

# Briffault's Law [Refresher]

April 28, 2014 | 121 upvotes | by [redpillschool](#)

---

Just reposting Briffault's Law since it's been a while.

## BRIFFAULT'S LAW:

The female, not the male, determines all the conditions of the animal family. Where the female can derive no benefit from association with the male, no such association takes place.

There are a few corollaries I would add:

- Past benefit provided by the male does not provide for continued or future association.
- Any agreement where the male provides a current benefit in return for a promise of future association is null and void as soon as the male has provided the benefit (see corollary 1)
- A promise of future benefit has limited influence on current/future association, with the influence inversely proportionate to the length of time until the benefit will be given and directly proportionate to the degree to which the female trusts the male (which is not bloody likely).

[Read More here](#)

---

Archived from [theredarchive.com](#)

---

## Comments

---

[deleted] • 39 points • 28 April, 2014 04:13 PM\*

Eddie Murphy raw - What have you done for me lately?

[deleted] • 6 points • 28 April, 2014 04:29 PM

This should be on the sidebar.

[deleted] • 12 points • 28 April, 2014 05:15 PM\*

Enjoy:

Eddie Murphy raw - Half

[deleted] • 22 points • 28 April, 2014 05:09 PM

To be fair to women, in the grand scheme of things, Briffault's Law is 100% rational and logical.

As said many times before here, honor is a male abstraction, and it does not apply to women. Reason being there is no real benefit to a woman being honorable.

Briffault's Law is just the most pragmatic way for a human to live when you throw out the honor/loyalty thing.

deptii • 7 points • 28 April, 2014 11:37 PM

Still, it doesn't say a lot for women when the vast majority of them wouldn't stay by their man if he was unable to find a job. Really helps kick them off that pedestal though.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 02:17 AM

Could you elaborate on the "honor as a male abstraction" thing? I don't think I really understand it well.

Sleep-less • 7 points • 29 April, 2014 06:27 AM\*

I treat you with a certain degree of respect when I first meet you, you probably do the same. I will, within reason, try and help you if I see you struggling. If you drop a load of shit on the floor that is going to take you a few minutes to pick up, I will lend you a hand if I can. It is not in any way shape or form beneficial for me to help you using my resources (time) to help you (a stranger)(like I am attempting to do now, as all red pillers do, you give a little and receive a little in return).

I also agree to not harm or hinder you if you do not threaten me. It's an unwritten social contract that we both agree to that eliminates most of the "dog eats dog" and "survival of the fittest" mentality that would make your day to day life very life or death.

It keeps competition for resources a little "friendlier". If we are competing for the same woman, job or the last bottle of my favourite beer, I'm agreeing not to crack your face to get it.

I'm also agreeing not to fuck your significant other. Honour is men agreeing we aren't going to fuck each other over to get what we want. You have this contract with your friends your father and sons. It is held to higher standards with those closer to you as you invest more into the relationship.

A vast majority of women don't have honour and don't understand the concept other than the benefits it provides them. An honourable man will defend and provide for women (not my opinion but the general consensus of what "honourable" men do).

It's abstract because you haven't made any of these agreements with others, but they are expected to be

enforced.

This is a very broad overview that hopefully answers your question. The statements above do not necessarily reflect my opinion or truth of any kind. They just aim to answer your question. An honourable man in general adheres to this social contract.

[deleted] • 6 points • 29 April, 2014 01:13 PM

A vast majority of women don't have honour and don't understand the concept other than the benefits it provides them. An honourable man will defend and provide for women (not my opinion but the general consensus of what "honourable" men do).

Many great points. However, saying that women don't understand honor is bullshit. What is chivalry then? It's women understanding and using male honor to get what they want.

While you're right that men primarily understand and implement honor, the reality is that women also understand it but instead chose to exploit men with it.

