinning plates, cycling through women and learning abundance mentality. And finally you find a Red Pill Woman. Because what good is all this without something long term, something with *real value*.

- Good relationship with her father
- Loves and wants kids
- Claimed n-count of 3 (turns out there aren't many if any virgins out there, despite your search through every state, door to door)
- Submissive
- Wants a traditional relationship
- Is open to working or staying home

Then she fucks a heroin junkie while you're away on business because "she was so alone." Oh and BTW, you were always a terrible father, never around and you're not going anywhere, and she never really loved you. Did someone just turn off a light switch? Was history just rewritten?

*Buht buht, I was the family alpha*

She too has the rationalization hamster, and she too, is a woman. AWALT. Don't fall for *Girl Game tm*, don't be purple pill mitch. Don't get married.

When you started dating your *Red Pill Dream Girl*, you knew steak didn't even exist, but you convinced yourself *this was actually, really, totally a steak*. You still had the blue pill in your throat. You still believed in *unicorns*.

Stop using the red pill to try and achieve your blue pill goals. Stop falling for girl game, and mostly, stop believing in unicorns. It's not healthy, and it's not red pill. You didn't find a hole, you just didn't digest it.

## **Q4ALL : What sacrifices do you believe each gender makes for a family that are more common or unique to their gender?**

3 upvotes | January 26, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---



## So I was talking to some fish about being a fisherman....

123 upvotes | April 14, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

If a fish could talk, do you think "put a fake worm on the end of the hook" would be met with praise?

Do you think it would say "oh yeah, that'd be a great way to catch me" or not?

First of all it would probably call you an asshole, because fish lives matter.

Second, it would call all of its fish friends to shame you for being a fisherman.

Lastly, all of the fish would tell you that no fish in their right mind would eat a fake worm, and that they all want real worms.

You might try to explain that you've caught an equal number of fish both ways, and they'd say that not all fish are like that.

You might explain if they were hungry they'd all eat the fake blue worm. But then they'd say that's just what a fisherman would say.

Long story short, who cares.

Learn what you want or need here and apply it in your life or observe it out "in the wild." Few people come here, digest the content, have meaningful debate about it, are honest with themselves and go back.

You don't start catching fish with fake worms on your way to becoming a real worm, hear them claim that no one would eat that, and still want to listen to what a fish has to say. You want to talk to fisherman.

Oft made anecdote here, but often not fully explored. This thread is a great place to explore that with your stories.

And finally, there is no use in trying to get a fish to think like or agree with the ideas that the fisherman come to agreeance on. Furthermore, no need to try to argue yourself as higher on the food chain.

# The solution to the problem "who is the right man for my daughter" or bluepers "no red pillers have daughters" problem.

125 upvotes | April 23, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

So for guys planning on having kids, or who already have them, I feel that there is a definite level of mental friction in this department. It's something I think I figured out that I want to hear some thoughts on.

## Problem

How do you simultaneously accept the vicious nature of the SMP, the realities of post-modern dating, marriage 2.0, the nature of a red piller man and your innate desire to protect your daughter, while reconciling that with what you understand she needs? Can you reconcile her desire for what Jordan Peterson would call a "high testosterone man" and what he also noted was likely the pinnacle of family arrangements?

## Hypothesis

Now while my daughters are a long way from dating age, it's something I've been hoping I could find an answer to.

My hypothesis, something I'd like to hear about from those with daughters that are dating age, or OGs that have had daughters that had successful marriages is this.

Naturals.

This I think solves a couple problems, but also creates its own issue.

The first thing here, is that a natural survives on innate personality and SMV differential alone. That is typically endearing. So, from the get go, you've covered a large part of the game. The problem here, is he's blue piller. You've got 18 months, give or take to red pill him while pair bonding is doing its job.

From there, you can subtly red pill both of them and help mitigate the outside influence of fourth wave feminism, post-modern SMP etc.

If you've done your role as a father, you hope you can set her up for this properly if she saves herself and you help guide her to the right guy. From there, you let pair bonding and the qualities of the natural do 90% of the work.

All you have left is some red pilling for the two of them, because they're going to hit bumps in the road, for sure. It is the nature of relationships.

My concern about this was, how do you in a modern age get a girl to see why  $n=0$  is a solution to her when everything she hears screams at her to disregard all of this? It's easy to operate in a fearful mindset here, but I genuinely feel in the next two decades the pendulum is going to swing back.

I think the evidence shows it already is. Men are starting to pull back and embrace hookup culture, or what we call STRPlate life. Women are starting to actually see a scarcity of men who are high value and want to commit.

But we all know there's no shortage of men who want the American dream, and that means a stable family, and when they're ready (all though we ALL claimed we didn't want kids, until we did), that

will statistically (90% lifetime) include kids.

And at least to my mind. I sort of imagine 1950s dad (as Jordon would refer to an MRP man) as a guy who would do this. Taking your future son in law under your arm and providing guidance to your daughter, ultimately directing both of them away from our self destructive nature.

That's the best I can come up with outside of a dice roll.

And if he never red pills properly, then she's got cash and prizes going for her.

## Moderating self deceptive bullshit by disputing : "Your kids will be fine or even better in a divorce"

71 upvotes | April 28, 2017 | /r/MarriedRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

It's great to read the trials and tribulations of guys here that have gone through the gauntlet and to remind ourselves that marriages go through semi predictable failure routines and they are mendable, to a certain degree.

There is great debate to whether or not one should "stay for the kids." That is up to the individual. But one thing that I think should be clear and nipped in the bud is the assertion the kids "will be fine" or that they would be "better with two happy parents."

Now in a recent thread, there was a link to a study that mentioned that there was only a smaller percentage of kids that ended up being *directly* damaged by the divorce.

These studies you have to remember first and foremost are almost always leaning left, blue pill you could say. But suffice to say, finding evidence against this study is **NOT** difficult. Essentially the entirety of research in this segment are in agreement, kids from families of divorce are the most likely to end up in dysfunctional relationships themselves, have a host of behavior issues, do worse academically, have worse career outcomes. **Hey, it turns out, having a family is a super important part of human development, maybe it's even hard wired into us.**

That's aside from the well understood point that many of the guys that land in TRP or MRP come from families of divorce, or one where the father was weak or the mother was overbearing. This point is not counterintuitive. This point is not to be understated.

The impact on children in this situation is **significant**. Children need role models *all the way until they become adults*.

"Separately, we are doing the job we should have been doing together."

**KNOCK KNOCK Who's there? HAMSTER HAMSTER HAMSTER**

I've heard it, I've seen it, **I've LIVED IT**

If you are really honest with yourself and you keep your eyes peeled, and you watch the impact on the families involved, and the kids, they will not be "alright." They will be drastically impacted, and the level of mitigation to that will be the dedication you guys give to them and their own innate ability to overcome this.

Listen, I came from the family that did this. It was as amicable as it could have been, despite it being a divorce rape scenario. My mom did a 180. It didn't help ultimately. It took decades to understand the toll it took, and didn't become readily apparent until I was deep in my own marital issues. It got traced alllll the way back for *both* of us, even though her family never split up.

I can't spend two or three days writing this all out, but if this post has ANY significant amount of support from the guys with kids that REALLY GET IT, I will continue to add to this post as it gets referenced.

Suffice to say, once you get out of the "lead and the kids follow" mindset and understand that there are huge milestones that they need to hit, you should understand just how complex getting a kid to college is. And not in the "they got into XYZ Uni!" type of way. But in the, they're ready, well

adjusted and prepared to find a long term mate, and make it work, type of way.

Enormous amount of effort and work to get to that point.

Listen, everyone has a limit of what they'll put up with. I've been fighting the battle against a woman with BPD for over a decade. That'll sharpen up your shit boy.

Just don't delude yourself into thinking that you're going to be the exception to nearly every study ever done on this. Your kids are going to be fucked up and you'll be doing your best to pick up the pieces and put it back together into something that resembles what they were before you broke them.

Do you even remember what it was like to understand the concept of mom and dad?

"They'll be happier with two happy parents" is literally the stuff I digested and lied to myself about when I was 12. This is shit a twelve year old believes and a blue pill therapist tells you.

It is NOT reality and it is NOT red pill. It runs against what this forum is all about, which is dispensing away with the bullshit and living in a pragmatic reality, allowing you to fix what you broke by adopting blue pill dogma.

*If you can not take it anymore or you want to be happier, and are willing to understand that involves damage to your children's lives then so be it.*

That's red pill, no moralizing here. You want to fuck up your kids lives because your wife is a mess, I get it. Trust me, I get it. The idea that no woman is ever at fault here is bullshit, there are women that are lost causes. There are women that are truly, without question, fucking nuts. But that means you're a headcase too! If your wife is BPD, that mean's you're likely NPD.

You can bullshit yourself, but don't come on here and bullshit us and then posit that I am moralizing. I'm not.

### **Here is my a priori argument**

- If you think there will be a net positive for your kids, you better justify it.
- If you truly truly can justify it, you probably can get full custody.
- If you don't think you can get full custody, then she isn't that bad.
- And if she isn't that bad, your kids will be better off.

*which means*

- If she is that bad, you should be trying to protect them by staying in the house and working on tail on the side or negotiating it.
- If any of this is true, but you still want to leave, you want to leave because you'd rather be happier than your kids be healthier.

YOU DO YOU. But don't come on here bullshitting users giving them justification to destroy their families under the notion it will help or won't hurt. That's what women do.

"Oh Tom? Yeah, you need to leave that guy, you'll be waaaayyy happier without him."

**Some reading for the TIP of the iceberg, I will continue adding to this ad nauseum if the post reaches any popularity, because there is NO shortage of the huge and detrimental effects of this**

Hetherington EM, Stanley-Hagan M. The adjustment of children with divorced parents: a risk and resiliency perspective. J Child Psychol Psychiatry 1999;40:129 -40.

Wallerstein JS, Blakeslee S. Second chances: men, women and children a decade after divorce. New

York: Ticknor & Fields, 1989. Kimball G. How to survive your parents' divorce: kids' advice to kids. Chico, Calif: Equality Press, 1994.

Hartnup T. Divorce and marital strife and their effects on children. *Arch Dis Child* 1996;75:1- 8.

Krementz J. How it feels when parents divorce. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1984.

Thompson P. Adolescents from families of divorce: vulnerability to physiological and psychological disturbances. *J Psychosoc Nurs Ment Health Serv* 1998;36(3):34 -9.

Emery RE, Coiro MJ. Divorce: consequences for children. *Pediatr Rev* 1995;16:306 -10.

Pruett MK, Pruett KD. Fathers, divorce, and their children. *Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin N Am* 1998; 7:389 -407.

Kelly JB. Marital conflict, divorce, and children's adjustment. *Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin N Am* 1998;7:259 -71.

Roseby V, Johnston JR. Children of Armageddon. Common developmental threats in high-conflict divorcing families. *Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin N Am* 1998;7:295-309.

Wolf AE. Why did you have to get a divorce? And why can't I get a hamster? A guide to parenting through divorce. New York: Farrar Straus & Giroux, 1998.

Lansky V. Divorce book for parents helping your child cope with divorce and its aftermath. Minnetonka, MN: Book Peddlers, 1996.

Furstenberg FF Jr, Cherlin AJ. Divided families: what happens to children when parents part. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.

Ricci I. Mom's house, dad's house: making shared custody work. New York: Collier Books, 1980.

# Carl Jung : The process of unplugging and the conceptualization of woman by man

22 upvotes | June 14, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Jung believed anima development has four distinct levels, which he named Eve, Helen, Mary and Sophia. In broad terms, the entire process of anima development in a man is about the male subject opening up to emotionality, and in that way a broader spirituality, by creating a new conscious paradigm that includes intuitive processes, creativity and imagination, and psychic sensitivity towards himself and others where it might not have existed previously.

## **Eve** *Childhood development*

The first is Eve, named after the Genesis account of Adam and Eve. It deals with the emergence of a man's object of desire.

## **Helen** *Naïve Blue Pill*

The second is Helen, an allusion to Helen of Troy in Greek mythology. In this phase, women are viewed as capable of worldly success and of being self-reliant, intelligent and insightful, even if not altogether virtuous. This second phase is meant to show a strong schism in external talents (cultivated business and conventional skills) with lacking internal qualities (inability for virtue, lacking faith or imagination).

## **Mary** *Informed Blue Pill**Purple pill*

The third phase is Mary, named after the Christian theological understanding of the Virgin Mary (Jesus' mother). At this level, women can now seem to possess virtue by the perceiving man (even if in an esoteric and dogmatic way), **in as much as certain activities deemed consciously unvirtuous cannot be applied to her.** *NAWALT*

## **Sophia** *Unplugged**AWALT*

The fourth and final phase of anima development is Sophia, named after the Greek word for wisdom. Complete integration has now occurred, which allows women to be seen and related to as particular individuals who possess both positive and negative qualities. The most important aspect of this final level is that, as the personification "Wisdom" suggests, the anima is now developed enough that no single object can fully and permanently contain the images to which it is related. *Death of the idea of a unicorn (The original "image")*

**Everything I've added is in italics, the rest, credit to Carl Jung**

## From the meta-analysis, where the red pill is actually wrong. hint : it's basically all correct.

20 upvotes | July 27, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

So I've been pouring through the meta-analysis study of the dualistic strategy theory that also does a bunch of "sexy son" analysis as well. And I've always felt the two camps needed a small bridge between the two of them, and that the analysis felt a little too... binary.

Well.. I think I've finally satisfied my desire to put to rest my feelings of unease in the theory, here are the only very small holes I've found so far.

1. Muscularity does not seem to be as important as people want to believe here, and in fact, it seems to be very polarizing. This would point to the idea that your body should be *functionally muscular*. No more, no less. This is why tradesmen are universally seen as more physically attractive. Their form, is function.
2. SMV is SELECTED AGAINST for long term relationships. Now this requires a caveat. I've made a post before, I still hold this to be true. Women see men as TWO SMV POINTS LOWER, than their actual SMV. So a woman sees a man two points above her as her equal. She sees a man 3 points above her as undesirable. This also explains why a lot of women are in relationships with men that are of objectively much lower SMV. Those specific examples are problem women that are more realistic or have lower self esteem, so they're matching with men they think are 1 SMV point lower, when in effect, they may actually be 2 or 3. This is a strong dispute against the idea around here that men want to increase their SMV to land the girl... bad news later with that. This supports an idea that in both AF and BB, the goal is control. Over the situation (AF) and the person (BB). For LTR, the primary way to control that is SMV disparity or pairing. Hence, the rejection of SMV for LTR (represented in the study as social presence and intrasexual competition).
3. Being good at math is important, demonstrating intelligence is bad, but having smart kids is good? Okay how to do demonstrate your kids will be smart without showing you are smart, but demonstrating you know math doesn't mean you're intelligent? Women... man. My best interpretation of this and some other weird data is I think the red pill is missing a functional category. It's AF (Alpha Fucks), BB (Beta Bucks) and AF (Alpha Bucks, high SMV, high social status). My interpretation of this data is that AFBB is a sort of masterbatory dichotomy, and that from a functional breeding perspective, that a meta analysis is done of her AF and BB suitors, from that, a suitable father is chosen. Here is where things get a little tricky and in depth. I believe that they are looking for "short term" features, but "dad" traits. This may seem self evident, but I'm going to further dispute "cads vs dads" or chads vs billys.
4. There is some dispute around here about BB being "warm and fuzzy." It turns out, that data supports that women don't even want that kind of guy for a long term mate either. I believe on concur with Mark Manson that what an LTR candidate best is, can be described as "not needy." This is also supported by "nurturing" being a positive for LTRs but actually not being negatively correlated with short terms. Then you might conflate that with "being a good dad." Turns out, according to data, that's not true either.
5. So BB isn't warm and fuzzy or a good dad? Well what is he then? According to the data, an



ATM (no surprise) but also someone who can be controlled. Limited options, faithful, and a list of things that she doesn't even find attractive. But SIGNAL that she can control you. This I think is bore out in some weird data indicating that moodiness is positively correlated in terms of long term relationship attraction. It contrasts with the idea of stoicness, but it absolutely aligns with the concept of BB as someone who can be controlled and manipulated.

6. Dominance is very nuanced and polarizing. Suffice to say, AM and AA are probably as dominant as one should be getting (outside the bedroom). That would probably be way above and beyond what your mean male is capable of doing. Your frame should then be "paternal." Not domineering.
7. AF BB then are "short term mating opportunities that can be controlled (the opportunity, not the actor) where signals of BB are limited or absent and AF signals are abundant" and "long term mating opportunities where signals of BB demonstrate resources and a controllable mate."
8. There is I believe a third categorization, that might muddy what we believe is alpha fucks. There is high variability in the measurement of "future income potential" and "intelligence" as I listed above. As I said, I think AF and BB are masterbatory categories. They are when conception is not a goal, or being avoided. This also allows for certain intricacies of "fantasy roles" we common see women cycling through. For instance "the artist" or "the musician." SMV accounts for this, but the lack of attraction to the individual traits bears some analysis. And that outcome I think is that most opportunities in the post birth control world, are masterbatory. And that when time comes (the wall), that there is a third category. Probably not worth any discussion past this because the party line here is to spin plates. But I believe that AB is probably within the range of BB instead, and that no such thing as AB exists. That presumes some sort of stable long term MF arrangement. AB is IMO just SMV10. And you can still be SMV10 and be BB or AF. So it's not a 3rd category. That third, I think is the dad category. And it requires a small list of traits that seem to defy AF or BB categorization. AFBBDAD. So from that you have your accidental AF kids, single mothers. Your sub optimal BB single mothers. And then your DADS, which are absent of negative AF traits or BB traits and positive on rearing traits. But bizarrely, being good playing with kids is negative on both AF and BB. I believe, innately, women understand a man's role is to provide. So the idea of him being good with kids, is bad. The idea of him providing smart kids, or having money for those kids are good. This further supports men love women, women love children.

Take it how you'd like. I've been searching for a long time on data that could support my doubts.

Don't try for an LTR, they're not built for it. You're either rent a cock, an ATM or a controllable partner (to be discarded for a father or rent a cock), or a father.

Then the hierarchy follows Maslow's. Fathers are chunked for providers, etc. Government functions as providers, and BB acts are surrogate fathers, to go back to AF.

From these we derive optimal male strategy.

If you're BB, cheat with a girl who sees you as AF. Cheat with who ever, you mean nothing.

If you're AF, spin plates.

If you're dad, if you reject having kids, you're cycled out. If you have kids, afterwards subject to same AFBB. Again, consult Maslow here for branch prediction.

**The only true power women hold in the SMV, is that men care and most are hopelessly solipsistic, so in far that they can only conceptualize responses to the (female) SMV which they are still honor bound, loyal and romantic (if even alternately so), even if pragmatically romantic.**

7 upvotes | September 10, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

I feel as though sometimes the most simplistic concepts don't truly get the weight they deserve until you've digested something so completely, that any iterative response to a concept, you've marched out in your head comes to the same road.

*The female centric SMV can only survives so long as one thing is true.*

**Men care and continue to operate within the (female) SMV above the table, with duty and honor.**

When the above statement is no longer true, the (female) SMV no longer favors women. And instead, it favors those that exploit it. The end result, is not difficult to see within sub populations or understand conceptually.

One can easily see the results of women being openly hypergamous and having no shame in that regard, and men quickly working the math to its end by looking to what Jordan Peterson was not able to outright state.

"What if women did all the work?"

What he was talking about, was poor black communities. What if every man still competed, but did so disingenuously, and for no reason other than sex? What if they walked away from their families, rather than assume their duty and burdens as men are expected? What if they stopped improving themselves within the socio-economic system because such growth was seen as weak and its lack of benefit, in terms of sexual selection, became obvious.

- Nearly the entirety of proposed solutions involve "above the table" solutions. E.g. vetting, contracts, open relationships etc.
- The vast majority of TRP users are trying to use the knowledge they gain to find an optimal structured LTR in which they believe a woman will be faithful to them.

This is, I think the clear fatal flaw of the (almost) entire manosphere. The entire manosphere can't imagine a world where they stop caring, stop loving women. They simply are unable to see women as anything other than capable of a love they never claimed to have.

Black dragon's ultimate conclusion is "get into an open relationship. " Which is really a way to hamster away spinning plates. A way to be "pragmatically romantic, and still honor bound."

This is exactly what I'm talking about. These guys just can't imagine a world in which they truly operate on the level that women operate on.

This is merely a stage until the final solution is clear. One the poor black areas figured out a long time ago.

All you have to do is stop caring, and anything is possible.

Every conceptual problem with the content involves male hamstering of how they can avoid being exploited, subject to unrealistic expectations etc. It's all trying to make it work in a way where they can live happily ever after. And all in ways that are above table. Get a better job, spit better game, be more appealing etc. Basically, be better at being a commodity within the system, honestly.

It is, I think intensely racist to think that poor black men didn't want the same things affluent white men want now. I believe Rollo's statement of men being the true romantics to be true, but not beyond the statement that men are the more rational gender.

And that desire for romance does not trump rationality, for a man.

I think its much more reasonable to believe that poor black men wanted the same things that affluent men want now and invariably came to the conclusion that they would better serve themselves by rejecting the idea of competing honestly.

The birth of the player, really. To play, is to game. And to be a player, in a real sense, is to play the game dishonestly.

And therefore, I believe the ultimate outcome of open hypergamy is not some alternate game, alternate strategy or hyper competition, but instead the acceptance that game will be inherently inauthentic.

If men have to choose between loving women and understanding them, rationality will bludgeon their childish longing. And when that boy dies, the man that replaces him operates in a way that women fear.

Not because they are not attracted to him, but because he is impervious to the greatest exploit men have. That they care.

## CMV: Red pill concepts don't translate into the blue pill.

3 upvotes | September 23, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

I've seen mentioned a *lot* around here that the red pill shares most content with the blue pill, but simply that the language is toned down.

There is no "women are children" in the blue pill.

## With apologies to the blue pill users of the sub...

29 upvotes | October 9, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

This forum is starting to fill to the brims with men that can't wait to spit out "you're not red pill, you don't determine what is or is not red pill."

And I don't, however, the sidebar does. And the sidebar is clear.

1) "Do not move in with women you do not intend to marry within 6 months." -Rollo

2) Do not get married.

MRP & LTR flaires are garbage filters. They're why craigslist had an adult services section, so hookers weren't posting in W4M. TRP is as a system inherently STR oriented and for good reason, it's designed around attraction, not the desires of male romantics.

How many guys in MRP that have turned their family around would get married again? If you give these guys time machines and say they can still see their kids whenever they want, they're setting it to the last night they didn't get her pregnant, right about the time their lease is up and that's that. They're walking out that door with a smile that can only be matched by her when she steps on his back 5 years later after 2.0 children, to get an extra couple feet to grab onto that branch and golden parachute onto the hard embrace of a hundred cocks.

I realize this is Donnie Darko esc, deal with it.

I would highly encourage you to read *Changes in Women's Mate Preferences Across the Ovulatory Cycle*.

It is clear from this meta study that women do not have any such preference for something akin to "alpha bucks." All descriptions of "alpha bucks" from blue pill users trying to masquerade as anything but, are high betas.

High social status men using said status to attract mates with the promise of long term comfort. Beta game 101.

Women look only for short term or long term partners. What is "alpha bucks" to her, is a man with all short term mate features, who is willing to give her provisioning (comfort and security). A blue pill, alpha male.

Also a contradiction. A man with options, who won't exercise them. Someone who can get the milk, but instead will buy the entire whale.

But we know what happens to blue pill alpha males, we call them naturals. They suffer the same fate as all blue pill men. Do not let their abundance or notch count fool you. This is not a conflict with red pill theory, it is confirmation.

**Women are not built for long term relationships under the male conception of love and honor.**

You can not escape this, only conform to her STR requirements and enjoy your time while it lasts. And as long as she has *enough* comfort with you, she will *let* you persist.

The notion of providing comfort, then giving STR traits to her is backwards and your blue pill desire will eventually be exposed to her in *some* moment of weakness.

You don't get to create a solution to a problem that doesn't solve it. You either fit the role of genetic contributor, or provisioner. The only long term solution is true abundance, in your mentality and at

your disposal.

When the term provisioning is used, this does not mean you pay for her, literally. It means that you offer comfort and security in exchange for mutual exclusivity. If your relationship depends on your figurative fidelity, then you are BB. If it depends on you making her feel comfortable, you are BB. If you also pay for everything she does, and your relationship is anything other than traditional, then you have a local mail-order bride.

Implied male fidelity is the foundation of nearly all LTRs. So by extension, LTRs almost unanimously mean you are blue pill.

The only LTR that conforms to the red pill framework involves a woman who gives you exclusivity, without ~~asking for~~ requiring it in return.

Eagle eyed, dick swinging users saw *implied* and knew exactly what was being said here.

This is the only arrangement that does not involve male disposability, but instead mirrors a man's position. This is not a male dominant position in an LTR, it's merely **power neutral**.

I can not tell you how hard this will be as a blue pill man to understand this.

A one sided open long term relationship, as a man, is power neutral. All other relationship structures, all of them, women hold the power. Short and long.

That's how huge the power disparity is, and that's how far you have to climb.

And only then, are you in an optimal attraction position, there are still administrative and other issues in terms of having an actual advantage in terms of the power exchange.

This is the only arrangement that does not offer provisioning, but has a long term orientation.

This is the foundation of male disposability that most users do not want to understand.

- When you plate a woman, she plates you in return.
- When you offer commitment to a woman, she revokes attraction in return.

When a woman offers you her exclusive devotion to you in return for your love without your explicit fidelity, you won't see other women because you *love her so much*, but because she'll give so much of herself to you, that you won't have the time or energy. Once you reach that point, you will understand women, so you will not *be able* to love women in the way that you loved them before. Because what you thought was love, was instead, weakness. A need for external validation, using sex and romance as that validation that you deserve love and attention. The extent of loss you feel when a woman leaves you is directly proportional to the extent you use them for validation.

When women do not validate you, there is not a sense of loss, but instead an understood closing of the metaphorical book as it is shelved. You don't think about whether or not the book will ever open again, unless you decide that you've outgrown it. Then you might decide to never open the book, but feel no malice about that decision.

This is the only arrangement in which both parties are mutually disposable, both have the duty of performance and neither are in a suboptimal attraction arrangement.

"But this is impossible!"

No... it's not. But it will show you how far away from an optimal arrangement you are. And when you get there, you'll understand women.

But no longer love them.

And because ultimately, women no longer validate you. They only offer what women are looking for, a good time.

You are selling each other, at this point, the same goods. And existing within her world as she understands it. She understands abundance, a good time and disposing of a useless mate. She understands temptation.

Until she understands you in the way that you should understand her, you're walking dead.

This is what it means to have an external locus of control.

This is what it means to live without covert contracts.

When you understand this and feel it deep inside your soul, your infantile view of women and longing for validation will die. But from this, a fully actualized man will be born.

## DJ's story : The story of the narcissistic high beta that fooled us all... the blue pill alpha male.

33 upvotes | October 11, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

To be clear I really like this guy before I spill all this. He's really entertaining, smart, and he's the kind of guy that will call a woman out when she deserves it or tell someone to go fuck themselves when no one else will speak up.

The guy has frame and he's become wildly successful on his own terms, but he's paid his price with women never having gotten out of his blue pill mindset.

Highschool : Sports, lifting, rich parents... a natural. Abundance, AF... then...

The first *the one*. Usual high beta, succesful frat boy natural story. This is a guy that is closing hundred million dollar real estate contracts and he couldn't see a bad deal that he literally stuck his dick inside of? Boggles the mind.

He got involved in real estate in a big way. It was a golden spoon situation, but he went to college and did legitimately prosper despite the easy beginnings comparatively. I don't know if I would call the guy self made, but certainly smart, talented and driven, despite using women to validate himself... to a degree.

He was never desperate or needy, but he certainly enjoyed the attention of being with models, actresses etc. It fed his ego and his ego relied on someone validating him. Without an attractive woman that "was his" he felt like he was missing something.

In shape, rich family, educated and married by his early 30s. I don't think anyone could have imagined just how much cash he'd make and how high he would go. I mean really. This guy has made some serious blunders in the world and if you asked a thousand people if he'd be where he is today, 1 person would believe that and then tell you they were kidding.

The cost that's leaked through the grapevine is this guy has paid out over \$26 million dollars between alimony and child support in addition to some super swank properties to his first two wives. Places nicer than I'll probably ever own.

He wasn't desperate, he had abundance mentality and eventually after marrying his THIRD wife hit SMV10. He seems very happy with her, but that's beside the point.

The real point is that if you ever want to have true abundance as a high beta, you're going to end up paying millions of dollars if you choose to remain locked into the idea that you'll be happier if you're married or in LTRs.

Really the only thing that held the guy back with women is he was so preoccupied with business 24/7 that the only arrangement that he was interested in was being in LTRs, and he paid dearly for it.

He's never seemingly regretted taking that chart in life. He never seemed to truly question the way he did it, for him, it was just the cost of doing business. Which again, was in excess of \$26 million dollars.

The argument from the courts is these women basically laid the foundation for him to build off of. I'm not really sure how you make a legal argument for it, but that's the idea, conceptually in marriage law. I can see how a guy who works 24/7 just wants to rely on having someone to come home to. But never understood how these women, not bringing much to the table, could with time become so



uncooperative with time.

He seemed to learn how to start managing them properly but it never really made much sense when no one was forcing him to get married. But that's just how it can be. Lot's of guys that have their act together in say the business world, can come home and even if they are getting laid say "you mean the world to me" every night before snuggling up for bed.

The act of giving comfort destined him for failure. It didn't matter how high his SMV was, his girlfriends or wives always had some excuse and when it was time to see a counselor they basically just wanted the cash and prizes.

Even today, everyone sees the guy as the ultimate alpha, even though he needed the comfort.

Who would have ever thought the guy would become the president of the free world.

But thankfully he's here to show us what it truly means to be a high beta, and how deeply inured we are within the blue pill dogma. Thinking that we are just SMV away from our dreams of happily ever after.

I personally don't think most men want to be 70 years old before they *maybe* find a woman that *might* stick around and not take the cash and prizes after they've obtained one of the highest SMV ranks on the planet.

No matter how much money you make, how big your dick is or how high your SMV is, tinges uber alles. And the biggest killer to that is comfort. You'll always be disposable.

**It is difficult to digest not because it is false, but because it is true. If you think it is false, bring your smoking gun. We're all waiting, we'd all love to return to a world not in ruin.**

37 upvotes | October 19, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Short and sweet gentlemen

There is no such thing as "purple pill." As Rollo states, and I agree, men who ascribe to the name purple pill want you to believe they are rejecting some of the ~~harsher~~ incorrect truths of the red pill. That doesn't make you purple, it makes you blue. The whole pill analogy is apt because it must be swallowed in whole.

You either get it or reject it. That's why we have phrases like *failed unplugging* or *choking on the red pill*.

It's difficult not because it is false, but because it is true. Think about that.

The guys that went through the long and painful process to go through and exit cPTSD, the stages of denial, destroying their worldview, diverging from public interpretations and understandings of sexual competition etc. None of that stuff was easy.

A frequent occurrence in MRP are men who stop being faithful to their wives, divorce them, fall out of love.

Guys who get it stop being able to pair bond.

None of these guys took the easy way out, because once they understood it, not only were they unable to betray themselves, they were getting results.

None of hundreds of thousands of guys that have tried to dispute this have ever had a smoking gun.

Stop identifying with, or as, or acknowledging "purple pill." These are just blue pill users. Treat them as such.

# Children without fathers, and women without providers. Short term mates, long term mates, alpha bucks and the silverback patriarch.

23 upvotes | October 22, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

I've been having small scale conversations with a lot of guys lately that are honestly red pillled but are having a lot of trouble figuring how this plays into starting a family, and this is causing a lot of cognitive dissonance and strife. So I think it's worthy to expand this out because it is a clear point of contention that is not well defined enough from key content such as Rollo's.

I also teased about how I was trying to wrap my head around some issues with the meta study I was talking about in terms of a possible third category, how I couldn't understand how this male concept of alpha bucks was fitting in and why women didn't want good fathers or smart partners, even for long term mates.

That really threw me for a loop... but I think I've got a coherent understanding of this now that makes a lot of sense to me, at least, and does conform to the TRP framework I believe.

Here's the main concepts that reconciled should help men understand exactly what it means to provision and to understand the TRP framework at a high enough level to understand what they're getting into when they start a family or get married.

## Short term vs Long term mates

*When you think of a man that is a provider, what does that mean?*

To remove some of the TRP terminology for a second, you can understand both sides of the male equation by understanding them in the way they are referred to in studies of mating behavior.

Short term mates are men who are high on traits we come to associate with the red pill. Good looking, strong frame, narcissistic.

"Long term" mates are men who are high on traits we associate with the blue pill. Reliable and typically with a strong earning potential. They are as Jordan Peterson would say "high in agreeableness." Or *good guys*.

The description here we see oft of "alpha bucks" is actually a *high SMV provisioner*. Yes, you can even put Brad Pitt into this category. Elon Musk is an easy one to understand here. Which many men on here would describe as "high smv, in shape, make lots of money." Many would describe this hypothetical guy as being a programmer or business owner.

From there, many readers would project their inner desires readily. To be this high SMV man and enter a long term relationship to start a family. To be a *high smv provider*.

## Illegitimate Children

*When you think of children without fathers, how do you imagine the type of man that she was with and what type of woman was she?*

We're going to break this down into two archetypes

- Failed providers
- Failed mothers

The type of man in the mainstream narrative of a children without a father, is the failed provider. This is the "immature man child" who won't take responsibility and won't "man up." The scorn that is held for this type of guy is because he is not honoring his archetype.

What men more often see, is an archetypical guy that we all know would not be the type of guy to stick around. The stereotype here is Tyrone. In these cases, it's not unusual that the "immaturity" angle never rears its head, because it wouldn't pass the smell test. What would be obvious to anyone, is that this man simply honored his archetype. This is the failed mother.

What the *actual* "alpha bucks" is to a woman, is not Brad Pitt. It's Tyrone, who doesn't realize he is Tyrone, but instead a high SMV provider. **This is the point that I've noticed men are having trouble reconciling.**

### **Male solipsism and the nuclear family**

So the inherent conclusion from most men is *great, just get in shape and be high SMV*. But we already know what happens to naturals. It would seem at this point that there isn't a solution to the problem, what is *the solution*. That's what men do with everything, you give us a problem, we find a solution.

*But what if there wasn't a solution, what if the solution, was in fact, it's inability to be unsolvable, and if that was the case, then what is the question?*

### **How would you ensure both the fitness AND genetic diversity of offspring to ensure a steady but constant improvement of the species?**

The way that men want to answer that question always ends BEFORE the AND operator. It's "AND genetic diversity." Or the concept we know as "she's not yours."

### **Tyrone changes some diapers : Tradcon and a successful blue pill relationship**

The actual conflict between Tyrone and the mother of his children isn't necessarily that he is not an alpha male, or even that he is blue pill. Our example is a blue pill alpha male.

A while back I wrote that there *were* successful blue pill relationships, but I couldn't put my finger on what that meant. This is that.

#### *Attraction Components*

- Female has low or no n-count
- Female *is naive*
- Male is highly dimorphic
- Female is of markedly lower SMV

#### *Family components*

- Female has strong maternal orientation
- Females primary or sole personal growth is done through the family, not career or social life.

This gives the woman control over an alpha male, and that control is balanced out by other *significant* factors. The component *naivety* is REQUIRED. We can think of the opposite of naive as "westernized." But the fact that she does have control over him, *firmly* places him within the provider framework.

But this relationship can work, especially if the guy makes all the right moves, even if he is blue in

his heart. This is the fantasy that is sold as *a normal relationship*. Statistically though, this is *very* rare.

Just do the math on *female with no partners* and one standard deviation to the right for height. We're talking about less than 1% of relationships are falling into this paradigm. But they are the ones you recognize in your SMV circle. They're the ones as a red pill man you go "how is this working?"

A low n-count with an archetypically attractive man for a woman who hasn't yet westernized herself goes *a long way*. *But what you can see here is that in order to realize your "blue pill dreams" the requirements are a male optimized woman.*

### **Tradcon vs Modprog**

Okay so you're jacked and you want a family. You find the girl with a low n-count, she always loved kids, has a good father and asks you if she should work or not. The ball is in your court. You run the family *EXACTLY* how you want it.

You provide only

- You can be an equal partner in the arrangement and change diapers and go to the zoo.
- You can spend that time doing man things

Any variation between the two, do whatever you think works best.

You both work

- You can be an equal partner in the arrangement and change diapers and go to the zoo.

*There is not enough time for you to do a tradcon setup\** To be clear, I'm not saying you're whipped, but you certainly can NOT pull off tradcon.

So you can easily see there isn't an arrangement that doesn't involve you providing. Easily. Listen buddy, trust me, you're going to the Zoo for Cupcake day. And you know what, that isn't terrible.

### **Wrong solution for the wrong problem**

There is no solution to "how do I enter a long term provisioning relationship and be treated like a short term partner in terms of attraction?" "How can I be treated as non-disposable, while subjecting myself to acceptance into a provider paradigm?"

Remember how we talked about how blue pill dreams can only be optimized by a "male optimized woman?" If that is the case, how does the system optimize for the other 99% of women?

### **The system is optimized under the truest possible pragmatic reality.**

*Men compete, women select, society supports hoping to bill a provider. Women are nomadic and the nuclear family is a primarily male value system.*

You know what other question this answer solves?

