

# Proper interpretation of the Captain/First-Officer model

September 20, 2018 | 68 upvotes | by [man\\_in\\_the\\_world](#)

---

Many guys here misinterpret the Captain/First-Officer model for marital leadership as a formal military/Star-Trek-style, appointed or agreed-upon official chain of command. This is a flawed interpretation which will serve you poorly; the informal "Leader-of-the-Pack"/"Best-Mate" leadership model, which is natural to small voluntary human social groups, should be your goal.

## Forget Star Trek, the Army, and adult supervision

The military/Star-Trek-style, formal chain-of-command view of leadership *is actually deeply blue-pill*, because the leader is *appointed* by some higher external authority (admiral; Star Fleet headquarters; teacher; Bible), or elected or negotiated (which means that it can be withdrawn or renegotiated), and often ends up with a beta or inferior man in charge. (Have you ever wondered why so many red-blooded ex-military/police show up here with deeply blue-pill ideas and behavior and failing marriages? Now you know why!)

Formal, chain-of-command leadership is unnatural, inefficient, demotivating, and an ongoing source of conflict and resentment in small, voluntary or informal social groups (such as families; small gangs; groups of friends; pickup sports teams). In such groups, the leader emerges organically, based on his superior "alpha" and social traits. The leader is never formally voted on or declared, but everybody in the group knows who the true leader is and defers to him, his vision, plans, decisions, and judgments. This is informal "Leader of the Pack" or "pirate captain" leadership, with voluntary followers inspired by the implicit "captain" and his vision. If well led, small groups of inspired and motivated followers are generally much more productive, harmonious, cohesive, and happier than formally structured organizations.

In such groups, a "right-hand man" or "best mate" often emerges with whom the leader preferentially takes counsel, delegates secondary leadership, and entrusts to represent him or lead when he's away. The "best mate" *earns* this trust and role by being the most loyal, dedicated, diligent, and capable follower fully committed to the leader's vision and mission. This is the informal "first officer" role that you want your wife to spontaneously and willingly take up.

## Becoming the Leader of your Pack

Leadership of the pack is never negotiated or discussed, but is simply *claimed* by the actions and behavior [\(not words; don't do this\)](#) of the "alpha". If you have to negotiate being the captain, **you aren't a real captain.**

[Think about it, if she has to approve it, it means she is still leading. Leading is not achieved with verbal arguments so she recognizes your leadership.](#)

[This excellent post](#) by [/u/strategos\\_autokrator](#) describes how to become the leader of your pack:

Leaders don't need permission to lead. They just lead, period. Those that like your vision follow willingly. Those that don't, well, they are useless to your vision, so you won't miss them when they stay behind. It is that laser-beam focus of the vision of the leader and doing whatever it takes to get to the goal that inspires others to follow. Thinking others have to follow so you can

lead is having it all backwards, and this backward thinking is *why she doesn't trust you to lead*.

Don't negotiate or discuss "who's the captain" with your wife; just **be** the superior productive, effective and charismatic leader of your pack, and she will likely follow and happily assume the "first/best mate" role over time.

---

For you hopeless Star Trek nerds, Khan, not Picard, is your model.

---

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

---

## Comments

---

Persaeus • 25 points • 20 September, 2018 02:42 PM

For you hopeless Star Trek nerds, Khan, not Picard, is your model.

your're a fucking genius MitW

SorcererKing • 5 points • 20 September, 2018 05:00 PM

Khan

So funny... was going to bring up good ol' Khan but OP beat me to it.

"Botany Bay? Botany Bay! Oh no! Oh NO!"

SteelSharpensSteel • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 11:17 AM

The Captains Council should be changed to the Klingon High Council. Just sayin'.

Rian\_Stone • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 12:45 PM

khan wasn't klingon. He was Ishmael.

SteelSharpensSteel • 2 points • 21 September, 2018 03:04 PM\*

Hab SoSll' Quch!

(translation: Your mother has a smooth forehead!)