Sleep-less • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 02:52 PM

I did say other than the benefits it provides them, and I think chivalry falls under that category. I didn't really have time to go into a lot of detail as I wrote that on the way to work. Thanks for your input and clarifications.

Sleep-less • 3 points • 29 April, 2014 06:41 AM\*

As an interesting side experiment think about someone you personally know and consider to be a great leader. Think about their qualities and think about how they benefit you. Take the abstract and put it into real terms.

I have a great video I can link when I get home from work that covers the subject. Being a great leader is good social proof and can really paint you in a good light with friends of friends in your social circle and do a lot of the legwork for you, taking a lot of effort out of approaches when you try to fuck them.

You can probably find it before me if you go on YouTube and search "why leaders eat last". If you find it please post it here for others to examine.

At first a lot of the concepts seem to contradict red pill theory and maybe some do but it would be interesting to see some discussion about the video

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 01:32 PM

I do understand you clearer now, thanks. Also, how would machiavellian or dark triad men fit in this concept or male honor? I would assume they would really have none.

Sleep-less • 2 points • 29 April, 2014 03:06 PM

Ok, think of a samurai. They have their own "code" to live by. If a samurai loses a duel to another samurai for example he must kill himself with his own sword. They have a specific social contract they take to become a samurai. Any samurai who abides by the terms of the contract is honourable.

A garbage man has a duty to turn up to work, sober, on time and otherwise fit for work. He has a duty to perform his job competently and to the satisfaction of the public he serves and his employer. If your garbage men do this, they are honourable garbage men.

To me and you, thieves are not honourable. Some even say there is no honour among thieves, but if two thieves in a partnership abide by the social contract they make with each other, to each other they are honourable.

If somebody is honourable to you, what you are saying is you can "trust" them to behave in a way that will not infringe on your interests, and to a reasonable degree, will act to help, and act in the interests of others when it is reasonable for them to do so. (Read others as people who are a part of the same social contract, not necessarily everybody). You can also trust their word and the promises they make. You can trust them to turn up on time and at the place they say they are going to.

When you say you "trust" somebody, what you are saying is, you can predict how they will react to situations with a high degree of certainty. You leave your missus with your best friend alone. If you can trust him, your saying he won't try and fuck her and your confident about this fact.

Hope that helps.

[deleted] • 2 points • 29 April, 2014 10:29 PM

I see. Basically it would be sort of a social contract system.

How about marriage? Can there be such a thing as a honorable wife as well as honorable groom?

Or in the earlier example, wouldn't it also apply to a garbageman (an honorable one)?

I understand now that perhaps historically honor was a male concept, but what's stopping women from being honorable at what they do nowadays?

Sleep-less • 1 point • 30 April, 2014 06:27 AM\*

Traditionally, gender roles have relied heavily upon honour. A woman who cheated on her husband ("Dishonouring" him) would become a public pariah, or worse a corpse. A woman definitely had to be honourable. They were the ones who were most accountable to the consequences of breaching the contract. A man could do what he dam pleased.

These days we tend to have a justice system weighted towards women, social media is geared toward the protection of women, men are depicted as martyrs in mediums such as film and television expected to sacrifice for women. You are expected to stay on the titanic.

When media discusses changed to laws regarding sex attacks and new rights afforded to the "victims", we rarely hear about the "accused" we hear about her attacker, and this is prejudicial as it assumes 100% guilt.

Women see all of this. Gender roles are being reversed in a way. Whereas in the past women were expected to behave a certain way, and would be held socially accountable(good wife), now men are. A woman gets up in your face and barrages you with abuse? She even strikes you? You better swallow your pride and walk away, because if you so much as shove her, your going to be a spouse abuser to her entire family and the local pub.

Women take advantage of the system today the way men did in the past. If your wife didn't wanna give it up? Tough. She didn't have dinner on the table? She got too black eyes. Mayaswell tell her twice so she doesn't forget eh? Does that sound like honourable behaviour? She couldn't leave you. She would have been an outcast in the community.

