

Religion makes sense

April 24, 2014 | 151 upvotes | by [Cyralea](#)

If you think I'm about to preach and try to convert, rest assured, I'm not. I'm an ardent atheist, and I always will be.

No, what I want to delve into is the practices that are the core of the largest modern religions, Christianity and Islam. For most progressives, religious traditions are laughably outdated at best, tyrannically controlling at worst. I admit I used to think this. What TRP has done is revealed the *why* as to how they came to be, and why they endured as long as they did.

What I, and certainly more intelligent men before me, now understand is that successful societies don't grow organically. Mother nature doesn't lend itself to the success of all humans. It favours those with the best genetics, discarding the weak. Successful societies allow more people to thrive by controlling the worst behaviours in humans, and by favouring the middle at the expense of the top. Allowing betas a chance at marriage and procreation prevents them from becoming frustrated, angry, and most importantly *dangerous*. It allows them to function to the greater good of society by providing tax income to be spent on others, as well as become support figures for the next generation. There are no healthy societies with angry frustrated males.

So how does one do this? The only truly effective way is thought control, and what better way than to instill the values from birth? Religion does fantastically in this regard, and has been used as such for millennia. Preventing women from becoming sluts ensures that the sex isn't sequestered to the top 20% of males. Denying contraception means that women have to be careful about sleeping around, same with forcing women to bear children by denying abortion. Women that are forced to cover up serves the dual purpose of making it harder for them to flirt, as well as preventing temptation from other men. Every single one of these religious doctrines makes sense as far as the cohesion of societies are concerned.

Progressive attitudes will undo all of this, and lead to the fall of Rome. I don't believe in religion, but I believe in what religion stands for.

I'd be curious to see what other atheists make of this.

Archived from theredarchive.com

Comments

FortunateBum • 52 points • 24 April, 2014 05:13 PM

I think all successful religions do three things in this order:

- 1) Encourage women to procreate and raise their kids
- 2) Encourage group cohesion and outgroup animosity
- 3) Encourage conversion

Religions have been evolutionarily streamlined for optimum reproduction. The religions that weren't optimal were defeated by the ones that were.

Getting maximum utility out of women's vaginas is almost a hallmark of traditional religions.

So of course religious thought and RP thought are going to overlap in places - especially for RP men who want children and families.



Whisper • 151 points • 24 April, 2014 07:24 PM 2

Feminists are absolutely right that religions institutions are for controlling women's sexuality.

The problem is that when you *don't* control women's sexuality, here's what happens.

16-29 year old women have a 13-year sex party with the top 20% of sexually attractive men, both of their age and older.

Women 30 and older get little attention, sex, or love, and have trouble getting married.

80% of men cannot get laid, or have great difficulty doing so.

The top 20% of men don't work very hard on being productive, because they are rolling in the whole reason men are ever productive in the first place.

The other 80% of men are also less and less productive as they figure out that no matter what they earn, they ain't getting none.

Legal prostitution would fix this, but women over 30 won't allow that to become a reality, because that's more competition for a diminishing pool of potential husbands.

People start having children later and later... and the more successful they are, the later they have kids.

(Because successful men have no incentive to settle down, and women only exit the sex party when they have to)

Birth rate goes down

Productivity goes down.

The society is out-competed by one that controls and channels the sexuality of its women into productive avenues.

The beautiful, horrible, tragic irony is that the same feminists who spent their twentysomething years (back in the seventies/eighties/early nineties) trying to make the west a sexual paradise for women failed to notice that they were making it a sexual paradise only for **young** women.

They failed to notice this because they *were* young women at the time. Now they're not, and they are caught in a trap of their own design. This would all be wonderful, except that they're not just destroying their own lives... they are hurting everyone else, too.

With the invention of birth control methods that really, really, reliably work, we got the luxury of allowing people a little sexual freedom. But what's going on now isn't "a little sexual freedom".

It's ultimate sexual freedom and power for pretty young girls and caddish, psychopathic men... and fuck-all for everyone else.

The fact that we are here, deliberately teaching ourselves to be caddish and psychopathic, is a measure of how broken the system is.

renzy77 • 19 points • 25 April, 2014 12:06 AM

Whisper's post should be sidebar material - it succinctly summarizes every negative effect modern feminism is having on modern society.

[deleted] • 17 points • 24 April, 2014 08:24 PM

Great post, but I would argue that women over 30 still get plenty of attention. As I've said before, I think the notion of the wall is rather over-emphasized. It's more like a nice soft mattress that they can rest on after their carousel-riding days are over. To a man that must constantly look after his own well-being, that doesn't sound so bad to me.

I would also argue that legal prostitution isn't the fix-all cure that some believe it to be - namely because there is nothing comparable to having a woman submit to you through her desire. The difference is night and day. A few weeks back a poster from a european country with legal prostitution said as much as the same - that they are still having most of the same problems with women.

[deleted] • 13 points • 24 April, 2014 08:48 PM

As has been said before, all a woman has to do to have sex is open her legs, a man has to work for it (unless he's in that top 20%). A woman over 30 just has to re-calibrate who she is willing to sleep with.

apackofwankers • 10 points • 24 April, 2014 08:58 PM

There are many places in the world where prostitution is perfectly legal - Australia and many countries in Europe - it doesnt change the sexual landscape at all.

MotorcycleMann • 4 points • 24 April, 2014 10:58 PM

I don't understand this at all. if it was perfectly legal to walk down the street and have sex with a pretty girl without any strings attached and no worries this should make men deal with way less crap from "regular" girls and therefore causing "regular" girls to behave better and creating a better "landscape".

Whats the deal?

apackofwankers • 14 points • 25 April, 2014 01:25 AM

The whole world of prostitutes is rather icky.

As someone who has slept with a few, I can tell you its nowhere near as much fun as fucking someone you are attracted to and who is attracted to you.

Get a fleshlight if all you need is a fuckhole.

Timmytanks40 • -2 points • 25 April, 2014 06:02 AM

Yet you did this a few times?

apackofwankers • 5 points • 25 April, 2014 01:35 PM*

I kept hoping the experience would be more like what I had with my regular women, but it never was. Sometimes a hooker comes along and suggests that it might be (TEMPTATION), and I try again, but it never is.

Last hooker that tempted me was Russian. She looked so cute, had a band of flowers in her hair, and was tonguing my ear while rubbing her diamond hard nipples against my arm and grinding her pussy against my leg. I was almost convinced of her arousal, everything was there except the smell of a gushing pussy. She wanted \$5000 to stake her for a poker game in another country. I declined.

All Hookers Are Like That.

I know that in Germany, for example, they talk about sex workers restoring the dignity of the severely disabled, and the state pays for that.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 12:19 AM

It's pretty obvious so I'm not going to waste my time spelling it out. Imagine if you could only get laid by paying to fuck a whore, what would you/others think of you?

dotrar • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 12:50 AM

not only that but they're expensive as fuck.

veggie_girl • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 02:52 AM

I think the only reason it isn't legal is because it would be too hard to tax.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 08:29 PM

Stripping and waitressing are hard to tax too but they are legal.

MotorcycleMann • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 12:56 AM*

Well I'm pretty sure I'd be happy. Knowing that I could go in, get what I wanted and leave without any hassle would be great. Plus my tolerance for BS from women would be so low that I'd be able to actually get a girl I liked, instead of putting up with her and jumping through hoops for some ass.

As for what others think, who cares? Live and let live

RedPope • 7 points • 25 April, 2014 02:31 AM

Prostitution is legal where I live. They can work as a slump-buster, but that's about it.

When a normal girl takes some random stranger home for a one night stand, she rarely feels satisfied after the act. She hasn't accomplished anything. Anyone can give away pussy.

Same when a guy buys a prostitute. He hasn't accomplished anything. Anyone can spend money.

It might be a rush the first time you hire a whore. But don't be surprised if you feel bored the next time. Prostitutes are masturbatory aids.

Timmytanks40 • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 06:05 AM

If youre willing to jump through hoops for pussy thats on you.

vaker • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 03:41 AM

what would you/others think of you?

Who cares?

apackofwankers • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 05:44 AM

what would you think of you?

vaker • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 05:49 AM

That I'm a pragmatic person?

apackofwankers • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 01:50 PM

That you have lost all your game, that you cant get a woman without paying. Its would reduce your confidence in being able to pick up women.

Cyralea[S] • 11 points • 24 April, 2014 08:19 PM

16-29 year old women have a 13-year sex party with the top 20% of sexually attractive men, both of their age and older.

Women 30 and older get little attention, sex, or love, and have trouble getting married.

80% of men cannot get laid, or have great difficulty doing so.

The top 20% of men don't work very hard on being productive, because they are rolling in the whole reason men are ever productive in the first place.

The other 80% of men are also less and less productive as they figure out that no matter what they earn, they ain't getting none.

Legal prostitution would fix this, but women over 30 won't allow that to become a reality, because that's more competition for a diminishing pool of potential husbands.

People start having children later and later... and the more successful they are, the later they have kids. (Because successful men have no incentive to settle down, and women only exit the sex party when they have to)

Birth rate goes down

Productivity goes down.

The society is out-competed by one that controls and channels the sexuality of its women into productive avenues.

A primer on what happened to modern day Japan, if I ever saw one.

87GNX • 13 points • 24 April, 2014 11:52 PM

I don't think that's accurate.

What happened with Japan is that they structured society into *extremely* bifurcated roles, the home was much more matriarchal than even 1950s America and likewise the workplace was hypermasculine. So for instance the average middle-class man's paycheck goes straight into a bank

account controlled by his wife, and then she gives him an "allowance."

Then what happens in the 90's is the social contract between the Zaibatsu (business/banking conglomerates) and the worker breaks down, suddenly you don't have lifetime employment anymore, you have continued pressure to reduce expense accounts (which were the only way Japanese men got the cash to drink/fuck/enjoy themselves).

To oversimplify further, in the US you had restrictions on women that were lifted and that led to our demise. In Japan you had the imposition of new restrictions on men and that's leading to their demise. Both countries have seen a relative shift in the power of men but there's a difference between doing that by bringing women up (US) vs. pushing men down (Japan).

Timmytanks40 • 11 points • 25 April, 2014 06:34 AM

Im really confused. How is womens sexual promiscuity a bad thing.. You know what this is? Its mens fault. Let me explain..

Ive recently come into a new unseen world. The world of the female roommate. Mind you not one but 2 girls. Both girls are college age as am I. Let me tell you these lil girls get theirs.. They pull ass like its not even a thing. Living there about 6 months now and the picture is very clear. The amount of dick thrown at women was previously unrelatable to me. Im 22, in college, lived in a fraternity, and ive lost count of the number of girls ive banged. That was something i used to somewhat feel accomplished over.

So why why mens fault? Well each time these girls brings a guy back. I can see the look in his eye. He feels accomplished. Each one is clearly just meeting the girl. The same generic questions and forced laughter. The guys all seem pathetic and they look at you in contemptful way. You want to tell them theyre the third guy in this bed since sunday but its doubtful theyd care.