Rian\_Stone • 2 points • 21 September, 2018 03:20 PM\*

deleted

[deleted] • 7 points • 20 September, 2018 02:53 PM

+1 on genius

[deleted] • 2 points • 28 September, 2018 06:47 PM

Damn y'all are nerds!

redwall92 • 7 points • 20 September, 2018 02:41 PM

A lot of men didn't have coming of age experiences that included groups of friends that exemplify this model without parental involvement/intrusion. Parental involvement may be necessary at some level in a oversight function; I don't deny kids will be stupid sometimes, and stupid might be better mitigated at some levels. But parental oversight easily moves to parental intrusion that limits the kids' ability to learn to function in society by natural rules.

I am wrestling with how much parental "oversight" is best at each stage of my children's growth.

However, parents will not always be present to enforce their rules - which are most likely Disney rules or marriage 1.0 rules. The kids are left to grow into men that don't know how to function unless they can appeal to some rule set to make life work for them (church, marriage 1.0, military, etc).

"The Outsiders" by SE Hinton is a good example of the 'leader of the pack' mentality. Darry never asked to be in

charge. He never acted like he was in charge. He just was. Plan and simply. If he wasn't around, then there were a few other guys that would fill the "in charge role" without debate, discussion, or even conscious thought. Some guys just guy? Hmm.. Never typed that out before...

Be that guy. Don't try to be "that guy." You do you. That's what this forum is about. I love this place.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 4 points • 20 September, 2018 05:45 PM

A lot of men didn't have coming of age experiences that included groups of friends that exemplify this model without parental involvement/intrusion. ... But parental oversight easily moves to parental intrusion that limits the kids' ability to learn to function in society by natural rules.

This!

I think that lack of exposure to the natural "male social matrix" and experience with and proper socialization in informal male peer groups is a disaster for our boys, and our society.

redwall92 • 4 points • 20 September, 2018 06:27 PM

Read Iron John by Robert Blye for a good description of making a break with the "Mother" that most men in our times never did - for which we are reaping the consequences. The idea of initiation into manhood is covered in detail in his book as well.

It's been interesting watching my boys. Oldest is 15 now. My wife went through a rough time a year ago and made some wacko choices with rough effects for our whole family. My oldest (14 at the time) very readily made a break from her mothering. It seemed easy for him. Another son who was 11 at the time was clearly not ready to make the same break from his mother. I read Iron John and was thinking on these things during this time, and it was interesting to see the difference between how the boys reacted. My 8 year old son didn't have any idea what was really going on. He just cried some days getting ready for school. No break with mom in his department yet.

I still have anger sometimes because I know I never made that break in good ways - anger at my father, anger at myself, just anger for anger's sake ... you know, living in the past-type shit that's good for nothing other than lifting or running.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 10:14 PM

Young men today are growing up in a very different environment than I did ...

SteelSharpensSteel • 6 points • 20 September, 2018 05:50 PM

This post should be integrated in the sidebar some way. With all the hubbub around captain/first officer model in Athol Kay's book and in the posts - this evolved point make it more clear on leading.

rocknrollchuck • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 11:14 PM

I was going to say the same thing.

RuleZeroDAD • 5 points • 20 September, 2018 08:17 PM

I won't go down with the ship if changing ships makes more sense.

I also won't captain a vessel without the enthusiastic support of my crew.

Destination matters, not the ship or its crew. If I offer a boring, dangerous, and poorly executed itinerary, only stupid, bottom barrel, desperate, or crazy people would agree to sail.

MrChad\_Thundercock • 3 points • 21 September, 2018 02:41 AM\*

Great post.

If you're a shit captain, expect for mother fuckers to be jumping overboard like it's the titanic to find a new ship.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 2 points • 21 September, 2018 03:41 AM

Or to try to take over command, either openly or by stealth.

j\_arbuckle2012 • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 05:53 PM\*

CEO and secretary.

Or King and concubine, if you want to get medieval.

The CEO is the CEO, no matter what. His authority is self-evident. He rules. Period. Same for the King.