People will always take advantage of a system weighted in their favour. Honourable people don't. A woman strikes you, it's usually no big deal, your a bloke, suck it up. You strike a woman and you've got 3 cop cars there in a matter of minutes and a justice system that's "cracking down" on domestic violence ready to sentence you harshly to make an example. "This is what we do to monsters".

Generally the honourable partner has the most to lose out of not following the social contract in a relationship. There are honourable women. They treat you with respect, and expect to be treated with respect.

Honour is a very complex topic. It's a form of peer pressure more than anything. It's a way of making sure that private relationships can be "peer reviewed" in a way. There can be libraries of books written on the topic.

Get the red pill perspective on this, start a thread on the topic.

[deleted] • 21 points • 28 April, 2014 03:42 PM

This is so important, and something I didn't properly take on board initially.

Not only must you be someone who can provide, you must always be able to keep it up. Hence the 'a woman will not love you unconditionally'

j0hnan0n • 18 points • 28 April, 2014 04:01 PM

<http://www.smbc-comics.com/?id=2773>

We should all be aware that the word 'unconditional' is pretty much always a lie. I, for one, strive to be one of the most conditional people on the planet. Life depends on specific conditions. So does attraction. Anyone who appears to profess a genuine belief in ANYTHING unconditional is deluding themselves, about the topic at hand, and likely about almost anything else.

bitzin • 29 points • 28 April, 2014 04:08 PM

Its entirely true.

If you're a good supporter your entire life, but at age 45 you find yourself unable to work I'm willing to bet the woman of the house will quickly be on her way.

If you're a good boyfriend but are going through a rough or difficult patch in your life in which you become distant, preoccupied or worst of all, sad, you can be willing to bet your girlfriend will leave you in an instant.

I don't entirely agree with the notion women won't seek out future benefit. A friend of mine recently graduated from medical school to become an intern, even with his relatively low current pay rate he is receiving a large amount of interest from women as a whole. Why? The tag and the option of attaining future wealth. Basically they're putting their bags on his ship and hoping it takes the to their destination, a destination which they may be unable to attain had he already arrived.

Invalidity • 23 points • 28 April, 2014 04:52 PM

Girls are actually more attracted to guys who are distant and pre-occupied. It is just when guys hit a rough patch, they tend to convey their frustrations and emotions through their body language. When going through bouts of depression, guys may try to lean on their partners for support, but women often expect men to be their pillars of strength. Weakness from a man indicates a weak pillar, which means that whatever structure the man is supporting may collapse soon.

Nobody wants to be inside a structure that is caving in. And this is exactly what makes men different from

women, men have a natural tendency to try to be heroic and women have a more natural tendency to seek cover and stay out of harm's way.

tmpjb • 5 points • 28 April, 2014 07:14 PM

Notice how you said intern (residence). Briffault's law says its directly proportional the amount (docter salary is high) and inversely proportoinal to the length ( almost there ). Your example proves it because no girls are going after pre-med guys.

bitzin • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 02:11 AM

Thats very true. The closer you are to completion or a higher pay grade the more likely they are to come. Also the more evidence you show you can actually do it the more likely they are to come. Someone with a degree is just that, someone with a degree until they show long term potential of actual earning capacity. I'm sure if a guy was 100% certain he would get a multi million dollar inheritance in 5 years and women knew this they would stay as its certain. But maybe not for 50% certainty.

LastRevision • 4 points • 28 April, 2014 05:40 PM

Each example should be preceded by "if the woman is still sexually valuable."

redpilltree • 3 points • 29 April, 2014 01:35 AM

They all won't leave you instantly but for the ones that do stay, as Chris Rock said, the clocks ticking.

newpopehere1 • 17 points • 29 April, 2014 12:00 AM

Girl: Tell me babe whats bothering you?

Guy: Its nothing

Girl: C'mon babe you know its good to talk!

