

# Questions on a Completely Red Pill World and The Role of The Female Imperative In Such a World.

August 8, 2016 | 6 upvotes | by [yellowmonkeyzx93](#)

---

Hello everyone. To those earlier who responded to my earlier question, thank you.

I was reading "**The Rationale Male**" and this two parts under "**Discomfort and Disillusion**" made me curious to ask two questions.

**Here are the two parts:**

- a) "Game is simply the most recent countermeasure developed by men to better adapt to this feminine primacy, but it was only possible through advances in both communication technologies, access to globalized information and new socio-psychological theory."
- b) "The great and powerful Oz that was feminization is finally having the curtain pulled back on it. In this age of communication men can globally "share notes" and come to their own conclusions - and women shriek all the louder as we hit closer on the truth."

**The questions are:**

1. Let's assume in this world, women don't learn at all to counter "Game", just for this discussion. In this ideal world, every man (and soon to be men) have (or will) embraced the Red Pill. The world has become a man's paradise and is a return to patriarchy. **Would humanity as a whole make better progress with men leading rather than women?** (Edit: Almost like traditional gender roles..)
2. **In such a world, where would the female imperative fit in, if even possible?** (I'm curious to see where this question will lead and what the responses would be.)

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](http://theredarchive.com)

---

## Comments

---

CopperFox3c • 9 points • 8 August, 2016 02:45 PM

Would humanity as a whole make better progress with men leading rather than women?

Look around you. All the technology you see - mostly invented by men. The buildings, roads, houses, other edifices of civilization - mostly built by men. Who keeps the power running? The sewer system working? Who grows the crops? Men. Civilization was built by men.

In such a world, where would the female imperative fit in, if even possible?

Men lead, women follow. That's not a knock on women. They were simply designed by nature for a different purpose ... *to support from behind*, to build social connections, to be the glue that holds the family and community together. And that purpose is equally important, and equally valuable, just in different ways. A woman in her pure feminine essence, living up to that potential, is an admirable thing. Thinking otherwise is simply another lie that we've been sold by Feminists.

yellowmonkeyzx93[S] • 1 point • 8 August, 2016 03:05 PM\*

For the first question.. point noted.

For the second question.. as I understand it, generally speaking, you mean to say that **women must (or mostly) be subordinates to men's will and fulfill their feminine role as nature had design for them (or as they've evolved)..?**

I'm an advocate of a person creating their own freedom and meaning in life, both men and women.

So, the thing that I can't reconcile is.. suppose there are **very few** women that can excel and survive in a man's world by merit and capability. Do we as men bind them back to their feminine role or...? That's something I'm not clear about.

CopperFox3c • 5 points • 8 August, 2016 03:30 PM\*

**People should be free to make whatever choices they want ... but they should not be free of the responsibility for the consequences of those choices.**

In that vein, we should *encourage* (not bind or force) people to pursue avenues that are most likely to lead to them maximizing their full potential. If that means encouraging many women to embrace more traditional feminine gender roles, then so be it. There will always be exceptions, but the *exception to the rule does not invalidate the rule*.

There was a reason things were the way they were in the past. It wasn't some random choice, but necessity, that caused certain traditions to not only develop, but to *persist*. They were useful.

yellowmonkeyzx93[S] • 3 points • 8 August, 2016 03:51 PM

**Thank you, CopperFox.** That was the exactly reasoning I was searching for that I couldn't quite get yet. **You nailed it down hard..** Sincerely appreciate you explaining it to me.

FairlyNaive • 1 point • 8 August, 2016 05:03 PM

The world has become a man's paradise and is a return to patriarchy

Not really. It would rise the level of competition but wouldnt change 80/20 rule. The fact that all men would

know the rules wouldn't change the nature of the game.

yellowmonkeyzx93[S] • 1 point • 8 August, 2016 05:12 PM

That's really interesting.

When you refer to level of competition, you mean competition among men or competition among women? Next, when you cite the 80/20 rule, what are you referring to? (I haven't come across it yet, still new to this, though I grasp concepts fast). Could you explain?

It's true that the nature of the game itself does not change. Rather, I'd like to think **the game itself has changed**, or at the least, the male players of the game have changed how the game is being changed. I mean, in this idealistic world, men would lead and call the shots.

Meanwhile, feminist movements and interference would be at an all time low. The world would live in a male-centric reality. Wouldn't that be great?

FairlyNaive • 2 points • 8 August, 2016 05:30 PM

Men compete, women chose. 80/20 is idea that vast majority of women are attracted to a small amount of top men, which leads us to the conclusion that notion of alpha is relative to your competition. The same man can be part of the desired top 20% and invisible majority depending on the surrounding. Teaching every men on planet game would skyrocket the requirements for being at the top but won't change women attitude towards majority of men.

yellowmonkeyzx93[S] • 1 point • 9 August, 2016 03:24 AM

Hmmm.. you gave me something to think about. I'm learning about economics and this is really similar.. thank you for explaining.