After seeing how much dick has ran through what once looked like a decently attractive girl, its easy to be put off by the whole notion of getting laid at all. Finding them attractive is impossible now. My neighbor banged one when they first moved in and bragged. Now hes watching a conga line while his dick shrivels from dehydration. A deadly combination of sadness and embarrassment.

TL;DR - Get a slutty female roommate. You wont wanna hook up with any random girl again.

87GNX • 5 points • 25 April, 2014 04:53 PM

How is womens sexual promiscuity a bad thing

I think you just answered your own question there, bro.

Timmytanks40 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 05:25 PM

How so?

RedSpectrum5 points 24 April, 2014 09:27 PM **[recovered]**

No, I do not think this applies to Japan as feminism never had/has a grasp on Japan like it does on other Western nations. Japan has a workaholic mindset coupled with the fact that many young men and women are disinterested in sex and having offspring which is needed to replace the rapidly aging populace. Japan has been discussed before a couple of times and this is what I remembered from it.

/u/RedSunBlue should know more about this.

zephyrprime • 2 points • 29 April, 2014 08:38 PM

Americans are disinterested in having offspring too. The difference is, Americans are still interested in sex and Americans are much less responsible than the Japanese. This leads a lot of accidental births which don't happen in more responsible Japan.

tedted8888 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 12:34 AM*

I'm not exactly sure your right here. If you are indeed correct that without slut shaming from whatever source (religion in this example) that 20% of men will sleep with 100% of women 16-29, what actually happens?

Lets assume these 20% men are aged 30-50. Are these men going to be pussy addicts and spend 90% of their time fucking and chasing the next hot 16 year old? I'm not so sure. 1st, how do these men become attractive? I thought it was "red pill knowledge" to put your life first and women 2nd. These men that are hot to women are going to be very busy running their business, negotiating deals, learning skills, having male friends ect. The way men become attractive is by being a leader. Men don't have the luxury of good looks. Men are going to have to work hard at business, music, whatever endeavor he is interested in. And what is more fulfilling to you, a pretty cum dumpster or leader in your field?

These top 20% of men are going to loose interest in pussy. The've had it all, blondes, brunettes, asians, mexicans, indians ect. Its going to take alot to pique their interests. So no, their not going to just sleep with every 16 y/o that walks thier way. 30-50 y/o also start having old age dick problems. Sex more than 3 or 4 times a week I dont think is going to happen. Sure you could take viagra, but why when you've scene it all? These men are going to be interested in 7 and 8's which can actually talk to them. These men are going to have very high standards for women. They will end up with the top 20% of 16-29 year olds, but not the other 80% of women in that age group.

tl;dr you haven't learned the concept of equilibrium. 10's will mate with 10s, 9's with 9's, 8's with 8's ect. Only maybe 3% of people are "10's", probably 5% 9's and 12% are 8's. . Saying that the top 20% of men are going to have exclusive mating rights with 100% of women, and that the men will stop working, is just religious dogma. Male 5's are still going to mate with female 5's. And the top tier of men are going to get more fulfillment from life in their business than banging hot 16 year olds.

I mean common, if you told me, "we cant legalize drugs because everyone would just get high all the time", I'd laugh you off like your stupid. This is essentially the same argument.

argyle_fox • 5 points • 25 April, 2014 02:00 AM

I have to agree here. A lot of the comments I've been reading don't seem to be based on reality but extrapolations on a lot of the fundamentals of TRP.

Just because some 10 Alpha can get all the pussy he wants, doesn't means he's going to take it all. There is plenty left over for 9s, 8s, hell even 5s should get some.

TRP is about understanding how society limits male capabilities, and using that knowledge to overcome these obstacles. If all you're doing is bitching about Cock Carousels and fuck-a-lot Alphas, then you need to rethink what you're taking away form all this.

tedted8888 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 04:42 AM

Thank you

Timmytanks40 • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 06:38 AM

Wait you mean getting laid isnt the central purpose of existence? This doesnt make sense. Im 15.

argyle_fox • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 10:48 AM

Getting laid, one way or another, is absolutely the point of existence. If you're a man.

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 April, 2014 06:54 AM

If you're a man.

If you are a living thing.

Demonspawn • -4 points • 25 April, 2014 04:26 PM

30-50 y/o also start having old age dick problems.

Um.. no. 30-50 year old men with "dick problems" is because they're fucking 30-50 year old women. Just like men's "mid life crisis" is actually caused by their married mate's menopause. I've seen guys older than me with "dick problems" that disappeared once they got divorced and were fucking younger, attractive, desirable pussy.

Sex more than 3 or 4 times a week I dont think is going to happen.

Hell, I'm in that range and routinely have sex 3-4 times a night.

tl;dr you haven't learned the concept of equilibrium.

TL;DR: you somehow mistake "equilibrium" with "equal".

sansurnt • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 04:49 PM

No, it's a biotrueth that men's sex drive declines with age. Look it up.

Demonspawn • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 05:21 PM

It declines a little bit as testosterone declines, but that alone doesn't cause ED.

sansurnt • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 05:24 PM

It's getting more common though, considering testosterone levels have on average have dropped 20% globally in the last 20 years. Better start lifting them weights.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 08:24 PM

You're so right. I practice being a jerk but I know that for society to go down this road is a pathway to destruction.

FortunateBum • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 12:35 AM

I think your analysis is spot on. I was trying to think of scientific evidence that might support it and *light bulb* it's been proven that women are attracted to Dark Triad traits.

I guess the question is, what enforced monogamy in the first place? Christianity?

Cyralea[S] • 17 points • 24 April, 2014 05:46 PM

So of course religious thought and RP thought are going to overlap in places - especially for RP men who want children and families.

This is what led me down this path. In looking for a potential partner for raising children it struck me that a

traditionally religious girl is ideal. I want a good mother, not an empowered slut.

I wonder though, how often has this cycle of conservative ideology and progressive death-spiraling occurred throughout history?

LibertarianLibertine • 6 points • 24 April, 2014 05:53 PM

I reckon you can look at the end of many great empires and see sluttiness ('decadence').

But than again, in the past rape was still an accepted way of producing kids.

zyk0s • 3 points • 24 April, 2014 09:31 PM

But than again, in the past rape was still an accepted way of producing kids.

Not really. Unless by rape you mean "woman regrets it the next morning".

LibertarianLibertine • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 01:46 PM

I was referring to the early dark ages where tribes moved across Europe, always looting villages and taking the women.

johnnight • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 11:21 AM

Not if you are the father of the girl being raped. There are men capable of violence on both sides of the rape frontline.

In the past men knew that there are other men capable of evil so they made sure that the women they care about were under protection: their own or their husbands.

LibertarianLibertine • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 01:50 PM

It's a tradition in some places in Asia to abduct your future wife, rather than propose. One may refer to this as accepted rape.

FortunateBum • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 12:39 AM

I wonder though, how often has this cycle of conservative ideology and progressive death-spiraling occurred throughout history?

That is a very interesting question. I tend to think nothing ever changes, but it's hard to believe that great wealth doesn't lead to some sort of social change.

Take the Bonobos for instance. Apparently, they live in a resource-rich environment which is entirely responsible for their matriarchy.

MurderKube • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 01:22 PM

If you got some spare time I would suggest reading this. It's a short (20 or so pages) but interesting analysis on the downfall of empires and civilizations through history. Moral decadence being one of the main attributing factors according to the author.

zephyrprime • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 08:43 PM

Rome? Babylon? Greece? Sodom and Gomorrah?

[deleted] • 19 points • 24 April, 2014 05:44 PM

Religions are memes. They reproduce in the minds of humans. They can be beneficial in some ways, and

parasitic in others. Ultimately the only goal is to reproduce, like you said, and our societies can benefit or get fucked over by them.

[deleted] 25 April, 2014 12:26 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 05:01 PM

Depends on how the society is "fucked over". Look at middle eastern countries. They got fucked over in the past and now Islam is keeping them in the Dark Ages. Their society is still around though, for now.

Nicolay77 • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 12:26 PM

Getting maximum utility out of women's vaginas is almost a hallmark of traditional religions.

Abrahamic religions.

In fact, the Gaza conflict is a population growth war. There are more palestinians now than 20 or 50 years ago, all by population explosion.

[deleted] • 14 points • 24 April, 2014 06:18 PM

Another way to control the excess of betas was war, so yeah.

theozoph • 5 points • 25 April, 2014 05:21 AM*

War, and its corrolary, slavery. Africa, notorious for its r-strategy sexual mores, polygamy and general barbarism, was and is rife with slavery. Beta men need to be dealt with.

shadowq8 • 1 point • 27 April, 2014 09:18 AM

So that is why world war I and II occurred?

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 April, 2014 09:32 AM

Could they have occured without large numbers of men willing to fight?

shadowq8 • 1 point • 27 April, 2014 09:41 AM

I am not sure they were willing, they were either drafted or manipulated...

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 April, 2014 09:54 AM

By... other men, yes.

However, I meant war in tribal times because it's in those ciscumstances that we spend most of our time evolving. A man who could not spread his genes or gain status and resources in his own tribe still had the possibility to attain these things through war. Cruel as it is, through either winning or losing the problem solved itself.

shadowq8 • 1 point • 27 April, 2014 10:03 AM

A human survival of the fittest of some sort... It is true, tribes would enslave weaker tribes, and nations would enslave weaker nations...

IMO and as a Muslim I believe religion fights this by attempting to set up a marriage structure...

[deleted] • 1 point • 27 April, 2014 10:19 AM

Marriage has benefits, but you're not going to fight the advantages of winning a war for men with it (temporary marriages, loot, status).

Denswend • 72 points • 24 April, 2014 05:56 PM

Welcome to the traditionalist/religious branch of neoreactionary thought. This is what you are closely describing. This is where you start.

You see, in order to have a stable civilization, you need to have stable agreements on certain things. You may not see it, but the entire judicial system is one huge agreement. This is something known as social contract - you will surrender a part of your freedom and in return you'll have safety. This is what Hobbes means when he says that "the state is a corporation with a monopoly on the just use of violence". Now, in order for this agreement to mean something, in order to make people **willingly** (otherwise there's a chance for revolution) give a part of their freedom, security that is being bought with freedom as the money, must be **unquestionable**. If you system can't make sure that people aren't obeying their part of the contract, then that system will fail as people will stop agreeing with it. And system without people is nothing. So there must be some metaphysical or even quantifiable value that makes people comply to their part of the agreement.