Guy: No its fine

Girl: I know somethings bothering you babe, tell me.

Guy: Im just stressed from work, not getting along with my new boss. Also i dont think I am getting paid enough.

Girl: ahan ahan oh ok

Guy: blah blah blah

*Later that night girl calls her friend*

Girl: Yeah I think i need to break up with Steve he is soooooo negative you know?

csdx[ ] • 3 points • 28 April, 2014 07:01 PM\*

So does it then follow that the point of adopting a red pill philosophy is to be more like a woman in this regard? Only associate with women if you are deriving a benefit? Honestly though it seems like it should be expected that people only enter into relationships which they believe will be beneficial. So perhaps red pill is more about being less willing to accept promises of future benefit and more focused on current benefit.

gg\_s • 10 points • 28 April, 2014 08:01 PM

You are doing TRP right to concern yourself less with how things *should* be and more with how things actually are.

[deleted] • 2 points • 28 April, 2014 09:05 PM

I'd like to note that there was another group of people that concerned themselves with how things were and tried to manipulate the sexual marketplace in their favor and they were extremely successful in that venture, they're called feminists.

"What should be" and "what is" are too often separate things but history shows that we can change these things to reflect an ideological goal. There have been times in history where women were subject to keeping their honor intact for fear of falling out of favor with society, or worse, if we give women harsh social consequences for certain actions they will modify their behavior because they are so concerned about social perception.

We can change the rules of the game.

Zosimasie • 2 points • 28 April, 2014 08:06 PM

I feel your addition of 'agreement' and 'null and void' take it away from 'animal family' and make it more human-centric.

General\_Fear • 2 points • 29 April, 2014 03:21 AM

Briffault's Law trips me up. Let's translate into plain English.

Basically, women think, "what have you done for me lately". Then chew men up and spit them out when they are done. Right?

Human\_v2 • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 08:01 AM

It's not really a case of 'thinking' this, women aren't conspiring to ditch men whenever they show weakness. It's more that women feel an intuitive repulsion towards men who are weak and an inability to provide 'value' to a woman will destroy the attraction she had.

This is what is meant by when people say women love conditionally, it's not that women are lying about how they feel it's that they cannot help but become unattracted to a man who fails to bring continued 'benefit from association'. The benefit can be a number of things, money, social status, emotional support etc. For example, in a beta orbiter 'relationship' the woman will often cease contact as soon as the man withdraws his constant supply of validation.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 April, 2014 08:17 PM

I think it's important to mention the power of potential benefit. If you're jacked out of your skull or it looks like you're rolling in dough it's usually not even necessary to physically defend her or materially provide for her. Just her knowledge that you could protect/provide seems to be enough for the short-term. She may even try to spend resources on you as a way of investing in your capital.

circihat • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 01:03 AM

Please do not think Benefit just equals money, I see a lot of people acting like they are getting the shit end of the deal because they think girls only want money.

Your leadership is a resource, this is why a girl will leave a stable happy family to fuck some jobless loser, because she desires his leadership and strength.

Even though great physical strength is almost useless these days, it's still prized among females; simply because they haven't biologically evolved to make any use out of green paper and neither have man.

[deleted] • 1 point • 29 April, 2014 04:50 AM\*

[deleted]

What is this?

AngraMainyuu • 1 point • 28 April, 2014 06:37 PM\*

So much for men "using" women, this makes it sound like every goddamn woman out there are "using" men!  
Does anyone give a shit about anyone else but themselves anymore!?

[deleted] • 3 points • 28 April, 2014 09:11 PM

Red pill is very cynical about the idea's you've raised as it's clear most people only follow "the rules" when it suits them. But on some level we use other people to meet our needs. Those that don't want to use people like things often end up at the bottom of the pile completely fucked over by following "right and wrong".

MakeTheSexyTalk • 6 points • 28 April, 2014 07:23 PM

Don't get caught up in the language, everybody "uses" everyone else.