A secretary is nice to have, but unnecessary. A CEO can function without her. She gains more being the CEO's secretary than she would with any other man. She is ultimately replaceable though. Same for a concubine.

[deleted] • 4 points • 20 September, 2018 07:54 PM

Pimp and Hoe.

RedPillRedemption • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 06:13 PM

One that works well is the "responsible teenager".

You don't give full access to your bank account to a secretary, concubine or teenager. Not even a large sum of money.

You make rules, she follows. It's not a tyranny because you still care, but the power to decide belongs to you.

j\_arbuckle2012 • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 08:47 PM

No. That infantilizes them. She has a role. She either performs her role to standard or you find someone who does.

She's not a teenager. She's an adult. And she is fully capable of acting like one.

RedPillRedemption • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 12:34 AM\*

It's a mindset to keep the relationship balanced.

I could try to expand more on that, but Rollo says it better.

hystericalbonding • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 10:06 PM

One that works well is the "responsible teenager".

One of many strategies for handling shit tests from good women and daily life with shitty women. Not a good permanent arrangement if you value more than sex and servitude from your wife. I prefer a woman who is self-sufficient.

RedPillRedemption • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 12:36 AM

I agree. But it's a mindset to maintain the relationship cardinality. 50/50 relationships don't exist, there's always a power balance.

Self-sufficient, yes, but not power to trample your decisions.

adeptintact • 2 points • 23 September, 2018 02:30 AM

I disagree. Picard is appointed captain by starfleet because he does have leadership traits. Riker also could be captain but defers to Picard since he's captain, following the chain of command. Indeed in some episodes, Riker is the captain of other ships.

Likewise in a marriage, some wives are independent and can lead if needed. However, if the wife understands the ultimate authority belongs to the husband, or captain, she will defer to him.

Definitely acting like a leader helps cement this. If the wife consciously understands the husband is the captain, she won't try to attain ultimate power if the husband is failing at times.

I'm a firm believer in chain of command in the military, at work, and even in a marriage. I wouldn't be so quick to disregard it. It has been the foundation of a functioning society.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 1 point • 23 September, 2018 05:55 AM\*

Picard is appointed captain by starfleet because he does have leadership traits.

The structure of leadership in the military (appointed command) is blue-pill. This in no way implies that natural leaders can never rise to leadership there, only that the system doesn't select for it as does the natural informal system.

Likewise in a marriage, some wives are independent and can lead if needed. However, if the wife understands the ultimate authority belongs to the husband, or captain, she will defer to him.

And why, exactly, should such a wife automatically "understand" or accept this, and agree to defer to a hapless beta or a man-child? My highly competent, independent wife wouldn't!

In our modern society, what higher authority do you envision enforcing the "husband is always captain" chain of command? According to your Picard/Riker=natural-leaders argument, a highly competent wife would and should be appointed captain over her loser husband.

Your argument is inconsistent, and unrealistic, wishful thinking.

adeptintact • 1 point • 23 September, 2018 05:39 PM

Your natural informal system has no basis in formal structure. Even if your petty officer exhibits alpha traits, there is no guarantee that anyone would follow this person as he has no official authority. He will just be thought of as a rebel that people will disregard.

You should act like the captain or leader over your wife, but if this is not understood by your wife, then what power do you really have. I bet if many try to follow this and people ask their wives who is the boss in the relationship, most would say it's equal or would even deny that their husband is.

However, if your wife openly agrees to and submits to your leadership, then there is no misunderstanding when making decisions. You naturally lead but also she knowingly submits to your authority. This is similar to the extremes of a slave who willingly consents to a master's authority, in a D&S relationship. Some have contracts where the wife willingly accepts this. To say that the husband has no authority just because the wife agrees and chooses this is ludicrous. I argue it shows the husband as the true captain, leader, and alpha when the wife recognizes this authority and submits to him.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 1 point • 23 September, 2018 10:06 PM\*

Your natural informal system has no basis in formal structure.