Ibn Khaldun names this "societal glue" *asabiyyah* or if you prefer Western terminology, *solidarity*. The **main** *asabiyyah* that all other *asabiyyahs* are derived from is **unity** - the notion that you're a part of something greater than yourself, and that by harming that something you will harm yourself. Unity can manifest itself as all kinds of things, it can even use it's opposite as their rallying point - "United in diversity". Some people would rather prefer to be united in unity, and those people are, well, more united. The main form of unity that trumps all other unities is the **cultural** one. You can have ethnical diversity, as long as you have cultural unity (Rome being the best example). You can have religious diversity, as long as you have cultural unity (Germany being the best example). You see, all other unities, are constituent part of culture, and culture can tolerate some diversity - religious/ethical/whatever. When the diversities become too much to handle, cultural unity stops. This is what happened with Rome..

When cultural unity is under strong attacks either by democratic or neoliberal capitalist systems, it will eventually fail. Because diversity is bad for a stable society. How can I make such a bold and politically incorrect statement? Because I have empirical evidence to back me up. And I know my history quite well.

Religion is just a form of metaphysical *asabiyyah*, as something metaphysical, it is beyond reason. It's essentially a **social construct**. But it's still very important.

Whisper • 61 points • 24 April, 2014 07:31 PM

Copied from one of my earlier comments:

The whole point of the term "Eternal September" is to describe how a community loses its values when it grows too quickly.

In the pre-1993 world, Usenet was a thriving community with social mores. Each September, it would get an influx of newcomers (new college students got access through campus networks) who didn't know the rules, didn't know how they were expected to behave, but by October or November, they had learned the rules, because there were plenty of established community members to give an example, and to chide them for any infractions.

So Usenet was a mess only in September.

Then, in September 1993, AOL gave its users Usenet access. The influx of new users was like any other September... except now the newcomers, who didn't know the rules and social mores, outnumbered the

established community. As a minority, the regulars couldn't enforce Usenet's mores.

September 1993 never ended, in the sense that Usenet was a mess forever. Usenet is now defunct. Dead. Nothing but a mass of spam where it even still exists.

It was a victim of its own rapid growth.

Analogously, if we, the United States, or we, the western world, accept immigrants from the third world or other failed states slowly, these people will learn our values. They will learn English, get educations, stop mutilating infants' genitals, abandon religious law, etc. They'll keep their music and food, and English will get a few new words, but we won't lose our core values.

But if we accept more of them faster, they form their own ethnic enclaves, don't learn English, and are cut off from the economic and social life of the culture they have moved to. "Little Saigon"s and "Little Mexico"s may be charming districts for outsiders, but they can form socioeconomic traps for the people born in them.

And if we accept still more, even faster... Eternal September. Sharia law in Europe. Whatever.

We must remember that these people come from failed states. That's why they bothered to come. If everything were awesome back home, they'd have stayed there. And they bring with them ideas from those failed states. Some of them good, but some of them the very same bad ideas that caused those states to fail. If you let them in a controlled rate, you give yourself time to sort the bad ideas from the good.

If you open the borders, your culture is committing suicide. And culture matters.

Denswend • 20 points • 24 April, 2014 07:47 PM

Holy hell that is one sweet analogy. Well written bro. Honestly, in order for multiculturalism/feminism to exist, it needs to be severely backed by artificial means like money or power hunger. Otherwise, it simply won't stand the test of time. Political correctness, and especially pervasive ones like this, is the means of giving this narrative it's much needed legal protection. But as with all mores, it's based of people complying with it. And the more they face the reality of their ideals, the more they will come to hate it. I've seen people who claim to be liberals turn into full SS mode after living in a Gypsy ghetto. "I don't like this Hitler guy, but he was totally right about them." Uncontrolled, this sudden emergence of nationalism/traditionalism will only be spearheaded by hot headed people who will be willing to shed lots and lots of blood to prove themselves for "The Cause", whatever that may be. This will be the worst possible way to go on.

On a side note, you can quickly realize that people are getting more and more frustrated with this prevalent ideology by simply looking at how much changed in reddit. TRP is allowed, and it has some sort of semblance to free speech not limited by the PC narrative. Back in the old days of reddit, this would not be tolerated.

Also, would you mind giving me the context of your post?

[deleted] 25 April, 2014 05:07 AM

[permanently deleted]

Whisper • 4 points • 25 April, 2014 05:36 AM

Hi, welcome to /r/theredpill. Hope you've had an interesting and informative two weeks.

I look forward to seeing the evidence from which you draw your point of view.

[deleted] 25 April, 2014 06:02 AM

[permanently deleted]

Denswend • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 01:37 PM

I'm guessing that you're a refugee from a bit more POLished parts of the internet, but this guy is essentially right. Division by ideology is the strongest division there is, much like the unity from ideology is strongest unity there is. Ask yourself, who would you give your daughter to, Thomas Sowell or Piers Morgan?

[deleted] 25 April, 2014 12:15 AM

[permanently deleted]

Xplicitable7 points 24 April, 2014 06:43 PM [recovered]

Religion is just a form of metaphysical asabiyyah, as something metaphysical, it is beyond reason. It's essentially a social construct. But it's still very important.

The Marxist interpretation is probably the most accurate considering our knowledge of history. I think the medieval crusades show religion used for political-economic factors the strongest.

Denswend • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 08:02 PM

I was never much to dabble into religion. I like to approach things from a distance. I recognize that religion's main selling point and it's main attraction is it's metaphysical core. This metaphysical core varies from religion to religion, but it still remains it's core thing. This metaphysical core is sometimes even with the direct clash with the reality, as seen in for example, Christ's resurrection. Essentially, this metaphysical core is either *beyond* or *against* reason in any relevant religion.

So yeah, religion is the opiate for masses. A non-truth at best. This interpretation is very valid and very true. But everyone can believe in the truth. To believe in a lie is a demonstration of loyalty, a sort of uniform. And when you have an uniform you have an army.

johngalt1234 • 4 points • 25 April, 2014 12:55 AM

Christianity is probably the only major religion that does have a major falsifiable fact that is the resurrection. It is the foundation of this religion by which it stands and crumbles.

No resurrection no Christianity.

Denswend • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 01:44 PM

Honestly, all religions have falsifiable facts - you've got the Burning Bush/Red Sea parting/Walls of Jericho/a shit ton of things in Judaism, Islam is undoubtedly filled with similar ideas (like Jibrail whispering to the prophet) and Christianity too.

And these cores are all pretty much nonsense. Honestly, virginal birth? How stupid and unoriginal. Not to mention unscientific at worst. Religion is based on this irrational nonsense. And that is its major strength, not weakness. I'll say it again:

But everyone can believe in the truth. To believe in a lie is a demonstration of loyalty, a sort of uniform. And when you have an uniform you have an army.

To be able to shelve your inherent rationality for something so stupid is a major feat. It's the very thing that makes religion attractive and powerful.

dray121212 • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 08:17 PM

What do you mean if something is metaphysical is is 'beyond reason'...Depending on the worldview you adapt, certain metaphysical truths have to be abandoned in order for said worldview to be coherent, comparable etc.

Denswend • 5 points • 24 April, 2014 08:46 PM

Reason is essentially a tool of man, functionally similar to that of a hammer. As all tools, it has its limits and its alternatives. Hume shows this and Kant further goes into the topic.

Pure metaphysical ideas, or noumena if you will, are simply *beyond* our capacity to understand and beyond the purely physical world. This is why applying God in science is a grave moral error. Because he doesn't *exist* in a manner in which the scientific method can show.

dray121212 • 3 points • 24 April, 2014 09:06 PM

Thanks for the response. Do you agree that it is rational to hold certain metaphysical truths/principals though?

Denswend • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 09:21 PM

Well I don't quite understand what you mean so I'll give you the best explanation of my understanding as I can.

I don't believe that holding *any* metaphysical truths/principals is rational. Think of it like picking between two equally nutrient meals that you roughly like the same. Eventually, you're going to pick one since you don't want to starve. Why do you pick A instead of B isn't grounded in rationality unless you heavily rationalize it.

dray121212 • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 10:15 PM

hmmm

I think I see what your saying, just curious where you stand on other things.

There are many things which cannot be scientifically proven that we hold as rational beliefs (like logical, mathematical truths etc); but you are suggesting that anything of metaphysical nature is not rational to accept? Like saying there are other minds or the external world is real

Denswend • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 10:53 PM

Essentially, yes. Accepting everything metaphysical is essentially irrational process as your human existence is essentially irrational existence. A lot of what we use in science aren't actually "proven" things, they are things known as axioms/postulates - but they are essentially and functionally same as dogmas. The unchallenged truths - the irrational thing from which rational is derived. For example, Newton's Laws or Schroedinger's Equations aren't "proven". They were postulated, and it was found that if we apply reason to them, we'd get a quite rad understanding of the world around us. But you need to have that one minor axiom, no matter how much you want to be objective. Goedel had a lot of work done on that. We essentially found the following formula - if axiom + empirical observations + logical (reason) machinations is good enough, then it works. But if the damn experiment shows otherwise, then we ditch this axiom. Our criteria for the truthfulness of an axiom is it's practicality.

But the problem remains when we try to apply this formula to the metaphysical. First, we

can't use metaphysical empirical observations since metaphysical cannot be empirically proven, otherwise it stops being metaphysical and become physical. Secondly, since empirical observations make it possible for certain axioms to be "better", we have a plenty of axioms to pick from, all equally valid. Logic is like a hammer, it's used to drive nails (empirical observations) into wood (axioms) to make for example a doghouse (understanding of the world). What's the use for a hammer when you don't have any of these things? You might as well have a rubber duck to drive your nonexistent nails into nonexistent wood.

Seriously, if you want to learn more, check out Nietzsche's essay *On Truth and Lies in Non-moral Sense*. It's short but sweet and it's great intro to him (don't believe anyone who tells you to start with *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*).

dray121212 • 3 points • 24 April, 2014 11:47 PM

Thanks a lot bro! I have some reading to do

FuttBisting • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 04:38 PM

I would like you to explain your interpretation of Godel's incompleteness theorem. In detail if possible, because i'm trying to understand.

Denswend • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 06:03 PM

It's a mathematical spin on what Nietzsche's saying. These guys (Russell, Wittgenstein and Goedel) are kinda hard to get into without understanding basic mathematics. So if you want to get to the "essence" of the argument, read *On Truth and Lies*.

FuttBisting • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 07:19 PM

Ive read Nietzsche. But explain the best you can, to the fullest extent possible

MotorcycleMann • 3 points • 24 April, 2014 11:00 PM

Can science prove that God doesn't exist?

Denswend • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 11:06 PM

Nope. It can't prove that he exists either. So we're in quite a pickle considering God. Anything metaphysical really. This is where we abandon logic, and utilize other things.

Honestly, it's all in this neat little comic. Normally I'm against this sort of oversimplification (and Action Philosophers really butchered Nietzsche a bit), but this is a good approximation of some of Kant's ideas.

Bad_Karma21 • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 03:27 AM

I want to sit and drink a beer with you

[deleted] 25 April, 2014 01:23 AM

[permanently deleted]

Denswend • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 02:12 PM

I value a society with no unchosen obligations and unlimited "freedoms which do not violate freedoms".