*How would you ensure both the fitness AND genetic diversity of offspring to ensure a steady but constant improvement of the species?*

### **Proof**

If we accept this statement as true, you will find NO conflict between TRPs canon, the structure of the society and the way women operate or behave. NONE.

### **So what now?**

You have two choices. Genetic contributor, or provider. Choose your path, but accept whichever path you choose. Don't deceive yourself. A provider is chosen either directly (her choosing a LTR candidate), indirectly (her finding a natural to groom) by her, or society (failed provider through child support, failed mother through welfare).

So ultimately, if you're asking how can you have children without being treated like a provider?

Understand that women don't respect good fathers, truly understand that. They're not attracted to them. They respect a good father in the same way that a manager respects a good employee.

Understand briffault's law. Understand what it means to "be a father." Understand it is, the *ultimate* blue pill dream to have a nuclear family, even if you have a proto-alpha setup of Don Draper.

You must operate as a contributor, only then, when your mental point of origin, as Rollo would say, is to spread your seed and conquer the world, can you allow a woman to enter your world, and in return, on your terms, can you be a father to those children. But only under your terms, and I don't believe that can be mutually exclusive.

And if you're honest that you are in fact, not operating under a blue pill paradigm, when or if she leaves, you move on to start the process all over again. And if you can't ever imagine doing that, just understand and accept your position as a provider. From there you can use the advice at MRP to become a *red pill aware, blue pill, provider presenting as an alpha male. A red pill aware, natural.* I don't mean that pejoratively either.

## She knows you're a fraud

59 upvotes | November 10, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Read the sidebar twice, keep your eyes peeled and put every woman you know through your mental ringer, do they all conform to AWALT?

Do you understand the gambit for the ones who *don't seem* to match up?

Do you understand if they have self deceived themselves that it will be temporary before they revert back to their ways?

Then you understand women.

And if you understand them, why would you think you can beat them at their own game? They lived with this skill from the moment they could walk, before they could talk. The word is *innate*. She thinks about those skills in the way you think about your grip strength opening a jar of pickles.

Stop trying to pretend you don't care about her, stop trying to pretend you don't want to get married and have kids. Stop trying to pretend you don't want to call her your girlfriend.

Stop.

If you feel the need to "calibrate" yourself to her, redigest the content. Because if you understand her, you can't love her (in that blue pill way). And if you can't love her in that way, then no act is necessary.

To be truly congruent is to understand women. It will then be unneeded for you to act, because your frame will be congruent to reality.

This is the stepping stone to "the talk." You can't have "the talk" if you're not at this level. And if you've made it to "the talk" without being at that level, consider yourself damn lucky the couple times she sniffed you out that she didn't believe you were a fraud or she wanted to still play pretend with you.

If you can't help but want that in your life, you still don't understand the content or women. And the solution is not to puff up your chest and feign disinterest. It is to increase your chest size, and to know them, which will make you disinterested proportional to the degree that you are unhealthily and unattractively *over invested* in women and underinvested in yourself.

Simply put, when you act, you are trying to hide your need to validate yourself, with her.

## Schrödinger's (n)AWALT : Right now, she (never) love(s/d) you. E.g. tingles uber alles and why finding a "unicorn" is a waste of time.

91 upvotes | November 15, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[https://old.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/7d5z5n/schrodingers\\_nawalt\\_right\\_now\\_she\\_never\\_lovesd/](https://old.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/7d5z5n/schrodingers_nawalt_right_now_she_never_lovesd/)

I've been trying to think recently about a way we can try to shepherd men, that are failed unpluggings to understand why the logic behind vetting and the idea of the unicorn is false. Fundamentally, the idea of the unicorn is nAWALT. Yet these women *exist*. But with enough knowledge you know even if they "exist," *they don't*. The confusion here is not that these statements are false, but why they are true. And why there are true, I think is pretty deep and profound, not just to why the language of the community is too vague to understand this well enough, but because I think it shoots all the way down to our purpose, as a species.

This essay will be most helpful to men that believe that they can *vet* a woman to search for a unicorn, that do not understand yet why this doesn't matter, and that TRP is right. If you already have gotten past your unicorn stage, understand how difficult and painful it was for you to understand and digest this, and if it was easy for you, understand most men go through a divorce or *many* to digest this, and still not ever understand *why*.

This is a stepping stone for why you want an "internal locus of control."

This is just one example of many why having an external locus of control is a futile way to live your life. You don't know, what you don't know. Systems are infinitely complex, and here you're about to read about how and why, all you can do is *love what she brings you. (right now)*

### Inspiration

After conversing with a woman in PPD it became clear as day that the fundamental conflict between men and women can be better understood, not in the *results* we see (which we may conflate as AWALT) but instead in differences in how men and women see the world around them. The woman I was conversing with *could not* possibly imagine a future where she wasn't attracted to her fiancé. Yet also, recognized that she would be unwilling to sleep with a man she wasn't attracted to. And that she was essentially nAWALT. To any man that reads this, they'd think, what do you mean you'd never be that woman if you wouldn't sleep with a man you've lost attraction to?

This woman believes nAWALT because she, right now, is nAWALT.

Now let me be clear. This does not mean she is not subject to the results we know that are likely to occur in this situation. What I mean is this. Her mental attitude is *naive*. She has *never lost attraction to a partner*.

If I had to place a bet on whether this woman, right now, is capable of cheating, or whether she's living two lives and has a side man, I would bet the farm that she's a "good girl."

Before a woman has lost attraction to someone, and been forced to confront herself, she is in a state of naivety that absolutely could be seen, at the time, as nAWALT. **This is the unicorn.** I consider this to be the equivalent to a male natural. She is not yet able to understand her own true nature,



because she hasn't yet confronted it.

I finally found one boys. But what does this even mean, what can we learn about this specimen? Well... like everything when you peel it apart, nothing good. We all know damn well how she behaves will be entirely determined by him maintaining attraction and nothing a couple SMV points higher showing its head.

But right now, she feels like that could never be true. And so right now, she could never imagine being that horrid, dishonest woman that is described as AWALT on TRP.

When we say "there are no unicorns" we are not commenting on her in this state, we are commenting on her end results, her outcome. Because we know "AWALT."

### **So here we can see that**

- n(AWALT) is TRUE
- and AWALT is TRUE
- and unicorns exist (nAWALT)
- and unicorns don't exist (because AWALT).
- and that she can love you (because she feels that right now)
- and that she never loved you (because she feels that right now)

So this is somewhat a semantic debate, in so far as the language of TRP is part of the problem with the "purple pill" issue (red pill aware, blue pill users). But it also helps us understand the nature of the conflict between men and women without resorting to hyperbole (all women are shit) or doublespeak (enjoy the decline).

This really is the nature of women I believe that men can not rationalize. I do not believe women are inherently wicked like those that sling AWALT around want to state. I believe women are incapable of understanding their wicked nature until they confront themselves.

### **Confronting the beast within**

Jordan Peterson has often brought up that inside, we are all at least Nazi prison camp guards. And until you are within the conflict of war, you can't really know yourself. I have met this man inside of myself. And I would say until you have fully accepted the teachings here, you can't say you know yourself any better than the subject of this essay.

What I believe, is that inside every woman is this equal beast, that we know as AWALT. As the woman you meet sitting at the divorce table that says "I never loved you" and would tear your eyes out if such a thing were legally permissible.

At some point, this very same woman was a unicorn. She was nAWALT. At some point, she thought *I will never love a man as much as this man.*

Which to any of us, makes no god damn sense. But that's because the beast we confront in ourselves serves a different purpose.

**WE COMPETE, SHE SELECTS.**

So the beast within serves her purpose, selection, while ours serves ours, competition.

### **Solution**

The only solution to this problem is to have an internal locus of control, which is aligned to the attraction mechanisms of a woman AND sufficiently accounts for the mercurial nature of a woman's

being.

Vetting, controlling your SMV etc only get you so far as strictly rational thought. When she's confronted with an irrational desire that far exceeds her ability to deal with it, you will meet what lies inside of every woman.

So not all women are like that, until they have to be. And when she feels that she has to be, she will bring a woman out that *I personally* will assure you is pretty god damn close to you in the fire you bring. When you start a family, understand that when this woman comes out, she is equally as dangerous, without hyperbole, as the man marching towards you with a rifle and bayonet.

If you don't have kids, get the fuck out of the way. If you don't have kids and you got married... why, bloody god, why, you fucking moron.

These posts should make it *excruciatingly* clear, your efforts to "game the system" or find flaws in the content is nothing more than the manifestation of you not wanting to accept the truth. I make these posts not so you can find ways to use this knowledge to further your blue pill goals, but to understand, that it is clear as day, that these systems do not have a solution.

The proof I put all this against never betrays the truth.

*How do you ensure ever increasing genetic fitness AND diversity?*

I posit this is a related and corollary to Rollo's war bride dynamic. Because if a woman was not capable of holding contradictory feelings like this, she would not be able to execute her evolutionary purpose. So these contradictory states, and beliefs which don't make a whole lot of sense on their face, I believe serve a purpose. They are the grease for a woman's own internal mental friction to achieve the purpose of the species.

For you, it should serve as a stark warning of trying to plan your life around what amounts to a permanently unsolvable variable.

Because the only thing that matters to her, is how she feels, right now. Tingles uber alles then is supposition of the states of being attracted to and not attracted to a man at all times. What has transpired between you two is null the moment she's decided it.

So work on the only variable which you, 100.00% control. Your god damn self.

## Schrödinger's (n)AWALT : Right now, she (never) love(s/d) you. E.g. tingles uber alles and why finding a "unicorn" is a waste of time.

88 upvotes | November 15, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[/r/TheRedPill/comments/7d5z5n/schrodingers\\_nawalt\\_right\\_now\\_she\\_never\\_lovesd/](/r/TheRedPill/comments/7d5z5n/schrodingers_nawalt_right_now_she_never_lovesd/)

I've been trying to think recently about a way we can try to shepherd men, that are failed unpluggings to understand why the logic behind vetting and the idea of the unicorn is false. Fundamentally, the idea of the unicorn is nAWALT. Yet these women *exist*. But with enough knowledge you know even if they "exist," *they don't*. The confusion here is not that these statements are false, but why they are true. And why there are true, I think is pretty deep and profound, not just to why the language of the community is too vague to understand this well enough, but because I think it shoots all the way down to our purpose, as a species.

This essay will be most helpful to men that believe that they can *vet* a woman to search for a unicorn, that do not understand yet why this doesn't matter, and that TRP is right. If you already have gotten past your unicorn stage, understand how difficult and painful it was for you to understand and digest this, and if it was easy for you, understand most men go through a divorce or *many* to digest this, and still not ever understand *why*.

This is a stepping stone for why you want an "internal locus of control."

This is just one example of many why having an external locus of control is a futile way to live your life. You don't know, what you don't know. Systems are infinitely complex, and here you're about to read about how and why, all you can do is *love what she brings you. (right now)*

### Inspiration

After conversing with a woman in PPD it became clear as day that the fundamental conflict between men and women can be better understood, not in the *results* we see (which we may conflate as AWALT) but instead in differences in how men and women see the world around them. The woman I was conversing with *could not* possibly imagine a future where she wasn't attracted to her fiancé. Yet also, recognized that she would be unwilling to sleep with a man she wasn't attracted to. And that she was essentially nAWALT. To any man that reads this, they'd think, what do you mean you'd never be that woman if you wouldn't sleep with a man you've lost attraction to?

This woman believes nAWALT because she, right now, is nAWALT.

Now let me be clear. This does not mean she is not subject to the results we know that are likely to occur in this situation. What I mean is this. Her mental attitude is *naive*. She has *never lost attraction to a partner*.

If I had to place a bet on whether this woman, right now, is capable of cheating, or whether she's living two lives and has a side man, I would bet the farm that she's a "good girl."

Before a woman has lost attraction to someone, and been forced to confront herself, she is in a state of naivety that absolutely could be seen, at the time, as nAWALT. **This is the unicorn.** I consider this to be the equivalent to a male natural. She is not yet able to understand her own true nature, because she hasn't yet confronted it.

I finally found one boys. But what does this even mean, what can we learn about this specimen? Well... like everything when you peel it apart, nothing good. We all know damn well how she behaves will be entirely determined by him maintaining attraction and nothing a couple SMV points higher showing its head.

But right now, she feels like that could never be true. And so right now, she could never imagine being that horrid, dishonest woman that is described as AWALT on TRP.

When we say "there are no unicorns" we are not commenting on her in this state, we are commenting on her end results, her outcome. Because we know "AWALT."

### **So here we can see that**

- n(AWALT) is TRUE
- and AWALT is TRUE
- and unicorns exist (nAWALT)
- and unicorns don't exist (because AWALT).
- and that she can love you (because she feels that right now)
- and that she never loved you (because she feels that right now)

So this is somewhat a semantic debate, in so far as the language of TRP is part of the problem with the "purple pill" issue (red pill aware, blue pill users). But it also helps us understand the nature of the conflict between men and women without resorting to hyperbole (all women are shit) or doublespeak (enjoy the decline).

This really is the nature of women I believe that men can not rationalize. I do not believe women are inherently wicked like those that sling AWALT around want to state. I believe women are incapable of understanding their wicked nature until they confront themselves.

### **Confronting the beast within**

Jordan Peterson has often brought up that inside, we are all at least Nazi prison camp guards. And until you are within the conflict of war, you can't really know yourself. I have met this man inside of myself. And I would say until you have fully accepted the teachings here, you can't say you know yourself any better than the subject of this essay.

What I believe, is that inside every woman is this equal beast, that we know as AWALT. As the woman you meet sitting at the divorce table that says "I never loved you" and would tear your eyes out if such a thing were legally permissible.

At some point, this very same woman was a unicorn. She was nAWALT. At some point, she thought *I will never love a man as much as this man.*

Which to any of us, makes no god damn sense. But that's because the beast we confront in ourselves serves a different purpose.

**WE COMPETE, SHE SELECTS.**

So the beast within serves her purpose, selection, while ours serves ours, competition.

### **Solution**

The only solution to this problem is to have an internal locus of control, which is aligned to the attraction mechanisms of a woman AND sufficiently accounts for the mercurial nature of a woman's being.

Vetting, controlling your SMV etc only get you so far as strictly rational thought. When she's confronted with an irrational desire that far exceeds her ability to deal with it, you will meet what lies inside of every woman.

So not all women are like that, until they have to be. And when she feels that she has to be, she will bring a woman out that *I personally* will assure you is pretty god damn close to you in the fire you bring. When you start a family, understand that when this woman comes out, she is equally as dangerous, without hyperbole, as the man marching towards you with a rifle and bayonet.

If you don't have kids, get the fuck out of the way. If you don't have kids and you got married... why, bloody god, why, you fucking moron.

These posts should make it *excruciatingly* clear, your efforts to "game the system" or find flaws in the content is nothing more than the manifestation of you not wanting to accept the truth. I make these posts not so you can find ways to use this knowledge to further your blue pill goals, but to understand, that it is clear as day, that these systems do not have a solution.

The proof I put all this against never betrays the truth.

*How do you ensure ever increasing genetic fitness AND diversity?*

I posit this is a related and corollary to Rollo's war bride dynamic. Because if a woman was not capable of holding contradictory feelings like this, she would not be able to execute her evolutionary purpose. So these contradictory states, and beliefs which don't make a whole lot of sense on their face, I believe serve a purpose. They are the grease for a woman's own internal mental friction to achieve the purpose of the species.

For you, it should serve as a stark warning of trying to plan your life around what amounts to a permanently unsolvable variable.

Because the only thing that matters to her, is how she feels, right now. Tingles uber alles then is supposition of the states of being attracted to and not attracted to a man at all times. What has transpired between you two is null the moment she's decided it.

So work on the only variable which you, 100.00% control. Your god damn self.

# There is no such thing as "purple pill."

7 upvotes | November 16, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

So I've been making a fairly regular contribution to hacking away at this exact phenomenon that Rollo first identified in "Mitch's Purple Pill" and really is the majority of the user base here.

Credit : Rollo

However, Mitch represents another type of Purple Pill man. This is the guy who's become Red Pill aware, but believes he can make his Blue Pill idealism work in a Red Pill context from the outset of his partial unplugging. As a result, there's a certain degree of affirmation seeking men of this stripe look for from other men in Red Pill forums. That affirmation is entirely based in the false hope that he can use Red Pill truths to achieve Blue Pill goals. Thus, **he looks for affirmation in this feminine-primary idealism without realizing he's really just asking Red Pill men for their permission to persist in his Blue Pill hope while calling it Red Pill for himself.**

Absolutely fantastic grab here that describes most of the replies I got, and I GAVE years and years ago. Which is why I mention a lot that I'm jumping into a delorean to try and save myself.

Lol...you guys can go fuck yourselves. I appreciate where ya'll are coming from, though. Trying to save me from myself. And i appreciate how naive my post must sound to a bunch of hard core red pillers like yourselves. However, I am not nearly as inexperienced with women and LTR's as ya'll assume. I have learned a lot from red pill in general and this site in particular – it's very insightful and helpful, and I've adjusted my attitude and posture toward women because of it. At the same time, though, it strikes me that many of you are taking on red pill ideas as a kind of ideology, and that's its own kind of danger. The absolute certainty that ya'll think you know all you need to know about me and my woman and my relationship from that very brief post is what I mean. As if red-pill theory, or whatever it is, completely and concisely explains the total dynamic between a man and woman. Red pill explains a lot of things really well

If you are in pain and are having trouble with the idea of letting go of the idea of marriage, and are still trying to figure out how to game the system (you still believe there are good girls and bad girls (NAWALT\existence of unicorns), ladies I can't speak to your side in this discussion), I recommend you look at my post history. Almost everything I write is with the intention of waking you up to understand that you're still firmly within the blue pill paradigm. If that's what you want, that is fine. However, it is much easier than to look at a website like Hooking Up Smart, and ones like it. That is a blue pill dating website that takes the convenient red pill content. Stuff that doesn't change your world view. I made a post about Freud's own unplugging that should help get guys to understand they're only in a rudimentary stage of understanding of women. TRP represents a final understanding of women, albeit with a lot of locker room talk.

These are posts that were created with the idea of addressing myself in a failed unplugging. When I called myself "purple pill." Lots of users and mods told me the same thing that lots of you have heard on here when you said "well I'm PURPLE then, haha!"

No. You are still blue pill. Mods and users at TRP told me the same thing, and I had all the same

replies. The difference is that instead of sitting at PPD and patting myself on the back, I spent two years actually looking for a hole.

And wouldn't you know it. Everything I ever tried testing, researching, debating etc. It all said exactly what TRP outlined, it wasn't just "manchildren" or "misogynist anger." It was all true, I just didn't like the truth.

The fact of the matter is TRP could use some cleaning up on the way the content is provided and presented, it could use some changing of terms to make things a little less ambiguous and prone to issues of interpretation. But the mods have an attitude I have trouble disputing. "We're giving you the gospel for free, go fuck yourself."

With time, I may rewrite some core content and redefine some terms and fly it up the flag pole, but for now, you can use content I've created to help understand where you're wrong.

**Do I expect many to do this? No.** I understand, at a personal level, how hard these concepts are to understand. Before unwinding this, I never imagined "brainwashing" to be a thing. But dogma, advertising, promotion, propaganda.... it's all very effective. I see that now.

But if you're in that analytical mindset that you've got a solution that ends in marriage or a stable family, read my content. I'd be surprised if you've done your homework to the level required. If your solution isn't a one sided open relationship on the male's side, then keep doing the math.

Rollo posited this, and I came to the same conclusion.

Some other things that are *critical* and foundation concepts of the red pill that, without, you are still blue pill.

- Socio-neoteny ("Women are the smartest teenager in the house" in TRP locker room talk)
- Hypoagency
- Believing a tradcon setup to be "red pill"

And again, not realizing that AWALT is literal, and unicorns aren't real. Which my latest post addresses in excruciating detail. This is I think the largest point that TRP did not address in enough detail, which is why a lot of these guys even *think* they can say they're "red pill" *at all*.

The list could go on, but this is just a very small list of things I see constantly on here and even on TRP. I very much sympathize with the mods at TRP now.

One of my weaknesses is fixating on an issue and working it out to its very end. I looked for flaws in TRP for somewhere to the effect of two years, and I have found nothing in the content. The issue, at it's heart is semantic, I address this in my most recent post. But suffice to say, I never, not once, found an angle that didn't actually reseat itself firmly within the TRP framework.

I'd like to use this discussion to see what if any other points are out there from users that are in denial that are still blue pill, why they think they are red pill, and what points they don't understand to continue addressing this part of the failed unplugging.

I fully expect this thread to be Mitch's Purple Pill on crack and brace for the incoming "go fuck yourself's."

# What you can learn from foreigners infecting women with HIV, worst reason to understand stats ever...

4 upvotes | November 17, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Without a doubt this is one of the saddest, most disgusting red pills to ever be written about, so buckle up buttercups, we're about to explore with a set of mirrors and some smoke stats you'd normally never be able to assess or understand. Things that normally take place behind closed doors, forcing you to look at the mean, never the outliers.

Just how successful would a man be of the "contextual SMV" variety if they were aligned with whatever social dogma was the rage at the time? We could call this a combination of bottom 20% physical smv and contextual smv approximating something to the effect of SMV9 or SMV10 in a contextual sense. This is the modern "rock star."

This started with two points of reference.

First, the infection rate to PIV intercourse is very low.

## Infection rate per 10,000 exposures

- Blood Transfusion 9,250
- Needle-Sharing During Injection Drug Use 63
- Percutaneous (Needle-Stick) 23
- Receptive Anal Intercourse 138
- Insertive Anal Intercourse 11
- Receptive Penile-Vaginal Intercourse 8
- Insertive Penile-Vaginal Intercourse 4
- Receptive Oral Intercourse Low
- Insertive Oral Intercourse Low

We also know that it is extremely difficult to track how many people are often infected in a case. Often the people who are infected refuse to get tested, because they would rather not know, because they can't be criminally charged if they don't know they have it. Furthermore, they may just want to know what they know might be true.

**From this, we know that the number of confirmed infections will be MUCH lower than the total number of exposures, by orders of magnitude.**

So when you see "two women infected with HIV" what you should understand is instead, you're dealing with astronomical numbers of exposures comparatively if they are from *the same male*.

So let's start with this one.

A man in custody since last month on suspicion on infecting women in Iceland with HIV has been released from custody. The suspect, believed to be an asylum seeker of Nigerian nationality, was arrested last month. Police have grounds to believe that the man knew that he was HIV+. He was released from custody yesterday and served with a four-month travel ban. According to Inspector Friðrik Smári Björgvinsson, Head of the Reykjavik Metropolitan Police Criminal Investigation Department, there is no reason to keep the suspect in custody any longer. The case is currently being investigated by the police and the



Icelandic Directorate of Health and is said to be proceeding well. As at 24 July, two women had been confirmed HIV+ and 10-20 more had been tested.

So out of two confirmed cases, a minimum of let's say 15 were tested. Remember, *these are just the ones that let their conscience get the best of them*. They didn't hamster it away. Let's be real, it's at *least 20* as time goes on, at least. And this guy wasn't even there for very long.

So now, let's blow this out a bit. Let's give this guy some status and contextual SMV.

Record number of HIV virus cases were detected in the central Mazovia region and the whole Poland in January 2007.[34] Simon Mol's had visited Gdańsk in September 2006, where he helped organize the anti-racist "Music against Intolerance and Violence" festival. After publishing Mol's epidemiological alert, the number of HIV tests in the Gdańsk provincial centers exceeded 100, day in day out, including two worried males who learnt that their partners had slept with Mol, while the usual number had been hovering over a dozen cases daily beforehand.[35]

This rather average guy plowed **at least** a hundred women IN SEPTEMBER OF 2006. And two guys who they actually spilled to. Any guy that knows their shit here knows how astronomically low that number of actual admissions is.

11 actual infections, a .0008 transmission rate per encounter. The math on this is *enormous*. Even the lowest possible numbers you can come up with are 300 different encounters, with again, a absolute minimum unique count of 11. But clearly that number is likely over a hundred.

What do we learn from this? Well.... contextual SMV is powerful as *fuck*. Pun intended. Status is basically worthless currency these days, in fact, traditional status is basically the new low status indicator so far as I can see.

## **Q4W What is a "high quality" woman, and what is a "low quality" woman?**

8 upvotes | November 20, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

# The failed feminist hypothesis : PT1 The Norwegian gender paradox

195 upvotes | November 25, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

For those unaware

Norwegian gender paradox is the phenomenon that countries widely considered to have more gender equality actually see **more** gender division into stereotypical male and female jobs.

## So what does it mean?

To be clear, no one knows the answer to this yet. The answer itself raises it's own questions, so this is my take on it. Dr. Jordan Peterson stated that essentially, what you end up seeing is the *naked biological preferences* in job choice once you remove all the social elements. Which he stated "maximizes the gender difference effect." I believe this is not an accurate way to look at it. The statement as he puts it I believe is true, but false in spirit.

This was the part I had the biggest time confronting and understanding. If you *remove the influence*, and this *increases* the effect, this means that the "prejudiced" social element was actually *influencing* non-gender-typical choices, *not* discouraging them.

**So I think the best way to look at it is this. Society's efforts to "remove undue influence on the choices of women" has done exactly that.**

The liberal hypothesis was "if women did not have barriers to these jobs, they would be in these jobs in substantial numbers." This was the hypothesis, because this is *how they felt*. However, when they no longer thought *what if*, they made choices based on *what they actually wanted*. Do we know anything else like this?

What women want, is as Jordan Peterson put it, is people oriented jobs. Not thing oriented jobs.

## Expounding out the thought process of the pre-Norwegian progressive movement

- *No one can tell me that this is a man's job.*
- *I can do this better than a man.*
- *If I had the ability to get that job...*
- *What if women could*

So what happens when you culturally propagate "women can do *anything* a man can do" and remove all the barriers to allow women to choose those jobs?

Well, **they have no monsters left to slay**. They just have a choice to make. "What do I want to do?"

And it turns out, women have always wanted to do jobs that are "stereotypically female" and men have taken the burden of "male jobs." And furthermore, these aren't even necessarily male and female jobs, but instead jobs with a people vs thing orientation. Or to make this more clear, the jobs are "stereotypically male or female." They are just jobs that men and women have always preferred to hold.

So this entire failed hypothesis experiment was just a challenge to widely understood established desires.

"What if women want to do these jobs and you're just not letting them?"

The answer is clear. Women didn't occupy those positions because they couldn't have them, instead, because they didn't want them.

And furthermore, the muddying of the waters *encouraged women to make choices to either challenge the system or make choices that do not seem to reflect their genuine wants, needs or desires.*

Now the liberal challenge to this will most certainly be "*some* women will want to be programmers and engineers." And **no one** is disputing that. But what is clear, is that when you remove the element of doubt, and remove the lurking variables, only self interest remains.

## Predictions

- Expectations to change jobs with a thing orientation, into jobs with a people orientation. (Google adopting feminine operational structures)
- Candidate surpluses in female centric disciplines within male degree paths (HR in business etc)
- De Facto legal codification of gender quotas (Possibly as a way to usher in changes from thing to people orientation)

## Strategy

- When it suits you, train for jobs which will have a surplus in female candidates, which require little to no additional knowledge to undertake. For instance, obtaining an HR minor in addition to your desired minor in business, under your major. If true codification of gender quotas begin, you will have enormous leverage.
- Become well versed in Rule 38 as you weather the storm.
- Be prepared within our lifetimes for what we understand as a "red pill male" to become the obvious mate choice.

We are in a transition time period where you are given great advantage. Right now, that which was at one time *obvious* (women want masculine men, and women want jobs with people orientations) is apparent to only a small minority of the population. It will be only a matter of time until, just like gendered jobs in Norwegian jobs are simply known as "male" or "female," women make the obvious hypergamous choices and the minority will be the women that instead chooses the guy who does not conform to the attraction archetype. And she will make those choices because she will not have to second guess herself.

She will make those choices because society has done what it set out to do. Which is "allow women to make the choices which best pursue their innate wants and desires."

So then, as we can see, it will be only a matter of time before reality beats down the false hypothesis. Because any person, when left with the simple choice "what do you want to do?" Will invariably make the choice with their best interests in mind, *given the available information.*

I will expand this out in PT2 to lay out how I believe this will play out with sexual selection. But suffice to say, enjoy the advantages you have while you have them. For those of you that were on the internet back in the dial up days, do you remember what it felt like after everyone knew about the internet, and you were no longer a wizard? Well... expect that in the SMV.

## **Q4BPW : When a woman infers another woman is either high or low quality, what does that mean?**

3 upvotes | November 27, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

The last thread was not concise enough, so tightening things up a little bit.

When used in the context of one woman's opinion of another woman, in relation to her value as a woman.

This is distinct from *attractive or unattractive*.

## **Q4BPW : What are the most important features of what\who you aspire to be?**

2 upvotes | November 28, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

## **Q4BPW What does "to be a good wife" mean to most women?**

4 upvotes | November 29, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

# One question that will help unplug you any time you need some perspective... "What does *\*to be a good wife\**, mean to *\*most women\**?"

48 upvotes | November 29, 2017 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

A lot of what I like to do is examine concepts from both sides.

And the biggest divide you'll find between TRP and other camps in the SMV comes with language. Once you start peeling away language, you learn *a lot*.

## An example

"Men *only* care about sex."

If you are on TRP, you're fine with this statement. Even though you know it's not *literally* correct.

If you are a male feminist, you would argue this statement is *false*. (And would be technically correct, but as we would say "a fucking moron.") This is the origin of *the late neo's* observation of far left people being *rigid*.

No one, not the male feminists, the real feminists, regular women, regular men, fail to understand what this means. They can argue the intricacies, semantics and tautologies, but we're not incongruent.

Fundamentally, I've been saying, the problem TRP and men have with women, is they are *often incongruent to their stated, or even implied messages*. This is the fundamental divide.

You learn a lot when you start looking this deep, at what people say, how they say it, betrays a lot. Sometimes you stumble on a deeply personal question that will let you see right through someone.

This is my favorite little nugget I've discovered thus far.

## "What does *to be a good wife* mean to *most women*?"

There's so much juicy goodness in this....

1. You are making her qualify or reject commonly held, normative belief systems.
2. You are allowing her to accept or reject the idea of their being a good or bad model of "a wife"
3. Allowing her to either demonstrate her ability to abstractshow empathy or her solipsism.

Now to be clear, this is **not** a *vetting* post. Standard TRP applies. I'm only giving this as a disqualification tool, because even those that qualify themselves, you know the drill.

Tingles uber alles and SNYIJYT.

This wasn't the intended outcome of the post I made at PPD, merely the observation. I only made the post because in the last post I made, many women stated they "wanted to be a good wife" but I wondered what that meant.

I was actually surprised that many women wanted to be "good wives," despite being blue pill. Then I wondered what they imagined the concept most widely held as "a good wife" was.

So to let someone reframe the question, changes my intent. If they reframe it, then their answer "to be a good wife" is instead "to be what I consider or want to mean a good wife is."

So my observation from these two posts, is that a reluctance answer this question is most indicative of subconscious or even conscious incongruence between what a good wife is commonly held to be,



and what that person imagines they will want to be, if they get married.

This also shows, the *act of getting married* and *being a wife* are very different concepts to many women now. Many women *want to be married* but *do not want to be, what is widely understood to be, a good wife*.

This to me is analogous to the idea that a woman should enthusiastically want to be around you and be sexually involved with.

A woman giving this pause, and not enthusiastically outlying how she can't wait to align with what we know are healthy innate behaviors, is all you should need to know.

To which you might posit, "that's like finding a needle in a haystack..."

And then you might say "that would be a unicorn..."

Well... we know there are no unicorns. Just great men.

So if you gotta roll the dice with a woman to have kids with, or a steak that you want to pretend is real for a little bit, forget the door test.

Just ask her this.

Of course, a far left moonbat will posit "any man that asks me this question..." If she says "I wouldn't know what other women think" she's just confirming she's deeply solipsistic.

But think about this.

What has it come to, when this question, as simple as it is, isn't enthusiastically answered in a way that is congruent to widely held understandings of what a good wife is?

If a woman asked you "what does it mean, to be a good husband, to most men?" Think of the answer you would give. Is it vague, or does it embody not only your values, or what you believe a woman wants from you?

They hate this question because they are incongruent to what they know are widely held expectations I've been for a while been thinking about "how can you screen out and bin women quickly?" And I think I have a developing ethos for this, that roughly equates to asking questions that are on their face, somewhat blue, in which actual values widely diverge.

If this question goes poorly, you know how to slot her in, and to recover just AA or AM. Just remember when she unchecked that flag for you.

This is a congruence test, for women. Dare I say, the ultimate congruence test. If she fails it, she need not fail any other test and her only possible part of your life is *plate*.

## **Q4BPW What are 3 things most women judge other women for, that isn't cheating or being unattractive, if they do judge others.**

2 upvotes | November 30, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Obviously if "you don't" then no reason to answer...

For the sake of simplicity, do not mention if these traits are universal to any gender.

EDIT : Do not mention anything about how your response relates to gender. (same as a man, universal to gender, I think it's the same for all people etc)

## **RPW is not significantly different than what has traditionally been known as "being a good wife"**

6 upvotes | December 3, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Or wife material.

Essentially a more universal and informed tradcon.

## Q4W : For women who do believe intergender relations were better in more traditional times, what do you believe can be done to return to those value systems?

0 upvotes | December 4, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Question is wide open for those *that understand, in a generalized manner, what most people understood as "1950s" intergender relations*. And to be clear, that is *the actual way it was*, not the sanitized, glamorized or cherry picked version.

Roughly as Atlas put it, *good wives* with husbands that *understood proper husbandry*.

One valid concern that many women have with guys at TRP is "what about your daughters?"

Conceptually, you want your daughter with a natural (physically dimorphic, blue pill) in a traditional arrangement. But that also means that she hasn't been poisoned by what would be roughly described as feminist, "sex positive", value systems.

To many of us, it would appear that the system has reached a point that may be tough to rewind.

## **Q4RPM : Tall Chads, what percentage of women remain loyal, if their man is lower in SMV to her or you?**

1 upvotes | December 28, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[removed]

## Tall chads, what percentage of women in an LTR if she is higher SMV than him or lower than you will cheat?

0 upvotes | December 28, 2017 | /r/askTRP | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Your stories are welcomed. Have you found even one woman that you were positive wouldn't?

Post your n count and this is cross posted at ppd. They brought up a good point, probably no chads there ☐

## **CMV : For parents who want daughters raised with the most likely chance of them entering traditional relationships, religion is the most likely way to accomplish this goal**

3 upvotes | December 31, 2017 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

And yes it is obvious that "not all religious women end up that way" or "some of the worst are religious" etc. Any variation of "all women are different" is really a wasted reply.

Anyways, seeing if there's any other ideas out there.

Seeing a couple friends with otherwise perfect daughters and strong households starting to run head first into the new culture. It is.... not going well.

It does seem that the "fear of god" and the cohesion of the church community are the only possible solutions since a parents word means slightly more than shit these days.

Inspiration for the post from Atlas stating if her parents told her she couldn't date a 30 year old man at 16 she'd run away from home.

**CMV: If every variation of "that won't work on everyone" is removed from debate. TRP is iron clad.**

3 upvotes | January 1, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

[illegible]

Thank the lord for this day when we can tell the blue pill users that literally your entire ethos relies on "well I'M a special snow fake."

## What are you left with now?

[illegible]



# For the Incels - The only post you need, so you can shut up. Forever.

457 upvotes | January 3, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

All too often lately, I'm seeing a lot of this pop up on here, and frankly, this discussion should have been sorted out a long time ago.

**(Starts with) I am (pick several)**

- Low attractiveness ethnicity
- Short
- Have an ugly face
- Some debilitating physical ailment
- etc (some variation of "permanent impact to SMV")

**First thing out of the way**

*If you think you are this person, you probably are not.*

Getting in shape, dressing well and picking up a sales job so you can learn how to talk to people will get you laid, most of the time.

You **will not** be spinning plates. Fine. So be it.

There's plenty of guys who have a couple deficits with themselves and do OKAY or the few, chosen few, who despite, slay. You've decided, through rigorous analysis, that you will never.

FINE. This one post is for you.

**Listen Chad, I understand that, point is, I don't want to be a provider and be taken advantage of**

Cool, great, fine... we'll get to that in a minute.

To be clear, this post will exist for 3 reasons.

- 1) Your concerns are valid (some people will never be able to "spin plates" or not be a provider)
- 2) I am annoyed at the "Jim Jonesing" *orwellian doublespeak* about "enjoying the decline."
- 3) There is a solution

**I will make this post under only a couple presumptions.**

- You are not, the ugliest man ever to have existed.
- If you have some serious deformity, you need something, somewhere. Height, status, dark traits (being a criminal scumbag etc)

If legitimately, you can not change, any part of you, at all, and you're still horrendous, fine you win. You are the 1%. You are, again, not likely this.

And even if you were, *information is not perfectly transparent*. One woman's 3 is another woman's 5. It is unlikely, you are restricted to women who see you as 0 or 1.

**Being in shape, and strong, puts you SO FAR ahead of the game, it's not even fair**

It is, basically, unfair to be in shape. The VERY WORST that you're doing is living a longer life to

formulate your best shootout strategy when you finally exact revenge on your old friend for stealing the girl you never even told anyone you were into, who would have probably tried to nicely tell you she wasn't attracted to you.

But fuck him and her right? Comeon man, I'm going to extend you this advice without talking too much shit, just at least take the stuff that should be easy to digest. You can't lose with this. You're going to be so far ahead of the game.