Of course not; that's what *informal* means.

Even if your petty officer exhibits alpha traits, there is no guarantee that anyone would follow this person as he has no official authority.

In voluntary associations like marriage, people associate with and follow whoever they choose to follow. There is no higher authority *with the power to compel obedience* to the official authority; it is always and only voluntary. Pretending otherwise by negotiating verbal "agreement" to a chain of command alters nothing other than serving as a false comfort blanket for your ego and feelings of insecurity.

You should act like the captain or leader over your wife, but if this is not understood by your wife, then what power do you really have.

"If you want to be the captain, the only power you have is your ability to walk away. The woman can either hit the bricks, or get with the program. And since we don't have hard power mechanisms (rule of thumb, or other barbarism) we only have soft power, or the velvet glove." There simply *is* nothing else; accept and embrace this reality rather than seeking to negotiate a fiction to mask and soothe your insecurity.

I bet if many try to follow this and people ask their wives who is the boss in the relationship, most would say it's equal or would even deny that their husband is.

Who cares? Words and polite fictions, and this kind of validation, mean nothing in comparison with the actual behavior. My own wife might very well say that it's equal in our marriage, or more likely that we each lead in different aspects; not only do I not care what she would say, if such a narrative increases her buy-in, commitment, and contribution toward the things I care about as well as her own, I *welcome* it. This kind of empowering ambiguity is part of the *power* of informal leadership systems, and should be embraced and exploited rather than feared.

if your wife openly agrees to and submits to your leadership, then there is no misunderstanding when making decisions.

The verbal agreement means nothing if your wife agrees in order to placate you but doesn't follow; if she follows, the words were unneeded. Your faith in the power of an unenforceable verbal agreement (probably extracted under some duress) is touchingly beta, but naive, and driven by your need to reduce your insecurity. It merely highlights your weakness to her, and to us.

I argue it shows the husband as the true captain, leader, and alpha when the wife recognizes this authority and submits to him.

You are giving the wife the ultimate authority to affirm (or not) the husband as the captain, leader, and alpha. This Dancing Monkey perspective is antithetical to everything that we stand for here at MRP.

adeptintact • 1 point • 23 September, 2018 11:42 PM

If your wife would say you are equal, then you are effectively an alpha and leader in your own mind, but possibly not in reality. That may make you feel better, but doesn't change the truth. It does feel good to be a legend in your own mind. In fact her saying you are equal means she DOES have the ultimate authority because she doesn't recognize yours.

If your wife acknowledges that you are the boss and DOES follow and submit to you, that is the state of being a true captain and alpha.

If you can get to a point such as in a D&S relationship, where you have a written contract that

says the rules and so forth, that is being the ultimate alpha and captain.  
No reason for us to go back and forth on this. Let us agree to disagree.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 1 point • 24 September, 2018 12:36 AM

You do you, Cap'n. Until she takes your fancy hat away.

Sepean • 3 points • 20 September, 2018 02:19 PM

Yeah, that whole captain FO thing never sat right with me either.

Back in the early days of MRP the metaphor I thought was best suited was office rivals. You sort of share goals for your home and family but you're still fighting for position and you each have your own selfish interests, and the banter between rivals fits A&A.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 9 points • 20 September, 2018 02:31 PM

Viewing your wife as a rival seems like an undesirable model on several levels.

Rian\_Stone • 12 points • 20 September, 2018 03:51 PM\*

deleted

JDRoedell • 7 points • 20 September, 2018 04:06 PM

Jesus how do you string together these truth bombs so concisely?

If you want to be the captain, the only power you have is your ability to walk away. The woman can either hit the bricks, or get with the program. And since we don't have hard power mechanisms (rule of thumb, or other barbarism) we only have soft power, or the velvet glove.