I like you already. It's rare to find classical liberals, the ones who actually believe in "I may not like what you're saying, but I'll defend till death your right to say it" since the world is filled with "liberals" who want only self righteous moral masturbation at helping the oppressed minority of the week.

Your two paragraphs are factually correct, and it's the foundation of Islam which is actually working **with** hypergamy. It worked for them, lately not so much.

But I still value such a society. If you are worried about sex, there are ways to get it which doesn't require you to be in the creme de la creme of men. I concede that it doesn't mean you will get the love you will get in monogamy, but that is where we need to man up. Love as we imagine it doesn't exist. It's all just games and strategies for influence. So why not just pay for sex?

I like to think that love is this metaphysical value of commitment. It adds a certain spice that's on the tip of your tongue, but you just don't know what it is. It can be irrational and it can be rational. But with all things metaphysical, it relies only on the ability of the loving to apply faith in it. This love is just a natural extension of instincts of an elevated animal who can think, namely, us humans. Basic, vestigial instincts of pure animal is either the pleasure from it, or hormonal influence of the body - it's going to straight to the sex. Both sex and (romantic) love are simply tricks into getting you in a position where you will **have** to reproduce. And by becoming more and more civilized, we found that if we apply a certain commitment either in the manner of polygamy or monogamy, we'd get more productive individuals and generally a better standard of living. In order to cement this reproductional power, we'd bind love + sex in commitment using all manner of legal and societal pressures. Some of these pressures are considered draconian by today's standards, and rightly so, but others are not, namely those societal - the best example being slut shaming. Should be use legal methods to get our results - I don't believe so, because then we would be violating freedom of thought and freedom of association. But societal methods, the ones resulting from free speech and free thought, are definitely not - and seeing that religion today is divorced from law, it falls into that category.

The reason why societal methods work, and why law builds from them, and not the other way around, is because people have a greater degree of freedom when dealing with societal issues rather than legal issues. For example, slut shaming. No one is saying that a slut can't be 160+ IQ brain surgeon, or a productive member of community, or a great philanthropist. No one is doing anything to harm them directly. Men simply refuse to commit with such a person - and this is well within their rights of freedom of association. The main reason slut shaming is a "real" thing in today's feminism is because women still want to settle down - and for that, men need to exercise their freedom of association - which they do but by refusing to that. And any attack on that freedom will only cement the wedge between men and feminism, and by proxy, women.

The women will then respond to men's reaction to their revolution, and they'll go with the more traditional route - still well within their right of freedom of speech and association. And these women will be happier. So traditional ideas will once again become popular. Because if they don't, the very foundation of any civilization - contract between two sexes which produces more meat for the meat grinder, will shatter, and civilization along with it.

You don't have to do anything about it, you can simply look from the distance.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 04:23 AM

I agree, but I think we must also look at it from the perspective of human nature. Below is my own analysis

of your argument from a 'naturalistic' perspective.

Religion was a means to control the sexuality of females, and the impulsiveness of alpha males in order to create a functioning society. It is a noble lie, that has facilitated the creation of civilization; human civilization, with it's own laws and customs completely apart from nature.

However, the more "equal" (I wouldn't call it equal, but simply genderless, in the sense that we are discounting essential differences between the two sexes, that do exist. We are a sexually dimorphic species after all, with completely different drives and impulses. Of course, it would be equal if women weren't given a leg-up, but that's a discussion for another time.) we are becoming, the more natural impulsiveness is becoming commonplace. That's exactly why women only go after the so-called 'alpha males' or brutes, that can sexually dominate them and other men who threaten their power. This is because women want male power, but don't want to get their hands dirty, hence they seek out alpha males.

Edit: Yes, female sexuality was indeed controlled in earlier days. They weren't oppressed, but simply lived in monogamous pair bonds with beta males (contrary to nature, as they seek out alpha males), and beta males provided them with resources.

Now, I'm not talking down to alpha males, I'm simply stating the fact that alpha males were wanted by females because they possessed the traits that would allow a female and her offspring to survive. Yes, alpha males are only there to serve the female, but with the rise of monogamy, beta males could now provide resources and curb male/female nature to build a functioning society. The seeking out of alpha males is something that is primarily found in animals, but humans are also animals, and with the current setup, we've been launched 1/2 the way to how we actually want to reproduce. (Not monogamy, but alpha-male selection/massive beta male providers).

leftajar • 28 points • 24 April, 2014 08:10 PM

Many men are NOT natural ass-kickers. Work blows, and most of us need some incentive to suck it up.

Cue Marriage 1.0. "Do it for the kids," "Be a man," "Provide for your family."

Driven by those mantras, thousands of years' worth of betas sustained a *much higher economic output than they otherwise would have*. "Keep making money, and we'll guarantee you this piece of vagina for life." Pretty sweet deal for a beta!

What's the alternative? Betas become:

frustrated, angry, and most importantly dangerous.

Case in point: why is Islam so prone to suicide bombings? Simple: Islam allows polygamy. Meaning there are some males who don't get a female, ever. Suddenly 73 virgins in the afterlife sounds pretty good.

TL;DR: marriage 1.0 prevents the worst behavior in betas while encouraging them to increase their economic output "for the kids."

argyle_fox • 11 points • 25 April, 2014 02:18 AM

Dude I gotta call you out on the whole Islam suicide bombing polygamy thing. Polygamy in Islam was a direct response to supposed Betas dying in wars, working accidents etc. in order to protect widows, and orphans. Its essentially a societal safety net. Claiming that Polygamy is the direct cause of suicide bombings is just incorrect.

Suicide bombing are in part caused by the promise of 72 virgins, I'll concede that has an impact on their decisions, but the larger issue here is the indoctrination of young children into Islam (insert any religion here really) who then believe they are truly doing god/Allah's work.

This entire thread has disturbed me to a degree as the majority of religious ideals, though perhaps complying with TRP ideologies, are antiquated at best, and unnecessary.

OP fails to mention that some of the greatest civilizations were built on the backs of slaves with the top citizens reaping everything. No middle class. No betas.

I believe this thread is trying to equate a modern dilemma with historical events without proper context.

antidoxdevice • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 11:55 AM

Dude I gotta call you out on the whole Islam suicide bombing polygamy thing. Polygamy in Islam was a direct response to supposed Betas dying in wars, working accidents etc. in order to protect widows, and orphans. Its essentially a societal safety net.

It started that way sure, but dont pretend it hasnt been taken advantage of/corrupted by wealthy men and opportunistic women.

Cyralea[S] • 13 points • 24 April, 2014 08:27 PM

Case in point: why is Islam so prone to suicide bombings? Simple: Islam allows polygamy. Meaning there are some males who don't get a female, ever. Suddenly 73 virgins in the afterlife sounds pretty good.

This is quite insightful. Hadn't thought of that, but it makes perfect sense. ♂

trpbot[M] • 3 points • 24 April, 2014 08:27 PM

Confirmed: 1 point awarded to /u/leftajar by Cyralea. ^[History]

[This is an Automated Message]

colovick[] • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 02:02 AM

There was talk a week or so ago on here of a former Oxford professor who did research in this area of sociology. He came to the conclusion that regardless of the religion, this radical behavior is found in any society that allows polygamy.

YouDislikeMyOpinion • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 12:39 AM

I actually touched on this in my recent post in AR. You should check it out.

[deleted] 24 April, 2014 10:31 PM

[permanently deleted]

vaker • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 02:18 AM

Yet you live in a society where cultural Marxists, aka 'progressives' tell you what to think and how to live your life. Doesn't look much better to me.

Manuel_S • 0 points • 24 April, 2014 10:55 PM

Worse. They pretend to tell you how to think.

InebriatedMonkeys • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 10:58 PM

Islam does not allow polygamy. You are taking verses out of context.

I have been a Muslim all my life and have known hundreds if not thousands of Muslims. Only about 5 I have

ever met have had more than one wife, and they lived in Afghanistan

[deleted] • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 01:25 AM

Maybe not islam itself, but middle east culture is full of polygamy.

mbillion • 4 points • 24 April, 2014 11:28 PM

In practice it can and does - an ounce of action is worth a hundred words

InebriatedMonkeys • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 11:48 AM*

This is a cultural thing in some countries. It was happening for centuries before Islam. I think it's funny also how we realize here the reality of female behavior and how they act when they have their version of "equality", and we know western monogamy has become a complete joke that the vast majority of us would never advocate, yet there are still some of us that are so closed minded that we still see these things as so "wrong". That being said, Islam is **STRONGLY** pro-monogamy. In the Qur'an and the hadith (words of the prophet), the standards for being able to have more than wife were purposely made SO difficult that it was meant to be obvious in interpretation that it was virtually impossible. Not to mention that this was in a culture that could have as many wives as they pleased prior to Islam, and the "limit" set by Islam was 4, and only if you could meet the impossible, almost completely hypothetical standards that could allow you more than one even.

Also, keep in mind that A tiny minority's actions do not represent the entire belief system of over 1.2 billion people in the world.

On another note, I just realized how red pill those warlords/sheikhs with 20 wives are in those countries haha. Harems and all

antidoxdevice • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 11:58 AM*

Your two paragraphs are complete non sequiturs, it doesn't matter how many muslims you know and what they do, the quran and hadiths permit polygyny (my parents are muslim and I know the religion well).

InebriatedMonkeys • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 12:11 PM

I know my paragraphs were non-sequiturs. That's because I have read and researched in depth about what the Qur'an and hadith say about polygamy and I know that it does not permit polygamy, yet did not feel like going into a long discussion about it over the internet (and more you've lured me in lol). I know how to read with context in mind.

If you and your parents "know everything there is to know about Islam" (which is a sentence I don't believe any true Muslim should say btw, since you should always believe we know nothing and should learn more always), then please, enlighten me on the standards required for a man to have more than one wife. And also tell me why, oh wise one, that the vast majority of scholars believe it's not allowed

[deleted] • 0 points • 24 April, 2014 10:55 PM

good point about islam and polygamy. fundamental islam basically writes the 80/20 phenomena into law by allowing polygamy. rich men get many wives while poor men have almost no chance of finding a wife, and the poor men's only chance at finding any meaning in life or advancement in the social hierarchy may be to join the military or paramilitary and fight for a holy purpose. it's a fantastic system for creating a class of desperate men who are willing to give their lives for whatever the ruling classes want.

societies make so much more sense when you see how and why they choose channel each class' sexual urges. you also see the danger of not confining and channeling people's sexual urges.

vaker • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 02:16 AM

rich men get many wives while poor men have almost no chance of finding a wife

Notice that this is also in the females' interest. More than one of them have the rich male support them and their offspring. In a monogamous society only one wife would get the rich male's resources and the rest would have to get by with what the poor men have.

dray121212 • 49 points • 24 April, 2014 05:38 PM

Females need some type of external morality and ethics placed upon them, because they lack the ability to moderate themselves based on anything but their own emotions.