NO, you won't bang 8s. Sorry, most of us have A LOT of trouble doing that, most of us PAY for that right. And you know what, filling a 5 or 6 up with a bunch of cum is a good time, seriously, most of us subconsciously only achieve because of this. It is theorized that it is the underpinnings of competition within the socioeconomic system, and without that drive... well you'd probably just... oh my GOD... play video games, eat cheetos and drink mountain dew?

Okay, put down the controller, spend some time at the gym and now you're so far ahead we don't know what to do with you.

**Damnit normie... you're still not...**

That's not what I'm addressing. What I am addressing is the valid concern that you don't want to work your ass off just to become a high beta and get divorce raped.

Well, how fuckin' sad is this when I realized the reason why these guys are locked away in their rooms miserable is because *they're still honor and duty bound*.

So let me help you unwind this.

Women don't owe you honesty, and you don't owe it to them.

AND TO BE CLEAR

Women, in my opinion, most of them, aren't setting out to fuck up your shit intentionally. In the moment, they felt like they would be comfortable with you and spend forever with you. They probably think to themselves that "this guy is not attractive, at all, but he's funny, cares about me and he says he wants to be a programmer. He's not terrible in bed..."

She'll lose attraction to you, straight up. You're weak genetic stock, and that's okay, let's work with that.

**Meet Casey Neistat**

He's extremely unattractive, in shape, runs beta game and has an attractive (pick your own HB at or above HB5) woman who has chosen him to father a child with her.

Look at this guy, honestly. How much room do you have to claim you can't get laid, none. Take away his status or money and he's still having sex with women that will get your dick hard. And if not, put down the porn you god damn junkie.

Lot's of women that are fairly mediocre will turn you on, turns out your body is fairly apt to get your dick hard and cum inside a woman because it's only the most important thing for your body to accomplish outside of homeostasis.

**Now... you might be saying "no shit, sherlock, but I'm not going to be a provider, you can't make me." FINE FINE FINE, let's deal with it... FINEally**

Well you know what....

**No one can make you be a provider, except yourself**

Newsflash. Plenty of men, who deep down in their guts, knew, in their heart of hearts that the women they were with were "the wrong choice" only let it happen to them because they weren't half committed as you to the idea that women do not care about you.

They somehow convinced themselves the stripper with 4 kids actually liked that thing they did with your tongue. Which by the way, stop that, she hates that. That bamboozled themselves that "church girl" hasn't had a train run on her before. That believes, NAWALT.

Well guess what snowflake, you already think every woman on earth would only use your penis as a mechanism to extract resources out of you. So you're WAY ahead. You have AWALT built into your very existence because you don't have pussy goggles on.

**You have built in cock blocking that while terrible, has a great side effect. You will never be blinded by the naive optimism of the average man.**

Honestly, good for you. Lot's of guys would be IN BETTER PLACES if this was their life. If they could erase that 5 year divorce wreckage on their life they'd be in better spots, that you never got to. Look for some silver linings in your wastebasket diagnosis.

**Yeah, so what, I don't want starfish sex**

To be frank with you, I don't actually believe when Casey's wife started letting him take a trip to tuna town that she laid there motionless in terror of this man pumping away at her.

She probably enjoyed it and was turned on with the fact that she was with a guy that had some status, some money etc. She liked that he offered her *access* to this world.

And I'm sure for a while, she fucked him proper and well.

That's what a lot of you guys aren't willing to digest between the ridiculous dichotomy between DIEING IN LONELY AGONY and HAREM FULL OF SUPER MODELS SPINNING PLATES.

Easily 80% of men are serial monogomous, and easily 80% of men settle into marriages that become lackluster in the sex department.

Almost zero marriages continue to have "pornstar sex" into their older days. It's just the nature of attraction in a mutually exclusive arrangement. Now there are plenty of ways to get around that, but that's way above your level.

You're just trying to get laid, you're scared you're going to get dogshit sex and get taken advantage of.

Well guess what, we all had a bunch of dogshit sex too. That's what it's like being normal. And guess what, we all worry about and deal with that too.

But you know what?

No one is forcing you to propose to this woman, or even continue to see her.

**Level two prep work**

You're in shape, you dress not terrible, you've taken a sales job so you can talk to women without terrifying them.

It's highly unlikely you're not at least at the 50% mark for men, grats. Faggot. (This is a term of endearment among men, just like 4chan)

Now start researching TYPICAL dating websites like Hooking Up Smart

These are blue pill dating websites. They will tell you everything you need to know to attract women that are hunting for providers.

- It is important they do not think you are just looking for sex
- They are looking for well adjusted people who don't have extreme views or other peculiarities
- Income is not as important as you think, sales jobs are healthy for you and pay you

It is important that you do NOT give off any tells that you are "red pill aware." This means not talking about women poorly, you DO NOT need to lick their boots or be a male feminist. In fact, don't become one.

It is most important that

- 1) She can use you for comfort, you get sex from this
- 2) She can control you, this is because you have low SMV and are "blue pill"

If you try AF game, you are first, not attractive enough, and second, not offering comfort. Lastly, she can't control you. Large part of this arrangement, is she can predict how you behave and that you're not going to fuck her over, dump her out of her fertility window etc.

So then, as we know with Briffault's law, you are useless. Therefore no association takes place.

I don't even need to tell you to wrap it up, because of that built in AWALT you have, remember?

This is "beta game." Any site like Hooking Up Smart will be PACKED with this advice. Which amounts to BE A NICE RED PILL GUY THAT RESPECTS WOMEN AND WANTS TRUE LOVE.

This should not be difficult, because you are probably very needy. Just hide your dark inner sadness long enough to get it in. You're talking 3 dates, THREE. HOLD YOUR INNER DEMONS FOR THREE HOURS. THREE.

### **Explained to you in plainspeak, because you are unable to understand the simple things in life**

Here is the simple manual for how to navigate your life of attractive, normies, to which you will, on occasion get to have sex with.

- 1) The initial sex, will almost always be good after you learn how to not be so goddamn terrible in bed. This may take you longer than usual. Hire a couple hookers to show you the ropes so you don't fuck up your chance when you land a normie.
- 2) She will press for your commitment, this is a trap. At this point, you have no choice, since you have low SMV. You tell her that you are falling for her. And you probably are.
- 3) Pull up horror stories and remind yourself as you pairbond that you're about to be used and discarded.
- 4) Continue having sex with this woman until she either demands that you marry her and then tell her that "love works in mysterious ways" or something non-falsifiable, and then dump her.

This is called "pumping and dumping."

As you become more and more skilled at this, you will slowly, slowly, become "a normie." And you can use your knowledge here to get there.

It's worth it, trust us. Even being a mediocre guy that gets mediocre pussy is miles beyond the guy who says he's "consumed with his hobbies."

The sad part here is lots of guys feel like "they need to be honest." Bullshit. You don't owe anyone, anything. Everyone is out there fucking each other over.

If she wants a guy to provide for her and she can't get it out of you, she'll leave for a guy that can.

Maybe she fucks another guy on the side, maybe she doesn't.

Who cares, only the chosen few have women that really, really, yearn for them and love them in a way that you understand love.

You literally stop being a fat slob, have realistic expectations, and just don't open your stupid ass mouth and enjoy a woman trying to fuck you well enough that you throw caution into the wind. Which you're already built to be defended against.

So what the fuck is your problem now? Are you really going to convince yourself you'd rather play video games than get pussy, live longer and have a life which is worth living?

This is the basic manual for how you can get laid, and if you can't do this, then you really do deserve the scorn and misery that other users have given you and told you to go kill yourself.

I basically have never met a guy this wouldn't work with, never. If you don't think it would work for you, and you don't have horrible deformities or medical issues making you bed ridden, post.

If you are bedridden and deformed, none of us are talking shit about you. We're talking about the people you despise, that we do too.

There...

Your concerns are valid, you have a solution. Now fucking move on.

## CMV Assuming alpha widows exist for women, it is unsolvable

8 upvotes | January 6, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Obviously if you dispute the existence or validity of the concept you can't contribute anything worthwhile to the debate.

Other presuppositions

- Settling for a man that she is attracted to "in a different way" is not considered a "cure"

## Back to Basics : Hypergamy doesn't care... about women either.

135 upvotes | January 9, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

- Hypergamy doesn't care if you leave the father of your children
- Hypergamy doesn't care if you leave your children
- Hypergamy doesn't care if they become criminals
- Hypergamy doesn't care if it makes you cheat
- Hypergamy doesn't care if it destroys your social image
- Hypergamy doesn't care if you have to hide your relationship
- Hypergamy doesn't care if he won't commit
- Hypergamy doesn't care if he treats you like dogshit
- Hypergamy doesn't care if it doesn't make sense to you
- Hypergamy doesn't care if its a bar bathroom
- Hypergamy doesn't care if he raped a teenager
- Hypergamy doesn't care if he wants a threesome
- Hypergamy doesn't care if he wants it in your ass
- Hypergamy doesn't care if he loves choking women
- Hypergamy doesn't care if he doesn't care about you
- Hypergamy doesn't care if it will ruin your life

Hypergamy doesn't care if you never experienced that excitement again, with any other man, for the rest of your life.

Hypergamy doesn't care about women either.

Remember, Tingles Uber Alles

# Protectors vs providers, AFBB. Killing the blue pill dream.

369 upvotes | January 12, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Since we're back to basics here I'm going to own up to a promise I made to start fleshing this out for guys that aren't digesting this properly. Frankly the number of men here who are trying to formulate "alpha checklists" here is getting embarrassing. Oh the ironing that this will be a list, but this is not from my ass.

## **This is what it means, from a decision economics standpoint to be a provider (beta).**

An important thing to take away from this, is that protectors (alpha males) are *not* simply providers with traits amplified. What is clear, is highly attractive traits are in fact, *selected against*. What this means is clear, a provider is a man who is selected to be *controlled*.

Women don't dislike or even care if low status, unattractive men try to use the advice at TRP. Since these men aren't likely to be selected for short term relationships, they are invisible and women that are in the fold know these guys aren't helping themselves. It isn't until these men become highly dimorphic (by lifting), obtaining status, and getting experience with women, that these men become viable in terms of plating them. And men are equally as disposable in this arrangement, so women are not worried.

The only thing that actually worries them, are men who appear to be controllable, playing the game in return. Tall men, who feed them the idea they will commit, and then dumping them. Beta plate game.

There is a great degree of truth to the fact that commitment is a scarce resource for women. The number of men who *would* commit is high, but the number that will commit to her, and for the arrangement to work in her favor is low. It takes time to work a deal here with a man that is tolerable. That is clear when you understand the economics in this study. You begin to understand how fickle a long term relationship is when you understand the selection criteria.

Before we do that, let's start with short term relationships.

## **Selection criteria (in order of importance) for PROTECTORS (AF)**

- Scent indicating facial symmetry (chemistry & beauty)
- Physical dimorphism (height disparity)
- Gate (swagger)
- Vocal masculinity
- Jawline
- Strength\*
- Scent cues to dominance (likely a signal of confidence)
- Status
- SMV rank (called intrasexual competitiveness)
- Arrogance

TL;DR : Build up your T, walk the walk and talk the talk literally. LIFT

What isn't talked about in these studies that we already know is a prerequisite is frame. One way you could phrase this is to be *self actualized, non-needy, and know what you want in life, with an understanding of what the SMV is all about*. Another way to look at this is that this composite male, has frame woven through his very existence. Women are real life bullshit detectors when it comes to



frame.

You can't fake pretty much anything here. This is a list of essentially unshitestable features. You're either walking like you should be walking, talking like you should be talking and smelling like you should be smelling or not. These are all outward signals of "this guy fucks."

I take issue with one measurement of *strength*. Studies have a high degree of volatility in the strength department and muscularity. I believe we've already sorted this out here, women don't want roided out freaks, and they don't want guys that lift for vanity. The other study demonstrating a linear relationship between actual strength and attractiveness does seem to indicate that your muscles *should be for a reason*. This coincides with my observation that women dislike intelligence but like *competency*. Nothing should be above it's functional need, because beyond that is vanity.

So now everyone can stop waving their dicks around on what is or is not alpha. It is clear, this picture is not ambiguous. It means to be a great genetic specimen and to demonstrate that with your very being.

Blue pill types will invariably point out something like "I prefer a X man, to a Y man." This is not a formula, but simply a list of items and their correlation to attraction. Preferences vary, but they are consistent.

### **Selection criteria for PROVIDERS (BB)**

A lot of what is selected for in terms of providers could be interpreted as "easily controlled." What women look for here is better understood as, what they're *not* looking for.

### **SELECTED AGAINST**

- Vocal masculinity
- Jawline
- Status
- Arrogance

### **SELECTED FOR**

- Future income
- Nurturing

TL;DR they don't want boyfriends who are competitive in the SMV. This is the tall soyboy blue pill boyfriend right here. The purpose is not at all difficult to discern. Interestingly enough SMV seemed to a tough one to pin down (went up and down but all low correlation between studies), I'll put my hat in the ring here... women already know these guys are low SMV, so the question doesn't make any sense.

There were *tons* of variables for providers and they were all over the place. I believe the snowflakes, there's no composite for the provider, because he's just simply not arousing. He's negotiated arrangement, so they *have* to be picky. Those ultra small details make the arrangement *tolerable*.

"What is the most physically attractive (that is not masculine), tallest guy I can find that will put up with my shit, pay the bills and help take care of our children that is into all these weird things I'm into?"

FAIR ENOUGH. Not an unreasonable composite to look for.

I'd say the blue pill woman angle is *confirmed*. There's some translation here.

- What men call a "high beta" and what men call "alpha bucks" are roughly the same.
- What men call a "blue pill natural" is what women call a "high beta." This is *her* alpha bucks.

## Alpha Bucks

I previously wrote that I was having trouble figuring out if there was some third classification, I have sufficiently sorted this issue. There is not, TRP remained correct. What women want here is clear.

- Protectors : Composite physically arousing masculine men
- Providers : Tall, blue pill men who will fill a motherly role that are easily controlled and not subject to poaching. (low SMV naturals)

This also lends credit to the idea of blue pill women never shutting the fuck up about their special wants and needs. Why, is easy to see. When you are looking specifically for low SMV, low status men, who lack masculine features who are easy to control (who are least attractive and arousing), these niche fetishes become important. These are absolutely negotiated attraction arrangements. This is also the source of "communication fixes everything." The entire relationship is constructed mechanically, there is no real source of animal love here. These women aren't "falling out of love" with providers, they're "falling in love" with other men. It was never really there.

I wasn't sure if there was some LTR vs "have children with" distinction for men who fit the provider role. But it turns out, that being a provider is the *same thing* as looking for a man to have a child with. They are basically selecting against a protector because of the instability of such an arrangement. This also betrays something women I don't think like to admit, that they need men in their lives to raise their children. It does show the real fear of actual single motherhood (not the status boosting subjugation of a provider male into joint custody).

## SMV strategy

If anything this shows that blue pill women are actually right and honest when they point to guys on here trying to lock down LTRs and win the blue pill dream girl running a fool's errand. What they don't realize is we're advocating against it too, and now I'm giving you *very* compelling reasons why you should stop that. They're right. They don't want red pill men for LTRs. They don't even want truly masculine blue pill men. The name of the game isn't arousal, it's control. They use words like "attracted to" or "deep love."

I am less inclined at this point to believe the dualistic strategy is one of "necessity" so much as the men in these arrangements just aren't important. More or less, selection strategy dictates here, they're all fronts. To be a blue pill LTR, is to be close to worthless in terms of primal level attraction, by design.

It is clear most LTRs are not even in the same ballpark as protectors that have put their high water mark in a woman's mind. These guys don't even stand a chance.

Unless your goal is to become objectively less attractive, controllable, and naturing, and you're ready to play mom2 every other week when she decides "it just isn't working anymore" then you're a poor LTR candidate.

There are large numbers of men coming here for the answer for their blue pill dreams. They want the solution to retain the women in their lives and keep their love. This is clear, you don't get that without

being unmarketable and disposable.

So if you've come here to try and sell yourself as a protector and masquerade as one, it's not a very strong strategy. You'll always find someone, just like the blue pill says. Preferences vary and that is entirely part of the blue pill LTR game, finding niche points of interest and conflating them into romance.

Once you've unplugged you know that a woman "in love" is essentially a woman *aroused by*. So if you're chasing a woman being in love with you, you're looking to fill the roll of protector. And just like Rollo and everyone else has laid out to you, that is done by spinning plates. When they fall they fall.

You don't get the blue pill dream. But at least you understand what it is, from a real analytical standpoint.

You don't want it.

Now you can let go of it.

## "But not everyone is like that"

4 upvotes | January 21, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

In my time debating this issue, one thing stands out as the primary hindrance of any movement on the topic. There's a couple components to this, but these are the basic handwave techniques, which I argue should be added as "no handwaving."

I don't suspect this will get much support as all these debates are more or less hug chambers that are supported by these actual defense mechanisms, but I'll give it a shot.

*This observation does not apply to everyone.*

This is useless and I have never once seen this offer any substance to a single debate. And the vast majority of time this reply rears its useless head is when someone is figuratively, not literally something that is relevant to *most people*. So from the very beginning they're creating a strawman simply out of their own inability to enter the very beginning of the debate, which is almost never presented in a literal, absolute sense, unless that point is literal or absolute.

Which then is followed by

*I don't know how most people feel about, but I...*

This inability to abstract these concepts and a refusal to make the topic a high level discussion, rather than one of personal preference and dismiss well reasoned or supported evidence with a handwave that says

1. Not everyone is like that
2. I don't know what other people like
3. I do\don't like that

And if you're

1. Arguing absolutes against a topic which does not assert an absolute
2. Are unable to understand the debate topic at hand in a wide and general level
3. Are only willing to discuss your own personal feelings on the matter

Then you aren't qualified to debate a topic and you're adding to the inability for this debate to reach a consensus.

This constitutes 90% of this forum and PPD. The remaining 10% are a couple of useful red pill OC concepts starting to grow and a few really valid blue pill points that are difficult to see because they are drowning in a sea of "yeah, but not everyone."

This is not a discussion about AWALT, which is in this frame of discussion "do women, have a nature?"

# The Nordic Family Paradox - The Nuclear Family Is A Male Value System (Briffault's Law)

242 upvotes | January 28, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Join me for a journey through the mind of a liberal woman as she *finds herself* and indulges in the utopian culture of Denmark, as we do a little bit of analysis and find out what this *really* means.

<https://s3.amazonaws.com/berkley-center/ZoeWeiner.jpg>

*Zoe Weiner graduated from Georgetown University in 2013 with a major in English. She participated in the Berkley Center's Junior Year Abroad Network while studying in Copenhagen, Denmark during the fall semester of 2011.*

In contrast with America's male-oriented gender bias, Denmark's high level of male-female equality fosters behavior that transcends the gender barriers set by less egalitarian societies. As a feminine culture, Danes have more flexible gender roles, which allows them to be more relaxed when considering romantic relationships. The absence of pressure to fulfill certain gender-based stereotypes fosters a liberal attitude toward sex, dating, and marriage.

Good, so we've established that a liberal American woman can consider this a *high level* of equity. Enough that it fosters *some approximation of a liberal female ideal*.

Male-female relationships start at a very young age in Denmark. Friendships between boys and girls are encouraged when children are toddlers, and it is considered normal for boys and girls to have sleepovers when they are 10 years old. In America, a parent who allowed a prepubescent child to spend the night with a friend of the opposite sex would be extraordinarily controversial.

Something that would have to be felt out, but... why would that be... controversial? What concern could a parent have?

The Danes' nontraditional relationship ideals are further made evident in their liberal attitude toward sex. It is not uncommon for Danish men and women to talk about and even engage in sex in public places. During a dinner party with some Danish friends, I was shocked when one of the men turned to me and casually asked at what age I had lost my virginity. When I uncomfortably refused to answer, he teased me for being a "prude American." He went on to explain that it is common for Danes to start having sex at 11 or 12 years of age, and it is expected that they have many different partners throughout their lives. The most surprising part of the conversation was how candidly these strangers discussed their own sexual histories.

Oh, maybe because in America we do not want 11 year olds having sex. Clearly, this is not a norm. But the fact that anyone would excuse such a thing is fairly telling to the level of cultural decay trotted out as "progress." Maybe this fine example of Denmark's culture was instead a clever gaslighting ruse for her to lower her guard and *explore herself*?

I'm less willing to indict the Danish culture here, because I still can't accept rationally such abhorrent culture decay and degeneracy, but I can clearly indict her for not writing about any such objection to accepting this fact as a tell of her mindset. Maybe it is *weird*, but this must be the reality that comes

with such *an advanced and progressive society*. This is everything America should achieve, right?

This openness is not only witnessed in discussions about sex, but also in the act itself. Denmark's flexible gender roles allow for a wider acceptance of sexual experimentation. Two of my male roommates have spoken frankly about their experiences with other men, despite the fact that they are in serious relationships with women. In the United States, such activities have enormous stigmas attached to them.

Yes, because we do not want to create a degenerate culture where pair bonding, families and relationships are held to so low regard that "a hole is a hole" becomes a logical conclusion. But then again, the Danish are a culture who hold family and children in *very very high regard*. Right?

Denmark's relaxed attitude toward male-female roles fosters an environment for untraditional relationships. Many couples are characterized as LAT (living apart together). These couples are romantically involved but are not married. In Denmark, marriage is not a prerequisite for starting a family. Unlike in the United States, there is no taboo associated with having children out of wedlock.

Fair enough, marriage is just a formal acknowledgement. But isn't "living apart, together" just called... dating? Okay okay. So they're non-traditional. No big deal. But certainly, by in large, these children are being raised in the households of their parents, right?

Because they've done away with traditional family structures. The people who do choose to get married and have kids, then, they would stick together, right? Because their relationships are fair.

With these *sex positive liberal men*?

Denmark also has a very high divorce rate, with ~~nearly 45~~ {over 50%} percent of all marriages resulting in divorce. The lack of pressure to marry in combination with the social normalcy of divorce breeds healthy relationships, which could explain the Dane's tendency toward public displays of affection.

Note: Modified this quote to reflect actual divorce rates.

1. The lack of pressure to marry
2. in combination with the social normalcy of divorce
3. breeds healthy relationships.

How do you even type this out? The best part about this is you're already excluding out the most radical group. So there can be no claim that they are *pressured into marriages they wouldn't have otherwise entered*. Those that don't want to, don't, and face little to no social pressure to marry. Great. Only people who *really love each other or want to do it for their family will then*.

Exit barriers are almost non-existent in Denmark. And before someone comes in here and exclaims that you can *get divorced over the internet now*, that surge leveled out after 2015, 2016 showed a return to the trending line. So it appears that even if you create what would amount to some degree of normalizing impulsivity here, it's not reflected in the divorce trending line.

1. Denmark is one of the "happiest" countries on earth
2. Denmark is part of the group of countries in the "Female happiness paradox." Where an increase in egalitarian values and practices also shows a decrease in female to male relative

happiness (which controls for happiness across cultures even despite the clarification below).

3. Denmark has a very strong welfare state and social support system with robust availability of daycare and coverage of childcare expenses.

This isn't a contradiction, because happiness in Danish culture is more equivalent to what other cultures would call "content." You may even say they, *enjoy the decline*. Men who understand this aren't happy for it, but they accept it, they are content.

And since children are easily dealt with by handing them over to daycares whenever necessary or men take up coparenting as stand in mothers, and childcare expenses are mostly taken care of, women can focus on what is really important to them. ~~Their family~~ Hypergamy.

Even though it doesn't even make them happier (Female Happiness Paradox).

**So what does this really mean?**

- Give women a society they claim they want
- Have the government sort out childcare
- Let people "who don't want to get married" do just that, without judgement.
- Foster culture of sexual access
- Encourage people to enter into egalitarian relationships

Does that mean that the divorce rate declines? No.

And if divorce rates are higher in countries that have removed the barriers to female happiness, which are claimed to be patriarchal, then we can see the naked choice.

When such a thing was done in the job market, gender disparity *increased*. Because ultimately, women did not want masculine jobs. They wanted the choice to have them.

When such a thing was done on the sexual market, physical dimorphism, divorce and single motherhood *increased*. Because the nuclear family is not a female value system.

*I offer a statement I find irrefutable as law.*

Sado's Law

**Given a relationship structure, laws and norms that adhere closer to popular female stated desire, the number of children who will grow up in the same house as their father decreases.**

Let that sink in.

I do not believe the situation can be resolved, and I worry about the outcome of the culture of family, and concur that we already crested over "Peak Family" culture.

So very literally, cultures seem to accept this and "enjoy the decline." It is not tongue in cheek or malevolent. It is a somber acceptance. And the solution to that is to feminize men, obfuscate the facts that family doesn't mean as much to women as we perceive and that evolution plays a stronger part in her manifested behaviors than a child growing up with both their parents in the same household. To stabilize male expectations, sex must be freely available and widely accepted in any manner to encourage supply. Again, at the expense of family stability and long term female happiness.

I thank those that have allowed me to post under the endorsement, almost as a sort of cruel joke throughout the years I've tried to find some hole in the theory here. Some statement, like, enjoy the decline, and try to deride it as not actually being a beacon of wisdom.

And every time, I fail.

I am astounded at the quality of analysis that has produced this framework, it is obvious that the men involved in this were ruthlessly honest with themselves at every step of the content here being refined. As I derided "enjoy the decline" invariably I had to concede that it is likely all we can do and even found a culture that seems to embody this in a way that outsiders can't even understand, which requires a sort of translation.

Women won't be happier (Female Happiness Paradox), men will have to accept that the idea of the nuclear family is something you *may get to have* but only if she decides she wants to share that with you, because of your benefits. Protection or provisioning. Briffault's law.

Her family is something you help to either create, or manage. She held each one of them before they were handed to you for a minute to let you pretend for a moment you had created something together to share and grow, when instead, you had created something together for her.

When I started writing about the fact that the nuclear family was a male concept, it was something that I took no enjoyment in realizing and becoming certain in, conceptually.

But nonetheless, I recognized it as true.



# **Why do most men, cross culturally, who have the most casual sex, embody the values, behaviors and attitudes towards women that the red pill advocates?**

14 upvotes | January 30, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Bloopies : Most important words are *most* and *casual sex*.

## The "true alpha" : On male virtue

84 upvotes | February 1, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

A comment yesterday serves as inspiration, concealed in pleas to male virtue is a hidden agenda, or at least usually. The user is too new for me to truly dress down, but this is a standard enough blue pill PUA reply that I'll just get it out of the way regardless of the user's claimed intent.

### A wild sociopathic male enters the picture, looking to spread his seed

Of course all stories on here are assumed erotic male lit. I couldn't care less if this story is real, it's irrelevant. What I'm here to dress down is the comment in reply to this comment below.

Ultimately, I'd come down to the fact that she misses her previous 'real' relationship. This guy was an Alpha to the max. He didn't care about her and went even so far as to suggest hint pimping her out to his friends. He'd treat her like garbage but he was a "man". He didn't take shit from anybody, made over a six figure salary, and did what he want when he wanted. He was dominant outside and inside the bedroom. He'd leave randomly and cheat on her but make it up to her by using her to sate his sexual appetite. He'd brag about her being a 'cock monster' and once ditched her at the airport because she was stirring drama.

And to this, we get this reply.

So this is what is considered "alpha" on trp nowadays? A true redpill moves pass this phase, the "insecure fake alpha"-phase, a necessary step when the paradigm shifts. But, to all you guys reading this, at some point you must move past this immaturity and become a man, a leader of men. Don't leave anybody behind, for whatever reason, even your enemy (and don't have enemies, it's also immature). Don't cheat (unless you've been together for a long time, and the relationship is more practical, not sexual, then i'd say alright. We humans are not supposed to be monogamous for that long.). You can only cheat if you're committed, **so don't commit unless if it's the right for you at that time in your life**, not validation. Also, you must learn to let go of the validation you get from sex. It's pleasurable, but you must do it to truly develop as a man.

Well not as concealed as you'd think if you pay attention. But we'll let the blue pill tell slide.

Doing these things to be appear "alpha" means you're dependent on what SHE thinks of you, therefore you have already put HER on a pedestal. Doing things to appear "alpha" instead of what a normal functioning decent human would do? Insecure.

When I found redpill, years ago, I turned into this exact type of person. The fake alpha. I walked macho style and didn't move away from anyone, even old ladies, because I was "socially dominant". It hurts my heart and I cringe when I look back on that. You must understand how deep the rabbithole goes, how deeply you have to find yourself spiritually to truly find joy and peace in life. Reminder, it's ok to be at the fake alpha stage, it's normal, but you HAVE TO move past it and become what you need to be.

What he's cringing at is his assimilation of the content here that distilled into some haphazard approximation of how blue pill men see this man. He sees his own hyper insecurity in a man that it is highly unlikely to have shared his view of the world, even remotely. Never mind the fact that clearly

this man has a purpose based on his income, if you've ever made that much money you'd know the sacrifice involved. So it *isn't even likely his primary mission is women*.

What he posits couldn't be genuine, must be fake, because he himself, could never imagine a point where women serve so little purpose that the sex acts themselves are the only thing that this man is interested in or some novelty like the idea of having such extreme ownership of her that he pimps her out.

You will naturally work to this end should you ever have a strong enough sparring partner. And you will find through your toil that what *love is*, constitutes fucking to a draw. To demand a woman is "your cock monster" and that she demands that you are her monster, and her monster only.

That is Beauty and the Beast. Fifty Shades, what have you. That she gets to have a monster. The endings are feelgoods, when the true reality of an alpha widow is closer to the ending of Requiem for a Dream. And the true reality of a monster, is they do monstrous things. To the degree that any woman's man is virtuous, is to the degree that woman worships the man she is with as she understands the world with purity. Or to put this woman into perspective, these hoes don't want to be saved. She is just as corrupt or more corrupt than him.

So our poster here suggests that you slot yourself into male disposability (which is fine, we can not argue against such a reality) but then goes one step further and pats himself on the back for assuming that any or even most women would not appreciate this "fake" masculine archetype.

The number of upvotes it got, serves as indication that there is an undercurrent of men that come here looking for permission to be slotted back into a morally virtuous program. The just world fallacy embodied within the blue pill dream dressed in red.

Sure, maybe he accepts that "it's just his turn." But he does it *in a morally virtuous way*, by not cheating if "you're not ready for a relationship." This is taking red pill awareness and operating within a blue pill paradigm. No one says you have to be immoral, *but to try and conflate female arousal with male virtue is just flat wrong*. Which is exactly what he's done. He's essentially stated that a woman is attracted to some illformed approximation of true masculine energy, that by his own assertion would be *more* arousing if it was how he imagined it *should* be. Or would he concede that point and that instead men should *control their urges*? Or maybe claim *she's damaged*.

And there's truth to that. Hypersexual behavior *does* damage women by setting the emotional bar high. So that when your...

built like a quarterback, works as a bouncer and looks like a model. He's deep, and thoughtful, understanding and kind. He's got insane social proof as he knows everyone in the club and music scene in the city. He works part time within construction and is handy around the house. Well adjusted without any major criminal conviction but has been in fights and can carry himself really well. Allegedly, he's hung and fucks like a bull and isn't emotionally available all the time.

...replacement would be comes into place...

Despite all these qualities, I hear her looking for reasons to drop him. She'd pick fights and complain about nonsense and I'd hear her try to rationalize each transgression. Ultimately, I'd come down to the fact that she misses her previous 'real' relationship. So here I am listening to all this. Her current bf is awesome and actually a nice person but given the chance she'd be on her previous X at a drop of a hat and while I'm not certain of this (wasn't

there) I'm pretty sure she has cheated on current bf with Alpha when he was having a B-day party in another city.

This is the conclusion to his blue pill call to honor, right in the story itself.

Want to get properly read? Head on over to our favorite relationship sub and read story after story of men putting themselves through the virtue grinder without anyone giving them guidance of how to sort their lives out other than to repeat the process with the next woman and give them a pat on the back. The virtue grinder exists because of innate incongruence between male and female value systems. Something blue pill men are unwilling to accept.

The entire reason this forum even exists is because for the still plugged in, this archetype of a male *does not even register as possible*. And then when you take one step further, *he reasons that such an orientation is done out of a place that is not genuine*. This is a buffer and an elaborate mental defense mechanism to avoid the true conclusion, that there are plenty of women that accept this type of man into their life willingly and pine over the loss of him as well as plenty of men who enjoy being this man and feel no shame what so ever.

And here's the last and final blow to his ill conceived view of the SMV.

What separates a woman who claims up and down they would not tolerate that man is either circumstance or self deception. Certainly not attraction. And women are rife with self deception because such a thing is necessary to facilitate her sexual strategy.

The very concept of hypergamy is made possible by her ability to deceive herself on her long term self interests, even at the expense of her own children. And why not, her body is mostly agnostic to such a thing before menopause. I will post about this next month in detail, but speaking frankly, his views are not shared by women, they can not be.

So his claim to virtue is simply an unwillingness to play on the level that women are hardwired for. That doesn't make someone better, it just makes them weaker. Had he said such a thing just isn't an interest to him, and outlined the reason why and what his mission was, so be it.

But make no mistake, plenty of people in his life are this corrupt and they enjoy it. And it isn't for a lack of personal development, but instead because they have played fair, played the good side of the coin and decided to taste the other. Maybe even that they have been born corrupt.

He is, in his own way calling guys that jump off cliffs, attention whores. To be clear, his actual refute is to dispute the malevolence and or callousness of this man's soul. *But to what higher order must he assert himself?*

Women love these men because the alternative is to sanitize the Beast.

That man made no qualms about who he is. Are you going to take his dirt nap? Men like this man have made a choice. He played by the rules, then he stopped. And he liked what that brought him. It freed him from the kangaroo court of life.

And before painting this as *suffering* as he has, I will say this. You understand what a real love is when you reach this point. It is what is left after you both win at your strategy, in the face of naked hobbesian anarchy. Just like you find out who your true friends are when you're *zero'd out* and you see not who is left standing, but who has their hand out.

What that women had was a true love for him. Just not one this poster can understand in a way he's willing to accept.

And when you understand that, you can understand him, without reorienting the world to wash away the thought that maybe you'll never be on this guy's level.

Instead he handwaves the results, which make a strong statement, and claims this man a false idol.

For society, yes. For a woman, no.

As a man, he answered yes.

So what does that really say? Who's incongruent now?

# Alain Soral on Feminism : Marxist application of conflict to use women for capitalist goals, built on the backs of lower class women.

51 upvotes | February 10, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

This has been posted before, but without the translation, which sort of surprised me that someone wouldn't have taken the time given how great it is.

## Marxist ideology and gender warfare

I have appended the adherents of male rights because many men who are deeply embedded in "black pill", MGTOW or MRA movements, some even self ascribed red pill men, do adhere to principles and ideas that are mirrored within feminist ideology. I think it is important to be cognizant to what is going on when you are finding yourself part of these movements.

Are you preoccupied with "us vs them?" Do you want to change the power dynamic and fight that fight? Then you are likely a rival to feminism, but also indeed *part of* the Marxist fight, where the presupposition is based on "class warfare." You are part of an illusory battle which is really taking place underneath your surface level debate.

If you've learned anything worthwhile here, it is that women are not in conflict or at war with men. They are at conflict with themselves and their innate strategy which clashes with a very real patriarchal structure of the world. Alain Soral posits many red pill beliefs here as he asserts that essentially, feminism was a movement to use working class women as workers who then become servants for upper class women to pursue careers and evade their homely duties strictly out of their own boredom based on their own luxurious existence not afforded to lower class women who lack the aptitude or means to live this lifestyle, who instead provide it to the very women whom they believed to be allies.

The female happiness paradox indicates this is not a successful strategy for long term female happiness (which is the basis of the argument that this was a giant lost shit test). So we will merely address the shorter timeframe in this essay.

## Alain Soral on feminism

The original translations are not my own, and on top of that, I've taken liberal application of the brackets where I felt the translation was clunky to get the general point across. Skipped sections I didn't feel were making forward movement or were repetitive or not of importance. You can easily find the video if you speak French natively and can give a comprehensive translation I would include it. What I think is most interesting here, is this French intellectual is *not* interested in the SMP or even anti-feminist in terms of this video. He is considered an anti-feminist, but the overarching angle in which he approaches this is one of being opposed to the socioeconomic implications. I'm always interested in views and frameworks that are unrelated to our own, overlapping to provide useful insight or bounds.

You have to clearly differentiate feminism, from women and femininity. Feminism is a political movement which, somewhat on the Marxist model which claims history is class warfare, here it claims history is the war of the sexes. And that in fact, the point of history would be to free women from the oppression they are subjected to by men. So it's a view of

the world that I call victimary communitarianism, with a mono-deterministic aspect to it, which is to say, "women are alienated by men and they have to free themselves from masculine oppression." That's the first serious definition of feminism.

Feminist demands, which are often legitimate, are manipulated in order in order to make them servants of commercial and wage worker society, which is the same thing since you need wages to consume.

I think we can clearly disagree with this last point, as such a thing isn't true. Merely control over someone who has wages, will allow someone to consume. As is already the case in the United States by an enormous margin.

so in fact, the feminist demands for emancipation were used to turn them into wage workers and consumers it was a two part process.

This started in the United States with the theory of the new woman which consisted of getting women out of the home and to make them feel guilty {by making them think a housewife is} an alienation, a suffering, a form of humiliation and in the end, make her shift from her husband's sphere of influence to her employer's, which is pretty ambiguous. Then thanks to the feminist struggle they end up with a dual alienation which is to endure both the husband and the boss. That's what some call "the double shift."