Describes OPs point beautifully

[deleted] • 6 points • 20 September, 2018 04:57 PM

why not?

harder to build the value add cycle.

the only power you have is your ability to walk away.

the inherent desire for women to please men they deem worth pleasing.

hystericalbonding • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 10:02 PM

harder to build the value add cycle

+1

It's mutually beneficial, not a zero sum game.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 05:13 PM

If you want to be the captain, the only power you have is your ability to walk away. The woman can either hit the bricks, or get with the program. And since we don't have hard power mechanisms (rule of thumb, or other barbarism) we only have soft power, or the velvet glove.

Yes, exactly. Same as in the business world for people with highly marketable skills.



bogeyd6 • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 11:45 PM

Will agree here. You can't bring the art of war to bear if you don't see her as an enemy.

redwall92 • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 02:46 PM

The best leaders end up turning even rivals into cheerleaders/followers. Or ... the rope gets cut one way or another because dead branches are pruned when necessary by good leaders.

I think the wife as a rival is understandable given RP understanding of her actions and motives behind those actions. It's almost like "woman" is the rival at that level, and the man must fight to maintain his masculine expression; he must fight against things that would remove it from him - including his own beta tendencies as well as the tendencies of his woman.

Persaeus • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 03:07 PM

viewing your wife as a rival or on the other team has a lot of potential negative repercussions.

however, there is a facet of the male/female LTR dynamic that doesn't fit into the "leader of the gang/team" dynamic that bro's are trying to capture with the "rival" concept

betaization. i believe there is a biological drive in women to beta-ize her mate in order to lock him down for her benefit. of course, she also want's an alpha and has these two cross currents going on. in the way of passing shit test, being OI, demonstrating you have options you are essentially a rival to her beta bux tendencies.

JDRoedell • 4 points • 20 September, 2018 03:43 PM

I've come to understand this cross current like this;

If Her desire to have an alpha outweighs her dread that some younger/hotter/better woman could compete and win them she'll want and reinforce alpha behavior (I.e. she'll fall into your frame.)

On the flip side, if her dread is overpowering her desire to be with a confident alpha man, then she'll try to beta-ize the man. After all, it's easier to fatten up your husband and make him a supplicating simp than it is to actually have to better yourself as a woman to stay on par .

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 04:33 PM\*

i believe there is a biological drive in women to beta-ize her mate in order to lock him down for her benefit.

Surely there is ... just as there is for your boss to get you to focus on his or the company's benefit rather than your own career advancement, for your parents to get you to support your siblings, the military to train you to follow orders ... and in every other human relationship. Pushing back to maintain the best balance between our own interest and those of others is *always* necessary; I somehow fail to see why the challenge should be considered so different or difficult with one's wife, or why we observe this universal human urge to "domesticate" and exploit each other with such singular horror when it's our wives.

Persaeus • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 12:33 PM

I somehow fail to see why the challenge should be considered so different or difficult with one's wife

it's a good question; and i'm not sure i have the answer. however, i can say in my own personal experience i'm absolutely ruthless in putting my interest above others to the point of "running

over/through people" except in the singular case of women i'm fucking.

i think this is so common that it's a "feature not a bug". so yes it's different. i have had to actively train my brain to break this feature.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 02:46 PM

i think this is so common that it's a "feature not a bug". so yes it's different. i have had to actively train my brain to break this feature.

Interesting thought. Not my personal experience, but maybe I'm the odd man out.

Persaeus • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 04:18 PM

It's a gift , it's a feature of a natural or alpha

Rian\_Stone • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 02:54 PM\*

deleted

Sepean • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 02:44 PM

Why? That's how women treat non-alpha partners.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 3 points • 20 September, 2018 03:30 PM

Why?

I don't acknowledge even the *possibility* of competition in leading the things I care about; I just *lead* and *do*: you can follow, or stay out of my way.

I wouldn't be in a relationship with someone who didn't variously respect/support/share most of my vision and missions and thereby add value to my life.