To be fair, most men need this too.

mozeiny • 16 points • 24 April, 2014 07:34 PM

I have no problems with atheism, but faulting religions for having external values of ethics and morals is wrong. Almost any religion, if followed to the core can be incredibly fruitful. Not just for women either.

colovick[] • 4 points • 24 April, 2014 11:24 PM

Who faulted religion for anything? It's a positive facet he listed that in part explains why it was so instrumental and attached to cultures so tightly...

[deleted] 25 April, 2014 12:22 AM

[permanently deleted]

colovick[] • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 02:17 AM

If so, it makes little sense in context... But then again, I read it as someone upset at religion being rationalized at all, so it may not matter what he meant...

mozeiny • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 03:36 AM

My comment was not in reference to OPs post. I was responding to dray121212. I was simply stating that viewing religion merely as an external standard of ethics is wrong.

colovick[] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 11:11 AM

He made no mention of religion, making your comment seem even more out of place

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 April, 2014 05:51 AM

Almost any religion, if followed to the core can be incredibly fruitful.

Is this some sort of metaphor about apples? If not, this statement is meaningless.

30303030303030 • 30 points • 24 April, 2014 07:35 PM

Catholic church got it right.

Man-woman marriage, no pre marriage sex make couples marry early in their twenties, lots of time for multiple pregnancies, men grow up faster because they become fathers early, no pregnancy prevention means lots of

babies, keeps women busy with family and men working harder, earning more, spending more, which is good for economy. Many kids = many tax payers = good for economy.

This obviously is true for 1st world countries. Africans and Indians should stop breeding, for their own sake.

You must be an idiot to fight with Catholic church. I don't go there but I support it. Only 2 happy marriages I know are between catholic couples, no zealots but they attend the mass every Sunday and every catholic holiday. I keep in touch with 1 couple and they are, after 15 years together, still happy and very much in love. The girl had only her husband inside. She doesn't believe in divorce, not that she wants one, simply not an option.

kempff • 6 points • 24 April, 2014 09:03 PM

Yes, and the contract still includes till death do they part and no divorce* as a way out so you had better choose wisely or not at all.

*skipping the nuances

ur218 • -1 points • 24 April, 2014 09:41 PM*

Fancy seeing you here

Edit: who the hell is downvoting me

kempff • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 10:50 PM*

I get around. I do have other sheep.

EDIT: Not me.

jerpta • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 05:34 PM

Ah, like Ireland?

Contraception was actually illegal there until 1979; it's still a very rural country outside of Dublin and frankly the only reason it has a functioning economy in many parts of the country is the low corporation tax rate which encourages foreign companies to invest.

Haraklus • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 10:14 PM

the only reason it has a functioning economy in many parts of the country is the low corporation tax rate which encourages foreign companies to invest

The above is true even of "some parts" of the US, Britain, or Germany.

Ireland has an exceptionally well developed and productive economy (in fact, better developed than Germany and Britain in many ways), I'm not sure what you're getting at here.

Haraklus • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 10:10 PM

This obviously is true for 1st world countries. Africans and Indians should stop breeding, for their own sake

Eh, we Westerners are a small fraction of the world's population, but we're dependent on almost all of the world's natural resources to sustain our lifestyle. Meanwhile the poorer countries of the world support very large populations while operating on only a fraction of their nation's resources, while the oligarchs sell the difference to rich foreigners for a pittance.

I'd say we Westerners need to cut back our numbers and learn how to live leaner lifestyles or we're going to get outcompeted by the hungry masses overseas.

[deleted] • -10 points • 24 April, 2014 10:03 PM

Yeah, Bluepillers still think organized pedophile rings are somehow bad!

30303030303030 • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 03:29 AM

there are bad apples everywhere, police, politics, doctors, teachers..., everywhere

[deleted] • -2 points • 25 April, 2014 11:20 AM

A man charged with covering up a network of pedophilia became the supreme leader of the organization. This is some hamster bullshit in this thread.

vengefully_yours • 5 points • 25 April, 2014 01:13 AM

The only good woman I ever dated/was involved with was an arab. We were engaged but didn't get married. She married a German and lives there, but we talk often about our lives. Been friends for over twenty years, and she trusts me. Anyway, she has had a dead bedroom for almost ten years now, but she won't leave him. Even when I divorced my second wife last year, she wouldn't leave him. I make as much money as he does, so that's not an issue. Its her religious upbringing that keeps her there when any American woman would branch swing despite having sex.

BTW, I'm atheist too.

renzy77 • 15 points • 24 April, 2014 06:10 PM

Excellent post. I had the same epiphany after swallowing the Red Pill as well. Before the Red Pill I really just viewed religion as a haphazard set of anachronistic rules that really didn't apply anymore in modern day society. But I now "get it" when it comes to the purpose of religion - it's a series of checks and balances on the destructive parts of human behavior, and a way to channel the positive parts of human behavior into aspiring for something higher.

Progressive attitudes will undo all of this, and lead to the fall of Rome. I don't believe in religion, but I believe in what religion stands for.

Agreed.

I remember hearing a quote once that *"Civilization is like a thin crust over a volcano, and liberals are constantly picking away at that crust."* Religion was part of that crust, and they've been chipping away at it for decades now.

kempff • 12 points • 24 April, 2014 07:25 PM*

I'm not an atheist but I play one on TV.

For me redpill thought boils down to this one line from the Bible:

"Unto the woman he said, I will greatly multiply thy sorrow and thy conception; in sorrow thou shalt bring forth children; and thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." - Genesis 3:16

God rarely if ever punishes sin; rather he abandons people to the natural consequences thereof (cf. Pharaoh), yet with each impending consequence he rearranges things to manage the fallout so as to leave room for hope for the future (cf. Noah).

Here he could have summarily executed Adam and Eve for having eaten the Apple; but mercy triumphs over judgment, and he imposed a containment policy that allowed them to live out the rest of their natural lives and generate the human race.

The key part of that containment policy relevant to redpill thought is the part about "thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee".

Now Man, even alone in the garden without the Woman, is in the image of God and bears a relation to creation analogous to God's: he rules over creation as a rational principle cooperating with natural processes to make the universe a better place. But a man has needs, and in order to become even more like God, God made Adam a helper for the task of procreation so that Man as a species should fully dominate nature; Woman is the complementary passive principle that makes it possible for Man to carry out his mission.

But the wrench in the works was that Adam allowed himself to be seduced by his wife into disobeying God, transgressing his commandment, abandoning his principles, subverting his mission, and choosing the immediate visible good over the ultimate invisible good.

So, to prevent Woman from acting too independently, redirecting Man away from his goal, the *novus ordo seclorum* will have her craving her husband's leadership and operating under his authority and management. And this order allows a humane and just society to thrive in spite of creation's inexorable downward spiral that Adam's sin initiated.

Bluepill and feminist thought are essentially contraventions of that order, but I've gone on long enough.

johngalt1234 • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 01:06 AM

Actually adam had prior authority over his wife. When you read Genesis. You should note that Adam called his wife: "Woman" and named her"Eve" the mother of all the living and to be the one naming someone is to have authority over them.

Only adam did not need to rule his wife because her subjection is automatic. Only after the curse is his wife who now has"desire" for her husband which is the same hebrew word for when sin is crouching at Cain's door desiring to dominate Cain. Hence because Eve now desired to usurp Authority over the man he has to "rule over her".

kempff • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 02:29 AM

Yes, he had naming rights over her too. This rabbit hole goes so deep your ears will pop on the way down.

What a shame most people stop reading at the talking snake.

Labarum • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 12:44 PM

You want to go even deeper, note that Genesis 3:6 mentions offhand that Adam was there the whole time when Eve and the serpent were having their exchange. The Fall of Man came about because man chose to passively stand by instead of taking the lead. God even specifically castigates Adam for listening to his wife instead of God.

Haraklus • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 10:16 PM

Adam got AMOG'd by a fucking talking snake. Beta as fuck.

vaker • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 01:32 AM*

Dealing with reality (red pill) instead of progressive brainwash leads people to notice additional inconvenient truths. You just rediscovered the concept of memetic realism from Neoreaction/Dark_Enlightenment. Congratulations and welcome to the club.

Memetic Realism ("Deep Heritage"): Traditional folkways tend to be real, i.e., non-ideological, and naturally arising adaptations to social realities, which therefore represent pretty good (at least) local solutions

to very (or intractably) complex problems;

Traditional religions simply codified ways of making human society work successfully. They also attempted to explain the universe in a pre-scientific era. Dropping those explanations, god(s), demons, creation, etc, leaves the working social core of the tradition. Even prayer can be viewed as an enforced mental health, meditation practice.

If you're interested in a more modern definition of irrational belief systems note that it doesn't require the existence of supernatural beings. For a definition think about the following:

a worldview not supported by science

members of the religion consider themselves superior to nonbelievers (outgroup)

imperative to proselytize, viral spreading of the meme.

On a closer look you can see that liberalism/progressivism fits this definition to a T:

Irrational belief in institutions and various equalities in spite of obvious gender and genetic differences and ample biological and statistical data proving the opposite.

Smug feeling of superiority

Dominating propaganda channels from mainstream media to academics. Zealous attacks of anybody daring to have a different view. For a recent example see the Mozilla CEO story.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 01:45 AM

Dealing with reality (red pill) instead of progressive brainwash[1] leads people to notice additional inconvenient truths.

Yup. Kind of makes me wonder why some of my former acquaintances from the atheist movement got "stuck" in their ways somehow, as last time I checked they are still "fighting the good fight" and trying to combat organized religion. It just didn't feel right to me so I started to distance myself from it. And now that I am really coming to terms with TRP, I'm beginning to see the overlap in the theory, religion, and politics.

The question that has to be dealt with in my mind now is, how are we going to be able to make this all work together? I have no problem kind of sitting in the sidelines of the mainstream, doing my own thing and following red pill practices based on theory, and let the rest of society go about their own way. Alpha fucks, beta bucks? I have absolutely no qualms about playing part in the former and simply observing, sometimes lamenting, but mostly laughing at the latter. Is this kind of thing sustainable, though?

At the end of the day, I can't help but feel I'm alienating myself more and more from the mainstream. Not that I regret swallowing the red pill. I just recognize that I have to deal with the reality molded by some handful of generations before me: the one that is based on fairy tales and fantasies about gender equality, the role of males *for* females in the the community, and the accepted outcome or path whenever individuals interact or engage in social dynamics.

vaker • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 02:07 AM*

Kind of makes me wonder why some of my former acquaintances from the atheist movement got "stuck" in their ways somehow.

Sometimes people invest too much of their ego in one thing and are incapable to admit that their investment was wasted. Ability to adjust one's views based on new information is the difference between the truly open minded, and those who think parroting the currently popular view somehow makes them 'open minded'.