To be both a mother and a housewife, and wage worker. And it has often, especially in the working class, made the situation worse, not better. The feminist emancipation has often been the interest of upper class women, and they've rarely identified it as such.

In reality, {most} militant feminists are bourgeois women trying to escape their housewife role, dependent status or mother role to go towards civil society to {adopt other interesting roles, such a lawyers, researchers or to run a bookstore.}

Where as for the working class woman, it's not only caring for the children and the house, but being an assembly line worker. {so in reality women's emancipation often happens at the expense of other women, doubly alienated, {for instance the maid or daycare worker} who must take care of the children of the bourgeois and then her own. Which is left unsaid. But for working women, a babysitter would cost more than the work they make themselves.

*So this isn't a matter of free choice, it's a matter of social class.* {It is rare for couples to survive on one income today.} So a woman who stops working is a luxury in today's working class so that feminism {gets what they consider the fruit of their struggle, the "right" to work for wages. Which is actually an obligation}. {Which is a benefit for mercantilism}.

This does align very closely with what a lot of intellectuals have been saying, which is that marriage is becoming an institution of affluence that will be barred from the very people who used to benefit the most from it.



# "The Deal" : Amy, Monogamy, Polygamy, Hypergamy & Loyalty.

181 upvotes | February 12, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Amy is black woman that has dated a number of men from varying backgrounds. She is discouraged to learn after completing a profile for online dating, that she is not given preferential treatment that white women receive on the platform. After discussing the issue, a consensus is quickly reached. She must *lower her standards* if she wants a man to be loyal and not *leave his family*. She realizes that black men, en masse, have rejected family life, duty and honor and are *enjoying the decline*.

A poster mentions that he's noticed recent pairings between Asian men and black women. He posits that these women are *settling* for provider relationships. The reasoning is clear, these men still hold family values, are highly aligned to societal values and therefore are often successful, loyal and unlikely to leave their families. They hold lower positions in the SMV, and are matching with other lower SMV races.

Amy believes she's entitled to

1. Hypergamy : This is number one, because she's unwilling to settle for "fugly" men. It is highly unlikely that she means *less attractive*. What is likely a more accurate descriptor is that she's looking for *masculine men*.
2. Monogamy (assumed)
3. Resources in the form of a man who "isn't lazy"
4. Security in the form of a man who "won't leave"

This is a somewhat complex interaction taking place that I'll unwind for you a bit.

1. Women are generally unaware of hypergamy, they operate either totally unaware of their capability to destroy their own family, or at least believe a man they find willing to commit to them they will love forever. I cover this in my post *Schrödinger's (n)AWALT* which is pinned on my profile.
2. *Most* men are unaware of how hypergamy functions.
3. Men who *are* aware of how hypergamy functions, generally choose to interact with women in a vastly different way.
4. It is often said to these points that a man "can choose to love, or understand women."
5. Therefor we can conclude that women choose between naive men, who will love them in naive ways, or men who understand women, who love them in pragmatic ways.

So for Amy to pledge to any man that she is looking for a *loyal* man who can provide, what she's ultimately looking for is *a naive man*. We would call this man *blue pill*. Yet she wouldn't tolerate a man with such a disposition, and the truth is, he wouldn't, and doesn't tolerate her either. She is unwilling to engage blue pill men within their mental fantasy schema.

Many pragmatic men deduce that women must be colluding or purposely conditioning men to believe that they must operate in this mindset to exploit them en masse. But I don't find this conclusion at all believable, and address this again in *Schrödinger's (n)AWALT*. Most women, are not openly hypergamous, they are not self aware, they operate naively to their own capabilities. To expand this



out would be to rewrite my post, so if you do not share this view with me, I recommend you read the post and then continue from here.

Amy on the other hand, is self aware, and very aware of her own capabilities. And she's not even cunning enough to conceal it. Women who have reached self awareness are not capable of loving a man in the way that a naive man or woman loves. And not only does she demand that she is entitled to that love, but that she won't accept it from the very men even capable of giving it to her.

Using the oft mentioned *roller coaster analogy* that women want a rollercoaster which spontaneously builds itself, without any such direction, to experience the thrills on, yet feel safe enough to ride it, Amy instead demands that the roller coaster actually be dangerous, yet safe, at the same time. She derides roller coasters for either being safe, or dangerous, then demands that the market allow the sale of both types, yet enforce safety on the dangerous ones, only to her benefit. It should let her experience the thrills, get the benefits, but then should she want or need safety that it is available at her disposal. You know, should her experiment fail.

And those failures would either be that Tyrone actually becomes Ted for a bit, hunkers down, opens up and tries to start a family with this woman, who would clearly set fire to her household the moment this man became anything manageable. In this case, she'd demand the state and gynocentricity hold him responsible for the transgression of becoming safe and instead either deride him in an openly hypergamous manner *by trading up, cheating or emasculating him for being anything less than her penultimate hypermasculine hypergamous ideal* or because he "became abusive" after she started operating in a covertly hypergamous way, because, while she demands to *feel* safe, she must also be excited. And this catch22 is simply not her problem, *next!*

Or maybe Tyrone stays Tyrone. And he does things Tyrone does. He never becomes safe. But she demands safety along with the excitement, and so she contents that she must have access to the state and gynocentricity, *next!* "He ain't no real man!" Rest assured, should she find a provider to replace Tyrone, we all know that Tyrone is still going to be involved with Amy, and she'll come up with ever increasingly complex reasons why that make no rational sense.

She couldn't ever acknowledge that maybe, maybe, Tyrone's more civilized alternative Ted, just like Billy, has a pretty good read on Amy. That she's *not the type of woman you have a family with*. And even less masculine men like Billy know better. In fact, only the lowest SMV men are willing to risk their lives on a group of women who impulsively signaled to the world they were unwilling to offer ownership of themselves to men and were beholden to no one but themselves, declaring only the biggest and hardest swinging dick was going suffice.

Fair enough. And so they brought the biggest and hardest swinging dicks, and left their legacy across the ghettos of the United States.

Yeah and it seems like Asian women are more willing to trade financial security over a man's attractiveness than a black woman would. Some of these really cute Asian women latch on to the fugliest white guys I have ever seen, and I can't imagine any black woman who wasn't similarly fugly dealing with that.

Amy believes she's entitled to *attractive* black men, who are *also* successful and nurturing. She doesn't overtly state she wants a nurturing man, she just believes the hard men she wants, will *take responsibility* and do things, that require a nurturing disposition. She is oblivious to the fact that *many* white men would have *no* issue whatsoever dating, marrying and raising a family with a black woman. But many white men figure out quickly that black women share Amy's attitude (a large

minority of black women though, as evident below). And in fact, black women were the first race to enter *open hypergamy*. She unwittingly perpetuates her race's stereotypes in this very post, as she demands everything, offers nothing, and openly derides less attractive men who would offer her stability, despite her knowledge that it is highly likely that should she decide to have a child with Tyrone, that she will end up a single mother on welfare. She is absolutely clueless to the fact that she is the very reason the problem even exists.

But Amy isn't the only black woman trying to find a man that doesn't leave her sitting in a house full of children. Amy's situation is complicated by the fact that she's

1. Entitled
2. Openly hypergamous
3. Self-aware
4. Unwilling to settle
5. Solipsistic

Hypoagency does not require entitlement, though it typically creates it. Hypergamy doesn't require a woman function in such a demonstrably low class way that she openly advertises it. She doesn't believe in love the same way anymore either, since she is self aware. Her love, is closer to arousal. She demands a *real man*.

Despite this, she is unwilling to compromise and unable to even conceptualize that other black women are willing to settle. As heavily as the deck is stacked against her, the very men that offer the stability she claims to want, *are invisible*. She can see only hypermasculine men, and high betas. And we all know, even the high betas will not suffice.

Black women highly value provider traits, it's just the means for black men to provide have been severely limited by white society. Women tend to gravitate toward the most successful men in the community. In a resource poor environment, the dope dealers and the pimps are the ones who have the most money. The drug/ prostitution game is violent and ruthless - and many black men went to prison or died, which made black men scarce in some communities. So, more women flock to the men that are left, the men left learn they don't have to do much to be alpha in the community but be breathing, and become lazy and entitled rather than motivated to do better. Hence my entire post.

Anyone that knows even the *basics* of drug dealing is that the *vast* majority of these guys don't make a lot of money. Your average black male with a bachelor's degree is going to outearn 90% of dealers. But what percentage of those men (roughly 15%) are tall? And what percentage of them, are mentally strong enough to be able to man handle a masculine woman like Amy (Around 20%)?

Let's *remove the highly speculative mindset element here of calculating what percentage of men have abundance mentality*.

The math for "a tall man" is simple. In statistics, 2 & 3 deviations to the right encapsulates 13.6%, 2.1% & .1%. So 15.8% of men are *not just above average in height but tall*. 34.1% of men will be of average to above average height.

Let's simplify this and say she's willing to consider a man who is *just not short* instead, and say that she'd trade off for a guy who is just instead in really good physical shape, really good, highly masculine. Let's just make it even simpler and say she "doesn't want the 62% of men that are

overweight."

You can't honestly do the math any such way and come up with any reasonable number. The more honest you get, the smaller it gets.

So using some pretty lenient math here, she's looking for a 3.8% man (that's *just* a black male who is not overweight and with a degree), a *top 5%* man. Is she even a top 20% woman? Even a top 50% black woman?

Frankly, you can see here she's looking for some percentage lower than 1%. This hypothetical man is what I've been calling a *hyper-masculine composite*. And it is reserved for *alpha widows*. Which this woman will never admit to, but that's a side point.

This is a great look into the mindset of a woman when you remove civility from the discussion. She's a low class woman speaking in ways that betray the subconscious, that *men and women* do a great deal of mental work to smooth as they speak and type, attempting to conceal. Because we all wear masks. Not Amy though. In male SMV interaction, we call this DLV. Black women have a substantial minority who do this, as part of their default mode of operation. And so it stands as no surprise that they are considered low value socially, romantically and sexually.

What her survey of the SMV *really says* is this. "I hate the fact that the most attractive man I see in my world is a drug dealer." To even debate this point shows how women view the world. This is the incongruence that providers can not rationalize. They believe the drug dealing man is invisible to a woman looking to start a family, when instead, *he is invisible*. That the drug dealer *is more preferable*.

So what will be? Are black women *just low class hoodrats that don't know a good man when they see it?* Or is it that provider traits aren't appealing to women?

Will it be racism, or the red pill? How are a supermajority of women different, while not being different? Oh that's right, no study has been done on this (that is hyper specific enough) and even if it was done it'd be part of the replication crisis.

OK Cupid on black women having the highest response rates : Whether it's due to talkativeness, loneliness, or a sense of plain decency, black women are by far the most likely to respond to a first contact attempt. In many cases, their response rate is one and a half times the average, and, overall, black women reply about a quarter more often than other women.

It would appear that other black women are thirsty, and so Amy is in a substantial minority.

And so, from this, we can observe *The Deal*.

### **The Deal**

Men sacrifice polygamy (male value), and embrace monogamy (female value). Women sacrifice hypergamy (female value) for loyalty (male value).

Men take ownership of women (male value), women take ownership of their children (female value), and under one household they share resources, the nuclear family(male value).

### **What's the problem?**

Fundamentally, *hypergamy doesn't care*.

Both optimize their goals by *limiting the impact of either gender maximizing their goal*.

Amy will accept only her fraction of 1% maximized solution, and Tyrone *is* maximizing his biological imperative. She wants him to run a suboptimal program so that she can *maximize* her strategy. This does show that if such a thing happens at scale, that women will actually lose the war here. Such a thing is obvious when you read Amy's pleas for help, that are actually masked by her contempt, anger, bitterness and entitlement. She obviously hopes that she and other black women can have functional families in the face of such abysmal likelihood of ever achieving such a thing in the post open hypergamy cultural decay of the black community.

This can only be achieved with a *female value system* if we discard a patriarchal value system. Amy's real solution, is to move to Norwegian countries where she can sleep with whoever she wants, have the government foot the bill and dump her kids at daycare most of the day while she posts on the internet about it. Oblivious to the fact that she's actually talking about the destruction of a patriarchal value system, asking for a patriarchal value system to coexist within her gynocentric catch22.

Meanwhile, men can have only two orientations, pragmatic (RP), or naive(BP). Men who are pragmatic accept and understand hypergamy, and therefore, they conclude that loyalty is not a true trade in the arrangement. It is only illusory. And so they can either entertain fantasy while they roll the dice, or demand a woman enters into a no-loss deal by her bringing income that meets or exceeds his or is enforced by strict social decorum and status as is such in ultra high status society. Where operating in the manner in which Amy operates, would result in her being thrown outside the walls and gate of the community. And in fact, she'd have never been let in to begin with. Such communities operate as a form of long term, ultra elite vetting mechanisms. And it may be in the future, these are the only forms of male security available.

Nevertheless, a woman at best, *believes* she *can or will* be loyal.

A self-aware woman, who takes a second swing at bat, believes *she can*. A woman who has never confronted herself (the temporary state of a unicorn) believes *she will* be loyal. Again, the basis of my oft mentioned n(AWALT) concept in this post.

And a pragmatic man, is unwilling to offer monogamy for "*I think I can be loyal.*"

Plenty of pragmatic men decide to roll the dice, for traditional conservative family arrangements if the woman is *naive and not self-aware*. We can call this "non-westernized." Or to be excruciatingly specific, n=0 with a pleasing orientation and a belief in romantic love, as opposed to an understanding of love based around arousal (which *is* hypergamy). Amy loves in a way in which is approximated as arousal. This isn't wrong, but it's certainly suboptimal for any man who would choose to take a risk. Any such man taking a calculated risk with her, has either balls of steel or shit for brains. But probably just catastrophically low SMV.

At *best* pragmatic men can roll the dice on a woman based on the understanding that she is hypergamous, but not openly so. And so, that bet is based on the understanding that he leaves a strong enough imprint on her, that her self interests remain within the household. Then he takes ownership of her, while she takes ownership of her children and they attempt to subvert evolution itself, in the goal of achieving the male and female dream, independently of each other, under the same roof. Red pill application of the blue pill dream, and as we all know, the likelihood of that outcome being positive, is very low.

Instead, Amy seeks to achieve the outcome of the woman she could have been, insisting that men offer the deal they were willing to offer her before, after that contract became untenable. And not even that, with men who offer the financial stability that is required to run a family, which is above

and beyond any such claim to love for love itself. A family with a woman that has replies such as this to outline who she is in character and composition.

I love how men's reactions to slight challenges from women is to go full retarded and stop participating in society. Y'all are a mess.

Amy will continue to avoid any such self rationalization of settling, and therefore be subject to the downsides of being self-aware and with her only remaining option being dualistic strategy while using the state as a surrogate father.

**The New Deal is to *enjoy the decline*.**

Open hypergamy dictates a male response that is to reject monogamy and practice polygamy. Either legitimately through open relationships or casual sex or by cheating (dark beta game).

George Carlin once joked "and the poor... just there to scare *the shit* out of the middle class!" If any women of other races are paying attention, this is a peer into the future.

And Norwegian counties show clearly, that this will not *just be a black issue*. It looks like being a single mother will be the new normal over the next 10-20 years.

If you think Amy is happy, then *you go girl*.

# On male value : Calling debt due and boiling the frog.

63 upvotes | February 25, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

This post is influenced by [u/Archwinger](#)'s "Men are not happy."

RE : The reevaluation of male expectations in a relationship and the resulting outcomes.

Archwinger observes the *reason* why these things happen, and blue pill men and women offer their *judgement* on these observations. I'm going to comment on the decision economics and strategy involved.

It should be noted if you are *only spinning plates, or do not have children, or will never have children* then this post will be of little value to you outside of understanding the decision economics. In these cases, an overnight bag and a new phone number end the problem. And any other situation where you're focusing your effort on a single woman in which you don't have children with, your attempt to call due any debt on your value has a negative return on investment in terms of time invested to return. In these cases, you shop in the open market and reset your value instantly if she calls your bluff.

## Before & After

Blue pill men and women address the relationship in the before and after state. And they address it as *correct* and *failed*. As in, the relationship was *correctly oriented* then *failed when men asserted their value*. Sort of a moral warning. "You better not try and assert your value, or, you'll lose *the one*." Maybe even *your kids*. If the relationship has not failed, it is *abusive* or *going to fail*.

Archwinger disputes this by positing the relationship as one in which we can argue *at least* one of the parties is unhappy, who then takes the reins and begins to get some of what they want, risking failure in the process.

Fundamentally what blue pill men and women are not addressing here, is that these situations are really *men who are realizing the value they bring and are calling due the debts* accumulated by the women in these relationships while they work on increasing their own value.

When a woman is unwilling to *pay up*, then both the man and the woman agree that they can't meet each others expectations. The correct thing for this relationship to have done at this point is actually to have "failed."

## Balloon payments and adjustable rate relationship mortgages

So now you've got a guy that is unhappy about some part or many parts of the relationship who has a set of expectations, and he'll move through the stages of dread but ultimately it comes down to two parties entering a *hostile negotiation*.

These women then either have to *pay up, trade while attempting to prevent accumulating negative equity or default*.

When a woman decides she's made an error in the value of the mate she's chosen and treated him below his new found evaluation of value, she *pays up*. It would be too forgiving to assign this as a function of her misattribution of value. In this case you can expect she's already shopped for a replacement and realized that she was wrong. She didn't come to this conclusion based on your demands or facts. But instead based on her doing an opportunity cost analysis. This is a very important contribution that all men should pay close attention to. If you make a large demand that she

has rebuffed before, and in short time she accepts your demands, it is very likely she's already done actual choice analysis.

There can be a large degree of *pulling teeth here*. But the takeaway here is that ultimately she decides she will *pay the demands* to prevent *default*.

Men have often posited that "going beta" is one of the best ways to get a woman to leave a relationship, I can't disagree more.

It is my belief, and I will write to it in the future, that men should *raise their cost until such a cost is no longer tenable*. More often than not, men will realize their value is *much higher* than they thought.

Turns out that maybe you are worth a threesom, a girl on the side, getting better or more sex etc. Maybe not, that's up to her and you can't be operating under the idea of not rocking the boat. If that is how you're going to play, then you're entitled only to her desired valuation. That is the price you pay for outcome dependence.

Blue pill men and women operate under a presumption that for a woman to *pay up* is wrong. They won't have a very specific reason why, just that you're changing the rules of the game. And in fact, I believe this objection is *innate*.

It is my personal experience that a woman being influenced to pay up, can only be done with a man's willingness to leave and exercise options in two domains.

1. His time and attention
2. His *physical* fidelity

I do not believe women will tolerate emotional infidelity coupled with physical infidelity in any meaningful amount.

### **On process**

For any man who feels that he is undervalued, and is willing to leave the relationship he is in, the mechanics are simple.

1. State your demands in a polite manner : "I'm unsatisfied with X, and I expect Y because Z."
2. When these demands are met, repeat step 1 for other issues.
3. If you are satisfied with the relationship at this point, stop.
4. If these demands are not met, withdraw your willingness to give your time and association and begin the process of revoking your fidelity, overtly.

The situation will resolve itself much quicker than you think.

### **On failure**

Failure is a real possibility for a lot of reasons when someone tries to change or reboot a relationship that has operated under provisioning principles. The most obvious of which, is that the relationship was built under a paradigm which is fundamentally suboptimal and misaligned with arousal. If your read studies on arousal and long term relationship orientation, you'll see a trend. Women *select against* a lot of arousing traits in the long term mate, and *select for* unarousing traits. That's because *for most women* her selection for a long term mate can be based on only a few usual outcomes.

1. He is a prospective father for her children, and expects that he will raise them.
2. He supports her lifestyle through status or niche fetishes (and is controllable)



The first is evident by selecting for traits that are correlated against arousal, such as nurturing and other traits that indicate there is a primary interest in *being able to control her mate*. The goal here is to make sure he sticks around and can't leverage value in the SMP.

The second is evident by a myriad of interests and non-primary attraction triggers given substantial preference in selection. These are primarily upper and upper middle class women who look for men who give them status who are primarily fetishising shared interests or attitudes into some amalgamation of arousal ("I love that we're both gamers"). This is lampooned in *The Lobster* as their "distinguishing characteristic."

These men and women are looking for some post-hoc rationalization for a minimal amount of attraction and some ill defined future goal for their relationship (which usually in this arrangement is child free, at least for the time). Otherwise the relationship would subsist on pure arousal alone or would be a family arrangement.

---

Where this all starts to go very wrong is when the men involved in these arrangements start to place what they perceive to be accurate valuations on their contribution to the pairing and begin to see their bargaining position deteriorate. They struggle to understand why they can't demand their value, not realizing they have none. And that their values are not shared between male and females.

Either he believes that him being the father of their children to be very important, or that his unique composition and history with the woman to be more important than it truly is.

These incongruities are simple to pick apart.

*Their children* is instead *her children*. The nuclear family is a recent, male value system, which is evident when you align it with Briffault's law. There is an expectation that men will take care of their children, so this presupposition is the basis of it having little to no value.

If she does have to trade, she assumes he will share parenting. And therefore she can pair off with another lemon, in the market for lemons, that is sharing parenting. If such an expectation is revoked, she will quickly realize that not many men have the time or patience to deal with a full time single mother. I will write about this more in the future.

If this is revoked as a presumption, she will properly value this input. And it is *very large*. If not, his parental contribution will hold no value. She'll use it in good times to puff up your ego, but make no mistake, men provide little value to children directly. Their primary purpose is to provide boundaries and run the household. I've been told I make a terrible mother, and I agree. Men should not congratulate themselves on their nurturing skills, though no man should feel shame enjoying things such as sleeping with an infant, tickling a toddler etc. Taking parenting hyper literal is no different than the story of the guy "holding frame on his boss."

The second largest valuation deficit is a man's belief that his relationship and history with a woman, along with their "distinguishing characteristics" hold value. They do not. This is also related to Briffault's law. Men in the protector category *are not* exempt from this. What this means, is that men are disposable. We compete.

The only *real* provisioning value men hold are their relationships to their children and willingness to provide child care. All other provisioning values are likely available readily and freely with a replacement mate.

Men who compete on a strictly physical or sexual basis will always have a guy who is better looking



or better in bed. And even if such a thing wasn't true, there'd be someone almost as good, but different.

### **Valuation inefficiencies in men who reorient themselves to female value systems**

The most common area to "clean up" will be the difference between what a woman is willing to give a man who can maintain attraction and *what she has been giving him* when he's undervalued himself and lacked the frame to set clear expectations.

The process above remains the same. But ask yourself "what are some reasonable demands I have, that aren't being met?"

Don't fight every battle, but demand and expect change. This is also a great area to see if the woman in your life is holding you in a degree of contempt. A recent post talks about making small requests and paying attention.

Maybe you'll realize she doesn't even think you're worth being polite to. And once you realize that, you won't feel so bad as you *boil the frog*. In the process you'll find out what you're really worth. And turns out, it's probably a lot higher than you think.

## Young girls want love. Grown women want partnership.

1 upvotes | March 10, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

## **Long term field report which even boggled my mind...oh wait, not really.**

7 upvotes | March 23, 2018 | /r/MarriedRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

# RE: TRP vs MRP on red pill application of knowledge within a blue pill relationship

9 upvotes | March 23, 2018 | /r/MarriedRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

I just wanted to make a post to clear the air between these two related subs about some fundamental differences between the two.

We are united under the banner of red pill knowledge, which can best be understood as empirical and epistemological research through loose peer review. You could call it "trading notes." It's application of the scientific method, in ways that are practical and pragmatic, efficient and expedient.

I say this, explicitly to piss off blue pill snowflakes who believe in science only when convenient and within their ideological view of the world.

## Background of choking on the pill

I am a theory snob and Endorsed Contributor at TRP, I'm only making this clear because I am not coming here as a newbie in any capacity, neither am I here to promote one camp vs the other. This post is inspired by what I believe is a perception of calling MRP "application of red pill knowledge within a blue pill relationship" as negative. I want to outline this why that isn't a negative and also provide some insight into how men can transition between these two camps and when they should. These aren't conflicting frameworks, they're actually layered on top of each other joined by a woman's current relationship orientation with said male.

At TRP my journey began many years ago with red pill awareness within a blue pill relationship. At the time, I considered myself "purple pill." That terrible stage where you pick and choose the easy parts and reject all the hard truths. It takes a long time to realize that just means *blue pill*. Which you can imagine the cognitive dissonance as I read Rollo's *Mitch's Purple Pill* and realized that in my own way, I too, was mitch.

Unable to accept this, the decision that most men who choke on the pill or reject it becomes *they have some good information, but there's a lot of stuff that's wrong*. Denial.

And so a pilgrimage to *Purple Pill Debate* began, certainly, the unicorn *must* still exist. Who hasn't seen the "red pill woman" in their social circle? My *first* choking point was AWALT, mainly that I could not accept it. And frankly, "AGAL" is not sufficient enough to outline that concept in a way that allows a man to accept what AWALT *really* is.

From this *Schrödinger's (n)AWALT* : *Right now, she (never) love(s/d) you. E.g. tingles uber alles and why finding a "unicorn" is a waste of time* was born (pinned to my profile).

But there's still no way that *all women are like The Red Pill*. And there was truth in both that statement and to what women at PPD said. So what was "red pill vs blue pill?" This became hyper meta. I reread all the studies on female arousal and hit the basics again and realized the truth behind BP vs RP was really LTR vs STR, from a woman's perspective. Highly recommend you read the post below if this is not obvious to you.

## Prep on "red vs blue pill"

For the complete picture here, you can reference *Protectors vs providers, AF\BB. Killing the blue pill dream* in my posting list. Which is the total expansion on the point here.

A blue pill male (provider\bb) is nothing more than a woman's *long term mate selection*. What she

does for this is simple, she searches for men who are easily controllable who have a nurturing disposition and tries to maximize physical dimorphism. This is the actual source of the soyboy gamer in PPD and in society at large. His purpose is to assist in raising children. He is a suboptimal choice in terms of arousal.

An alpha male, is a male with a variety of traits high on genetic quality, low on controllability or suitability as a father. Traits that make a man a good partner and father are *negatively correlated to arousal*. These men are selected for *short term* arrangements. Arousal is the only consideration.

"Alpha bucks" would be a man who matches the traits of a STR who *has a nurturing disposition, and is controllable*. This is a *blue pill, alpha male*. Or a "natural." You could call this a "female unicorn." These guys get chewed up, but regardless, they exist as a phenomenon.

The male (solipsistic) conception here is actually a *high beta*. (Elon Musk is my favorite example) Again, to be in a "red pill relationship" is to be within a woman's *short term mate* paradigm. This means you are *not privy to the overt and implied contracts that a long term mate is given*. This is why interference *or even the concern* over her has such a drastically negative connotation at TRP (we'll get to MRP in a moment).

As a male competing within a woman's short term mate preferences, what god damn right do you have to care or involve yourself at all in any other mate choices? You are literally, a casual sex partner, and to assert any sort of ownership over her is an incoherent, hypocritical farce and sign that she mischosed a needy provisioning mate for such an arrangement.

At MRP, the view is much in the same, yet the reasoning differs, because such a thing is generally ineffective. Yet some degree of concern or enforcement is necessary because total inaction is to condone and to show weakness, even if indifferent or apathetic (which could disqualify the LTR itself as a comfort test failure). And in most cases the male is insufficiently positioned to compete into the transition to STR and so he is essentially demoted to orbiter if he isn't viable as an LTR or a STR.

Many (even most) women entertain the idea of a fraudulent "alpha male" (STR mate) within the provisioning framework, which is what MRP is. This is what a "unicorn" is to a woman. You are trying to recreate the natural selection of "alpha bucks." "Mutual" monogamy assures such a thing is fantasy. Since STR mates, compete within the STR paradigm. And unless you're willing to feign being blue pill, she's not going to buy that you're a natural. So instead, you're a fantasy archetype. You are, when your wife dresses up like a prostitute, and propositions you at the kitchen table.

And that's okay. Still wound you up didn't it? And a real stripper still trumps your wife dancing out of rhythm, bordering on cringe right? It's a compromise, that's okay.

Yet the reality is such an act won't often stand the test of time against evolution, which conceptually seeks to provide the highest quality genes *and* promote *diversity*. That last part is the part that no one likes. Even if you're "the best" at some point the chemicals stop doing their job and well, *next*.

Women who are high on FTO, low on impulsivity, will accept this arrangement. And even if arousal remains low, they may remain faithful with this *bargain*.

The conflict with MRP I outline in *She knows you're a fraud*. It is near impossible to operate with total indifference to a woman before Dread Level 10. And so you are at the mercy of time and her rationality (as well as your SMV and plainly circumstance or luck). At such a point where her rationality is surpassed by her impulse to trade her provisioning relationship for a new mate, men are

rarely doing using dread level 10 as strategy as such a thing is the natural outcome of her unwillingness to submit within the blue pill\LTR paradigm. At that point, a man recognizes the incongruence and joins in her shenanigans (or preempts it), even though she may still be doing a good job of hiding it or still making it covert.

So is blue pill inherent to family and or long term relationships outside of the categorical meta observation innate to female choice?

### **Nature's view on the matter**

In a way, I believe, yes. Even beyond the meta categorical implications outlined above which are post hoc rationalized as rational choice (gene quality vs resources). With the most impulsive low FTO women conceiving with high genetic quality mates, and the highest FTO women choosing men who will make good fathers.

Recently I've begun a fairly substantial effort to define the framework in which men can operate with in understanding how to start families that are created within the red pill framework. This caused some issues because despite there being an orientation within the STR framework, something felt *off*. Both TRP and MRP take a fairly consistent approach to mate guarding. Don't. Yet it would be absurd to ignore such a thing taking place within the animal kingdom, where no such social decorum would be necessary. A lion doesn't play off his lioness flirting or heading off to mate with a lion from another pride. Violence breaks out.

There are other theories that he is trying to return her back into a receptive state for mating, but that's been disproven, but suffice to say, mate guarding is part of the fabric of the animal kingdom. Without it, such assurance to paternity or longevity of the pride, nuclear family etc is unlikely.

Egalitarian societies then make great effort to try and separate out *biological* from the term *father*. France even going so far as to outlaw private DNA testing. Time will tell if men are willing to accept fatherhood as a social role, rather than a personal one. But it's highly unlikely any substantial subset of high value males would ever do such a thing as ignore their innate warning systems against such a thing. Concerns over paternity are hardwired in males as concerns over resources are hardwired in females.

In *The Nordic Family Paradox - The Nuclear Family Is A Male Value System (Briffault's Law)*. Where a society adopts egalitarian values, *the number of children who grow up in the same household as their father decreases*. In terms of how this can be translated to the relevant theory, patriarchal values can be reflected as *an interest in externally controlling hypergamy, as opposed to competing within short term or long term dating paradigms and embracing male disposability*.

And so from a strictly arousal based perspective such strategy to ignore cheating or maladjusted long term behavior and to focus elsewhere is preferable. And especially so for her as you become part of her ride on the CC. You transition from being part of her LTR(BB) framework to her STR(AF) framework. But again, you've now jeopardized the LTR framework and retention is strictly based on your ability to be at the top of the AF pile to create conditions.

Which is why in the TRP theory framework for family (which is still a work in progress), provisioning is tied to fidelity and practiced under the basis that you will provision only to the level you're prepared to lose, while this is true.

And so, in an arrangement where a man is in a long term arrangement where he provisions, provides his time in exchange, a degree of management and mate guarding will be required as to retain the

mate against the wishes of evolution. Yet such a thing provides long term happiness for both parties.

**And so, at the margins, you find the exact separation between TRP and MRP.**

- Blue pill relationship = *typical female* LTR paradigm (selects for provisioning)
- Red pill relationship = red pill knowledge within STRs (selected for arousal)
- MRP = red pill knowledge within an LTR (high beta masquerading as AF or "alpha male agreeing to provisioning relationship")

TRP's schema ends when the effort to retain a mate becomes more important than changing them out (since TRP is a description of how to compete as a casual sex partner). Rollo's Iron Rule #7 here then defines where TRP can not cross MRP. Your marriage would be over before it started here for many men!

MRP's schema begins when the loss of said mate causes enough issues that managing that relationship becomes more important than competition within the short term mate paradigm.

When I'm using the term *masquerading* here, it's not pejorative, but descriptive.

A male breaks back out of MRP around dread level 10, and the relationship returns to a red pill one. If she agrees to and follows your terms and you reenter a long term arrangement which is no longer in STR chaos, you've re-entered the MRP paradigm.

Another way to look at this, is once you've reached dread level 10, your reading is probably better suited at TRP. And conversely, men in LTRs would be better suited reading here. Though I am putting together a framework for men to turn their pre-marriage LTRs into red pill families.

So is there anything wrong with being a "blue pill framework?" No. It's descriptive, and such a thing is necessary for long term mate retention. It is in fact, part of patriarchal values. Women rewrote family because they posited such a thing made them unhappy, because they believed they'd find happiness embracing male disposability. The Female Happiness Paradox disputes this.

And so, blue pill\LTR\MRP relationship management with red pill knowledge and application is a net benefit to men who are not only trying to ensure their family, marriages or LTRs stay in place, but the women within them are happier, despite their paradoxical belief they'll be happier under their program without subjecting them to the same disposability that TRP mirrors women with that applies to men.

## Stacy's Credo : Death of the plow horse

281 upvotes | March 25, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

I hadn't read a succinct way to reference the *archetypal solipsistic value system driven male* until I read it yesterday referred to as *the plow horse*. Or what we could understand as a *high beta*. These men are either failed unpluggings or partial unpluggings that are in the last bargaining stage. They've accepted some foundation concepts here, but *they're different*. They just need to be *more*. And "yeah yeah yeah AWALT and all that." The burden of accepting this is instead shifted to the self.

If you could pinpoint one of the most common things that will shatter a man's view of the world, it is the moment he realizes the values he held to be true and important hold zero, or close to zero value with a woman. At first, he'll reason those values just aren't held by *this* woman, but over time he'll realize it is with all women. The plow horse then, exists in two states. The one in which he doesn't realize his values are not shared by women, and a second state which follows after he realizes this.

For he'll be ready for the future, because in his next attempt at the *forever until she changes her mind* program, he's got the solution. These other men, they are donkeys, but it's time to get your shit together and be in *the top 20% percent*. Then if he never fucks up ever, it'll work out just fine.

He'll be *the best plow horse... ever*. Top 5%, here I come.

And therefore, the only man that would leave him would be irrational.

This way he doesn't need to truly restructure the way he views the world, simply improve himself. And should any such failure happen, he can continue on, simply asking to be whipped harder, by himself. And with every whip, the harder he'll work, and the harder he works, the better a position he'll be in.

There is nothing inherently wrong with this approach, but the mentality is incongruent and lends itself to some issues.

The plow horse believes *because* he works hard and does things that one *should do*, he is rewarded with fruits of labor that conform to his value system. When this fails, he shifts to believe his failures are *only* because he has not worked hard enough. And therefore, all failures, are his failures. The entire world is explained through the duty of performance.

This is another stage of bargaining that leaves the plow horse in a well meaning, often periodically successful position, but not yet fully developed. While the *ethos* is correct, which is to work hard and that you and you alone are responsible for yourself to get the fruits of labor, he must understand that he gets these things because of the work he does. Not because of his value systems, and not because of how hard he works. This is part of his first stage of growth. To separate out the value systems he holds as important, from the ones that get results.

But he must develop one more part of himself to be able to structure his world properly and operate congruently.\* To accept that failure, is not entirely within his control.\* Failure is to be assumed, and the duty of performance is to be adhered to. These two things function independently of each other, and from this, you realize the need for a safety net. The plow horse who is still in the bargaining stage of denial, believes that his sacrifice is his safety net. And so with each failure, he is left with nothing. Although he is strong, his position is fragile.

Knowledge gives you a cognitive safety net in which you position yourself with the understanding that failure is not a flaw, but a feature of the system. But it is up to the plow horse to shift his mental



schema and adopt a real safety net in the form of options. The barrier to this for the plow horse is often moral. And he handwaves the safety net because he hits the field harder than any of these donkeys he surmises.

### **The Story of the Plow Horse**

The plow horse drags the fields, day and night, and has enough to feed his family. With an enormous sense of pride he tells his children at the table, that one day, when they drag the field, that they'll be rewarded with the same pride. He says that their field is wet and the yields are strong because of his sacrifices and that he never misses a day. Today, was to be the day that he takes a rest he declared. And so, he lifts his swollen feet to the table and smiles.

The rain that night was the last the fields saw.

Deeply reflecting, he realizes his pride was instead arrogance. His rest, was laziness. And that he had scared off the rain gods. His weakness caused his suffering. And the only solution was to work harder, to regain the trust of the rain gods.

And while others who knew the plow horse begged him to understand that this drought would pass and to look for other ways to put food on the table, he fought the idea that nature was a cruel mistress. The plow horse knew deep in his heart it was his fault and no one else's and returned to his field, the only one he had ever truly known. And that had he worked harder, and not been arrogant, that she would have been wet for him. How could he be so god damn foolish? How could he take everything he learned as a young man, that he put into as an older man, and let it be destroyed by such a foolish mistake?

And so he plowed the fields and although they were dry and cruel, day and night, as everyone begged him to give up, he soldiered on. The gods will notice, the gods will notice. They have to, they must.

Dying of thirst, he crawled to a man he knew who had fields who had once dried up, still putting food on his table although neither had rain. Although this wise man did not share the values he did, and did not work as hard, he begged to know where he had gone wrong. To which the elder explained to him clearly and without mercy the way of the world.