Sepean • 3 points • 20 September, 2018 03:43 PM

Because you're alpha. As a beta, and in the transition from beta to alpha, that approach won't work. I don't know your backstory, but me and most of the guys had wives who fought us tooth and nail when we started taking the reigns, and for years before we found RP they actively sabotaged us with their "advice" on how they needed comfort and communication and gifts and blah blah.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 04:16 PM\*

We're here to talk about our end goals and to strategize on how to transition to them, not to whine about how much resistance we get from our wives due to our past beta failures to lead.

I don't know your backstory

I admit that I was never beta in this way and never had to make the transition myself, so I defer to /u/strategos\_autokrator's post for how to do that. I've retained and even grown my "alpha" "captain" status throughout 30+ years of marriage by maintaining my primal focus on my missions and vision, and leading well in the areas important to me.

Sepean • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 04:29 PM

We're here to talk about our end goals and to strategize on how to transition to them, not to whine about how much resistance we get from our wives due to our past beta failures to lead.

Noone is whining, it's just how women are. And it has nothing to do with leading or not leading.

I've retained and even grown my "alpha" status throughout 30+ years of marriage by maintaining my primal focus on my missions and vision.

What makes you say that? It sounds like classic confusing correlation with causality.

Look around you. Look at alpha losers, look at beta CEOs, look at beta men trying with all they have to save their dead bedroom marriages. It's clear that women value alpha, not mission and vision.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 04:44 PM

By "alpha" status I meant "leadership" or "captain" status, not the RP sense; my bad.

redwall92 • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 02:49 PM

Why? ~~That's how women treat non-alpha partners.~~

Who cares what women ...

Rian\_Stone • 7 points • 20 September, 2018 02:57 PM\*

deleted

Sepean • 4 points • 20 September, 2018 03:08 PM

Not caring is fine. But if you go into a relation with a cooperative mindset and the other party is adversarial and deceptive, it ends up bad for you. Which is why team and leadership ideas are dangerous when there are women involved.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 3 points • 20 September, 2018 03:49 PM

That's why you go into the things that matter to you with

that laser-beam focus of the vision of the leader and doing whatever it takes to get to the goal

This is why we stress **mission** here. Yes, a missionless, visionless, go-along-to-get-along chump will get co-opted into his wife's (or boss's, or friend's) vision and mission if he has none of his own, and get as little respect for it as he deserves.

Sepean • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 04:09 PM

No, you can have all the vision and mission you want, if you go at a relationship like you would a team you're going to fail.

Take our mantra of not listening to your wife. Can you imagine that in a team setting?

Can you imagine a team member that says what really motivates him is X when in reality getting X makes him hate his job?

On the other hand, some rudderless loser who lacks any goal outside of lifting, fucking

and partying will have girls submit to him just because he's alpha.

*You* value your mission. Your wife just submits to you because you're alpha and adopts your mission because of that. But she only cares because you do - stay alpha and drop your mission, she'll stay submissive; lose your alpha and keep your mission, she'll treat you like shit.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 05:07 PM

No, you can have all the vision and mission you want, if you go at a relationship like you would a team you're going to fail.

Take our mantra of not listening to your wife. Can you imagine that in a team setting?

Can you imagine a team member

No. I am not merely a team **member**; I am the team **leader**. There's a fundamental difference.

And yes, I quite often "don't listen" to members of my teams. That's part of my responsibility, *as the leader*.

Can you imagine a team member that says what really motivates him is X when in reality getting X makes him hate his job?

Yes, I encounter this not infrequently as a manager. Managing around this to keep these employees both productive and satisfied in spite of themselves is a key component of my leadership skills. Nothing new here that's unique to marriage.

Sepean • 1 point • 20 September, 2018 05:14 PM

I think you're just arguing for the sake of it now. Or maybe you can't unwrap your personal experience with your wife (who submits due your alphaness) from the general behavior of women.

To the degree that you shouldn't listen to your wife, I have a really hard time imagining that you keep an employee around that talks like that.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 05:27 PM

I have a really hard time imagining that you keep an employee around that talks like that.

In "creative" industries your best performers are often somewhat "difficult", but there's a real competitive advantage in effectively "managing" such people.