I just recognize that I have to deal with the reality molded by some handful of generations before me:

the one that is based on fairy tales and fantasies about gender equality

The generally accepted view in this sub is that western societies are broken beyond repair, and the best one can do is enjoying the decline.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 02:13 AM

The thing is though I don't think those people even came to the realization that they might be wrong. It's like, organized religion is wrong, atheism is right, fuck everything else in their minds. I guess it just feels odd to me how their thinking has kind of plateaued right there, and I'm pretty much the only one who managed to move on to the next level of reading what's going on in society. And yup, we enjoy the ride while we still can.

Haraklus • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 11:00 PM

At the end of the day, I can't help but feel I'm alienating myself more and more from the mainstream. Not that I regret swallowing the red pill.

Do you have any RP or semi-RP friends or family?

[deleted] • 1 point • 26 April, 2014 01:12 AM

Absolutely not. I've a couple of friends who seem like they might have potential but they're both young and just coming into their own, and I don't want to be the guy to shove red pill down their throat. I mean, it's stuff that I didn't even need the red pill for when I realized them, so I figure there's a chance for others to do the same without having to deal with this whole other reality right away.

throwwhatthere • 6 points • 24 April, 2014 07:54 PM

Had a post about this on AlreadyRed the other day, reposting here FWIW:

I recently made a post reminding people of the fact that women are incapable of believing in higher principles than their feelz. I feel this is point is not given enough attention these days on TRP channels. That being said religion is the ultimate exception to this rule. I believe in many ways it can be viewed as a hack that men use to control women (for EVERYONE'S benefit). The genius of religion is that it marries a woman's feelz to a higher principle. It actually embraces irrationality and provides women with a strong man to control them, which as we know is what all women crave and need. Or to put it another way, god is the ultimate alpha male. You will never be more alpha than god. A woman who has been with god will never place you first. The best you can hope for is to be second to god, and to help her feel like she is complying with god's will. If you can place yourself between her and god, and serve as his representative to her, then she will eat out of the palm of your hand. But please do NOT try to play this game if you don't have the stomach for it. You will never out-alpha god for her affections. And honestly, it's a waste of both your time. Now, you can definitely fuck her, but please know you will only possess her body, not her mind. Any second tier male can get a romp in the sack (the woman does have physical needs) but the alpha will always own her mind. Think of a woman after god as the ultimate alpha widow.

vaker • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 02:32 AM

Very interesting thought, thank you!

Timmytanks40 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 06:53 AM

Women are going to school more than they ever have and are becoming less and less religious. Even if you

found one like this. How appealing could she be? She probably wouldn't make much money and I don't like fairytales so what's she have to offer? Is TRP about finding a partner on any level or is the need to bustanut clouding the air?

throwwhatthere • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 02:30 PM

Friend, no one said it was gonna be easy. Hell, I've been at it for ten years now and still haven't found wife material (though this latest LTR is promising). Anything worth having is worth working for.

Timmytanks40 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 05:28 PM

TRP isn't trying to find a wife tho. Most guys here are just sad and blueballed to anger. It's tragic.

[deleted] • 6 points • 24 April, 2014 10:00 PM*

another interesting bit about religion is the true reason behind the hatred of homosexuality in most ancient cultures, particularly male homosexuality. it was a grievous sin in most ancient cultures because ancient societies needed the men to look after women and beget children. if men were allowed to live a gay lifestyle, then they wouldn't produce any offspring (future fodder for war), they wouldn't marry and support any wives, and they wouldn't work as hard because they didn't have to worry about supporting a family. this would also mean less tax revenue for the state.

allowing homosexuality in the ancient world would create a small class of unmarried childless women who needed welfare to survive and small class of underachieving gay men who only provided for themselves. families and the state did not want to provide welfare for those unmarried women for their entire lives, so homosexuality was considered a crime against society. homophobia was always intended to force men to work harder to support women and provide future soldiers and tax revenue for the crown.

of course, it was also intended to force women to marry and bear children instead of living for themselves. the image of devil-worshipping lesbian witches was spread to make women do what the state needed them to do.

religion was the best tool to enforce these laws. with religion, you don't even need to make a rational argument to convince people and control thought. you just make threats and blame all natural disasters on whatever behaviors the state doesn't like.

vaker • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 01:43 AM

with religion, you don't even need to make a rational argument to convince people

Most people can't understand rational arguments.

I'd also replace 'state' in your argument with 'society'. A successful society needed soldiers to defend it from aggressive neighbors, etc.

RedSpectrum • 12 points • 24 April, 2014 05:51 PM **[recovered]**

I too am a strong atheist and I got into a heated debate with another redpiller about religion and conservatism but he argued society needs religion for exactly the reasons you just wrote. Oddly, enough he too was an atheist but he saw the need for religion as a guide and to combat the far left and progressivism in Western societies

I now see what he was arguing is true to a degree.

However, on a personal level, I will disagree on a religion as a whole. It is thought control and has been that way for a long time. What better way to consolidate social influence by making everyone stay in line and obey without question?

Correct me if I'm mistaken but you do not religion in order to exert power over women by preventing them from

sleeping around. Many societies, if not all, throughout history are patriarchal and many males preferred a virgin bride without evoking their faith.

My two cents.

vaker • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 03:28 AM

I will disagree on a religion as a whole. It is thought control

Correct. Now broaden your horizon a bit. Is progressivism not thought control? (It is, you're just supposed to believe in different things.)

Cyralea[S] • 7 points • 24 April, 2014 06:01 PM

I think the problem with this attitude is that it works by external control rather than internal. In external systems women are kept in line because they fear the consequences of the law, social stigmas, peer disapproval, etc. With internal systems women keep *themselves* in line because it appeals to their own sense of morality (however distorted it may be). Some women will try to circumvent external policies, particularly if they feel they can get away with it. Far fewer women will bypass their internal morality.

I think a secular version of functioning society would be something like Sweden, but look how pacified and pathetic it is to be a man there. Their society only continues to exist the way it does because of how effeminate and weak (albeit happy) the men there are.

Again, no successful societies with angry, frustrated men.

soulmatter • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 09:58 PM

I guess you have an alternative. I would like to hear it. Remember that even religion can be subverted and must evolve with the times.

[deleted] • 8 points • 24 April, 2014 07:55 PM

I do not understand the obsession with neoreactionary thought in so much of the manosphere. I haven't finished forming my thoughts on it yet, but I don't think I agree with much of it.

I got into a small conversation recently with a neoreactionary/monarchist type and asked him about his view on a concept that is fundamental to me: liberty. His reply required some chewing upon. He said that liberty can improve the natural tendency of people to flourish *if* they have demonstrated what he called "a virtuous character." In other words, liberty can be granted to those found to be worthy thereof. I don't understand how that could be considered to be anything other than a well-dressed tyranny.

A man has a certain inherent right to himself and his space, a right which does not require affirmation or gifting by any authority, great or small.

As for religion... Religion is the original hamster. It puts forward contradictory assertions about reality and tells you to forget that they aren't in line with the evidence because the framework put forward is useful in practice. Religion encourages you to be dependent, supplicating, and fearful instead of confident, self-sustaining, and in control. There is nothing good unique to religion that could not, conceivably, be accomplished through other, more logical and straightforward means. Something more consistent and less attached to the fearful infancy that man has outgrown.

steadymotion • 3 points • 24 April, 2014 11:45 PM

You're thinking at least one level too low here. You're just thinking of how these things apply to your own life. Sure, for someone like you religion isn't necessary, but think bigger. Put yourself in the shoes of someone who is responsible for many people, someone who can see the lives of each individual and

understand them: their motivations, their worries, their happiness. It doesn't matter what's wrong with religion or with monarchy or tyranny or whatever other method of control. What matters is whether these things work to bring order to the chaotic lives of the masses of people.

If you are wise you will understand that something doesn't have to make sense, doesn't have to be logical, doesn't have to be *true* in order for it to be valuable. Lies are often much more valuable than truth, much more practical. Truth and freedom are reserved only for a small few, who make the decision to seek it, and who have to chase it all their lives and earn the right and responsibility to use it. The average person who just wants to live a normal life and experience simple pleasures doesn't want to have to deal with big truth and responsibility. They just want to live in an orderly society where they can go about their lives relatively free from fear.

A man has a certain inherent right to himself and his space, a right which does not require affirmation or gifting by any authority, great or small.

No, man has no rights but those that he somehow acquires for himself by his action and the action of those around him. You decide what you think your rights are, and all the people around you also make their decision about what they think your rights are. The two parties may or may not agree. There are no guarantees, but having some sort of government in place allows for something close to guaranteed rights.

Cyralea[S] • 6 points • 24 April, 2014 08:12 PM

Provide one example of a secular, self-governing, unified thought-controlling tool as effective as religion. No secular system has come close.

For whatever incorrect ideas they have about the way the nature works, it's still incredibly useful as a tool for shaping successful societies. I don't see that as being possible without something that at least mimics a religion.

redpillshadow • 6 points • 24 April, 2014 09:55 PM

And it is also an incredibly useful tool to destroy societies.

Like the religion of feminism and equality right now is attacking our society.

The thought-controlling part is what makes religion so powerful. But it doesn't make it good. And religion itself (the whole belief in a higher power and punishment/ redemption) has nothing to do with the morals attached to it. As soon as you have people believing in GOD you can make them do anything. It is foolish to believe those in control of "the voice of God" will use it to stabilize and future society instead of their own personal gain.

When you use religion to build your society you include a time bomb which can destroy that society at any time depending on who is in control.

vaker • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 02:30 AM

When you use religion to build your society you include a time bomb which can destroy that society at any time depending on who is in control.

Can you think of any society in history without religion? Current 'secular western' societies are governed by the religion of progressivism.

RedFlagsAreGood • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 01:03 PM

Provide one example of a secular, self-governing, unified thought-controlling tool as effective as religion.

Progressivism.

colovick[] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 01:46 AM

For liberty, a good comparison is in money... You earn your wage and you decide how to invest it... Whether you buy food, buy shelter, pay for education, any of that is investing in that product to further yourself. If you manage it well, you invest excess money in things that generate more money for you and you begin to reach freedom of trading your time for money. If you manage it poorly, going into debt for things you don't have the money to afford and you leverage yourself too much, you enter a cycle of slavery to the lenders of your money. The same applies to concepts like liberty in his example.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 08:45 PM

Your friend was saying that giving an inherently evil person liberty is the single worst thing you could do, as it would lead to a spree of heinous crimes, or something to that effect.

This is why prisons exist -- to restrict someone's liberty.

tyranus89 • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 08:10 PM

It's hard to debate that religion is used as a tool to stabilize early civilizations/societies. However, getting them to a point of organization predates organized religion. The conclusion is that there had to be some mode of rational unity amongst men.

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 12:16 AM

I'm an atheist.