*"Plow horse, you are hard working but the world does not care about your sweat and toil, only what you give it. And sometimes even then, it does not care. And since you believe only your hard work is rewarded, you are at the mercy of your field, who is at the mercy of nature, and she is a cruel mistress. You were once great, but now you are thirsty.*

*Many others traded their plow for more advanced tools. They have more than one field, they save resources, even if they have enough already. They know work is only rewarded if it is effective, and that nature does not care if it is good and pure. They know she can't be trusted, and so, they live as if their field will dry up that day.*

*Even the buskers who barely break a sweat at all, who have no wholesome values that I know of, just entertaining in the streets, can eat. And yet here you are, at death's doorstep, crying to a god that doesn't care for you. If you don't die, I do at least hope you learn. Although you care about these things, she does not. And so, understand nature, so that you can live despite her and not for her."*

---

### **Stacy's Credo**

"Honestly I'm wild about you, right now. You're the best I've ever had, right now. I'm almost totally unable to imagine a world without you, right now. And it's a good thing you think that I'm not like

"those other girls" because that would make this whole thing a lot more tense.

Instead, you won't believe me. You say I'm magical, unique. You'll tell yourself that you're better, that you've got the formula or you'll never make any mistakes or be put into a position where you'd be anything but my number one. Right now, I think you're right. You're special, right now, and so am I, right now. You work hard for me, and that's just adorable.

But I think there's some things you should know about me. Know that my attraction to you will decline over time, and eventually or even suddenly, I will likely not at all be attracted to you. It won't matter how great of a father you are, whether you are in shape or how strong you are mentally. It doesn't matter how much work you put in or how righteous your values are. Frankly I don't know how or why it happens, but it just does. It does seem to happen usually when I've put myself into a situation to be around a lot of other men. And I do sort of find myself doing that when I start to feel unsure about things. But right now, I think that will never happen. I remember at some point I never thought it would ever happen. But then it kept happening. But this time, it'll be different.

Your job is probably boring to me, and I already know other guys that have more exciting jobs. The fact you're good with kids is weird to me, but its useful. So long as you can help out with any kids I have, I mean we, and it doesn't jeopardize me getting exactly what I want, without any compromises, we'll be just fine. And I'm sure you'll never be in a company that downsizes, get fired, transferred, make a mistake or stop getting promoted faster than other people that I know. Seems like sometimes things get crazy when that stuff happens. Just out of nowhere! That can be really silly. Especially if he calls. When I was in college we spent a lot of time together. I'm over him. He was the only guy I didn't cheat on, before you. I'll never, ever, cheat on you. I'll stick by you in the times when they're tough. I'm sure of that, right now.

None of your family members will ever get into any serious trouble or get hurt, because if something like that made you depressed, I'd worry about that silly old feeling popping up again. So when your parents die, you can let out a tear, but don't be a little bitch about it. Honestly, you make everything look easy, so you'll have no problem being perfect, forever. I think about him a lot.

I'm always looking for the best and sometimes even just different will suffice. There will be other suitors that will try to woo me, and it will be up to you to make sure I do not become attracted enough to someone else that I convince myself that it's over and there will be little you can do to change that. I'll try to get a hold of him. I told you that I'm over him. Why do you keep bringing him up? You know you don't have any right to say that I shouldn't be talking to him, right?

And once that happens I'll convince myself in whatever way necessary to make that reality possible and true. None of the things you think are important I'll allow to be important. And I will cut off my nose to spite my face.

And honestly, I'm not even sure what you're on about at this point. If you think all of these things about you are important, your job, that you care about my kids, I mean our kids, you're honest and loyal are important.... why don't I care? I don't understand why you stopped talking to those other women just because I told you that I would break up with you if you didn't. Why do you listen to anything I say anyways? Are you some sort of social retard?

What about all those *other girls*? That I wasn't like, do they care?

I never loved you and the thought of touching you again makes me physically sick. I know you keep talking about the good times, what good times? And you're a piece of shit and an asshole to even insinuate that I'm like those other whores. If they were dealing with an abusive piece of shit like you

they would have left you a long time ago.

---

So what do you say? Does this sound like a good deal?

The field is over there.

Will this be temporary or are you going to sign up for the forever until I change my mind forever program?

If you're planning on being a temporary worker, don't let me know. Our requirements are much higher for that program though I'll warn you. Doesn't appear as though that'll be a good fit for you.

So just walk right under the banner that says *marriage*.

# The emotional load of bullshit, failed mothers and household management.

30 upvotes | April 16, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

So now that the buzzword of 2017 (human trafficking) has faded, the new buzz for 2018 is the *inequitable distribution of household work and emotional labor*.

- When housework is equitable, the complaint will be, that instead, she harbors the *primary emotional and or thought load*. This is analogous to the *head of the household*. This is a *valid non-starter*. It's valid, because *you should be the head of household*.
- When housework is "inequitable" the complaint will be that her husband *is more work than if he wasn't there at all* or something close to it.

## The non-obvious, obvious

99 times out of 100, this is a symptom of a bigger problem. Tingles uber alles. Frankly, your lack of them. So you'll have to work on this in parallel. Just do not *ever* let house work be the lever she claims is how you get sex.

This is also compounded by the fact that you're *probably with a woman that has a low maternal drive*.

If you've ever been around a woman with a high maternal drive, she's too busy playing with her kids to get too worked up by much. Her "emotional load" is *dominated* by her desire to get those reward hits from her brain by engaging with her children.

In your case, she's probably more mechanical, that's why she's looking for reasons why she doesn't feel like the jackpot she thought she might hit when her body was screaming it was time to conceive.

Tough luck buddy, you picked a dud. Your job is now to rewire her junk programming by cleaning off her plate, running your house and forcing her to spend more time with the kids.

If work becomes a focus over your children, book an appointment to the shrink politely *because her children need her, and she is somewhere else*.

These arguments are all underscored by a degree of contempt that if you read it is *my kids aren't really all that great*. You let her win at her game, and she doesn't really find it all that great.

Her children are burdens. Not something she loves to work on.

In a properly run household with a maternal woman your job is to get out of her way, because she's too busy setting up things to do for the kids or with them, and she's enjoying every moment she has to spend with them.

Just like when you're trying to get that project at work off the ground, the slavery still makes you feel good.

In women where this isn't happening, her children are a job she hates. You might be part of it, but ultimately, you picked a masculine woman who probably shouldn't have had kids anyways.

## Acceptable contempt

What you should understand is these arguments hold a degree of socially acceptable contempt that

most women would never allow to enter their household *if they treated it in the way that men believed it was understood by their wives.*

Do you remember that time when she wanted nothing more in the world than a baby girl or baby boy?

And where are you now?

To the point where what probably amounts to an hour or two differential in housework duties has given her mental justification to burn the whole house down.

And how much work do you think Chad or Billy take a some other dude's kid in is going to do? As much as you? If the answer to that is *yes* then, well, she's right. But hopefully the answer is probably "no way." Of course, most of the guys on the other end of these complaints are *plow horses*.

Don't work harder, work smarter.

**On equitability**

## ***1 Nothing in life will ever be completely equal unless you start from the premise of equality of outcome.***

If you want a job occupied by a 50:50 split of men and women, the only way that will occur is by random chance (which would occur more the closer a job is equally as desired by equally qualified men and women) or by enforcing the outcome by explicitly hiring an equal number of each candidate, dividing your candidates into two hiring rounds.

So in many of these cases one of the actual issues that can be a non-gendered issue is a lack of actionable accountability.

Have you ever worked for a company that vollied requests over a cubicle? Delegated two different versions of the same request from multiple departments?

The way that companies often solve this issue is through the use of a *project management portal*. Where the issues are centralized and explicitly delegated. Each task is given an owner and an expected outcome. In this case, the way you put this fire out is draft up a list, *do not hang this up like you are 10 years old. It's just for reference*. You're already beyond a point of reason, now you need accountability.

*Solution* : Draft a solid distribution of housework and *do it*. In MMSLP they call this the "I word" for *laundry*. MRP calls this "owning your shit." The rest of the world calls it *adulthood*. Regardless, in most cases, the issue isn't really a lack of willingness, but a breakdown of communication as a woman tries to push the choreplay framework.

*Warning* : Do not *ever* agree that housework should or would have any impact on your sex life. If the reason why your girlfriend, plate, wife, hooker, fwb etc won't sleep with you is because you forgot to vacuum, your problem lies elsewhere. That is, unless, you actually are in a relationship where you exchange household duties for sex. And in that case, continue on dustslut. Get a good lawyer on retainer for your divorce.

## ***2 Rarely does anyone feel they're getting the good end of the stick unless they've got almost the whole stick.***

Again, one of the major benefits of centralizing things like this, including KPIs (key performance metrics) is to track, analyze and account for difference within populations.

When Jack says Jane is a lazy brown nose, the first thing any competent manager does is look to see if Jane's KPIs demonstrate such a deficiency. Just as corrupt police hate body cams, people that have an aversion to responsibility will refuse to be measured or will reject such measurements as biased or try to maliciously comply.

If she refuses and instead says "you should just know" or deflects, then make a chart yourself of what she's doing and what you do. Then work on the distribution based on her own words.

But if she refuses, again, your problem lies elsewhere. She's probably looking for reasons to hang you and once she runs out of reasons you'll just be an abusive asshole. And who is going to argue with that once she's giving out free pussy?

## ***3 You get what you get, and you don't throw a fit***

I actually jacked this one from my daughter's preschool teacher, credit to her on that one. But that's it, what you've given her to go from, yourself to follow and the results from that is what you get. Give it some thought and imagine the ways she will contort your plain requests, because you should expect that from anyone, even well meaning people will have different views of the same thing.

Have you really completed a task that is done suboptimally in the view of the other?

Is it fair you've got garbage which is once a week when the bathroom should be cleaned every day?

Your job when this issue breaks out is to *let her hang herself*.

*Solution* : Give yourself the worst distribution and let her argue her way into the optimal distribution for you. Rest assured, if you take all the heavy tasks, she'll try to argue that you instead took the easy ones. Give them to her.

### **The mental load of bullshit**

Now understand this argument above about equity is a failure of the human condition, not gendered, but also exacerbated by a woman's orientation to feelings and built in fitness testing. That's why #3 exists. If she feels its unfair, then it's unfair. Even if rationally, you taking all the hard tasks should be self evident.

On the same front, understand that the *mental load of bullshit* houses the former debates. Underneath this, is the fact that you've let her argue you into a corner because you're lazy or you believed what *she said*. Silly silly man. If *facta non verba* should teach you anything, it's that women talk out of both sides of their mouth.

What she's actually saying to you is *why the fuck am I doing your job, you effeminate loser?*

One thing that many households learn is that it's *okay* if your wife makes more money or a lot more money, so long as she still feels as though you run the house. Frankly, if such a thing is true, you have the leverage legally speaking. Have her pay you alimony, child support or whatever if she wants to throw a tantrum and eject. Adopt that frame.

Wrestle control of your household back by hook or crook. Have her send you problems and iron them out. That IS your job, **period**. Equal household duties are a farce.

THIS CAN NOT BE MORE CLEAR. YOUR JOB IS TO RUN YOUR HOUSEHOLD, HER JOB IS TO BE THE MOTHER OF YOUR CHILDREN. If you're married and you don't have and don't want kids, why god, why?

She gives you problems, and you *solve them*. Her complaints translate into actionable objectives to sort out. And for all the work you do in this domain to turn 1,000 complains into 999 solutions, the only thing you'll get out of this is complaints about the last one and the 10 that weren't solved in the way she thinks it should be solved, even if you already did the math on her way and figured out it wouldn't work, even though she thinks it would.

In these cases, you can let her fail and take ownership. This is one of nature's great delicacies, a form of marital schadenfreude. If she's not a complete moron she'll show some gratitude here and realize that's really not her gig. Don't chide her, take the opportunity to have an ego free discussion for about 10 seconds before her programming hijacks her back.

### **The frame**

The frame here is simple. *Solve the problems in the household in a transparent, non-demonstrably maliciously compliant way, exactly what you should expect from her*, demanding in return simplicities like courtesy, feminine behavior etc with an expectation you have a woman with low maternal drive.

Her complaints of emotional load are valid because you shouldn't be running an equal household. You should be doing most of it and having her focus on the kids. You're the CEO of the house *and* the operations manager. She is the president of the child care division.

When that doesn't work, you'll have the proof of what you already know, things are way more fucked up than you thought when you started. From there, she'll either take to the kids well, or completely unravel, reject her motherly role and try to relive her life as a girl.

In parallel, work on the fact you're not bringing tingles. And remember, if she really loved her children and you, you'd be able to have a discussion about this and solve it, but you can't. Because she doesn't love you, and she probably is suboptimally wired in terms of her attachment to the children.

I am taken aback at the level of contempt in this message on how it's become accepted in society. Such a thing can only be accepted because family and children don't hold a high spot in the world any longer.

And if you extend out the olive branch that "you would fight for 50:50 custody" she'll probably take you up on that because that's a 50:50 vacation arrangement for the failed mother you're now managing.

Good luck.

Reference my *boiling the frog* as you go through this process.

## **The emotional load of bullshit, failed mothers and household management.**

4 upvotes | April 16, 2018 | /r/MarriedRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---



**Discussion: Men of reddit, if you could take the gay pill, and be permanently gay (no longer attracted to women), why or why not, would you take it? How do you think it would change society?**

3 upvotes | April 17, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

# Diaries of the plow horse slaughters 1 : Suffer in silence

18 upvotes | April 20, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Outstanding post in a thread talking about what happens when men share their struggles. Not going to comment because it stands on its own merit so well, macabre beauty. Like walking into a field and seeing a downed 747 surrounded by bodies, debris and a plume of caustic smoke. Despite its horror, you stand in awe.

credit to u/Jrobalmighty

---

I need to set some groundwork for my story. I had a kid at 16 with my first real gf. I raised him and took him with me as I attended college, just the two of us.

I've never had trouble attracting women but I noticed quite a few trends in dating as a single dad. The first thing I noticed would be women don't want LTR with men who have kids (even in an age difference of 25f to 20m.)

Secondly single young mothers (whom I met many) have an easier time "looking for love" than their male counterparts.)

Third, if you compound any of the issues with traumatic experiences from a physically and mentally abusive it will not matter how much love, generosity, support and attention it will diminish your SMV in their eyes and they start looking for the ejection button.

I spent 16-26 learning these fundamental truths of the male condition. Women are worse than men for nestling up to someone and backing out bc when men do it it's simply and obviously for sex, but when women do it, they're manipulating men emotionally and abandoning them the instant they think the SO will need emotional support.

At 26 I meet a girl who fulfills about 80% of what I feel I need in an SO.

- Loves me
- a good mother
- reliably employed
- sexually compatible

The only but is I didn't romantically love her 80% is pretty close and people marry all the time for reasons other than being chemically induced with hits of Oxytocin.

At 27 we marry and I eventually have some problems with depression around 28 and quit a job that I hated. She's pissed every single day that she comes home regardless of the fact that I've paid bills with savings, picked up and dropped off kids at school, cooked for the kids, cleaned the house, washed the clothes, taken out the trash, and applied for jobs.

She says she wants to quit her job to do that herself. Ok that's cool with me. As soon as I get another job you can quit. I get another job and she quits. She doesn't do half of the things I did before and I'm still cooking and cleaning the kitchen. She doesn't like cooking so it's cool bc I do.

I buy a house and an acre of land so she can plant gardens and whatever else she wants land to do. I'm working as a sergeant at a maximum security prison. At 31 my grandmother that helped raise me dies. At 32 my mother dies suddenly from a drug interaction and we had recently been trying to

reconcile after years. I tried removing myself from the lives of those who were bringing me down for my immediate family. I didn't want my wife and kids living around drama.

At 34 my stepfather murders my youngest brother. Enter another bout with depression.

So I have a stressful job, she's working 9-5 at a cake job, I'm cooking and cleaning, I'm washing all my own clothes and paying all the bills, dealing with trauma both past and present. I never take it out on her or the kids.

I decided the only way to get better is to work through it and focus on my family bc that's the only thing that matters. This is how I handled everything up to that point.

Then I start actually thinking about how much I'm doing, the pressure being put on him to solve every single problem in our home, doing all the grocery shopping, cooking all the food, cleaning all the dishes etc etc and dealing with a stressful job and still I have this ungrateful person who does nothing to help me, who will never help clean even while I'm working on our roof in 110 degree heat, I'm replacing a hot water heater and she's watching murder mysteries.

I ask her to watch anything but that. I'm sick of hearing about murders bc I work at a prison and my brothers been murdered.

Well she needs it bc murder porn is the only bs she's interested in watching. She's doesn't like fiction. Yada yada whatever.

I start looking back on the selfish, uninspired, lazy, unmotivated person that is like a dead weight dragging me down worse.

I decide that to solve this problem I'll just stop holding it al together and see what happens. I stop cooking, cleaning etc etc except for working outside and repairing the home as necessary.

Guess who picks up the slack when I stop what I've been doing for 10 years? The answer is no one.

Not only that but she quits her job and is getting maybe 20 hours a week during Christmas but she's angry with me bc I need to pay the bills and our TEENAGE children might have to wait to get presents. Oh no, the horror of a teen waiting on Santa Claus!

She starts getting the hint and asks me if I even care that she's there. I told her, "I'm try to care" and boy that was it.

I put up with all this crap over the years to be a good husband and father. I never mistreated her and I wanted to build her up as a confident person.

She finds a guy that's interested in her at her new job and leaves. She didn't want to change, work on her own issues, or do her part.

She wanted someone to leech off of and make her life as easy as possible.

Now don't get me wrong, I know I shouldn't have married someone that I knew I didn't love but I did care about her. I wanted her to be a strong independent person and I still consider her a friend.

However, I gave everything to this woman as a man, a husband and a father. Yet when it becomes clear she's going to need to pull her own weight with bills, around the house and I'm not going to be her lackey anymore she's going to bounce like a check from her banking account.

I've learned a lot from all of this. I started out as a young man, raised by women to treat women with dignity and respect so that I could be loved and cared about.

Most people posting here that say the world doesn't care are absolutely completely correct.

I will never mistreat women bc of my experience but my eyes are open at 36. I will only engage in relationships that are beneficial to me in the short and long term from now on. Romantic or otherwise.

I'm just happy that my son is an adult and I'm single and young enough to still take advantage of some good years to have fun and enjoy my life without being the foundation to someone else's happiness/laziness.

I'm not being conceited but when I was young women only wanted me bc they were attracted to me and had no intention of being emotionally close. Over and over again I saw that from 16-26.

Later in my life trying to be emotionally close with one person, I still get taken advantage of even when I thought I had found a person that actually wanted me for me.

When you open up to women who just want sex they leave. When you open up to women who say they love you, they just use you for their own personal gain until it is no longer advantageous.

You are only loved or cared for in so far as you provide something they need while requiring limited emotional currency in return.

One weakness was immediately displayed as a young father and the other to a SO through a series of dramatic life events that had minimal direct impact on the SO.

Maybe all people are like this and not just women but in my experience men are not allowed to ask for help or even equal investment into a relationship. Yet when we demand equal treatment the women in our lives lose sexual interest bc they can't be expected to deal with too much. You handle it all and do it with a smile or when it falls apart it's all your own fault.

Hopefully from 36-46 I'll get it right. Let the games begin.

## [CMV] Despite the complexity of reasons as to why the SMP in the black community degenerated, it's a cautionary tale of what will happen if the SMP continues to "degrade."

13 upvotes | April 23, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

The debate is about the SMP outside of the black community.

1. I understand the reasons why the SMP within the black community are multivariate and up for debate, so such a thing is outside the scope of this debate.
2. This shows that *boycotts* are not effective.
3. Understandably, small subsets don't care. These are men who do not value romance highly, (non-black)UMC women etc.
4. It shows us that a full decline is a *male optimal* outcome outside of small subsets of women such a child free types or spinsters (less than 20% of women). Above average providers have leverage to choose their female mate, protectors have robust availability of short term mates. Duty of performance is actually more weighted on women in this arrangement (must either be promiscuous to compete for AF mates, or within the top 20% roughly of women, in terms of male interest traits, such as hip ratio, feminine dispositione to obtain a provider).
5. Also seems to indicate men will orient themselves for female arousal rather than male status (AF\BB)

Will continue to add points if debate seems to fall out of the primary spirit of the CMV.

## The official "an incel murdered somebody" thread for onlookers, bystanders & media suit types (ignore this and publish a story saying we are just like them for that sweet adrev)

846 upvotes | April 28, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

I've seen posted around reddit recently that we're starting to get grouped in with the incels. While it should be clear that we are not associated with them, let's make this *very clear*, autistically clear.

I'm not here to write for controversy, but instead for people to understand the issue. If anyone actually cared about the people's lives who were lost, they'd read this, and take action from it. But I don't expect anyone to care, or take action, and I would go so far to say that even people who are involved in the media that read this will disregard the information here and push for views to get that sweet sweet adrev until the next misguided, desperate sexless guy at the end of his rope shows up in a crowded area to kill a bunch of innocent people.

I knew blood was on Reddit's hands the minute they closed down that sub.

I don't typically write content with the intention to judge, but today, I'm judging.

Park Deitz, a Forensic Psychologist, along with many other mental health professionals have advocated against many of the practices that mainstream media companies use to sensationalize this behavior. Yet these organizations operate agnostically as if they are unable to control the outcome, even with feigned malicious inaptitude as if they don't understand or realize they provide a platform for society's rejects to get up and make their statement.

These men make a statement when they take the lives of innocent people, and if any of these media companies cared about preventing such a thing in the future, or even curbing it, they wouldn't fuel the message of an "incel revolution" but they've given credence to people who self identify with this idea that at one point everyone thought was a joke, that started on 4chan as the "beta uprising."

"If you're lonely and unsuccessful with women, when you're ready to give up, kill a bunch of people, and we'll be here to make you the anti-hero."

So this most certainly isn't the last time we'll hear of this, and just like school shootings, I won't at all be surprised when this becomes a recurring issue. I knew the moment that sub closed down that someone would pay for that with their life.

---

**TRP** as a "system" analyzes and trades notes *within a woman's short term mate selection paradigm*.

**Incels** are *involuntary celibate*. That is, they *do not have sex*.

Traditional, monogamous, long term relationships, *are frowned upon here*. They are considered a *fool's errand*. (Since women can not negotiate attraction, and men harbor the duty of performance, making any such arrangement willful ignorance at best)

Casual sex, obviously, being much more difficult for men near a median level of attractiveness to obtain, puts this group pretty far and away past the types of men within the incel grouping.

So you should understand now that the primary audience for this group, are men that are interested in

having sex with women, without having traditional long term relationships.

The system here advocates for "spinning plates" which is our ingroup speak for *having sex in an uncommitted relationship with more than one woman at a time*. This is equivalent to what people in the left call "hookup culture." *We advocate competing within this culture.*

Incels, on the other hand, understand they are incapable of competing within this culture, and even unable to obtain a girlfriend, which is considerably less difficult to compete for than a casual sex partner.

---

### **Why do we appear to share somewhat similar views?**

Incels seek information to understand their position in the world. They've tried all the advice that's been given to them by family, friends and other groups on the internet. Yet they remain lonely and unsuccessful. So they are forced to study female behavior at a level that is considered atypical. They begin to over time understand that they are physically uncompetitive specimens, low status awkward outcasts or maybe self aware enough to realize they have significant personality disorders scaring women away.

TRP subjects men who are not *Über males* to a large shock as they begin to understand women are just as if not more superficial as men. The primary difference being that women are born into a blind entitlement, who will never know what is like to try and have sex and fail, some for years or even decades at a time.

It is as much of a shock for men who have had limited success with women through serial monogamy to learn they've functioned as useful idiots as it is for men who have no success with women to learn how much work they need to get anywhere *at all*.

The difference between these two outliers (men who can compete within the STR paradigm, and men who can not compete \*at all, either STR or LTRs) is the median. The "rest" of men function more or less as useful idiots to women, whether they understand it or not. This is clearly demonstrated in sexual selection literature.

A small fraction of men are within relationships where he *is her best choice*. In these cases, these men are not often useful idiots, but instead *jackpots*. Mr. Dreamy. These are men with top physical traits, highly sociable, usually successful financially who *choose to compete within a woman's preference*. Rather than using his superior physical genetics to obtain many short term mates, he chooses one woman. They are the men whose words pull the least weight in this argument, but argue the most loudly without any self awareness whatsoever.

If you believe we share similar views, it's because you don't understand the content here or you're not self aware enough. Likely because you've functioned as a useful idiot or align more with female preferential sexual strategy. You've been selected against (likely) as a controllable mate, you see no downside to this arrangement (believe that serial monogamy is preferred to polygamy), and therefore you either can't understand your genetic advantages over these other men (incels) or you can't understand the mechanisms men use to compete with women within their short term paradigm (TRP) to maximize their sexual success.

If you understood the content here and didn't harbor a view that played so well into female sexual strategy, you'd understand we're actually polar opposite of each other.

### **Why do men need TRP at all? What about the men who have success without these groups?**

They don't *need* it. Men come here because they are *unhappy or looking to increase their sexual success*. They could choose to remain in the pattern they're in, but they've chosen for one reason or another to come here and break out. What they're doing from a top down, systems analysis, game theory perspective, is breaking out of a woman's LTR preference, which is conflated as *the way women date* and instead understanding women from a *raw arousal* standpoint.

Plenty of already attractive men, who were born with superior genetics coast on that until they land in here after their first, or maybe even second divorce. This is when they are forced to understand concepts like *Facta Non Verba*, or, watch what she does. This conflicts with the largely held view that women operate at a rational level in a relationship. **To be clear, such a thing can never be possible. If it were, women could circumvent evolution itself.**

TRP's position is that a woman's arousal takes precedence over her responsibilities as a mother or her loyalty as a partner. Such a thing can be easily demonstrated by looking at egalitarian countries, *who have higher divorce rates, and much lower numbers of children growing up within the house of their biological father*. Also of consideration is a disproportionate number of women who file divorce. Finally, when raising children in the nuclear family is no longer a societal priority, physical dimorphism increases.

This is because while men are polygamous, women are hypergamous. This demonstrates absent societal structuring to prevent women acting in ways they prefer, they will choose to nomadically change mates to the detriment of themselves (female happiness paradox) and their children. If such a thing wasn't true, then the absence of male valued systems of control wouldn't have an effect on the rate in which women change partners or stay in the nuclear family. Yet they do, because as we say, *tingles uber alles*.

What many of these men take for granted is that they often are

- Tall
- Conventionally attractive
- Functioning as useful idiots for women

Speaking frankly, but likely above your reading level for the content here, *most women select against* for long term relationships. The type of men within the incel community would *never* be considered short term mates, since such enormous numbers of much more attractive mates are on supply.

This means that many of these men figure out that *even if* they were to procure a relationship, they understand they'd be chosen because they

- Are easily controlled
- Provide resources
- Are a temporary mate until a more attractive one can be obtained.
- Would likely be cheated on

More or less, they begin to understand how useless they are within the system. This concept here is called "male disposability." And that *even if* they were to become more attractive through significant effort and sacrifice, that they could still lose a significant portion of their life in the event the relationship fails, leaving them on the hook for child support or losing assets. Men who lack the physicality or intelligence to even compete to this level of "high beta" begin to resent women for having such a low level of necessary competence or value in the world outside of their youth and or



attractiveness.

Upper middle class women would argue that many women struggle with the same issue. Yet they aren't *alone*, they're merely too choosy to be saddled with an "unattractive" partner, even if, they are unattractive. If you were to pair these women with men of equal attractiveness, they'd consider these men beneath them. As is often demonstrated, women select on the pareto distribution. 20% of men are attractive, and 80% are invisible. Most incel men are in the bottom 20%. The idea that "everyone has their equal" isn't true for men because this also, would conflict with the purpose of evolution, which serves to increase genetic quality and diversity.

One need not look further than the advertisements of prostitutes to see that men are willing to stoop pretty low, for a chance at intimacy, even if more shallow and less long term. Frankly speaking, *voluntary celibacy* is not the same as being *involuntarily celibate*.

And frankly speaking, from what I outlined above, these men lack the physicality to stumble into the sexual marketplace by accident and have success. And so we are united in a forced understanding of women, yet for different reasons. The readers at TRP do so, to become *more successful with women* and men who identify as incel do so to understand their failures in life or because we provide the only explanation as to how they may even create a suboptimal solution for themselves.

*The divergence between our groups is the men here accept these facts and change how they compete. Many incels do not. Instead they use our content as a way to justify their misery, when most are physically able to compete, just lacking the strategy and mindset.*

I have created a post in my post history that helps these men, and have received many messages of thanks. To this I will make the strongest point of this group.

### **Incels are the creation of male duty and honor**

The saddest realization I had when I made the post for incels to understand sexual theory, was a realization that many of these men struggled competing on the level that women compete on in the sexual marketplace. Women who have high sexual value simply need to put themselves onto an online platform and they are assured to get messages pouring in. Even average women are bombarded. And there *are not* as many sexual messages as they'd like to claim, it's just part of the flood. Regardless, the average number of messages a median woman gets, is *infinitely* higher.

That's not hyperbole, it's literal. The average number of messages a median male gets on an online dating platform is *zero*.

These men were stuck in decision paralysis because no one was telling them that they could date these women and leave them. This may be a hard thing for a normal person to digest. But these men were so stuck in male duty and honor, that they couldn't push themselves to compete within the sexual market in a way they considered dishonest.

That they could be the low value "controllable" man that a woman searches for, who isn't her best option, and turn her down for marriage.

There is an odd paradoxical sadness in that male incels often times have internal standards that are too high.

This can be boiled down to this conceptual shorthand.

Take the average involuntary celibate man, match him with a woman who is of equal levels of attractiveness, and they are both hypothetically obligated by totalitarian enforcement to

be loyal to each other till they die, most of these men would take this agreement, almost no women would.

We explain to men why such an arrangement isn't feasible. (Hypergamy, SMV differential, etc) Men in TRP use this information to formulate their sexual strategy to one that is designed for long term stability. Incels use this information to help understand their state.

The truth of the matter is that *some men*, normally short men or men who are foreign, have *valid concerns*. Their best case option is to pray that the woman that they marry doesn't cheat on them militantly and divorce them. They know in their heart of hearts it's unlikely they'll ever be a woman's number one. And even at TRP, many men try to point to a man like Kevin Hart, yet if you took away all the money and status he has, Kevin Hart could likely be just as discouraged. Men below the median height of women have *an extremely difficult time* finding partners.

Naive men say they're just "be themselves" or "approach more" away, some of these guys having confided to having done hundreds or thousands of approaches to me.

These men deserve to understand the truth, that women select based on height as one of their primary selection mechanisms. A fact, so indisputable that it serves as a canary in a coal mine as to how misinformed most men and women are in regards to sexual selection. Such a choice is so obviously innate to the species and yet most men and women would insist that such a preference "isn't universal." Which is only true in the most obscenely absolutist, truth deaf way. True in the sense that *not all men dislike having their balls stomped on with high heels*.

Tell that to men who are 5'2" tall, who have tried speaking to a thousand women. Who are competing for a small subset of women who are that height or smaller, who are selecting men who are 6'0". Too bad, so sad, be more yourself, stop hating women, you aren't entitled to them.

Die alone, loser.

And yet these same men are confined to their rooms, scouring the internet for some solution to their misery that doesn't involve treating women in the way that "those dirty misogynists at TRP" do.

They are looking at a group that has solutions to maximize potential, so that they may position themselves as having *something*. Lamenting that they'll have to grow the fortitude to treat women in ways that they've been treated. Discarded at a moments notice, for trivial errors in the dance of attraction, because they lack the raw arousal characteristics they learn are potent in sexual selection.

To the casual observer, a lack of regard to sensitivity that we have is unable to be separated out from the hatred many of these self identified men have that seeks as a way to soothe their intense inner sadness from a world that has rejected them, giving them little options to grow from.

### **The violent incel program**

1. Take away a support groups for some of the lonliest, purposeless human beings on the planet.
2. Deride them for their failures.
3. Offer them no actionable solutions.
4. Be surprised when lonely, purposeless human beings, who are being derided for their failures, with no actionable solutions lash out after taking away their support groups.

Truth is the matter is a lot of these guys could have remained within their "in group" as outcast loners. But taking down one of their last spots to hide away and bemoan their own lives sent a message I thought was dangerous.

*There is no spot a man is allowed to have in the world where he can be accepted for being sexually unsuccessful, not even in an obscure part of the internet.*

Think about that level of isolation. It's dark to even consider and to accept this black truth.

If you're wondering why incels come here, it's because you've provided no actionable advice for these men and taken away their last refuges. Until the only thing that makes any sense in their world is to pick up a gun or jump in a vehicle and kill innocent people as one last jab back at a world that if it operated with the claimed empathy and equality it purports, would have focused on helping these guys out a long time ago. And any claims that we should be the ones helping them are about as absurd as someone who has never played blackjack coming to a blackjack pro convention. The only reason that player is here is because there are literally no other places *for* him to go.

And FYI, that isn't just a "mental health" issue. If you criminalize being unattractive, then these men will "choose" to be criminals. Frankly I consider the mental state of incel men to be that of a society inflicted complex. Where men who are not attractive enough are told a variety of means to achieve their goal which are ineffective, persisting in a state of society induced insanity.

Where the only solution to this insanity is a group of men who do know how to exploit sexual selection mechanisms, yet have no sympathy for such divergent men who run literally counter to their mission to maximize male sexual success.

More or less, society, get your shit together. You stopped overt, easy to spot physical bullying and transitioned all that negative energy to "misogynistic men who feel entitled to women's bodies."

These men don't get their ass kicked in gym class anymore, and I would argue such a thing would be a positive to some of these guys. Instead, the world puts them in a box and tells them the key is in their heart.

It's not.

## "Older men getting with 20 year olds is a TRP revenge fantasy..." Oops! Maybe not!

314 upvotes | May 7, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

This thread is a goldmine and life fuel for anyone that has any second thoughts or doubt about how to live your life.

If you ever have to abandon the life of the plow horse, take inspiration from these dirty old men that made up for lost time.

<http://archive.li/5aJvp> Enjoy!

---

Some themes.

All the women are "low quality trash." Lot's of these guys aren't successful, aren't impeccable, more or less, these are [u/VasiliyZaitzev](#)'s brothers in arms. Just like you'll "never find another girl like her" or you'll "die alone" or anything else, use this thread to see what it's really like when you let the blue pill dream die and live for yourself.

The story is simply that my father is an irresponsible creep. It was just the two of us when I was growing up, but he made it clear he was resentful having to take care of me. **He's in his 60s.** I'm 34, my older half sister turns 40 in a few days. My youngest half brother just turned 2. I'm sure I have siblings I don't even know about. His current wife is maybe 30 and by far the oldest woman he's ever been with. He cheated on his last wife with her. **His last wife was 19 when they met (I was 17). But that was better than his previous girlfriend before that, who was a few months younger than me, and I was 17.** I always make sure that his baby mamma's know that I'll always be there for them and their kids when he leaves, because he's GOING to leave. It's interesting watching how surprised they are when he does.

What a *creep*! Seriously ;)

I found out my dad died because he stroked out while in a motel with someone younger than me. **This was (to our knowledge) the third time he'd cheated in a long term relationship, and he was already married to someone 20 years younger than him.** None of this really affected me because I knew he was a piece of shit for years so I guess it's not really a great answer to this thread but it's still kind of amazing.

*A real piece of shit.*

Not younger than me, but around the same age. I am (almost) 20 and **my dad recently married a 23 year old (my dad is 43).** Now, that doesn't seem so bad, but my dad is a high school teacher and she was his student for four years. I was very close friends with my dad's now-wife in high school, to the point where she would sleep over at my house. My dad was always a little too close to her and when my mum and dad divorced during my sophomore year my dad began an official relationship with her. It happened so quickly that my mum and I were sure that **they had something going on before the divorce and while she was still underage/my dad's student. But we had no proof** and she had recently

graduated, so there was nothing we could do. Of course, word got out about it at my school and it was all anyone would talk about. People would call my dad a pedophile and there were all sorts of rumors going around. It was pretty rough. When all of this went down, I didn't talk to my dad or my ex-friend for about a year and I still have a very damaged relationship with both of them. Now they've been married for almost a year and have a baby on the way.

Nice.

My dad is **71**. 6 months ago he left my mom for a 25 year old. I'm 33 and my sister is 28. His new girlfriend is 6 months pregnant. They're not married because my parents divorce hasn't gone through yet

This guy must be rich!

Nah, he's a broke retired school teacher who works part time in retirement. The girl is just your typical damaged southern trailer trash. She already has one kid, and got arrested for giving her infant beer at a concert... it's as white trash as it gets. They live together at her grandma's house.

Nope!

my dad is **65** and he's in a relationship with someone who's 26 (so 8 years younger than me). They've been together for 3-3,5 years and are happy together, and I'm happy for them. At first it was a bit awkward for me, up to the point that it took me a half year before I decided to meet them together (at first I just met with my dad alone every week). I was mainly worried about my dad (still am, a bit), he came out of a long relationship that went really bad (got cheated on after 8-9 years) and he had a really rough time with it. So I was scared he would end up in the same depression if this one went bad as well (not because of cheating, but the age difference eventually could catch up to them, as an issue). I've spoken openly about my worries with my dad, a few times, along the last 3 years, and it will take time for them to actually go away... **There's a 38 year age gap and my dad, at some point, will get health issues because of age and I'm cautious of what will happen.**

FYI your dad doesn't give a flying fuck. He's having the time of his god damn life.