Of course, there's a limit. Knowing where to draw the line is also part of the job.

SteelSharpensSteel • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 03:12 PM

Though you absolutely want your woman on your team. It is not sustainable if she's not.

Sepean • 3 points • 20 September, 2018 03:37 PM

Sure, when you're sufficiently alpha she'll follow and submit. It's still very different to the male team dynamics. A woman will shit on a beta trying to help her even when it is in her

best interest to cooperate, but she'll let an alpha abuse her and lead her into deep trouble. Much of the stuff that males value - loyalty, common interests, reciprocity - doesn't factor for them, at all.

JDRoedell • 3 points • 20 September, 2018 03:50 PM

It's like the US's relationship with the Russians pre-1945. We're on the same team but don't get too complacent.

Rian\_Stone • 2 points • 20 September, 2018 02:24 PM\*

deleted

johneyapocalypse • 5 points • 20 September, 2018 03:02 PM

Benevolent dictator works for me.

Fressshyyy • 2 points • 21 September, 2018 11:16 AM

This may get downvoted to hell but I need to make this comment anyways. I agree with everything posted here except for the view taken towards military officers and them being essentially blue-pill and derivative.

History has shown that some of the most bad-ass, brutal and effective leaders have been military officers or leaders. Every war has them. Dick Winters in WW2, Kurt Chew-Een Lee in the Korean War, David Hackworth in Vietnam, and the countless brave souls fighting all over the world. If you don't know Kurt Lee, google that. He wore a pink vest, stood above the slit trenches and fired tracers from the hip to direct fire and lead his men. He was wounded four times and each time returned to his unit. The book About Face by Hackworth changed my thoughts regarding leadership in a significant way. We might not honestly be sitting here typing all this out if not for the leadership of those men, especially in WW2.

I realize there are a lot of bad leaders in the military that have wasted millions of lives on pointless campaigns but to categorically dismiss them I think, simply lacks historical context.

man\_in\_the\_world[S] • 2 points • 21 September, 2018 02:39 PM

view taken towards military officers and them being essentially blue-pill and derivative.

The *structure* of leadership in the military (appointed command) is blue-pill. This in no way implies that "alpha" individuals can never rise to leadership there, only that the system doesn't select for it as does the natural informal system.

Another thing that's blue-pill is interpreting what you read by how it affects your feelingz rather than what was actually said.

Westernhagen • 1 point • 21 September, 2018 02:42 PM

For many years I have worked with retired military officers. What I have observed repeatedly is almost a form of schizophrenia in the ways they deal with men and women. These guys can be decorated combat veterans and leaders of men, and still they are completely whipped bluepill pussies around their wives. (Part of this is that military culture still encourages a lot of stupid shit about "chivalry".) To think that a man is going to be a redpill alpha at home just because he killed hundreds of commies in Vietnam is a major mistake.

Even in the office environment, these ex-military guys treat male and female subordinates very differently. Girls can get away with just about anything - overt laziness and incompetence - and these guys won't do a

thing. If a male subordinate tried the same thing, he'd get a foot in his ass (like he should). Time and time again I've seen young women totally play these guys - basically, turn him into an office version of Mr Betabux who provides good things to her but she doesn't have to provide sex - and they eat it up.

helaughsinhidden • 1 point • 24 September, 2018 12:35 AM

This is awesome, Negan vs Rick would have been a great modern comparison. As for Star Trek to be honest I always thought of Kirk over Picard, he just has an attitude like he just assumed command on day one and no one had the balls to tell him otherwise.

[deleted] • 1 point • 28 September, 2018 06:53 PM

I think this might be true for some but it doesn't fit my experiences.

Just because I tell someone what's going on doesn't mean it's negotiated. Lol. Get yourself frame and some social skills and you can lay down the law.

People don't like it sometimes but facts are facts! "I will make decisions but will always listen to your input because I value your perspective."

You lead by appointing yourself. You keep lead by showing success. Children don't appoint parents. Children obey because it is natural. Women follow men for the same reason.