I've always come to the conclusion that religion was an absolute necessity as we developed societies, as it created the basis of law and order that was more effective than Hammurabi's Code of "an eye for an eye". However, I think that as we become more and more developed, we should drop it in favor of ideologies that make more sense so we don't have to pretend that there's a magic man that watches over everything.

I'd be curious to see if there would be a way to implement some of the teachings of religion into society without having to put up with the dogma of it. This post made a hell of a lot of sense. I wish we'd be able to explain why certain restrictions were necessary for a functioning society without having to disguise it as the will of a magical man.

FLFTW16 • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 02:54 AM

I'd be curious to see what other atheists make of this.

I've been raised Catholic, became an atheist in college, then a Buddhist, now I am just apathetic. But coming full circle I appreciate my Catholic upbringing more and more the older I become.

I'd say the fundamental shift in paradigm has to do with understanding human nature. Old world religions, the big 3 at least, view humans as naturally sinful. The Old Testament gives us the story of the great flood. Humanity was basically a cesspool of selfishness. We were 3 hairs away from the apes. Almost no ability to reason. Rape, murder, war were endemic. Humans were BAD and needed to be controlled. Religion was the method for controlling and guiding humans throughout their lives. The Sacraments of the Catholic church are ingrained rituals that are experienced throughout life. At every milestone from birth to marriage to death, the church was there to teach, mentor, prepare, guide, and counsel its "flock." A vital part of this was to control access to sex through marriage. One man + one woman virginal marriage is the best way to keep civilization humming along nice and smoothly. Control of female sexuality allows for control of male resources, children are more likely than not to have parents raising them and keeping them loyal to the church. The circle of life

continues.

The modern shift in paradigm no longer sees humans as naturally evil or sinful or weak. The liberal 21st century paradigm is that humans are basically good and just need to be properly educated. Morality is decoupled from religion. Sexuality is unleashed entirely with no counterweight to slow it down. People are encouraged to be "sex positive" and try and "experience" things. Fatherhood is seen as irrelevant. Men are increasingly seen as irrelevant or even a burden, and now boys are seen as troublesome or incapable of control in the classroom--they can't help it, after all they will grow up to be irrelevant men. Of course even though sexuality was liberated for women, it means sexuality was tainted or ruined for men. No more virginal brides. No more guidance and control from the Church from birth until death. No counterweight. Since the Church is no longer in the spotlight at all we see new movements sprouting up to fill the void. Conservative/identity politics is one way the older generation is rebelling against the current status quo. TRP might be another example. The point is that unrestrained sexuality is detrimental to half of society, so that half will form some reaction. The liberal paradigm that "people are generally good" is widely rejected by men over 30. The older men get, the more wise they become to the world and they realize how power structures work, who gets access to sex and how, who reproduces and who doesn't, who is in control and who isn't, etc.

tl;dr: the Church once restrained humans and made sure the goodies of society (sex and reproduction) were distributed as fairly and evenly as possible. Now that the church is irrelevant, control of sex has been given up and new structures are being created to react to the ensuing chaos.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 04:49 AM

I like the way you think.

ur2l8 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 04:09 PM

You can understand the usefulness of religion as a tool (i.e. its culturally anthropological context) and still be religious for very logical reasons. Indeed, recognizing this utility gives further corroboration to religious beliefs. I'm a Catholic convert, actually, having converted strictly off the philosophical discrepancies behind an atheistic worldview. You should read some Edward Feser.

[deleted] • 2 points • 26 April, 2014 11:44 AM

Just to add my two cents. I consistently hear "athiests believe nothing happened to nothing and then something happened LOLLOLLOLLzers."

Then you ask "Well.. what created God?" "YOU CANNOT FATHOM BEFORE GOD!!!!!!!!!!!!!! SIN!!!!!!!!!!!!"

Ok.. I'm crazy believing "nothing happened to nothing", but no background check on a deity is perfectly acceptable. You go Glenn CoCo

SlickJamesBitch • 4 points • 24 April, 2014 07:18 PM

Chistianisty and Islams core is submission, God is a Dom. It's sacrifice of life now for a masturbatory fantasy, church is like jerking off your soul. Men do not need religion, we are our own Gods. Studies show once a woman has sex and she was previously religious she butts her religion on the back-burner, why, because men and God are no different.

Cyralea[S] • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 07:24 PM

I disagree, the extent to which it happens is far less. The number of slutty women with dozens of partners is a lot less in say, Saudi Arabia than it is in Arizona. There will be some deviants to be sure, but consider how much less likely a woman is to be deviant if her entire reputation (or her life) were on the line for it.

SlickJamesBitch • -2 points • 24 April, 2014 08:23 PM

Well there's culture as well, being a slut can get you stoned but I don't know about Saudi Arabia, I clump all middle eastern countries into the same blob.

shadowq8 • 1 point • 27 April, 2014 09:32 AM

I would rather make assumptions about countries because that is the best way to analyze anything.

FTFY

Revarent • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 03:12 PM*

It's great to see men who are smart enough not to be religious but still understand why it exists beyond "I wanna believe in the man in the sky criticisms". To be completely dismissive of it is to deny a vital part of humanity and its social evolution.

Religion is a tool. It has been a very effective one for thousands of years. Each of them have a core of truth and bits and pieces of value. Just have to know how to think about it.

ur2l8 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 04:05 PM

You can understand the usefulness of religion as a tool (i.e. its culturally anthropological context) and still be religious for very logical reasons. I'm Catholic, for example.

[deleted] • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 10:09 PM

Sorry guys, but (for now, at least) you're not gonna get what you want.

For the very simple reason that religion does not exist in a vacuum. It comes in a package - a package that ultimately boils down to FEAR.

That's right - when foragers had to become farmers, they had to learn to live in constant fear. Since basic human hypocrisy doesn't permit saying that sort of thing out loud, they invented (unconsciously, of course) all sort of reasons to justify that fear - such as vengeful gods who take a keen interest in your sex life.

Now that increases in productivity have largely removed fear, people have gone back to reckless (from a farmer's point of view) forager ways - because that's what comes naturally to humans.

You can't turn back time. The only way to get what you want is a return to subsistence.

mbillion • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 11:27 PM

That is a ridiculous over simplification and a denigrating view of humanity. If that is what you think we are then why the fuck are you on a computer

[deleted] • -1 points • 25 April, 2014 12:12 AM

Your hindbrain doesn't like what it heard, but your forebrain cannot come up with a reply - so you end up sounding like a butthurt feminist.

[deleted] 25 April, 2014 12:50 AM*

[permanently deleted]

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 01:27 AM

<http://www.overcomingbias.com/2010/10/fear-made-farmers.html>

<http://www.overcomingbias.com/2010/12/romans-foreshadow-industry.html>

Point is, you can't have farmer-like self-control and material plenty at the same time. We're gonna have to learn from foragers, who coordinate to suppress (relative) status-seeking.

vaker • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 01:39 AM

While is general Hanson is extremely smart, on this issue I strongly disagree with him. Hunter-gatherers also have religions and various vindictive, trickster, etc gods.

[deleted] • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 01:44 AM

<http://media.247sports.com/Uploads/Assets/407/511/511407.gif>

mbillion • -1 points • 25 April, 2014 01:27 AM

Hindbrain? forebrain? no man. I am in business and I understand what this woman is saying.

One does not rise to the position of CEO without being a boss - regardless of sex.

Check your own self, I am no feminist, but I can understand feeling bad about firing somebody despite it being a technical part of my job.

[deleted] • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 01:31 AM

<https://i.chzbgr.com/maxW500/4338688512/h44E5BD0B/>

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 07:33 PM

A society would expand by reproduction and the individuals were connected by blood. The limit to a society's expansion lies in the reproduction rate, but it is exponential. That means as societies compete, the largest society will outgrow the others faster and there is nothing to make the reproduction rate faster as it is limited by puberty. War is no good solution since the largest army usually wins the battle and technologies and strategies are quickly adapted by rivaling societies.

Organized religion allows a society to grow faster than the rate of reproduction allows since by conversion you can include people who are not blood-related to your group. This is why organized religion became so powerful, it was needed for a civilization to survive the competition. This is also why organized religion was totalitarian, it was needed to maintain society and in competition with blood allegiance.

After the industrial revolution production effectivity became much more important than the amount of soldiers you could amass, therefore organized religion was abandoned and exists as a mere shadow today. The state has replaced a God as object of worship, devotion and mortal fear. Power struggles have moved into obscurity as the population live in blindness, conditioned to be unaware and ignorant.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 05:00 AM

Thank you TRP for a very informative thread.

F@ck University, I have learned more on this subject from this thread, than in my 40 years on Earth.

bigyellowtwinki • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 05:38 AM

You're also forgetting that before modern medicine women could, and often did, die giving childbirth. It was deadly to be promiscuous, and societies needed to develop a way to protect their populations, so virginity became a virtue. Old civilizations would also make eunuchs out of their extra males, especially in polygamous cultures. It's kind of funny how nothing seems to change, our gammas and betas are self-made eunuchs and our polygamous alphas don't marry the "wives" (plates) but pass them onto the beta-eunuchs to provide.

I'm close to agreeing with you, but not quite.

Successful societies allow more people to thrive by controlling the worst behaviours in humans, and by favouring the middle at the expense of the top.

To me, this has a sort of "we're successful, and this is how our modern society is formed, ergo success looks like this" feel to it, which as a libertarian I strongly disagree with. Our modern society which is becoming ever more leftist is for sure moving towards this model but it doesn't mean we have achieved success, in fact we more growth and happiness during the capitalistic industrial revolution, there's a lot of signs that this leftist behavior where the needs of the poor are met by the rich may not last.

I'd like to throw out a candidate for a definition of a "good society" which should include the society being more productive than the sum of its parts, specialization is key, a tribe of 500 people who all specialize into their own field and then trade goods between them peacefully are stronger and more capable of protecting their future generations than a tribe of 500 people who all try and do everything by themselves and are bad at all of those things.

Allowing betas a chance at marriage and procreation prevents them from becoming frustrated, angry, and most importantly dangerous.

This is just down to biology, in humans we have a very long pregnancy time where the woman is weak and unable to be very productive, she's also vulnerable. Children are not born fully developed they require a good 4 years protection from their mother, breast feeding etc, and then don't become productive and able to fend for themselves, or able to even reproduce until about 13-15 years old.

Evolution, the practice of passing on your traits is not just about passing on your genetic material, it's about bringing offspring to an age where they're likely to reproduce, otherwise you're a genetic dead end. Which is why evolution has favoured traits that cause long term bonding between the father and mother because successfully raising a child is infinitely more successful as a family unit.

Religion is partly just a societal expression of that, a naive attempt to understand the bonding mechanics between humans and codify it.

I think you have the cause and effect backwards, religion doesn't cause the family unit, it's an expression of a biological reality that humans are stuck with. Beta men aren't "allowed" marriage and procreation, they get it because typically it's good strategy to form a family unit and for the male to help protect the growth of the child, that pair bonding means generally speaking you get a 1:1 man to woman pair up, 10's look for 10's, 9's look for 9's, etc, because people would rather raise a child with someone with less value than is ideal than not do it at all.