Dad is a serial monogamer? He has been married 4 times. This last wife is 5 yrs younger than me. **She is 25. My dad is 52.** She gave birth to my brother last year which resulted in an interesting conversation with my kids. Me showing my 6 and 5 yr olds a picture of their new uncle. Me: look guys this is your new uncle isn't he cute? Kids: that's not an uncle **THAT'S A BABY!** (caps are accurate) Smh She is young as hell and acts like it and my dad is hella gross for dating a girl younger than his daughter. But it's his life. It makes for weird genealogy talks with others but that's all.

Hella gross!

She's not my stepmom because my dad has no interest in being married again. But my dad's long term girlfriend is 26. He's **67** and I'm 30. **They met at grown folks night at a local night club.** The funny thing is she had a crush on me when I was in high school and she was in middle school. I turned her down of course for being too young. She wasn't too

young for him now though. I have no problem at all with it actually. She works full time and is also\*\* getting her Masters\*\*. My dad helps her like any other boyfriend would financially, but he isn't spoiling her with money like a sugar daddy. From what I can see, she actually likes his old ass for some reason and isn't using him.

Oh man. He couldn't even find a way to slander his red pill dad. Guy must be bulletproof!

My dad is married to a 25 yr old waitress. I am 26. When I was 18/19. Me and my family used to go to the place she waited at and every time **I would silently pray we were going to seated in her section (because I had a huge crush.)** My dad would always be a dad and drop some dad jokes, waitress style. I always thought she was laughing at these jokes to be polite, turns out she thought they were genuinely funny. They got together 5 yrs ago. He still goes to the same place to eat, and she's still his waitress... the jokes are worse now though. Edit: Yes my mom was a part of the the family that went. My parents marriage was already falling to pieces, they split soon after I turned 18, but tried a few times to work things out.

You snooze you lose *son!*

I'm 35 and my dad's wife is 25. I now have a little sister that is 6.5 years younger than my son (he is 10). I always considered my dad an "old" dad when I was younger, always much older than my peers' fathers anyways, but now **he is in his 70's** and constantly tired from toddler antics. **Honestly, I love his new wife.**

A wholesome ending here folks. Don't be fooled. You can be dickin' down girls in their 20s while you're 70. Just have the balls to live your life on your terms.

Dad married a woman 30 years younger than him. She was barely 2 years older than my big sister. **He had younger girlfriends ever since his divorce, so I never really thought it out of the ordinary.**

These guys get it. I've only scratched surface of the stories in that thread.

Enjoy!

## **Q4W who are roughly average, what areas, if you do you feel like there are any, need to be focused on in terms of women's rights?**

1 upvotes | May 19, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

So, no outliers (hate men, childfree, poly, slut, radfem, lesbians, weird genders etc). If you "don't know if you're average" or "who is average" you're an outlier.



# Women who act in ways, that are consistent with the widespread understanding of how a slut acts or looks, are unreasonable to expect to be treated as if they are not the same or share enough similarities to escape judgement.

40 upvotes | May 20, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

One of the fundamental arguments I see a lot around here more or less boils down to the idea that *promiscuous women* and *women who like sex (or are sex positive or whatever)* are different and that men need to delineate between these two subgroups.

The idea being that the *woman who is sex positive* will still "totally totes love her future husband forever" where as *those other women* are the ones who will cheat on their partners and divorce them. You know, they'll "communicate" and fix it. That *would never be me*.

Men argue, well yeah, that's what you think *right now*. That women are post hoc rationalizing their behavior and that eventually they'll have their own unique rationalizations why their future husbands are treated differently, dead bedroomed, cheat on or divorced. It will of course, be *his fault*. (yes, some men are at fault, not the point) But sooner or later "the spark is gone" yadda yadda yadda.

More or less, it's not unreasonable for men to treat a spade as a spade. If it looks like a duck, smells like a duck etc.

I see no compelling argument that men should not treat women who have high partner counts as "sluts." Outside of "that's mean" or "I don't want to be treated that way. And there's an easy way to not be treated that way, don't dress or act like one. *Most* men will presume a woman chaste unless given reasons to question that. Piercings, tattoos, aggressive attitudes and outspoken opinions on sex. Or they are outwardly "sex positive."

The arguments against this, more or less are entitlement.

A woman argues that she should be able to wear revealing clothing without being treated as if she frequently enters into short term sexual relationships with men. But why? Honestly, I understand she may *like the idea of having more freedom, without the resulting impact of this freedom*, but it's not realistic.

It is realistic for men to presume that woman advertising her sexuality, is interested in being pursued. The rude party isn't the male approaching, because that's what he is supposed to do, but instead the woman playing coy. *Who me?*

I would like to wear my watch when in poverty ridden areas traveling, but such a thing comes with consequences.

Even if I'm not robbed, certainly, they will assume I am an easy mark and approach me.

Am I a mark because I wear my watch? Aren't marks, and people who wear watches two separate sub populations? Do I deserve to be robbed because I choose to wear it? *Correlation doesn't equal causation* /s

Women love to say "no one is entitled to anything" and they're right. Men aren't entitled to your bodies, women aren't entitled to commitment. They're also not entitled to act in ways that men consider to be "slutty" without being judged. And they're further more not exempt from judgement



for their actual behavior.

A woman with a high partner count, is *factually, statistically* a poor bet for a man. And for him to treat her in that way, is consistent and fair.

She may *feel* it is unfair, but ultimately, his position on the matter, if it is to be risk avoidant is *prudent from a statistical standpoint*.

And every woman thinking she's the exception to the rule, embodies the thought pattern of *the entire subgroup*.

The number of women who think to themselves "I am the stereotypical slut that people look down on" is *close to zero*. But *plenty* of those women feel shame, and instead project that as "I shouldn't be judged." Instead of accepting the nature of their behavior, they wish that the world instead shifts around them, as if they operate as the sun and we all orbit them.

They handwave the studies that demonstrate correlation, and demand to be called "the watch wearer" not "the mark." But from the standpoint of the thief, what is the difference?

That's the point here.

Every woman believes she's different.

Every man is prudent to say "no you're not, you're just a slut" and to treat her as such.

The scraps go to the men who aren't smart enough to understand what *wisdom* is.

# Most women will prioritize their relationships over their children.

3 upvotes | May 22, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

I offer an a priori argument that women do not prioritize their children over their relationship satisfaction using the most egalitarian nations and increases in rates of divorce these nations have over more patriarchal societies, using the United States as the comparison metric.

*Simply stated, as a nation becomes more egalitarian, we expect that the number of children who grow up in the house of their father decreases since divorce increases.*

If this phenomenon was reversed, and more patriarchal nations led to an increase in divorce rates then we would expect a set of reflexive arguments to appear.

The reflexive response to this, which is factually incorrect, is that women aren't able to divorce in these nations. But we're merely speaking of developed first world nations with low exit barriers to marriage. And in fact, in nations where divorce can be initiated through the internet, such a low exit barrier *does not* increase divorces.

So from that, we can conclude, that the divorces that do occur, are because the person actually wants to get divorced, and within both nation structures, such a thing is easily accessible (we are excluding any nations where women are not allowed to freely divorce their partners).

We would also expect arguments that women are escaping "abusive relationships" in these patriarchal nations. And so conversely, we should expect these arguments then don't hold water.

Restated

*(Patriarchy)The nuclear family is not a female value system.*

## Facts

- Egalitarian nations have higher divorce rates
- As egalitarian values have taken root, women have begun to lag men in happiness (female happiness paradox)
- Nations highest in egalitarian values, lack, or have markedly lower social stigmas for women to have families outside of wedlock.
- Children who grow with single mothers have markedly poorer outcomes
- *Most* relationships *are not* abusive. Therefor it would be unreasonable to conclude that instead these women are just *more free to leave abusive relationships*.
- Since having children outside of wedlock is not stigmatized or markedly less so, men and women who value marriage and the nuclear family the least, have self selected out of the pool of possible divorcees.

## Fair assumptions

- Nations that are more egalitarian should produce men who treat women better, or else, such nations wouldn't be "more egalitarian."
- *Most* women are innately (or at least subconsciously) aware of the impact a divorce will have on their children. Therefor it would be unreasonable to assume that most of these women

believe *they are doing the right thing for the children*.

### Therefor we can conclude

- As a country becomes more feminine, the number of children who will grow up in the house of their father decreases.
- Women will prioritize their relationships, over their children's well being.
- And be less happy, while doing it. (female happiness paradox)

I conclude that it is reasonable to deduce that a society that prioritizes egalitarian values and allows women to operate in ways that "makes them the happiest" will have a negative impact on children and the very women who believe it will make them the happiest (female happiness paradox).

### Alternative proof

If the well being of their children were a priority for *most* women, then the number of divorces would *decrease* for two reasons.

1. They are getting "what they want" (egalitarian relationships & partners)
2. Since an intact nuclear family is innately obvious as a benefit to the child, she would prioritize this, over a new relationship (since it is unlikely such a change was because she was forced to choose a male lacking nurturing qualities, escape an abusive relationship)

### Caveat (converse to fair assumptions)

- Do women not actually understand the impact of separation on children? Does it need to be taught that such a thing is damaging to their children.
- Are feminine men, and egalitarian values not making women happy with their partners or their lives?

---

Satire is often a good source of pointing out the baseline phenomenon and exposing it for what it really is, and TL;DR, I think this was best brought to light by Southpark. Though such a view could be *male biased* (then reference caveat).

| Mrs Marsh: Stanley, you know you're the most important thing in the world to me, right?

| Stan: If that's true then get back together with Dad for me.

| Mrs. Marsh: Now Stanley, you have to understand how divorce works. When I say you're the most important thing to me, what I mean is you're the most important thing after me and my happiness and my new romances.

# TRP is scientific, not pseudoscience.

1 upvotes | May 29, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

TRP in rigid description is : Rational, ontological, epistemology, specialized in male happiness through sexuality with an in group lexicon\jargonomenclature\terminology, that participates in non-credentialed peer review to practice the scientific method to test a hypothesis which is roughly *women's sex lives deviate markedly from widely held conceptualizations and they often act in ways inconsistent with this widely held understanding (understood as a "blue pill view of the world.")*.

It argues from within a woman's short term mate preferences and constructs a minimax\maximin (minimize loss by forming of a system from the understanding that women will to a significant degree, prioritize short term mate features, to the detriment of long term relationships by maximizing sexual access through attractiveness and amorality).

## Definitions

1. Scientific : Based on or characterized by the methods and principles of science.
2. Rational : Based on or in accordance with reason or logic.
3. Ontological : a set of concepts and categories in a subject area or domain that shows their properties and the relations between them.
4. Epistemology : the theory of knowledge, especially with regard to its methods, validity, and scope. Epistemology is the investigation of what distinguishes justified belief from opinion.
5. Pseudoscience : A collection of beliefs or practices mistakenly regarded as being based on scientific method
6. Scientific Method : systematic observation, measurement, and experiment, and the formulation, testing, and modification of hypotheses"
7. Empirical Evidence : Also known as sensory experience, is the information received by means of the senses, particularly by observation and documentation of patterns and behavior through experimentation
8. Jargon is a type of language that is used in a particular context and may not be well understood outside that context. The context is usually a particular occupation (that is, a certain trade, profession, or academic field), but any ingroup can have jargon. The main trait that distinguishes jargon from the rest of a language is special vocabulary—including some words specific to it, and often different senses or meanings of words, that outgroups would tend to take in another sense; —therefore misunderstanding that communication attempt. Jargon is thus "the technical terminology or characteristic idiom of a special activity or group".
9. Peer review : Is the evaluation of work by one or more people of similar competence to the producers of the work (peers). It constitutes a form of self-regulation by qualified members of a profession within the relevant field. Peer review methods are employed to maintain standards of quality, improve performance, and provide credibility.

Alpha\AF is in scientific terminology *a man who embodies short term mating preferences for a woman*. You can read my AF\BB post about this, pinned in my profile.

Beta\BB is in scientific terminology *a man who embodies long term mating preferences for a woman*.

The entire hypothesis is subject to the scientific method, which is easily observable, and can even be

participated in (since it is no credentials are needed.)

So while skeptics of the system, its practices and discourse could correctly posit "they have loose peer review practices, and have no credentials." They *can not* claim it is not scientific or pseudoscience.

TRPs discourse goes through these standard scientific steps.

Conjecture is a conclusion or proposition based on incomplete information, for which no proof has been found.

Which over time becomes a *hypothesis*.

Which eventually with enough evidence becomes a theory.

At this point, it's fairly easy to see if you have the correct lens that TRP's conjecture has made it's way to a well validated hypothesis but as a group we doubt will ever be given the credence of theory.

The "disproofs" offered are merely women practicing standard LTR selection (selecting for BB) and the "unicorns" are covered in my nAWALT post, which I recommend you read if you believe you, or your partner, is a unicorn, and that it explains the rest of this away. As well as men who are being used as useful idiots from women who are unaware of how they will operate when or if they lose attraction.

Lastly, claims to authority, the requirement of credentials etc. are just a way to handwave inconvenient truths, if such things are even understandable to the person reading it.

And so they claim "it's pseudoscientific bullshit."

Yet the only person practicing pseudoscience, is the "skeptic" who is instead just dismissing their cognitive dissonance, by misunderstanding the hypothesis, relying on institutionalized science to tell him the "truth" and disregarding any other scientific endeavor not for science itself, but for his\her ego.

So ultimately, the argument is ego defense through affluenza\elitism because they believe science should be a certain thing.

And frankly, even if you get to that point. Then the person will just shift their skepticism to the science itself. Even if, the science was done in exacting standards in the way they believe it would be fair and proper, they'd just exclaim that we don't yet know the *true cause* for these results.

So ultimately, the reply that anything "isn't science" or "isn't scientific enough" is bullshit.

Being a skeptic doesn't make you right or TRP wrong. It just makes you a skeptic. Furthermore, the idea that TRP isn't populated with plenty of skeptics is just as laughable.

Or else the anger phase wouldn't exist. Failed unpluggings wouldn't exist.

# A priori proof of AWALT, definition of AWALT

2 upvotes | May 30, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

1. If women did not share substantial similarities in sexual preferences, we could not correlate behavior and/or physical traits to female sexual arousal. Yet studies are able to correlate these behaviors and traits.
2. If women did not select short term and long term mates differently, en masse, then we could not see different correlations between these traits. Yet studies show, they do.
3. If women did not have substantially similar reactions to their sexual supply and/or loss of attraction to their partners (or other issues which TRP&MRP have analyzed and formed systemized responses to), then TRP\MRP would be unable to systemize a response to their behaviors. Yet they are able to.
4. Because we are able to understand the effect that certain behaviors and traits have to STR & LTR selection, and because women behave in ways that men find to be roughly consistent across cultures and time, we are able to understand that *all women*, are *like that*. Which is not, *all women are the same*.

From that, we can derive a more universal definition, though I'd like to see that picked apart because besides it being overly verbose, it isn't sitting right for me yet. So tear it up.

Definition : Women have a discernible set of preferences and patterns of behavior in short and long term relationships which are closer to biological drives and/or states than generally perceived or stated, which they will all react roughly similar to, though some more or less extreme than others, yet as a whole will act consistently.

## Would her father bring a shotgun and a shovel?

8 upvotes | May 31, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

This concept was greatly influenced by a comment in a recent post in which a TRP poster from high school relayed his saga of a g/f who made a fake claim to being kidnapped by a rival. I'm fairly sure it's been removed, but if not, someone can post the title, I'd like to point the author of that comment, given my recent thought into the level of insight on that comment as it slowly burned over the last week or so.

The "clever" kid that he is, he decides to try and strong arm a report to the authorities through her father, that will make the girl either "shit or get off the pot." Assuming that she will make the claim that she was in fact kidnapped by his rival, grinding him through the court system, or have her publicly immolated as she back tracks.

The father however, saw right through this. This I thought was an important revelation.

On the one hand, many fathers would be oblivious to what was playing out. But this guy, being more of the strong type, knowing women better, knew instantly what was up. That his daughter had gotten busted. At this point, his interest was saving face and the guy does an absolutely masterful job of bamboozling the kid into buying hook line and sinker "shit is about to go down."

But as aware as that father was, I thought to myself, he's still just understanding the game, as it is played. He knows this kid is out, and her "kidnappers" were in.

But at some point, the games stop being so child like. At some point, the stakes get raised, and only the true bastards survive a woman's innate self destruction as she "finds herself" on her path to "self actualization."

### **The weak & the strong : Not all that different**

If her father is weak, invariably she'll learn as her mother psychologically demolishes her father, how a family operates and how she should treat the men in her life.

Men with options will treat her like poison, because she is. So, by design, she'll accumulate a number of weak men into her life and play out the script that she learned at home a couple times.

If her father is psychologically strong however, more often than not, her mother will be more feminine, even if outside of the house she is a high powered type.

---

This is a much more nuanced exchange here than is worth typing out, because each relationship will go through its own settling of power. But suffice to say, the vast majority of relationships will settle this power dynamic early in the relationship, which is why men at MRP can have some seriously long and dragged out reversals in their marriage.

I've said before that at MRP, many men do what is akin to telling their wife, who works at a bank, that they're going to show up with a fake gun to rob the bank. Maybe for a while she pretends that she's scared, and she tells him "pweese, pwetty pweese don't shoot me, you bad bad man." But eventually that gambit too will end and she'll laugh him out of the bank.

Then he threatens to show up with a real gun. Even as he begins shooting the tellers, she laughs. None of this changes the way she feels, or her plans for the future.

Finally, he sets the bank on fire. She'd still be unmoved, but she now realizes that she's on fire and

*begs* him to put her out, she just wants her old life at the bank back. But it's too late.

One of the saddest and most profound realizations that anyone that follows this type of thing should have, is just how many men hope they can amicably resolve the issues within their marriage, above the table, in a mutually beneficial way.

Few men can truly grasp the concept of *facta non verba* until they've been viscosly unplugged by a woman who they believed was the exception to the rule, who wore her mask exceptionally well. It was only when amicable resolution was completely incongruent to her behavior, and no benevolent explanation could suffice, that he was forced to reconcile her behavior with his unwillingness to process reality as it was, not how he wanted it to be. This is where men are shocked into cPTSD. They exit it by either deciding she was bad, he failed the duty of performance (work harder plow horse), or by actually understanding the content here. This allows the brain's threat detection system to relax. The only one of these that a man truly grows from is the last relief valve.

But the truth of the matter is this. Both fathers, the weak and the strong, are almost equally as likely to end up at this point, and both are equally as likely to listen to her demands and try to meet them in an honest manner.

If she says jump, he will ask in some way, "how high?" If she says 30 feet, he'll either start designing his spring shoes or he'll start laying out the math why such a thing isn't possible.

And from this, we can get a real take away.

It was important to lead up to the conflict in a marriage or LTR and for men to understand that being sharp with women, or even being dominant is no recipe from disaster.

*Failure is a feature, not a flaw* in sexual selection.

*However*, men who really understand how it works, will operate in a way that neither *the weak* or *the strong* father will be able to accept or tolerate.

These men almost certainly will be *old books* types (credit to *Rollo*). The weak and the strong are just two different sides of the plow horse coin. The weak man believes his currency is agreeableness and his willingness to do what is "right." The strong man believes his currency is that he "is the best" while still operating in a rigidly female centric manner. It is at best, male theatre. Any "threat" that the "strong" father poses, is illusory, he's still a dancing monkey who at best evens the playing field by having dread on his side. But almost all of them, with the exception of the few that have been truly unplugged, wouldn't dream of operating outside of that feminine frame that they've digested as masculine.

And both women, will tolerate this, in their own ways. Because LTRs are, for the most part, constructed by women, for control. And so, they are like the MRP "bank skit" acutely aware of the dynamics and power they hold.

---

Forget the idea that either of these men would be mortified to know she lets you have anal, or you two dressed up like farm animals one time. Or maybe even that you choke her and ask if she like's being a dirty little slut. Even the weakest father will just go "ewwwwww" and move right past this. Even the weakest father will understand a woman who is a plate.

But ask yourself this.

"If he had a camera into our day to day interactions, would his instinct to protect his daughter kick



in?"

"*Would he hate me?*"

**"Would he bring a shotgun and a shovel?"**

It is I think, intuitive to think that you would be on the up and up with the stronger of these two, and that he would understand you're just doing what makes her happy. But assuredly, he's an old books man.

Unless this guy is a certified lay machine (in which he would share your understanding of women), you should hope that his understanding of your relationship in totality would terrify and anger him. That he would want to show up with a shotgun having you beg for your life.

And so ask yourself this, "would her father show up with a shotgun, if he knew our relationship dynamics?"

This litmus test almost invariably will reveal the frame you're operating in. Because no such mainstream viewpoint of a male dominant relationship exists, you should assume that your relationship would start on the gradient of "is this abuse?" to "grab the shotgun and a shovel."

This is just a final reconciliation of boiling down to one idea what will tell you where you're really at. Plate, girlfriend, wife, it doesn't matter.

Even if you think back to your old relationships, when did they fail? In the times her father would say "you're a good man" or when he'd be "outraged at how you're treating her?"

It is so common for any man to confuse "treating her nicely" with "treating her right." She didn't want the weak guy, and she didn't want "the strong guy" either. This is, again, Beauty & The Beast, 50 Shades, what have you. This is, tingles uber alles.

The provisioning relationship ends when the *exceptions begin*. And that is where the old books holders, on both sides of the isle, begin to say "is that abuse?"

These are the men that are forged in a vicious unplugging, and these are the men that are most in line with how women operate. They operate outside of a woman's game, and inside of her innate schema.

When men do this, we refer to them as "abusive." It's a cheat code in life. Women respond to behavior that society considers to be against its interests, and so, you are not allowed to behave in that way. Despite her positive reactions to such behavior.

But tingles uber alles. Do you want to be fighting about dishes, or gonorrhea (cha cha cha) from your threesome? Her saying she's sick, tired and has a headache, or being on the morning and night program so she stays your main plate? Her crying that she's unhappy in the relationship she said she wanted, or crying because she *made an exception* and has to share you?

So again, **If he wouldn't bring a shotgun and shovel, you're losing.**

## Better to die a monster than a milksop

517 upvotes | June 3, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Inspired by a PPD thread "Are your sisters, mothers, aunts and mothers AWALT?" and a concept I've been waiting to pair with something.

A quote stuck out

ALL of them demonize their partners to allow them to end the relationship. ALL of them.  
There's not a single ex boyfriend in my family that's not a monster.

Always enjoyable to read when someone comes to an independent conclusion that we're already familiar with. This being the concept that all men, at the end of a relationship "become abusive."

See *the light switch effect* for more info on this, and also just a classic example of *hypoagency*.

We'll take a full circle trip back to this quote, so buckle up while we digest [u/Ultramegasaurus](#)'s story about his mother's appetite for destruction. I'd post more of the stories in there but this post would be *far far* too long. There's way too many great stories in there, and they *all* follow this pattern. So pay attention.

---

My now-dead mother was a walking AWALT

Ditched STEM beta for exotic, foreign Chadlet, my father who **was** loud, aggressive and loved to party Surprise, surprise, foreign Chadlet beat her, she divorces him

Gets to know working-class beta stepdad

Have a kid together, my half-sister

Almost immediately afterwards, she starts massively disrespecting my stepfather and it gets worse every year

Sexless marriage for 10 years

*Should have added for him.*

They are on vacation in the same country my Chadlet father is from

She cheats on stepdad with a fucking poolboy

Makes scenes, gets violent against him and the cops side with her

Divorce

Send poolboy and his family probably more than a thousand € while complaining to me that money is scarce being a single mother

Finally marry and import poolboy from shithole country

He leaves after a fucking week

Mother starts drinking and is miserable, he was "the love of her life" puke

Finds a new boyfriend in own country, hard-working, funny guy

A year later, she gets cancer from chainsmoking

New boyfriend stayed with her until the end, legit good guy

Find out later that she still wrote with the poolboy behind his back almost up to the day of her death

There were frankly *a lot* of stories like this in the thread. And the pattern here isn't all that surprising. This however, does dovetail with something I wrote about before. In *boiling the frog* I wrote what is essentially an expanded dread level 10 discussion. While that discussion was focussed on the *mechanic* (how to deal with relationship negotiation), this post is focussed on the *ethos & philosophy*. (how you should view your relationship for strategy)

The question here is, who do you want to be?

1. STEM beta
2. Foreign chadlet
3. Working class beta
4. Poolboy
5. Legit good guy

The real take away from this story is that you don't want to be *any of them*. I mean that in the sense of offering up commitment, which all of these guys are.

And these, are just the most *obvious* examples in his mom's roster. An obvious, lifelong carrousel rider, alpha widow etc.

But the truth of the matter is this. There is one consistent rational actor in here that is causing the bulk of the trouble, and she's at the center of the hurricane.

If there is ever a classic example to demonstrate you can't use red pill knowledge for your blue pill dreams, this is it. You're disposable, so embrace your level of disposability into something that benefits you without relying on her.

---

In *boiling the frog* one of the key mechanics is to *raise your selling requirements*. The gambit is this. A woman when she's become uncontrollable and uncooperative, is more or less, having issues with attraction. So the trick here, is to offer simple requirements, and charge her disproportionately for the infraction.

A maladjusted plate that you want to get rid of, you don't ghost her. You make some basic requests you know she can't handle. A very basic request, ambiguous enough to give you carte blanche to

judge in your favor.

"Just be pleasant."

When she is anything but pleasant, which you can expect, tell her before you'll see her again to bring another woman.

I do not know why this is so effective, but it is. There is something about *actually nailing her* that is some form of a chick crack challenge. Either way, it's win win.

Either she leaves, or she brings you another plate. Which again, I call *raising the selling requirements*.

---

So now we have a couple things here being woven together.

1. We're taking a look at the nomadic, destructive nature of a woman and a series of different blue pill men (they're all seemingly offering commitment), with varying levels of red pill traits
  2. We understand the way to end these relationships, is to raise the *selling requirements*
  3. Everyone is painted a monster at the end.
- 

It doesn't matter if you're STEM guy, legit good guy, pool guy etc. At the end, whatever dirt can be flung about you, will be flung. If there is none, *what she feels* is true, will become the truth.

The good guy, good father, that goes to marriage counseling will still be painted with the abusive brush. If he gives her "space," it won't be enough, until they're separated. And that'll be too much space if her next best option decides to bounce, when she brings up the obvious baggage like "hey, are you going to help raise these kids with me?" *as a cloud of dust emerges*.

Don't be afraid to be *an actual monster*. There is little to no, actual, pragmatic difference between the two outcomes. And lets even think about the concept from the standpoint of the dating pool for these guys.

We know damn well how this goes. You've got STEM guy and "foreign chadlet who beat his ex-wife" both fresh from divorce. Now that you've got your old books blinders off, it should be pretty obvious which one of these guys is DHV.

Am I saying you should beat your wife? As the joke goes, it's *your* wife, why would you beat her?

Point is this, why bother with such a thing when you could be openly plating, putting her on morning and night ball duty?

It is highly likely the Chadlet or the pool boy could have organized this in their favor, and I would argue that the pool boy did. Dollars to doughnuts she was a ticket to America, and little else. The letters she sent, and any time she spent as a plate with him served his agenda unilaterally.

What benefit would anyone have being STEM guy or "legit good guy" who while he took her to her literal deathbed was being played?

1. Good or bad, you'll be painted a monster and nothing you can do will stop that.
  2. If you are painted a monster with her brush, it will be DLV.
  3. If you are painted a monster, with truly monstrous behavior, it will be DHV.
  4. So, better to die a true monster, than a milksop.
-

The man that subjugates his wife into a prostitute is held in higher sexual esteem than the man who dutifully goes through the grinder marriage counseling, gives his wife some extramarital variety and time to secure commitment "space" and is ultimately left burnt to a crisp.

Don't for a second get on your knees to win her back when things start heading south. No matter how "good" you are, you'll be toast at the end.

And again, the paradoxical revelation here is that the worse you are, in male terms, the better you'll come out, in female appeal.

An old books man worries that after a divorce that he won't be seen as the guy "who did everything to save the marriage." When in reality, subconsciously, every woman that hears that story will understand instinctually he did everything he could to destroy it.

The traditional male conception of a good man, and what women want are almost diametrically opposed. I'll revisit a quote from a roast I did on someone in *The true alpha : On male virtue*.

Ultimately, I'd come down to the fact that she misses her previous 'real' relationship. This guy was an Alpha to the max. He didn't care about her and went even so far as to suggest hint pimping her out to his friends. He'd treat her like garbage but he was a "man". He didn't take shit from anybody, made over a six figure salary, and did what he want when he wanted. He was dominant outside and inside the bedroom. He'd leave randomly and cheat on her but make it up to her by using her to sate his sexual appetite. He'd brag about her being a 'cock monster' and once ditched her at the airport because she was stirring drama.

Be this guy figuratively leaving after getting his trip to America and having her write love letters or chasing him around the globe.

Not the "nice guy" in a 10 year dead bedroom.

At the end, both of them are painted with the same brush. And to men who are not fresh on this, they hope to be painted as the man on his knees, begging for it to work. Not realizing that women are taking pity on him, giving him lip service when they say what a great guy he was.

When on the flip side, they're talking about the pool boy as "such a piece of shit, how could he up and leave her like that?" While subconsciously knowing exactly why she loves him, who they would poach if they had a chance.

## **Q4BPW - If you're going or can limit the extent of your son or daughter's sexual exploration, where would the limits be?**

3 upvotes | June 4, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Inspired by a recent comment in which someone asked whether or not another poster would condemn the "sex in the city" lifestyle, I think the question can more specifically target the idea that as extreme as some people are okay with their lives being, they wouldn't support the same extremities in their children.

Or more or less, the woman who has been in a gang bang generally, wouldn't want her daughter setting one up (even if it was with consent forms, std testing etc).

In what cases are those limits things that you've done?

# The universal way forward, you get the relationship you deserve.

66 upvotes | June 16, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

A pretty surefire way to know that someone is new here is if they're asking a question about whether or not they're doing one specific thing right. It doesn't really matter *what* it is, because the fact that it can be *right or wrong* is usually an indicator of an external locus of control and a lack of a personal mission.

They're looking into the future, calculating the moves to their end point, despite their interest not being the endpoint itself, but what they want to extract from it.

They want to start a business selling frozen banana's because they believe such a thing to be profitable or that it'd be a good way to launder money, rather than being interested in the concept or experience of running the stand itself.

The poster who is wet behind the ears asks "how much time, is too much time, playing video games?"

The optimist says "Nothin' wrong with a little bit of game time. Play to your heart's content."

The blowhard says "that is a waste of your time, it's trash."

The answer is individual and somewhere in between.

*Most* issues, will with enough introspective honesty be easy to rectify and will allow someone to deduce the way forward. As it turns out, human beings are rife with self deception.

Mark Manson addressed this meta debate in depth as a critique in his book *Models*, which I never really stop talking about because it so greatly understands and articulates how to solve the problem that men who lack vision to their future end up encountering when they start trying to checklist and research their way into the future without a real end goal in mind outside of "best practices." A very *male* problem, but one with maturity that solves itself.

The mistake that most people make when they're starting out is that they're trying to reverse engineer their way forward to an end point. Which can seem similar enough to moving authentically to the same end point (which instead we'd call self growth).

The classic example Manson gives in his book is to contrast day game culture with a more authentic approach to the same thing.

The day game PUA, taking Roosh's game plan approaches every woman who passes the minimum threshold of attractiveness and subjects her to his incongruence paying him pity unless he is so viscerally attractive their wants overlap by chance, not by skill at all. And so, the vast majority of these men report back approaching 1000 women with 990 rejections, 10 phone numbers, 5 of which are bogus, and a couple dates from women who took pity on them. Because he wants sex and believes that this will validate him, not because he wants to increase his skills of talking to women he wants to talk to.

I would argue that *most*, even the *vast majority* of men using this approach to meeting women as part of their skillset *do not* enjoy this. They do it as a form of compulsion or a means to an end. Many of them referring to themselves as robots.

Instead, Manson argues that men should approach women they are actually interested in, a certainly

blue pill look at the world, but there is a truth nested inside of this message.

The irony is that for some men, being the pick up robot is authentic to their being. And these are the very men that end up being successful with this approach.

What they want, and how they will get it, are congruent. These are the RSD Julien's and the like of the world. Whether or not these men stage their interactions is mostly irrelevant. It's not really the point. The larger point, is that these are guys that have created a world, let's call it a "mission" for themselves where the way forward to their end point, and how they want to get there are completely congruent.

And so these two men, hopeful blue pill PUA and the professional PUA each given identical banana stands will have vastly different outcomes. Not only would we expect authenticity to drive a higher profit, but overall happiness can be derived from the process of running the stand rather than it being "a job."

Toyota has a concept called Kaizen, which is an internal manufacturing ethos to drive continuous self improvement. It is a form of the scientific method crossed with the very concepts we're talking about here.

Roughly, the process is this.

1. Plan
2. Do
3. Check
4. Act

Starting at point #1, we can expect that these two men will have similar plans having similar end goals. They will play out similar game plans approaching women, but this is where the similarities will end.

They will have vastly different outcomes and how they move forward.

Men who live authentically see each challenge as a learning experience and part of the bigger picture, they are motivated by their failures as much as their victories. This entire process is organic and logarithmic.

While the man who has reverse engineered his path to the end goal, instead can only refer to others on how they may achieve another man's goal.

That is why these questions are so telling.

If you had a mission, the answers would be obvious. The difference between one man's or another man's answer would be superfluous.

This is an absent meta discussion involving famous PUAs. What makes their lives possible or even worth living, for the time, is that it *is their life*. And if you read enough of these guys telling their life stories, you ultimately find out they did the whole thing for validation.

An external locus of control, authentic mission to find validation through sexual success.

Looks like it's back to *plan*.

---

So now we have a good origin story of how a man arrived into the dysfunctional relationship(s) he has in his life. Now lets rewind that relationship you had before she blew your ego and soul into a



million pieces and ask your former self some questions.

### **What did you want in your relationship, and what did you do to make that possible?**

For most men, they arrived at this relationship by accident, without a mission and maybe even gamed themselves into the chair with her. For most guys, they didn't get the girl because they had a mission and were really all that great. They were Children with Dynamite, coined by Ross Jeffries.

And the reason why, they were children with dynamite, is because they were an incongruent mess, without boundaries.

The writings here are rife with descriptions of how to manage this very dynamic of her pushing boundaries and perception within the relationship. But ultimately, the failing of most men who land here is that they lacked boundaries and willingness to enforce standards on their relationship(s) on top of the fact they had no real mission.

The origin story of these men is necessary because boundaries and expectations can only be enforced reliably by men who are operating in an authentic frame.

They demand things from their partners that inexperienced men scoff at, that they can't believe. Because the frame of these inexperienced men is desperate, the only expectations they can create and reliably enforce with the women in their lives is *desperation*.

And so, when she pushes, if he were to push back, she replies in a way that sub communicates *you are desperate*.

She laughs at him, derides him, storms out etc.

Most men identify with this perspective because their "mission" is her. Enough has been written to this end so I won't rehash it. Instead, to focus on the point being, that you can only enforce boundaries of a frame you actually own.

And so, outcome independence and an authentic mission are prerequisites to boundaries and requirements in a relationship.

And so now we've covered the origin of the incongruent man, and steps to an authentic frame to enforce expectations and boundaries in your relationship(s).

### **The cap stone, is that you get the relationship you deserve.**

If you are an incongruent man without a mission who is not doing things women find desirable, you should expect to be treated like an incongruent man without a mission who is not doing things women find desirable. And from that, we would expect he has no boundaries and can't enforce them.

If you are a congruent man with a mission who is doing things women find desirable, you should expect to be treated like a congruent man who has a mission who is doing things women find desirable. And from that, we would expect he has boundaries and can enforce them.

Between these two men, one will have the relationship they want the other will not. But they both get the relationship they deserve.

## The fundamental conflict of the rational man when confronted with hypergamy, a repost of what I found to be the archetypical covert female initiated destruction of a marriage. A failed effort to have him kill the puppy.

352 upvotes | June 19, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

This is commentary on a post that was deleted I was looking to reference, so I've reposted it. I believe it used to be called "Andy's story?" Either way, great stuff. Enjoy.

Started a few years ago. I thought we were happy. We were your usual suburban professional couple. Financially secure, healthy, good sex life, two kids (14f and 9m at the time). I thought we had a healthy social life.

We were going through one of your typical married couple rough patches. Both of us were working long hours, not spending enough time together, we were going through some developmental problems with my son and tensions in the house were running a little high.

The conflict between blue pill men and red pill men here is demonstrated so perfectly. At this moment, you can see the conflict between *rationality and an irrational impulse, hypergamy*.

I noticed that she was spending a lot more time on her phone texting with her "girlfriends". I didn't think much of it. I started making a much more concerted effort to get out of work when I could, help around the house and be more emotionally available, but over the course of a few weeks the gulf just kept getting wider.

And to accuse your wife or start acting a way to conflict with her behavior would be *controlling, insecure or abusive* and so he *does the right thing*.

I ended up accidentally finding some messages when I charged up an old iPad for my son to use. Her FB messenger was still logged in and there were a lot of highly questionable messages with a guy from her hometown who I will call JimBobCooter or JBC for short. The messages weren't completely inappropriate, but I could tell there were quite a few missing based on the times and context of the messages. I made a mental note to keep an eye on this and went about trying to fix things up.

Smart on his part to wait it out, because without it being clear as day, there's no way he could have forced the hand needed in this case.

The next day after I took the day off to knock out some projects that I thought would make her happy, and left her some sweet notes reminding her how much I appreciated her she was once again in the corner of the living room "texting her girlfriends".

A true sadist, I can appreciate this guy even if he won't admit why he did it.

I took the boys iPad to the office opened up FB messenger and watched in real time as my wife tore me down. Her and JBC were making fun of me. All of my flaws, insecurities and secrets I entrusted to my partner were now fodder for her and JBC. Not only that, but while

there wasn't outright sexting there was a sexual undertone to the whole conversation, especially when she was bashing my performance in the sack.

Certainly an example of many guys on here will use to puff up their ego and believe *they are JBC*. Not take the fundamental point from this, which is instead, every man *believes* they are JBC, and no man can ever ensure there is not another man who will make them be the one reading the iPad.

I managed to take some screenshots, but missed a good bit of the messages, because as the conversation was unfolding she was deleting them.

A chance, very, very few men will ever get. Which is why I'm pointing out this is again, covert. She hoped he'd leave way before this blew wide open. Only a tiny minority of men ever get to actually unplug this way and get the closure and certainty they need to understand what *really happened*.

Not that he "just needed to be a better man" or whatever horse shit is being fed to him.

I wasn't emotionally capable of confronting her. I stayed in the office until she was asleep and had a couple drinks.

I took off the next day and spent some time soul searching, drinking and trying to figure out what to do. The wife came home and wanted to know what was wrong and I just coped out and told her I had a bad day. A couple minutes later I was watching the iPad as the train wreck kept unfolding.

Hypergamy doesn't care.

So began a couple solid weeks of taking screenshots, drinking and detaching myself from the relationship. I knew there was no going back from this. The messages were now overtly sexual with my wife completely into it, and JBC was sprinkling in "I love you's".

This is a nice bit of color here. Lots of men want to read this post and understand it within the context of ChadTC vs everyman.

Lots of times, *the other guy* is just different, or new. This is that case.

I consulted a lawyer and got my options, and started moving forward. Here's where everything got absolutely surreal. Watching the messages I found out JBC was coming to town to spend a weekend of quality time with my wife in a pretty nice hotel. I was missing a good bit of the info, they must have had a phone conversation about it at some point, but I was able to infer enough to get the when and where.

Sure as shit the next day the wife is buttering me up and wanting to take a spa weekend with the girls to relax and when she gets back we can really focus on our marriage. I go with it all the way. It's the greatest idea she's ever had, and I'll do anything to get us back on track.

I get with the lawyer and have him draft a strong separation agreement stating that she would move out, she would get weekend visitation, no child support in the interim until the divorce is final. Then I sit through the most agonizing two weeks of my life. After all this most of my feelings for her are completely gone, and I'm just seething with anger like I've never felt before.

D-day arrives. I take the day off work. I Withdraw half of any money in any accounts we are joint on, leave her half alone. I had already redirected my paycheck to a new bank. I close our money market account and get a cashiers check for her half and deposit my half in my new account. I stop at office max and print out about 75 pages of FB messenger screenshots, and I kill time because I don't want to be at home.

She texts me that she's taking off and that she loves me. I tell her to have fun.

I show up to the hotel at about 830 and call the wife's phone from the lobby. It goes straight to VM. They are probably already at it, whatever. I walk up to the front desk and ask if I can use the phone to be connected to JBCs room. It rings three times and he picks up.

JBC: Hello?

Me: JBC, can you send my wife down to the lobby please?

JBC: I don't know what you're talking about bro.

Me: Ok then. I guess I'll have to call Mrs. JBC and get her down here. (Totally a bluff. I knew he was married, and I knew her first name but that was it.)

JBC: (Inaudible, shuffling, panic)

Me: You got five minutes. Click

Not even two minutes later my wife comes walking out of the elevator looking a little flustered. I sit her down in the corner of the lobby.

Her: Starts spewing bullshit saying it's not what it seems etc etc.

Me: I'm not here to argue. The things that are said in this pile of papers are what's going on. The only way I'm not giving a copy of this to daughter, your parents and emailing it to everyone we know is if you move out immediately. (Wife was very prideful. Daughter was going through a rebellious teen phase and her knowing probably would have forever killed their relationship. Wife was also her parents golden child and she always worried about what they thought of her. I didn't have much leverage and shame was my only card to play. Also her professional life is built up around her image, so I knew she would protect that at all costs.)

Her: Sniffle, mumble, inaudible

Me: This is a check for half of the money market account. I've withdrawn my half of the money from all the other joint accounts. You should have more than enough to get a place.

She starts to cry a little. I could almost see the different thoughts and waves of emotions

going through her, but now was the time to keep pressing.

Me: Here is a separation agreement that I think is more than fair considering what's going on. I'm going to need you to look this over, sign it, and leave it at the house when you get your stuff. Do you want to look through these screenshots?

Her: No.

Me: Ok. Go have fun with JBC. Do not come back to the house or I'm going to send this (holds up ream of screenshots) to everyone.

I bounce out of the lobby, and I can hear her start to have a breakdown. I get to the car drive off to a parking lot and have my own crying rage fit. Previously I would have cried in front of her and yelled and whatnot but I managed to get my shit together enough to pull it off.

I don't know what she did that night or over the weekend. She texted and called over and over wanting to talk. I just turned the phone off and by the time Monday afternoon rolled around there were movers getting her stuff and she delivered the agreement. I let her have a talk with the kiddos basically saying mommy and daddy need some time a part, we still love you, etc etc. Standard divorce talk.

After a week she wants to have a real talk for the first time. I oblige her because I've already got my shit together and I've got an idea of what I want, but I should hear her out.

She's so sorry. She wants another chance. She wants her family back. She'll do anything. She's on her knees crying into my lap. I have no intention of ever taking her back.

The only thing any man should even consider here is *demoting to plate* if you have a family. And these views are, I understand, controversial.

I tell her she needs to set up marriage counseling

*Get ready to get fed into the grinder!*

on her own at a time that works for me. I tell her that I can't live with her, but she should be around the children to try to maintain a relationship with them.

So starts our new normal of her coming over the house, cooking and having dinner with the kids three nights a week (she always saved me a plate, I made myself scarce), her cleaning the house and doing the kids laundry then heading back to her place.

We went to counseling. It consisted of her working through her issues with the therapist trying to figure out why she did it, her begging for forgiveness, and me stoically playing the victim.

I was never going to give her another chance. All I wanted to do was kill time, establish myself as the primary caregiver to the kids, and establish her as not having residency in the

house.

After a few months I go to my own therapist and get diagnosed with depression and PTSD.

I've said it before, men that land here are going through cPTSD, the content is the solution.

I ask my work if it's possible to go to part time for the foreseeable future to deal with personal issues, and it's no big deal. After six months of therapy I told her that I couldn't forgive her right now and that I wanted an amicable divorce, but she is still the love of my life and maybe someday we could give it another try. She was devastated, but agreed to the divorce if I promised to try again someday.

Women do this as their primary way to get rid of a man. But when a man does it, he's *a sociopath*.

Once the divorce was filed I needed the kids to want to stay with me. I left a google search for "how to survive your wife's infidelity" up on the shared PC at home, and I left some printed out infidelity articles not so hidden in the kitchen. My daughter found them and came to me crying. I told her she wasn't supposed to find those, that mom made a mistake, that mom still loves her, and that I would always be here for her. My daughter who used to hold my wife in such high regard now wouldn't talk to her without screaming, and it crushed her.

Stone cold.

Not surprisingly when the court needed statements from the kids a few months later little brother followed big sisters lead and they both wanted to stay with Dad in the house they grew up in.

When the divorce was finalized I got the house (had to buy out some of her equity, but that's ok). I got primary custody of the kids. I got awarded generous child support due to the difference in our incomes due to me working part time.

Now for the last two years I've gotten to live in the house with my kids, work part time, get the now ex to subsidize it for me, and when she takes the kids over the weekends I get to have my fun with tinderellas and some FWBs I've cultivated.

To be clear, this guy got pretty lucky. In most states, they'd have calculated *imputed income* or what he *could be earning*.

In the eyes of my kids I'm the patron saint of fatherhood for taking the high road and always being there.

In the eyes of my ex I'm the one that got away that she will always pine for, and I get the bonus of having her come over for sex whenever I want it by dangling that carrot of maybe getting back together.

Comfort kills attraction, this is the opposite of that.

But that is never going to happen.

| TLDR: Got divorced and it worked out.

This is the best story I've ever read of what happens when a man tries to address hypergamy in a rational way and the process of realizing that he's not going to be able to win this battle in the way that he's been raised to understand women.

I don't totally agree with the outcome of how to handle this, but I am an outlier here.

TRP will have to push forward with a view of how men should get into and exit families and that's in our future.

This is chalked up as a "win" for this guy and many men, but make no mistake. Watching kids as a single father is no joke. Being a *single mother with a penis* is not a win.

Take this as a cautionary tale, not a victory. At best, taking an L rather than being immolated.

# On Jordan Peterson : The ultimate TRP meta conflict brought into the mainstream. Why you're here, is why he's wrong.

193 upvotes | July 4, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

*SMC's Window : The constrained arousal hypothesis*

Challenging Dr. Jordan Peterson himself as a way for the readership to understand he is wrong on his views of the sexual marketplace.

Despite his desire for his belief system, which can be most accurately understood as operating as a traditional conservative, with knowledge of a woman's short term mate preferences, masquerading as a short term mate and or "compromise" within a long term relationship to be the optimal relationship structure for a man that wants a family, it is fundamentally misinformed.

The hypothesis is framed agnostically to him, yet as if it where to land on his desk. So for readers who haven't digested the content here properly, where it has distilled itself into some illformed approximation of what you should actually take away, imagine you, are sitting at the desk. Because you likely share some of the same fundamental attribution errors that he does.

## Important foundation content

## Title

Trying to achieve long term results with a woman's short term mate preferences

Mitch's Purple Pill by Rollo

LTR\STR mate preferences

Protectors vs Providers & Killing the blue pill dream by Sadomasochrist

Reconciling the existence of "good girls" with female behavior, women as "states"

Schrödinger's (n)AWALT : Right now, she (never) love(s/d) you. E.g. tingles uber alles and why finding a "unicorn" is a waste of time by Sadomasochrist

## Executive Summary

Romantic love is the world's largest mutually shared illusion, and has become an illusory truth we choose to believe because of a significant number of cognitive biases and an inability to view the world through lenses other than our own. Relationship failure is a feature, not a flaw, of evolution which seeks to increase gene quality and diversity.

Discussions of the sexual marketplace itself are put through a patriarchal lens, and argued within a woman's *long term mate preference* paradigm.

The reconciliation of that last sentence was the *dualistic hypothesis*. Which only could have been born through male hubris. The idea that men had certain women who were "wife material" and others who were "just for fun" and the idea that women didn't have the same preferences had to die before we could realize that women selected men in the *same way*.

Endemic to understanding this are three female centric paradoxes. The last two, originate within this hypothesis.

1. The female happiness paradox : Where as women approach their stated ideals for happiness, they lag men.
2. The female arousal paradox : Where as women approach their stated ideals for relationships, they are sub-optimally aroused. This is self-evident within the results of the *dual mating*



*hypothesis.*

3. The egalitarian family paradox : Where as the more egalitarian a relationship is, the more likely it is to fail, causing less children to grow up in the household of their biological father. This is self-evident in higher divorce rates of highly egalitarian nations.

Men who believe they can use knowledge of a woman's sexual preferences for a LTR attempt to masquerade as STR mates, this is not a solution to "the problem", and can not be, for fundamental reasons.

The solution to this systemic problem, is found within the female happiness paradox and requires a shift in male conceptualizations of women along with institutional recognition of this paradox.

The entire sexual marketplace is constrained on the basis that the female sexual arousal window is much smaller than the male's. And most if not all of the conflicts in long term relationships, family and marriage arise out of this issue. One that we could state is simply that "arousal can't be negotiated." More or less, that the failure point of a relationship is female arousal in the company of the male.

This is not finger pointing, as this is a gendered issue, some time is spent explaining that if men shared the same biological constraints, they'd likely act in similar ways. Pleas to male virtue are likely without basis.

The outcome of this knowledge greatly conflicts with Dr. Jordan B. Peterson's posits to young men everywhere on how they should orient themselves within the sexual marketplace. Which can be summarized as to be "a civilized monster" while still adopting the traits of "a real man." Namely responsibility and family.

### **Cognitive biases that distort the ability to be able to see the sexual marketplace from the top down**

#### *Superordinate cognitive bias*

Framing effect : First, we should understand that we're all seeing the same information and interpreting it in our own way. So while we're looking at the same world, we must control for our biases to see the truth that sits in front of us. Without this, we are constrained to an argument that is only addressing our willingness to accept or reject another's view of the same "truth." This is the reason this hypothesis is constructed in the way it is. It must accept that every reader will have a different view of every single facet to it, and attempt to control for the biases implicit to each portion of the *illusory truth* that has been debated since we've debated the idea of love and romance and whether or not we are monogamous creatures.

#### *The bias that houses the rest of the issues*

1. Availability heuristic : Potential partners are either *good or bad* and we are either monogamous or polygamous. These are the first available possibilities.
2. Availability cascade : Love is the world's largest mutually shared illusion. This is simply the widespread reinforcement of the availability heuristic. We then extend this notion to "finding good or bad partners and believing in or rejecting monogamy."
3. Confirmation bias : Which we reinforce by assuring ourselves that we are able to obtain the positive outcomes we see occurring naturally. These couples act as promotion mechanisms, even though they are very rare. Most people will see their positive qualities in themselves.

4. Declinism : Men view traditional conservative relationships and institutions as being "the best." When instead, it is best understood that these times simply represented the best tradeoffs in equity, not equality, and that it was *the least suboptimal solution*.

### Mechanisms of action\Promotion mechanisms

We can understand this as the *grease for the wheels*.

1. Natural declines in "love chemicals" to near depletion typically around 7 years (7 year itch) : This is part of the evolutionary framework which seeks to increase genetic quality\* and diversity.\*
2. Innate competition for female resources (sex) from men which exacerbate this issue.
3. Narrow lens of female perception of male attractiveness starting at top 20% of male attractiveness (does not follow a normal distribution) which *blinds her* to less attractive mates, making competition a certainty, even when women outnumber men greatly. This is also part of the evolutionary framework which seeks to *increase genetic quality* and diversity.
4. Widespread belief in the ability to negotiate attraction and that we will hold reason over their animal self.
5. Lack of widespread belief in the strength of post hoc rationalization and lower than perceived degrees of control over free will.

### Female Long Term Strategies

<i>gamy</i>	Description	Masquerades as	Actual Relationship Orientation	Strategy failure	Typical Failure Point
Mono	Woman chooses men who have traits of STR for LTR	Long Term Mate\Catch	Short Term Mate	Relationship incongruence	Realization relationship is not a LTR, and is unwillingly to accept this (being "pumped and dumped")
Mono	Woman adopts typical relationship norms	N/A	Long Term Mate	Incongruent to female arousal	Loss of female arousal to the male, after retention costs exceed trading costs.
Poly	Woman adopts atypical relationship norms	Long Term Mate	Short Term Mate	Zero trading costs	Loss of female arousal to the male, after retention costs exceed trading costs.

*Least suboptimal solution*

Description	Masquerades as	Actual Relationship Orientation	Strategy failure	Typical Failure Point
-------------	----------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------

Description	Masquerades as	Actual Relationship Orientation	Strategy failure	Typical Failure Point
Woman chooses man with STR orientation for LTR and relinquishes control	Long Term Relationship	Short Term Relationship	Mate volatility	Chooses male who feigns LTR interest(strategy failure), Evolution itself (System feature, can not be avoided)

This is a *higher risk* paradoxical outcome. The only difference between the first "gambit" in the table above is she's choosing a man that would trend more towards "abusive." And rather than seeking to control volatility, she's looking for signs he ascribes to *traditional male value systems*.

So, despite his proclivity to be a warrior, rather than a diplomat, would you expect him to be in the delivery room? Would he still want to see his child graduate High School?

And that outcome would be greatly influenced by her ability to reject her desire to control out the very things that keep her invested in the relationship. These are the paradoxical issues hundreds of thousands of men deal with every year that are counseled by men across the world.

Naive men ponder idealistic concepts like "whether or not he's spending enough time taking her out on dates." While experienced men are literally tearing their wives clothes off if the situation demands it.

The catch 22 here being that a woman who is certain she needs the control and hands it over to her rational side is being sexually assaulted. The woman that's able to separate out "how it should be" and "how it is" goes along for the ride and thanks him for it.

The "Disney fantasy" in which a woman dates, and appreciates a prince charming, is constrained to women with zero or close to zero partners, in which the man she's dating matches her *ideal composite male*. That gives *him plenty of room for error* and allows him to operate in a way suboptimal for attraction.

That woman can both believe in the idea of love for loves sake, and have it. But few women get this, and the ones that do, can jeopardize that in one night away from home. A thousand mornings with flowers will be boiled down to "that was cute."

The ones that don't get that, don't get it because they can't reconcile prince charming with their arousal floor. This can be understood as the likely reason behind the inverse correlation between partner count and stable marital outcome. This form of "lifestyle inflation" is a linear ratcheting mechanism to prevent a woman from rationalizing away problematic attractions that jeopardize her on paper life.

### Male Long Term Strategies

<i>gamy</i>	Description	Masquerades as	Actual Relationship Orientation	Strategy failure	Typical Failure Point
-------------	-------------	----------------	---------------------------------	------------------	-----------------------

<i>gamy</i>	Description	Masquerades as	Actual Relationship Orientation	Strategy failure	Typical Failure Point
Mono	Male adopts traits of short term mates, but still is beholden to the long term outcome	Short Term Mate\Compromise\"Deal"	Long Term Mate	Relationship incongruency	Loss of female arousal to the male, after retention costs exceed trading costs.
Mono	Male adopts typical relationship norms	N\A	Long Term Mate	Incongruent to female arousal	Loss of female arousal to the male, after retention costs exceed trading costs.
Poly	Male adopts atypical relationship norms	Long Term Mate	Short Term Mate	Zero trading costs	Loss of female arousal to the male, after retention costs exceed trading costs.

Least suboptimal solution

	Description	Masquerades as	Actual Relationship Orientation	Strategy failure	Typical Failure Point
	Male adopts traits of short term mates, only beholden to long term outcome while advantageous	Long Term Mate	Short Term Mate	Evolution Itself	Loss of female arousal to the male, after retention costs exceed trading costs.

This is the conclusion to *the least sub-optimal solution*. Which is essentially a mirror to Briffault's law.

The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no such association takes place. — Robert Briffault, *The Mothers*, Vol. I, p. 191

In this case, the male, determines his willingness to provision under the animal family. That is a shared duty of performance.

Men and women believe, or at least choose to believe, there is "a solution" denoting a way to change the world or balance the scales so "everyone wins." Yet the best we can do is select a system with the least number of negative effects, which maximizes outcomes for men, women & children while benefiting society at large by promoting values that can coexist within the socioeconomic system *to the extent we can*.

There is no way, we can't not hurt each other.

*Boiling this down entirely, I believe only one true conflict divides men and women.*

Women have a narrow view of arousing males, something around 20% of men and really the top 5% ultimately. And their attraction is fickle. If men were subject to the same, then only testosterone\estrogen would likely separate us.

This I believe is *the actual programming of evolution itself*. That very mechanism, is the way in which genes are improved, by always seeing the best, and being literally blinded, to inferior mates. *Where evolution seeks to increase genetic quality and diversity.*

If men were subject to this same constraint, all the claimed loyalty and male values would fly out the window as they saw the women in their lives the way that women see men who they no longer find arousing. Understand I've taken great effort to extend as much understanding to women as possible forming this hypothesis. And in doing so, been able to reconcile "good girls" and "bad girls." And dispute the idea that "men are more loyal."

This entire argument, that we frame as "men vs women" instead can be understood as "those who are easily aroused, against those who are not."

This is exacerbated by the fact that women *settle for men, by design*, since they select against features of arousal for a LTR. She trades to volatility of a more viscerally arousing mate, for an easily controlled man whom has nurturing characteristics.

And so what? So do most men.

But again, men are not constrained in the same way.

Regardless, to agree with Peterson here means a different thing.

It means to be a great physical specimen, who is narcissistic and arrogant, who walks the walk and talks the talk. Who is either unapologetically polygamous or at the very least has ultra high standards for his monogamous relationship but is capable of it. But likely, this serves as a cope, because the most viscerally arousing men simply have no interest in monogamy. There are viscerally attractive men, top 5% men with no interest. But now you're at a fraction of 5% of men.

To which many would argue that no family could survive such volatility, yet women "turn a blind eye" or "give a hall pass" to these men all the time. This just isn't something that most men are willing to understand or digest, much in the same way Dr. Jordan B. Peterson is willing to send a million men into the grinder rather than accept the message that men have learned in these forums through blood, sweat and toil. Few men in these forums started from a position of amorality. Few of them believed what it would take to save their marriages, how brutal courts would treat them or how duplicitous their wives would turn when their bedrooms turned cold.

These true monsters, balance "The Deal."

#### The Deal

Men sacrifice polygamy (male value), and embrace monogamy (female value). Women sacrifice hypergamy (female value) for loyalty (male value).

Men take ownership of women (male value), women take ownership of their children (female value), and under one household they share resources, the nuclear family(male value).

Since women are *biologically unable to promise monogamy*, the male rejects this part of "the deal" and trades her fidelity to him with provisioning. This creates a dual duty of performance. And only "a

civilized monster" can pull this off.

This is the gritty stuff that men always let their ego convince them is unnecessary. And the source for the masquerade.

*The short term mate schema ends when the effort to retain a mate becomes more important than changing them out.* From this point on, no attempt of the male to masquerade as a short term mate, can ultimately be congruent, absent his actual willingness to leave and to upend the lives of everyone in his family *strictly on his terms* with an unlimited willingness to enforce them. Whether or not this is interpreted as "emotional abuse" or *boundaries* is up to the viewer. Put another way, a man's willingness to provide outside of the nuclear family while sexually active with his wife, will negatively influence "the game" and its outcome dramatically.

This is where a man is put into a situation where a woman wouldn't tolerate it. Where "being a real man" expects that he accept the deal that would otherwise be seen "as abuse." This, is a manifestation of our innate understanding of sexual competition and selection itself. A subconscious recognition of a woman's superior position as *selector*.

Put even another way, we could say that to extend this provisioning either overtly or through implication by accepting the legal framework after a relationship dissolution, the man acts as a mechanism to help transition a woman to the second evolutionary stage. As a stepping stool, all with the encouragement that he's being "a real man."

Men and women within a short term relationship operate under the *Prisoner's Dilemma*. Each relationship is a game unto itself. The game is post hoc rationalized as casual, but its purpose is to promote high quality genetic transfer. Women who "only engage in casual sex with men that would be good fathers" are the loudest, but are practicing atypical selection as per the dualistic studies. When raw arousal and excitement ends, the game ends and players move on. If they reconnect, it's an entirely new game. But the women here more or less understand these men "aren't the father type."

Men and women within a long term relationship operate under the *Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma*. The game is post hoc rationalized as *romantic love*, but its purpose is to find a male willing to invest in his offspring at the expense of raw arousal. *Settling is stereotypically female, by design*. As she is the one *selecting* and that she *selects against* features of raw arousal, such as ill-defined jawlines, or features like nurturing (which are negatively correlated to arousal). *History is factored into the next "round" of play*.

So from the very moment a woman pushes back to the man in the relationship (which is already sub-optimally aroused for arousal) and figuratively says "what are you going to do about it?" the relationship is in peril. At this very moment, essentially anything a man does from this point on will be *wrong or abusive*. This is why, from a game level perspective, being a "good man" is impossible. The minute she questions your willingness to pull the pin, the gambit is up, either you commit to being the one that cares the least or you demonstrate your subordination by negotiating with her, on her terms.

This is a manifestation of *comfort breeds contempt*. The studies show a clear picture, short term mates in their very being are uncontrollable hyper-masculine men. Arrogant, narcissistic, with low features of nurturing, little future income potential etc. And these things are *correlated to arousal*. The very opposite of this, is to negotiate a mutual domestication with agreeable men. Men accept and promote this because, in their minds, it relieves them of the duty of performance. Within this context, I'm strictly defining this as a man's competition against other men.

They then shift their duty of performance to their mate and family although she does not recognize this sacrifice because she is not aroused by it. This is an "on paper" transaction that ever penny the male sinks into, he will lose if the duty of performance is jeopardized.

This is the exact point where men are locked into a double bind.

Want to wake up? Know that *traits associated with good fathers, are negatively correlated to arousal*. Stick that in your 1950s dad pipe and smoke it. Literally turned off by your good nature. Even if you think you're a "silverback patriarch." Which, you're still going to cupcake day at the zoo, buddy.

These paragraphs summarize the reason why dualistic strategy exists for a woman. Since these two types of men *can not* be assimilated into the same man unless she is *wildly tolerant to risk* and is willing to risk being left with children from a wild man who has no interest in sticking around. That is a tough gamble, and only the lowest status women typically make this gamble, though women should be leaning more towards this. It is again, paradoxical.

The willingness of a man to enter an honest, above the table, monogamous long term relationship de facto excludes him as a short term mate (in practice and definition), as comfort and high levels of arousal are often at odds for women, though the reverse is true for a LTR, which is why again, men in LTRs often function as useful idiots. Which is another failure point for long term relationships when amorally female, if the male discovers she isn't faithful.

Again, for the women making these choices, they make sense, to her, at the time. They're reasonable, rational choices. And they only have to finally "confront themselves" when they're in a marriage with children and they've lost attraction.

Then, *the spark is gone*. Then all the "good boy" points a man has accumulated instantly self immolate and the true value of being a good man becomes crystal clear.

Then it becomes real. Then the button up woman, with a degree who works 50 hours a week and is a mom too suddenly finds herself having moral conflicts she'd never had to confront before. Then she becomes the woman she never imagined herself to be, with a husband struggling to understand how his wife could be *just like* all those women he thought she could never be.

While everyone else either says he wasn't man enough, or that he "picked wrong."

Never accepting the possibility that they each played out their evolutionary script perfectly. And that it hadn't failed, but was just moving on to the second evolutionary stage.

So to any man that wants to be a family man, he must accept this first and foremost, before he starts lying to himself that he's just "responsibility and hard work away." Truly successful relationships are exceedingly rare, where both husband and wife are sexually satisfied through their years and the marriage functions as a useful mechanism for raising children. Though I would say men functioning as useful idiots, oblivious to their wives are common place.

And for the success cases, it probably would not be surprising that they trend more towards what is outlined in this hypothesis. Positive outcomes correlated to female arousal, negative outcomes correlated to female need for control over their mate.

Again, agreeing with Peterson here, men should be monsters, who chose to stick around for their children. NOT whom agree to be civil or domesticated.

### **The actual incongruence with Dr. Jordan B. Peterson & men who identify with him**

This can require some "unpacking." I am on the one hand *agreeing* with Dr. Jordan B. Peterson here

that "*women want a civilized monster*" or some variation of a monster that cares about her.

While fundamentally *disagreeing* with his overall message that men adopt traditional conservative viewpoints. The very man he understands and posits a woman would want, *fundamentally conflicts with how he wants men to orient themselves in the world.*

These very men *are not* generally going to trend on the side of *family man* types. *However*, unless she has without restraint let the dial move *all the way over* to "unrestrained psychopath type", more often than not, if she's fulfilling a feminine roll, he'll adopt a masculine roll and invest in his children.

I understand, in detail, where he's at through his journey in understanding this, and I do not expect Dr. Jordan B. Peterson to be able to reconcile *how he wants things to be* with his own knowledge base. Either a change of his message will be necessary, or a refute of this hypothesis.

Which so far, he softens with some degree of "work hard, be a civilized monster, and if she destroys it all, you probably missed some red flags or should have been a better man."

And the reason why this message resonates with men so widely, is because *that is the fundamental place that men start from, in one degree or another.* It's just a rebranding of the existing *illusory truth.* It sits as a nice piece of confirmation to the bias you hold, in the same way young men and women accept the idea that we are "polygamous."

*Amorality is fundamental and necessary to this arrangement, or else it is subject to the same failure point.*

If you came to him because you felt lost in the world and want a family, this isn't the solution to your problem. It's just a rebranding that will land you back in the same spot.

If the reason why you came to Peterson is to reclaim your masculinity, then you should look elsewhere. If you've come to him because you're just a mess and need to start getting back on your feet, then proceed with caution. If you're using him to mine some facts of the human condition, I believe there is no greater man on earth spitting this knowledge right now.

He is without a doubt, the world leader in understanding what makes us tick as people, and understands the individual better than anyone. But he suffers from the same belief system issue that nearly every guy had before his "unicorn" showed him she was just like "those other girls."

The collective knowledge of hundreds of thousands of men dictates that we do not know another way that men reach the next stage. And so, my concerns are that Dr. Jordan B. Peterson is unable to be moved from his position unless his family were to be put through peril. And even if, he'd likely externalize it on his work schedule, failing as a father or a lover, if the issue was instead arousal in say the introduction of a competing male while he was away.

| Loss of female arousal to the male, after retention costs exceed trading costs.

Again, the male *\*must* be willing to enforce his provisioning within the nuclear family, while sexually active with his wife, at all costs. Whether or not this man is moral or amoral in his choice of monogamy, extramarital partners etc, actually has a paradoxical outcome on marriage outcome anecdotally within these communities.

Put frankly, a civilized monster would cheat on his wife almost without pause, and yet the men you'd orient to the sexual marketplace, certainly would be draped in morality. Almost certainly, instead, what Dr. Jordan B. Peterson would advocate for would be to "masquerade as a short term mate." To ultimately still be a "*real man.*" This is, not markedly different than the very same men he rightfully



bemoans.

This well reasoned, seemingly articulate argument fails at a basic level, which is...

Dr. Peterson, we all tried that. Replacing a low-t, agreeable man who is within an egalitarian relationship with a man with a pair who sets boundaries *will not change the fact that failure is a feature, not a flaw of evolution*. We will never return to "enforced monogamy" and so only thing men can reply with is to "enforce provisioning."

Monogamy wasn't "legally enforced" it was just enforced *de facto*.

In a world where women offer freely what was once coveted, this is a fair trade.

And that... is the birth of the *real monster*. That realization, that women do not accept this compromise, *because they can't*, is the birth of amorality.

Ultimately, men aren't entitled to a woman's "love" (arousal) and men need to be willing to defend themselves against provisioning once the gig is up, *at any and all costs*.

I have given you every bit of understanding you need in this post. **DO NOT EVER** promise to provision outside of the nuclear family, while she is sexually active with you. You have your word, and your balls, don't break them for anyone. If she doesn't understand you, if you don't believe this deep within yourself, if this is not 100.00% congruent to you, then you are not oriented to deal with the world. If you are not capable of enforcing this, work on yourself until you understand this. It is the only thing you need to understand. Not the myriad of legal frameworks, PUA gimmicks, TPR theory etc. Just learn what separates you from the guy you wouldn't talk shit to in the bar. What separates you as men, defines the requisite capability of a man who wants to start a family to protect himself against female nature.

To reject *de facto* provisioning after the end of a relationship creates her own "duty of performance." Stop ascribing to ideas of women worshipping good men, when they just tolerate them. Women who are not fighting the battle with themselves will never leave a man who is satisfying her in bed, and helping to raise children, even if he does monstrous things.

Again, I agree with Peterson, but only in the way he's not willing to ~~understand~~ *accept* the very thing he's selling us. We can't in any way claim he "discovered this by accident" or "he's right, but for the wrong reason." Given his level of involvement at a clinical level.

He knows this, he just chooses to believe what he wants to be true, what he chooses to see as the solution. He wants to believe like nearly every man here, that women will respond to "the compromise" and accept the good man with an edge, and they will, until evolution steps in.

Then all the "good boy" points are invalidated, and guys land here look for answers. And they, like Peterson, will push back that we "aren't real men" but instead "little boys who are exploiting women."

Almost none of us started from the position of amorality.

---

Dr. Jordan B. Peterson, I politely ask that you refrain from pushing the very narrative that has destroyed a generation of men already. There are distinct male orientations and institutional changes (that do not involve "forced monogamy") that can change that, but right now, you are hurting, not helping men *in this domain* while helping them still find purpose and meaning in their increasingly meaningless lives.

Please, refrain from pushing this narrative until you are willing to have someone challenge you on it.

You are equipped to understand this and change the world, if you choose, but you are having an existential conflict where your very morality is up against the truths you've grappled with for 20 years.

You want the men you're talking to, most of whom are in the 50th percentile, to perform to the 95th percentile, and if they fail at that, lay blame at their feet. Which isn't wrong in a literal sense, but doesn't make sense from a pragmatic perspective.

Making men own their lives is important. Marching them into the grinder is reprehensible.

## Women will only be jailed for serious crimes, Justice Secretary reveals

1 upvotes | July 5, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[removed]

## Women should no longer be sent to prison unless they have committed a serious crime says Justice Secretary

583 upvotes | July 5, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

If you have a weapon, lock it up before reading this and having a chance to smoke a dart. No other commentary necessary on this, and believe it or not, this is not satire.

---

Women should no longer be sent to prison unless they have committed a serious crime, the Justice Secretary says today, as he unveils a “step change” in the way female offenders are dealt with. David Gauke will today announce plans for five residential women’s centres where offenders will get help with drug and alcohol problems, educational support and counselling instead of being locked up. Plans for new women’s prisons have been scrapped.

WOMEN should no longer be sent to prison unless they have committed a serious crime, the Justice Secretary says today, as he unveils a “step change” in how female offenders are punished.

Ministers want to “break the cycle” of sending women to jail after it emerged fewer than 40 women were behind bars in England and Wales for violent offences. Most were serving time for shoplifting and similar crimes.

David Gauke will today announce plans to open five residential women’s centres, where, instead of being locked up, offenders will get help with drug and alcohol problems, education and counselling. He is to scrap plans to spend £50million on building new women’s prisons with the focus instead shifting to keeping women out of jail, after research showed the majority were mothers of young children.

It comes as Rory Stewart, the prisons minister, said jail terms of less than a year should be abandoned for all but the most serious of offences.

His remarks signal a growing shift toward community care instead of short sentences after Mr Gauke said handing out short jail terms did not work.

Mr Stewart told MPS that offences involving sex and violence were likely to be excluded to ensure dangerous offenders could not dodge imprisonment. He said: “We need to shape the argument as to why an ever-growing prison population is not in the interests of the public.”

Official figures show just 1 per cent of 4,000 women currently behind bars are there for violent offences. Five per cent of the prison population in England are female and half of them have committed shoplifting or similar offences to support the drug use of someone else, often a male partner.

Three per cent of the 95 per cent who make up the male prison population have committed a violent crime, while 77 per cent are there for minor offences. Women have much higher rates of mental health problems in prison and 60 per cent have experienced domestic violence.

The Justice Secretary said: “While public protection will always be our priority, and prison must remain the only option in the most serious cases, I want that to be a last resort.”

He added that shifting the emphasis to greater community provision “ultimately benefits offenders, their families and the wider community, as we see fewer victims and cut the cost of reoffending.”

If the five new residential centres are a success, more will be created. The emphasis will be on preventing women from going back to jail after figures showed most women reoffended soon after being released. It costs taxpayers £1.7billion a year to deal with female criminals and £5 million over two years will be spent on the scheme, in contrast to the £50 million new female prisons would have cost.

The plans were welcomed by prison reform campaigners but are likely to raise concerns that vulnerable men in the prison system are being treated unfairly compared with women.

Dame Vera Baird, from the Association of Police and Crime Commissioners, said: “For the strategy to achieve its intentions, it needs to be properly funded.”

## Good hearted men with an edge

208 upvotes | July 31, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Last weekend I was dragged to a wedding I was thankful to attend. Invariably, weddings are dressed heavily in dogma of male servitude and this one was no exception. And so, I usually dread this up until the drinks start flowing and everyone drops the act so that their true selves make a short appearance for the night free from inhibition. The masks remain on their cheeks, but mostly off. As the need to maintain the facade fades, baseline impulses and desires come out.

For women, we already know what this means. The way we understand women becomes more apparent, but uniquely enough, the way we understand median men becomes equally more apparent. The divergence between the true nature of women, and the conditioning of men, becomes blatant.

At the table were some millennial couples, and let me tell you, we were blown away at just how "millennial" they were. The usual *she's too good for me* trope was out in full force, but what really hit me was a realization that struck to the very nerve that divides blue and red pill men, truly.

*Ultimately, amorality follows from a full unplugging.*

I realized that this group of men, all *deeply* blue pill, had a belief they were in fact *good hearted men, with an edge*. Even admitting so after some prodding. And then I had a painful reminder of a time of weakness where I had even once myself claimed this very same trope to myself, still very deep within the illusory truth we call blue pill conditioning. And remembered when I also steeped myself in self-deprecating humor and effigies to desexualize myself to present myself as harmless.

Suddenly it became clear, that this is the way a man can realize he still has a way to go in his journey, even if he believes he's made it far. It's certainly a marker of weak men, but also of men who have set real boundaries, understand the world around them and are well on their way to a full unplugging and embracing the true Hobbesian anarchy of the SMP, but still have some hangups.

The *edge*, can't be conceptual. It can't be potential. It's can't even be *an edge*. In fact, properly put, men must be monsters who are capable of extending kindness to a woman when it wants to, when she deserves it. Which is conceptually at an angle but intersects with the concept of "nice guy with an edge."

This concept is also expounded on in *The "True Alpha" : On Male Virtue*, where I tear apart a poster for virtue signaling this very phenomenon and trying to wrap it in a red flag. The short hand is that we get a nice look into a man that is a monster doing things monsters do, while the women he "victimizes" come back for more.