The "top 20% of males" could sleep around as much as they wanted back in the day and then simply fuck off else where, but a single "average" male who stuck by his single offspring to protect and raise it has a much greater chance of his genes surviving than 20 abandoned females left to fend for themselves during their weakest and most vulnerable point in their lives.

Like you I'm an atheist, I don't believe religion is a force for good in the world, It's my opinion that religion is just a placeholder for a society to help cope with things they don't understand, it primarily offers comfort in the absence of the ability to understand your surroundings, it may even be a necessary part of successfully transitioning from a biologically ruled society into an intellectual one. But I just don't think the family unit was a creation of religion, that a clear creation of evolution.

Very interesting discussion though.

Everything you summed up has already been layed out in anthropology. As a Catholic, I obviously believe there is more to it than this--the evidence you and others have presented only further corroborates my beliefs.

TRPsubmitter • 2 points • 24 April, 2014 06:49 PM

Pacification has always been a function of religion. It's how the catholic church ruled europe de facto for centuries.

"Religion is the opiate of the masses" as it goes.

Cosmicandy • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 06:02 PM*

Where does the refusal to eat pork and wear mixed fabrics in clothing come into all this?

In all seriousness, even though I don't believe in any deity, I wonder if religion is "worth it". Sure, it does a good job of making a cohesive productive society, but it also makes us irrationally angry and dangerous over both scientific discovery AND trivial nonsense like mixed fabrics in clothing.

kempff • 7 points • 24 April, 2014 06:24 PM

You seem to think this submission is about religion. It is not. Read it again and elevate your thoughts to something more general than a knee-jerk reaction to keywords.

johngalt1234 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 01:18 AM

Ritual purity.

RS73 • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 09:27 PM

it also makes us irrationally angry and dangerous over both scientific discovery

From The Enlightenment on through to the tech revolution of the last couple of decades, the world's greatest scientific and social advancements have taken place *in the Christian West*.

redpillshadow • -1 points • 24 April, 2014 10:01 PM

Or in the de facto atheist Europe.

RS73 • 1 point • 26 April, 2014 08:26 PM

In other words, you classify the West as a repressively Christian ogre when it suits you and "de facto atheist" when your argument falls on its face. You're full of shit.

Voltaire's Europe was "de facto atheist"? The jet engine was invented in a still solidly Christian England. There are millions of other examples. Again, you're full of shit.

mbillion • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 11:26 PM

I am an a bonafide atheist. I see no problem with this. So long as you really do not believe that there is an invisible friend who absolves all wrong you do I am ok with it.

The fact is - not killing people, robbing your neighbors, and controlling societal interaction is what the cultural elite do in every culture

So the game is played. If you want success you need to realize it and use it to your favor

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 11:54 PM

I stopped calling myself an atheist about a couple of years ago and even drifted away from the local atheist movement after getting involved in it for a while. It was miserable, the lot of them losers and beta fucks craved

for attention while decrying the perceived sad state of affairs going on in the lives of overtly religious people (who were leading happy lives for the most part, by the way). But I'm still a firm non-believer, only now that I've really come to terms with TRP, I've begun to start looking back into religion and religious texts, mainly because a lot of red pill theory proves much of its tenets right.

I still haven't got the time to spend thinking about this subject fully, so thanks for posting this. I agree that religion really plays a huge role in the thought control of the masses, and now that I think of it, there's just very little chance that society can progress any faster in terms of de-converting people from their religions; it's like /u/Whisper said in his analogy about culture. Religious culture and red pill theory can work hand in hand. Until atheists and other non-believers can come up with a better plan for controlling the thoughts and behaviour of the masses, I'd rather leave the system that's already in place than break it down and see utter chaos unfold.

Side note: anyone else in the process of reconciling their own thoughts about red pill theory and the basis/core tenets of most religions?

redpillshadow • 0 points • 24 April, 2014 09:35 PM

Not anymore.

Religion was a quick and ugly fix to a complicated problem. How to get a stable, successful working society going relatively smooth.

For that to happen the people need to agree on morals, rules and limits to freedom. Religion achieves that agreement via lies and fear. And thus needs additional cuts into freedom so these lies and the terror aren't the downfall of the society. Religion stands for the control, religion doesn't stand for the morals, do not confuse them.

We are in the age of enlightenment and information highways. Keeping religion up would require crass cuts into that. Up to a point where we are very effectively blocking the betterment of society just for the sake of having a society. Some of the smartest and most productive men would put all their effort in bringing religion down. Religion is just not a valid answer anymore to the challenge we are facing nowadays in building and maintaining a society.

vaker • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 01:44 AM

We are in the age of enlightenment

We are in an age of propaganda brainwash and thought control.

Some of the smartest and most productive men would put all their effort in bringing religion down.

Longish, multipart read, but worth it: part1

[deleted] • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 07:41 PM*

The show Gigolos is a great example of this. In the last season a new gigolo from Tennessee started on the show. He has some trouble with his family that want him to come back home and have a family. Eventually his brother comes to visit him in Vegas and is told the truth that he's a gigolo.

Younger brother is an unattractive schlub while his brother (Bradley) is scoring with lots of women and getting paid for it. He lives a life of luxury while his brother just reminds him of the church and what's expected of him. Bradley is one of those people that will always get women and have everything he wants but his fat brother has to bring him down because we can't have men out there leading such a wonderful life, can we?

jonforthewin • 1 point • 24 April, 2014 10:47 PM

OP, you should read Sodom & Gamora. The nuclear family (and similar family models) is the foundation of civilization.

Separate thought:

When I was a teenager I thought I was an atheist. A few experiences (speaking to a lot of DMT users, and people who had NDEs) led me to agnosticism, then after discovering the Electric Universe and looking at the mountain of collective ancient testimony of past events I know there "is God".

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 12:03 AM

I've long suspected that religion was spread by incel monks to kill hypergamy.

shadowq8 • 1 point • 27 April, 2014 09:27 AM

what is going to happen with a bunch of outcasts in a hedonistic society ? In modern days they join the Neo Atheism movement and go out of their way to be pricks... in the old days I would assume that is how raiders form...

edit: I think that perfectly describes what is so called a Beta... Outcasts in a hedonistic society..

xantris • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 03:08 AM*

Fellow atheist here.

Do I believe religion leads to a more stable family unit and gender roles? Yes. However, I think you greatly overestimate how important that is in modern society.

You have little need to look further than the current spread of countries to see that religion has a net negative affect in modern society. It inhibits free thinking, intellectual pursuits, and innovation. The Middle east, South America, Africa, and many of the less enviable south Pacific nations are all heavily religious. They are also some of the worse places on the planet to live.

Even the United States, which is quite religious for a 1st world country, is starting to fall (far) behind in quality of life and education compared to less religious countries. Quality of life is dominated by nonreligious countries, and I don't think thats a coincidence.

I'm far more concerned about religious zealotry destroying the world than some dude not getting any ass. Hell it won't be long and he'll be able to get all the virtual/robot pussy he wants, meanwhile the religious zealots will still be crazy as fuck and they'll just have access to more and dangerous weapons.

Slutlord-Fascist • -2 points • 24 April, 2014 10:01 PM*

This is an ignorant shitpost, and normally I wouldn't bother refuting it, but I'm going to so that perhaps a few ardent redpillers aren't lead astray. As a Protestant, I can tell you that you misunderstand a lot of the core ideas about religious conservatism and cultural roots.

Your statement that patriarchal societies control women's sexuality so that "betas" have a chance at sex is wrongheaded post hoc reasoning. It's nonsense. While patriarchal society ensures male-female pairing, patriarchal society encourages the health and existence of the community as a whole.

Patriarchal societies control sexuality because it prevents illegitimate children from burdening the rest of society. Currently, in a post-feminist America, women are empowered to be single mothers. Their children are poorly-behaved and emotionally unstable, liable to become criminals, and a cost to taxpayers. Aside from that, children raised in single parent homes are less likely to create stable families in the future, which means that there is less chance of the overall society remaining intact.

With regard to contraception, it isn't about female sexuality as it is the purpose of procreation.

In A.D. 195, Clement of Alexandria wrote, "Because of its divine institution for the propagation of man, the seed is not to be vainly ejaculated, nor is it to be damaged, nor is it to be wasted" (The Instructor of Children 2:10:91:2).

Until very recently, sexual activity without the purpose of procreation was frowned upon in the Christian church.

John Calvin said, "The voluntary spilling of semen outside of intercourse between man and woman is a monstrous thing. Deliberately to withdraw from coitus in order that semen may fall on the ground is doubly monstrous. For this is to extinguish the hope of the race and to kill before he is born the hoped-for offspring."

ur2l8 • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 04:03 PM

Protestant

Catholic here, just curious as to why you're protestant.

Slutlord-Fascist • 0 points • 25 April, 2014 05:20 PM

It's a trade off. Unlike some Prots, I have a deep respect for the Catholic church, and I would gladly convert if I didn't find some of the teachings objectionable. Protestantism has its own problems (mainline Protestants are terrible, evangelicals are dumb, etc.) but it suits me best.

Proud2BGay • 0 points • 24 April, 2014 09:30 PM*

Patton Oswalt has a piece regarding this as well. [Link](#)

edit: Didn't see this was already posted here, my mistake

[deleted] 25 April, 2014 01:08 AM*

[permanently deleted]

vaker • 3 points • 25 April, 2014 01:29 AM

However, the more advanced we are becoming, the more natural impulsiveness is becoming commonplace.

It's highly debatable that social 'progress' is making us more advanced.

[deleted] • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 03:12 AM*

That's not what I meant.

My meaning is that in societies which are "equal", and genderless sociology becomes popular, **natural** impulses and drives manifest themselves. Without affirmative action, men would literally dominate Science faculties, while women would dominate Social Sciences (lol).

With natural impulses now being expressed, females are in a hyperbolic overdrive mode, and seek out the highest-tier men. Of course, this is a hell of a lot more complex, and if you're interested, I'd advise you to watch stardusk's videos.

advanced

My wording is quite bad, I should replace 'advanced' with something else, I wouldn't say we're getting more advanced in the sociological sense, as we really try hard to shy away from understanding primal human impulses. Thanks for pointing that out.

vaker • 1 point • 25 April, 2014 03:50 AM

Makes sense, thanks for the clarification!

[deleted] • 2 points • 25 April, 2014 04:18 AM

I just hope I don't get down-voted to oblivion by the trad-con lurkers, or the "Alphas" who are really just PUAs masquerading as red-pillers, and don't possess the necessary mental acuity to understand anything about the red-pill or human nature.

To them, if I were to say female sexuality **was** controlled, they would equate me to a feminist, and say that I am implying they are oppressed. This is completely false, as I say above, and laughable because I am a MGHOW/MGTOW.