And so I offer you this black truth.

If you believe you are a *good man, with an edge*, you are most likely self-rationalizing your weakness. That you would ultimately concede as true if you sat in a room full of bastards and criminals. That you'd ration away was "not truly masculine" in our jargon (which I address at length on *The "True Alpha" : On Male Virtue*).

The truth of the matter is that it is a convenient cope, and that every median man feels the same way. While some of the weakest men proclaim they even lack an edge, most men believe they have it.

There is a reason why their primary "orientation," if you could call it that, is to be *good hearted* or a *good dude* or even *a nice guy*. Because ultimately, that's what they are. Just that they subconsciously

realize such a thing isn't all that valuable, so instead, they conceive a solipsistic male solution they believe "balances the equation."

Experienced women see through this. They paw at these men like lions with a wounded gazelle, that doesn't even know its wounded. They massage their ego and extract what they can from these useful idiots and leave a wake of discarded entrails behind them. Yet even after they've been destroyed, these men would cling to the idea that they do still in fact, have an edge.

I feel very fortunate and thankful for the men that shepherded me, who truly set me free. Because weak men can't understand what being a monster does for you. They are preoccupied with the moral component to unplugging, and viscerally feel guilt and emotional pain for "acting bad" or even *thinking about* or conceptualizing what this would be like. These are, in my opinion, secondary emotions that cover their baseline, which is in fact *fear*.

These are feelings that slowly faded over time for me and will with anyone as they become more experienced in the SMP and frankly, the world in general. What you learn, and I will post to, is that *no one cares*.

Everyone is out getting theirs, whether they consciously know it or admit it. Some people are oblivious enough that they rob others guilt free, because they truly believe their abhorrent behavior is justified. The blue haired radfem who *legitimately believes* that all men are subjugating her believes when she swallows her boyfriend's best friend's cum that he deserves it. She doesn't give this any pause. Maybe a decade later she might reflect that she was "kind of a horrible person" but she doesn't feel that guilt, or emotional pain, the fear.

Other people post hoc rationalize it. The reason why she passed off another man's baby as his, is because of that time when they were in college and he was treating her terribly. At least that's how she remembers it. He was probably... definitely cheating. Definitely. The first couple times she thought like this she felt the fear, she knew it was wrong, but also, sort of exciting. Should it feel good to be bad? Eventually, 18 years later, she'll feel absolutely *nothing* as she lays that black truth at his feet and slides over a divorce settlement.

Every time I hear a guy shoot himself "out of nowhere" I know exactly what happened. Some variation of the last paragraph you just read. Are we getting off track? No.

The truth is, those that don't find ways to "get theirs" are the defects. Not the ones who are "bad people." Which is itself Orwellian doublespeak. There are good people who are naive, and as Machiavelli pointed out in *The Prince*, time will expose them to the bastards who will force them to harden, die or cope.

And so, when the *good guy with an edge* is confronted with the woman who has fucked, sucked and been emotionally enslaved by one monster or many and she paws at him he must make a choice.

He can decide that he has no edge and admit his folly, that his "niceness" is merely a masquerade to fool himself from his own weakness and grow. To understand and tolerate amorality because morality serves only as chains for men to continue their lives in covert servitude. To die and resolve themselves as "men going their own way." Or to continue deceiving themselves and cope.

The trick your brain has played on you is to convince you that you're different. And that you're better for being weak.

But you don't get to claim to be the man "with an edge" that who if he was confronted by a woman who knows the weak from the monstrous would paw at him and laugh. You can choose to be the man

that "victimizes" women who come back to him and serve him, or you can be the man who is victimized.



## CMV : Less than 20% (likely 5% or less) of women are capable of obtaining the educational and career goals that UMC women are arrogantly promoting as "the solution."

1 upvotes | August 8, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Simply put, there is a general cognitive requirement of an IQ of around 115 to obtain a graduate degree. This means only 15.8% of the female population is *generally capable* of obtaining a graduate degree of significance.

This is not a hard limit, because variance is always present. But suffice to say, advising *all women* to obtain the level of education that we'd commonly associate with *professional level* (graduate degree\6 years or higher) is self-serving. As a *majority* of women who would enter these programs would fail them, this is statistically certain.

So now if we can ignore the UMC racket of pushing the child-free globetrotting interchangeable DINC lifestyle that only ~~prostitutes~~ sugarbabies and the intellectually blessed are privy to, it is in the interest of some 80%+ of women to properly situate themselves to have a good family life and to be a valuable wife.

The Female Happiness Paradox makes this clear as well.

If the UMC woman arrangement was stable from the male side, at TRP and MRP, we'd advocate the high beta program for men. But such a thing is shown to men en masse to be ineffective because women do not respond to comfortable lifestyles in the way that men expect and do not respect male job status (although they select long term mates as if it were true).

TL;DR : Listening to women makes men and women unhappy.

Women on the whole do seem to be incapable of the high level abstraction necessary to widely outline and conceive a response to this issue. I believe that this "blind spot" is part of the construction of the logic that houses the issues of feminism and women believing acting like men will make them happier.

Atlas has pointed out that historically, women did at some point understand this, but the overton window shifted, and women have now blinded themselves to this truth and are now in a state of gender dysphoric societally induced insanity, where every time someone gives them evidence that masculine lifestyles make women unhappy *on the whole*, they double down and insist that things should be *more equal* or outliers assert themselves as the arbiters of median women's opinions, despite studies repeatedly demonstrating against their reasoning.

Denmark blows this argument apart, where women divorce at even higher rates and take *more* gender typical jobs despite being *the most egalitarian nation in the world*.

This post is inspired by JamJam's claim that women need to "value themselves more than just baby makers and get educated" and Atlas's claim that women should obtain professional level careers.

Both of these claims ignore evidence that

1. There are cognitive requirements to obtain that level of education and success that "elbow grease" will not be able to remedy.
2. There is a finite number of men who make enough money or have enough status to be "higher

than" these women (which is a significant risk factor in marriages)

3. The female happiness paradox disputes this as a path to female happiness.
4. Professional environments deal with this issue head on. Retaining female talent at this level is a problem that hasn't currently been sorted out, *because most of these women leave their jobs to start families*. If such an arrangement made them happy, they wouldn't leave their professional jobs.

I concur with widely held "sexist" opinions that *most women will find happiness within the family home* and reject the "UMC woman" argument as a lack of self awareness to their own affluence and ignorance to the degree of rarity of men within the strata that these women will compete for.

These women would claim that "female doctors are marrying male doctors." But there is not parity, and the direction in which one partner will be willing to "marry down" is almost entirely on the male side.

Which means that a significant number of these women will have to select suboptimal mates or remain single. And since we already know that women leave these jobs en masse, we know that their families make them happier than their job (since they could afford daycare).

And so, for the lucky women who can "do it all" and optimize their mate selection to the literal 1% man, they arrogantly promote a program that literally 9 out of 10 women will be unable to duplicate. I've not yet done the math beyond the first level of abstraction here, but I won't be surprised when it comes out that this is a program that actually fewer than 5% of woman are pulling off, if not 1%.

The men these women are describing are top 1% men. With graduate degrees, in shape, tall and "not red pill types." You can't do the math and not have that work out as a man you're competing for that *is less than 5% of the male population*.

And so, it is in a woman's best interest to hold a bachelors degree and compete for men with graduate degrees using traditional female methods, or an associates for bachelors etc. Essentially self imposing a ceiling on herself, to retain an optimized mate pool and not price herself out of the market.

More or less, putting herself out there and having an attractive body and personality while rigorously vetting romantic prospects to find a man that will be marriage material without increasing her romantic volatility by decreasing her ability to appreciate men who are masculine enough to succeed in the world, but not so masculine that they are the type of men that would beat, cheat and leave them by avoiding premarital sex.

To dispute this, is to dispute lifestyle inflation. To dispute this is to dispute evolution itself.

Women that understand this problem rightly contend that we're advocating that women "simply don't know any better" and stabilize with suboptimal males. To make sure the women "remain ignorant."

This is correct.

Because a woman who has had a taste of everything in life is left with only the microscopic strata of the upper tier of men to remain aroused.

Ultimately, boiled down to its essence, the debate is this.

Women have a smaller arousal window than men, and that window shrinks as they "experience life."

It is statistically impossible that women can rack up higher than median partner counts and still be aroused by their husbands en masse.

Or else, women would be positing that they are able to subvert evolution itself. That we as a species

are able to decide what we're attracted to ultimately, that attraction is negotiable.

This outcome is evident in Japan, Denmark and other nations that are "ahead" of us in many of these outcomes.

So many women would claim "I'd rather be single" (Japan) or have children, leave their fathers and have the state function as the household (Denmark) while lagging male happiness and increasing divorce rates even higher (Female Happiness Paradox).

So ultimately, on the whole, these women are arguing that women en masse should become single mothers or cat ladies. While pointing to the intellection elite and upper strata of women that literally 80%+ (likely 90-95%+) of women would fail at replicating.

When instead, any median woman can get in shape, get almost any random degree worth anything, choose a first partner properly and score higher on individual happiness.

I posit that the anger and resentment modern women have for the women who choose this lifestyle is the female equivalent of "crabs in a bucket."

Not much different than men who have taken the high beta track resenting men who beat, cheat and leave women maintaining soft harems with little in the way of *male* status.

Instead, in these cases, these women chastise other women for not "being more than a baby maker." They are behaving like beta men, shaming alpha women, much in the same way that beta men try to shame alpha men for not having beta male credentials.

Despite evidence these women are happier and have deeper dating pools.

The last retort they'd have would be to cite that these UMC divorce less (ignoring the constraints that only a few women can obtain these lifestyles), to which the manosphere is so very privileged to know and understand exactly what these women are doing.

Which is so well known in society that the stay at home UMC woman cheating with the pool boy is a literal trope.

TL;DR : Women (and their arousal window) are the constraint on stable marriages and the solution is paradoxical, but they will double down anyways.

1st draft. So let's start with the tone deaf semantic debates.

# TRP at the Movies : Locke

1 upvotes | August 24, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

So if you haven't seen this movie, you aren't missing much. I consider this movie essentially unwatchable for anyone who has actually made peace with the content here and isn't "using it as a toolbox." There's a couple good lines, some good acting and a masterclass in how you can have a movie take place in *a car* for an *hour and a half* and actually get someone to watch it.

## The setup

A married construction manager with a family leaves one of the largest "pours" his company has ever done after 9 years on the job after a last minute phone call from a one night stand who is prematurely going into labor.

He decides to hand the job over to a young, inexperienced worker who he has faith in and calls his wife to say he'll be home the next morning because he knocked up a 42 year old woman from a one night stand. This goes as you'd predict and he is quickly fired from his job and his wife has a breakdown, calls her sister and tells him to never return to *her* house.

The whole time, anyone watching this movie is obviously trying to figure out in their head how he's going to unfuck his whole life.

He manages to coach the pour from the drive and he's close to the hospital as she gives birth. The post wall one night stand calls and asks if he'll be there. He reassures her that he will in fact be there.

## The punch line

And then, the movie *ends*.

For those of you already unplugged, you might be asking yourself *what?*

## What can we learn from this?

If society valued the nuclear family, the movie would have made little sense and had poor ratings. This movie makes *a lot* of sense to heavily conditioned men and irresponsible or idealistic women. The reason why the movie did well at all, which is actually saying *quite a lot given the challenge of how it was filmed*, is because the ending punchline resonates with the cultural demographic of movie watchers.

The idea of a man leaving his family, with his own children, to go tend to a 42 year old woman giving birth from a one night stand makes more sense than the obvious, amoral pragmatic decision to tell her "wow, that sucks" and hang up when that phone call came.

To show up and give her a little bit of instruction of how she should handle herself so she gets the point. Will every woman get this point? No. Do 100% of men reading this last part understand what I'm saying? No. But this stands.

More or less, the median man could not and would not do this, because they use their "morality" as a buffer to rationalize away their own weakness despite the overwhelming obvious point here that *he owes this woman nothing*.

Now there is some backpacking here, a somewhat irrelevant plot point here is the *I'm not my dad* trope, in which his dead father posthumously appears in the backseat of his vehicle, so he can berate him as "the reason."

This is of course, an indication of widespread male conditioning of the point that men "own up to their mistakes" as the movie puts it. But truly, this is men embracing the concept of *single mother with a penis*. The deadbeat father being the new modern day villain.

Surely, plenty of moral types find this post in bad taste. Poking at their blue pill sensibilities, to be captain save a ho, or a ho's assurance that a man be there as a sort of giant inflatable "life net" when her behavior catches up to her.

Let's be honest here. If a woman doesn't want to get pregnant, the options are there for her. We can listen to all these ridiculous complaints about sensitivities to this type or that type of birth control, but ultimately, a woman in the United States has *enough* birth control options available to her to manage this.

And in fact, in this movie, she admits she was actually *trying* when she admits she "she has no-one and this is her last chance of having something happy in her life."

From this we can assume the writer's decision to write this into the script meant that it seemed plausible, and the demographic felt this as well, that her *trying to get pregnant without his knowledge* did *not* preclude him from his *duty*.

This deference to the weak, reckless 42 year old woman, who this man really owes nothing, is the forged iron that is used to sledge hammer the viewer over the head with their own ill formed self-congratulatory conceptualization of virtue in regards to sexual conflict.

It is a sign of widespread weakness in the ego of men and the expectations of women.

The movie leaves the average viewer with a feeling of a man "doing the right thing." When from all objective analysis we can only come to the conclusion that he lit himself on fire to keep someone else warm.

Cowards and the weak love the "if you're not ready for a baby, you're not ready to have sex." It absolves women of responsibility and places it solely on a man's shoulder. Of course you'd say that if you could ultimately terminate any pregnancy, with 100.00% congruence to your own wishes, so long as you're prompt and intellectually capable enough to navigate the process of abortion. And of course you'd say such a thing if you were certain any man you did this to would show up or submit to the court system.

When we speak of frame, this is what we speak of.

Men and women adopting the frame that they are responsible for some idiotic 42 year old woman's idiotic life hail mary.

Reject the psychological schema that this movie is placed on, because it is the box used to imprison you. The tools you need are simple.

A while back, a user lamented that they were crestfallen when they failed to perform with a one night stand. He berated himself and wondered how he "couldn't get hard." Clearly, he felt it was his duty to be turned on, when obviously, it's a woman's job to be attractive enough for a man to be turned on and to be part of that process.

In order to set frame in any scenario, the overarching truth must be stronger than any perception someone can sell you. And so in this case, we have some truths and from that, we can understand how to manage the frame.

1. Any woman would expect, unless it is explicitly stated before hand, that no man is interested in

- having a child with her unless they have discussed such a matter.
2. That is, the default expectation is that a pregnancy is *unwanted*.
  3. Sufficient birth control options and knowledge are available to make such pregnancy prevention not only easy, but convenient.

Therefor we can conclude that any woman who gets pregnant from a one night stand has done so for her own reasons or because she's grossly negligent. Given the idea that by default a pregnancy would be wanted is absurd, it would follow that an expectation to support her in such an event would be a form of *entitlement*.

"You knew I wasn't interested in having a child and were negligent. Handle it, and I will support you if you choose to terminate and respect your wishes if you choose not to. But outside of that, do not ever list my name on any paper or contact me again. Are we clear?"

The most troubling part of this is that I know *plenty* of posters on here will sneer at this while trying to sell other users on their purple pill manifesto on how they will be the silverback patriarch of their church circle, or lift their way into the top 1% so such amoral behavior will never need to be considered in their perfect plan to the girl who is different, being as they are the "nice guy with an edge."

The truth of the matter being, if you don't understand this or are not capable of it, then you are not ready for a family.

And we can learn that from some shitty movie that rests entirely on the fact that this plot is virtuous, not idiotic.

## TRP at the movies : Locke

43 upvotes | August 24, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Since you guys pounded auto mod because you're incapable of reading *the sidebar*, this needed to be added.

*Rule #6 : No examples from fiction or lyrics*

Fiction, pop songs, daytime television freakshows, and reality tv do not present useful examples of typical human behaviour, and thus cannot be learned from.

**Discussion of overarching popular culture themes, however, is on-topic and makes for an interesting analysis of the shifts in cultural thinking.**

Use of fiction or other controlled narratives (reality tv, etc) should only be **used as an example of the author's psychology, not the character's.**

---

So if you haven't seen this movie, you aren't missing much. I consider this movie essentially unwatchable for anyone who has actually made peace with the content here and isn't "using it as a toolbox." There's a couple good lines, some good acting and a masterclass in how you can have a movie take place in a car for an hour and a half and actually get someone to watch it.

### The setup

A married construction manager with a family leaves one of the largest "pours" his company has ever done after 9 years on the job after a last minute phone call from a one night stand who is prematurely going into labor.

He decides to hand the job over to a young, inexperienced worker who he has faith in and calls his wife to say he'll be home the next morning because he knocked up a 42 year old woman from a one night stand. This goes as you'd predict and he is quickly fired from his job and his wife has a breakdown, calls her sister and tells him to never return to her house.

The whole time, anyone watching this movie is obviously trying to figure out in their head how he's going to unfuck his whole life.

He manages to coach the pour from the drive and he's close to the hospital as she gives birth. The post wall one night stand calls and asks if he'll be there. He reassures her that he will in fact be there.

### The punch line

And then, the movie *ends*.

For those of you already unplugged, you might be asking yourself *what?*

### What can we learn from this?

If society valued the nuclear family, the movie would have made little sense and had poor ratings. This movie makes a lot of sense to heavily conditioned men and irresponsible or idealistic women. The reason why the movie did well at all, which is actually saying quite a lot given the challenge of how it was filmed, is because the ending punchline resonates with the cultural demographic of movie watchers.

The idea of a man leaving his family, with his own children, to go tend to a 42 year old woman giving birth from a one night stand makes more sense than the obvious, amoral pragmatic decision to

tell her "wow, that sucks" and hang up when that phone call came.

To show up and give her a little bit of instruction of how she should handle herself so she gets the point. Will every woman get this point? No. Do 100% of men reading this last part understand what I'm saying? No. But this stands.

More or less, the median man could not and would not do this, because they use their "morality" as a buffer to rationalize away their own weakness despite the overwhelming obvious point here that he owes this woman nothing.

Now there is some backpacking here, a somewhat irrelevant plot point here is the *I'm not my dad* trope, in which his dead father posthumously appears in the backseat of his vehicle, so he can berate him as "the reason." Vowing to never be like him. Reference Rollo here.

This is of course, an indication of widespread male conditioning that men "own up to their mistakes" as the movie puts it. But truly, this is men embracing the concept of single mother with a penis. The deadbeat father being the new modern day villain. While absolving *her* of any complicity.

Surely, plenty of moral types find this post in bad taste. Poking at their blue pill sensibilities, to be captain save a ho, or a ho's assurance that a man be there as a sort of giant inflatable "life net" when her behavior catches up to her.

Let's be honest here. If a woman doesn't want to get pregnant, the options are there for her. We can listen to all these ridiculous complaints about sensitivities to this type or that type of birth control, but ultimately, a woman in the United States has enough birth control options available to her to manage this.

And in fact, in this movie, she admits she was actually trying when she admits "she has no-one and this is her last chance of having something happy in her life."

From this we can assume the writer's decision to write this into the script meant that it seemed plausible, and the demographic felt this as well, that her trying to get pregnant without his knowledge did not preclude him from his duty.

This deference to the weak, reckless 42 year old woman, who this man really owes nothing, is the forged iron that is used to sledge hammer the viewer over the head with their own ill formed self-congratulatory conceptualization of virtue in regards to sexual conflict.

It is a sign of widespread weakness in the ego of men and the entitlements women hold.

The movie leaves the average viewer with a feeling of a man "doing the right thing." When from all objective analysis we can only come to the conclusion that he lit himself on fire to keep someone else warm.

Cowards and the weak love the axiom "if you're not ready for a baby, you're not ready to have sex." It absolves women of responsibility and places it solely on a man's shoulder. Of course you'd say that if you could ultimately terminate any pregnancy, with 100.00% congruence to your own wishes, so long as you're prompt and intellectually capable enough to navigate the process of abortion. And of course you'd say such a thing if you were certain any man you did this to would show up or submit to the court system.

When we speak of frame, this is what we speak of.

Men and women adopting the frame that they are responsible for some idiotic 42 year old woman's idiotic life hail mary.



Reject the psychological schema that this movie is placed on, because it is the box used to imprison you. The tools you need are simple.

A while back, a user lamented that they were crestfallen when they failed to perform with a one night stand. He berated himself and wondered how he "couldn't get hard." Clearly, he felt it was his duty to be turned on, when obviously, it's a woman's job to be attractive enough for a man to be turned on and to be part of that process. His failure to understand this became immediately clear to him, and I hope it will with any man who believes they owe anything to this metaphorical woman after reading the explanation of how this is framed below.

In order to set frame in any scenario, the overarching truth must be stronger than any perception someone can sell you. And so in this case, we have some truths and from that, we can understand how to manage the frame.

Any woman would expect, unless it is explicitly stated before hand, that no man is interested in having a child with her unless they have discussed such a matter.

1. That is, the default expectation is that a pregnancy is unwanted.
2. Sufficient birth control options and knowledge are available to make such pregnancy prevention not only easy, but convenient.
3. You can only force someone through the legal system so long as they are willing to behave in ways that are legal. So long as they are willing to "play the game."

Therefor we can conclude that any woman who gets pregnant from a one night stand has done so for her own reasons or because she's grossly negligent. Given the idea that by default a pregnancy would be wanted is absurd, it would follow that an expectation to support her in such an event would be a form of entitlement.

"You knew I wasn't interested in having a child and were negligent. Handle it, and I will support you if you choose to terminate and respect your wishes if you choose not to. But outside of that, do not ever list my name on any paper or contact me again. Are we clear?"

The most troubling part of this is that I know plenty of posters on here will sneer at this while trying to sell other users on their purple pill manifesto on how they will be the silverback patriarch of their church circle, or lift their way into the top 1% so such amoral behavior will never need to be considered in their perfect plan to the girl who is different, being as they are the "nice guy with an edge."

The truth of the matter being, if you don't understand this or are not capable of it, then you are not ready for a family.

And we can learn that from some shitty movie that rests entirely on the fact that this plot is "virtuous," not idiotic.

## **Are men who aren't competitive in the SMP in either STR or LTRs omegas or outsiders?**

2 upvotes | October 1, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[removed]

## **No alternative framework exists for men to be sexually successful with women other than TRP**

1 upvotes | October 3, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[removed]

## Is there no way to tell blue pill men they're not being masculine that is PC?

13 upvotes | October 20, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[removed]

## Q4w how do you avoid being pumped and dumped?

8 upvotes | November 12, 2018 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[removed]

# Do you dream about opening presents with your wife and kids in the future tomorrow with the lessons you'll learn here? Are you a "family alpha?"

74 upvotes | December 25, 2018 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

HSP asked me to make a quick post for the fence sitters because well, I've spent a lot of time on a topic he was going to write on.

I'm busy for the holidays so I can't make a 15K post for you to say "what the fuck" to when you open it. So instead, feast on 100K chars a bite at a time.

TL;DR

You can't fake it, women don't value you being a good guy and your dreams of how you think your family will be are either fundamentally misinformed or you are still huffing blue pill fumes.

These guys were all right, all along. I spent years banging my head against the wall until I learned my **final** lessons.

Freedom.

It's the most valuable thing any man has. You give it up when you have a family. This is okay, but only if she doesn't make you sacrifice your imperative, because she *can't* sacrifice hers.

She gives you other women, because she can't sacrifice hypergamy.

And if that doesn't work, you exercise freedom. Because even if you become the Silverback Patriarch, again, you'll learn that you're still going to cupcake day at the zoo. You're still executing her end game.

Don Draper?

Was her best option, till he wasn't, gave her kids and then footed the bill and played babysitter. Great plan.

You want kids, no complaints from me. Got what some people consider a lot.

When it's working you're "winning." When it's not "you lose." Either way, she wins.

So plan accordingly. And when I say plan, I don't mean "work harder" or "yeah, I'll just..." I mean, *get it*.

Don't follow that path.

Your path means you don't sacrifice your imperative. Because she can't sacrifice hers. A woman can't agree to be non-hypergamous.

So don't agree to be her provider in exchange for a performance contract with a built in socially sanctioned guillotine. Don't agree to unconditional provisioning with someone who can't guarantee unconditional attraction to you.

Hit the books.

---

*Maybe you don't even know what women look for in a short term mate, what the actual difference is between red & blue. I got you.*

[https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/7ptnb5/protectors\\_vs\\_providers\\_afbb\\_killing\\_the\\_blue/](https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/7ptnb5/protectors_vs_providers_afbb_killing_the_blue/)

Maybe you think you're a *nice guy with an edge*. You're not, you're every dude before he gets wrecked.

[https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/93eykk/good\\_hearted\\_men\\_with\\_an\\_edge/](https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/93eykk/good_hearted_men_with_an_edge/)

Maybe you'll work *really, really super hard for that family of yours*. Those red pill guys are just butt hurt losers...

[https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/8746br/stacys\\_credos\\_death\\_of\\_the\\_plow\\_horse/](https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/8746br/stacys_credos_death_of_the_plow_horse/)

*Maybe you think that being a good person has some value in the SMP.*

[https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/7ukku8/the\\_true\\_alpha\\_on\\_male\\_virtue/](https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/7ukku8/the_true_alpha_on_male_virtue/)

*Maybe you think you'll be the "Silverback Patriarch"*

[https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/7815fp/children\\_without\\_fathers\\_and\\_women\\_with\\_out/](https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/7815fp/children_without_fathers_and_women_with_out/)

*What about if you made a million dollars and became the ultimate status icon, ever?*

[https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/75mjot/djs\\_story\\_the\\_story\\_of\\_the\\_narcissistic\\_high\\_beta/](https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/75mjot/djs_story_the_story_of_the_narcissistic_high_beta/)

*Or you think married red pill means TRP sanctions marriage?*

[https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/75c3ip/with\\_apologies\\_to\\_the\\_blue\\_pill\\_users\\_of\\_the\\_sub/](https://www.reddit.com/r/TheRedPill/comments/75c3ip/with_apologies_to_the_blue_pill_users_of_the_sub/)

---

I will answer any of your questions about family as a Christmas gift. If you think you have any viable angle why TRP is wrong, I will politely tell you why you are misinformed, as a gift.

Merry Christmas

*Love what she brings you.*

**The words "hate speech" (group and related), rape, sexual assault, misogynist and incel have all become worthless.**

25 upvotes | October 14, 2019 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

[removed]



## CMV : This subreddit has failed

1 upvotes | October 16, 2019 | /r/PurplePillDebate | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

## The death of god.

40 upvotes | January 23, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

Sitting in bed, either before or after a fuck and I was having an argument about just where the line should be, is where this epiphany starts. Monster, asshole, jerk, abuser, cheater, piece of shit and a list of insults that I can't even remember. The problem with this, is not that I didn't care about her, it was a realization that I wasn't really part of the church anymore. I didn't care about *that*.

That I was sitting in the wake of The Death of God and that I, a sinner, was being berated by my own former and personal Jesus Christ. A woman who I had held into a female image of Christ himself. But I wasn't scared of hell, or being excommunicated from the church. Wasn't worried that I'd be pilloried in the town square for my sins. It was the realization that I was being accused of blasphemy, when I was an atheist. Imagining what it'd be like if the whole church sat me down and told me I was going to hell, that I'd "die alone" as Rollo put it.

And what a laugh, really. Because in my liberal days, there was no greater badge *to pretend not to be proud of wearing*, than atheist. As you get older, this is just a fact, a reality, if you don't believe. It's not really something to be proud of, simply put, it's just a way to categorize your own personal belief system. Your view of the world. Liberals are very concerned about making sure that people share their "orthodox" view of the world. Self identity is more important, than the pragmatic elements.

A wider realization was birthed from this.

For men, we start off confusing sex with love. And at the highest state of being, we understand that love as we knew it, was an illusion. And so if we were to scour the source code of the illusion we participate in, and isolate all of the code that we thought was love, we'd realize that it was just an image of a person that didn't really exist.

What happens if we remove it? What if we were to remove the code, that made us fear... god? "Love?" In all most of us.

All of this shouting across the internet, they're just clergy members doing what they do, because they believe. The code that regulates this behavior, still there. And it isn't your job or concern to try and convert them. It isn't your place to state you're not a believer. You don't believe in god, but most of them do. As you get wiser, you get quieter.

If what you seek is a religious experience, then you must be part of the religion. You must sacrifice your blood, sweat and tears for this. And for this sacrifice, you "get to" believe. You get to believe she is special. That she doesn't have evolutionary hardware that regulates her behavior. You get to believe that you are, smarter than nature. How very clever you are.

Of course, this religious experience will last only so long as the facade survives.

When she shows you who she really is, your only real choices are disappointment and or insanity as you find more and more elaborate ways to deceive yourself until invariably you're shocked into it through cPTSD. I am a firm believer that TRP is a place for men suffering from cPTSD from this shock to find peace. It is where we instruct men how to protect themselves into the future, to "solve" this problem. cPTSD is the bodies way of saying "you've made a huge mistake, I'm not sure what that is, but figure it out... solve this problem." This is why men quickly race to conclusions like "she was crazy" or "I just need to work harder." They are incomplete solutions to return back to a resting mental state.

Nietzsche speaks of "The Death of God." How we all lie in the wake of the realization that the world is something we have a bit of control over. We all remain skeptical of the likelihood that such a higher being exists, and this of course manifests itself into behavior. Our entire culture is radically changed by this subconscious realization and philosophical truth. Regardless of any interpretation of Nietzsche or this issue. I am speaking about this issue directly and relating it to red pill truths.

The idea that any large portion of the young population is modeling their behavior after the bible these days is of course ludicrous. But when he made this observation, it was radical. But this observation is about *the church and its followers*.

What is around the corner, my belief that is, is a spreading of the same epiphany had while being shouted down by **my** Jesus Christ. That as the knowledge becomes more and more available, as men talk to each other more about these issues, as men *experience* these issues, we are maybe 5-10 years away from another "Death of God." This is already happening at a formative level in discussions about dating amongst youths.

A widespread cultural zeitgeist where the truth can no longer be denied. Where men understand and accept the reality of sexual dynamics manifested by women, reject the idealized image of women and realize that their own personal Jesus Christ was just a girl, just like the Jesus Christ before her and before her. The lucky ones, in High School, the unlucky by their 1st maybe 2nd divorce. But soon enough, these experiences won't be individual. They'll be collective.

And that moment, where enough people have that realization, where the undercurrent of reality boils to the surface, will be the last moment where we as a culture seek to serve women. From that moment on, men will mostly serve themselves. No amount of accusations of sin, threats of hell or excommunication can or will work after this. This idea, will be held with the same level of intellectual seriousness as Greek Mythology. Where the idea of being a male romantic seems, laughable. Where the man or woman scolding you, telling you it's time to "man up" occupies the spot of pyramid scheme salesperson.

~~"Unlimited income potential?"~~ "I'm never going find my soulmate?" *Laughs in red pill*

And so we must look to the shepherds who have fought this war before us. Whose voices echo in my head...

"Bitches ain't shit but hoes and tricks Lick on these nuts and suck the dick"

# Suicide note from alpha widow "streamer" who kills herself over AF\BB and liberal culture

81 upvotes | July 8, 2020 | /r/TheRedPill | [Link](#) | [Reddit Link](#)

---

I dated a bit, and I even started my first serious relationship. He is a really, really nice guy. Even when things went sour, he was always nice. Always caring, always there.

He was like, literally a brother to her!

I ruined him.

Are you here, reading brother?

He was raised right, and he was very good to me. I was not. Looking back, I don't even know why I treated him so bad. A lot was just anger took out on him. 3 years later, we end things for good and on good terms.

tldr; After turning this boy into a burnt out husk, he agrees to assume dust form and blow off into the wind so that she may devour her next victim.

This taught me a lot about appreciation in my life as should everybody learn about at one point in their life.. but I guess this is where Karma comes in.

Typical weirdo women shakra stuff

I **reconnected** with somebody else that I dated.. and I guess this is where the "main" part of this entire post is significant. I love this guy. I mean I really, really loved the guy.

Ok, fess up, which one of you cretens was dicking this girl down?

But again, I could never be perfect. I was jealous, I was clingy, and I was very emotional. I was blinded by his changes compared to 4 years before that I just threw everything I had for the second time. I dropped all that I had and went for it. He promised me good things, I believed. I did not do any of this because of chasing love, but rather I viewed him as my best friend and somebody I really felt supported me in my decisions. This went on for a long time, the amount of trust was unbelievable.

She literally can not tell the difference between "supporting her" and not caring about her at all. Because she was raised to believe that the most amount of autonomy and men agreeing with her, rather than guiding her, is what "caring" is.

In this regard, it is impossible for a woman to separate being a plate and someone who actually is cared for. Because of course, who gives a shit what your plate thinks, right?

"Oh I'm thinking of taking out a 100k loan to stream on Twitch"

*Oh wow, that sounds like a really bold and smart move for a super smart girl like you... wow, go get her tiger.*

Don't get me wrong, he's a nice guy to his friends and family. Nobody ever believed me when I told them the way it was at home. I've counted 3 black eyes, unlimited bruises, countless times of being thrown on the ground, and 4 times I was choked til tears. The fights

| were always about the same thing, me wanting more effort on his end

Wow, this sounds horrible. What kind of monster would just not care about someone, have no motivation to do anything for her?

| or being too clingy.. or saying things that he did not like.

Translation : *He would not commit*

| He's amazing to his peers, there for them, will go out of his way for them. Very loyal as well.. but to me,

Translation : *I was willing to share*

| I didn't even get 5% of it.

Translation : I was a maladjusted plate.

| I am not perfect. I broke things around the house, but one thing I never, ever did.. was insult him or talk down on him.

Translation : *I instigated the fights and physical violence and he smacked a bitch*

| I have been called every single insulting name out there besides my real name. I have been called Bitch and cunt so many times that I feel like it was plastered on my forehead. I've got scars on my body that taunt me, and i wake up from nightmares all the time. I tried my best to not stress him out. I tried my best to watch my words and actions, I tried for a long time to be perfect.

Translation : His SMV was very high.

| You see, nobody ever saw this. Nobody believed me besides close friends who would physically see the bruises and the times I cried for help from hurting so bad. Even after this post, a lot of you will not think any of it is true and "she's just being dramatic". I am in no way trying to make him into a bad person, he's really not. In fact out of all his friends.. I can safely say that he is the most loyal and caring for them.

Translation : Everyone knew this chick was mental.

| Depression is no joke. I've called suicide hotlines several times in the past 6 months, I have looked into therapy and anti-depressants.. and I tried to reach out about it to him. He told me that I'm pathetic and to not bring it up around him. I was a crybaby, I sulked too much. I think this hurt me the most because he was my best friend and who I looked to for support.. but instead I was thrown away like I was invisible. I guess it just all got to me. In fact, I just texted him that I felt so alone that i wanted to end my life, and again, he replied that I am pathetic.

Translation : There is no psychiatric program for alpha widows.

| And you know what, I am pathetic in many ways. I am not as successful or as intelligent as him and I sure as hell am not as strong. Til this day I admire so much about him. I mean, I really did care for this person. We had a lot of good times. In the end, it was all worth it.

tldr; I am RMV0 and have no self awareness

Although this makes him seem evil, I still don't believe he is. It was only this way to me, and it was not always this way. I held with all I had to the last bit of what I felt I could take... but eventually when you're told that you're not cared about enough, you begin to not even care about yourself anymore. If I could just pinpoint how I could stop making all this hurt go away, I would... but I can't. And that's why I'm here.

Translation : After sleeping around a lot, I am incapable of feeling attraction to men who care about me.

Now I know what a lot of you are thinking, " why did she depend her happiness over one person.." entirely not true. I would not kill myself over a guy. But could I feel more broken from what has happened? Yes. Could it exemplify my emptiness and open my wounds, yes.

Translation : I'm killing myself over a guy, because nothing else that has been sold to me as fulfillment has any value to me. My dopamine receptors are shot.

Realistically, this post may seem like I decided to end my life over a failed relationship. That is not true. It may have contributed to depression but all in all, I just feel alone. I may have had spurts of happiness, but whenever things turned sour, I returned right back to where he put me.

Enjoy the decline...

But to be honest peeps, I'm done. I'm hurt to the bone and I just don't have any will power left in me. Please understand.

What do you think the chances are if we rewound her back to more simple times she'd have written this and killed herself.

Pretty much zero.

Stupidest shit I've read all week. Liberals will handwave this as "mental illness."

This isn't mental illness, this is cultural decline. She was a value system shift away from getting her life at least halfway sorted. Doubtful she'd be able to settle down after the CC ride she's been on, but at least for her to be able to understand how to make real friends, get a real purpose in life etc and start building something of value for *herself*.

This was a life lost to cultural decline, I'm sure of it. I'm not mad or sad.

This is just disappointing.

If this continues on, more and more kids in households that will begin or have begun in this forum will be addressing issues like this.

Just imagine having to watch your own daughter trainwreck her life for 10 years straight into the grave because everything you tell her to try and make her happy is "misogynistic" or "patriarchal."

This was a very honest letter. She framed it as "his fault," literally an external locus of control, but it was honest as far as she could understand honesty.

Reread this letter and my commentary and you can see how the hamster, and narratives spin.

This was a violent basketcase alpha widow with an external locus of control who was emotionally bankrupt that any man worth his salt should be able to see right through.

Dark read, but it's not often women dump their brains like this.